UNIVERSITY OF BATH

University of Bath

WELL-BEING IN DEVELOPMENT: COMPARING GLOBAL DESIGNS WITH LOCAL VIEWS IN PERU

James Copestake, University of Bath.[*]

Disagreements over development arise in part from different ways of thinking about human well-being, an issue explored here with reference to two pieces of empirical research in Peru. The first is an analysis of ontological assumptions underpinning secondary literature on development policy at the national level. The second is the pilot testing of a combined ethnographic and psychometric approach to measuring individuals' perceptions of well-being. Congruence and disjuncture between the different views of well-being that emerge from this analysis are systematically explored, along with the potential for reducing such is gaps as a means to improving development practice. The paper also examines the link between such analysis and the role of what Mignolo refers to as "border thinking" within the geopolitics of knowledge.

Key words. Development, well-being, mental models, border thinking, Peru.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper contrasts global and local understandings of well-being that underpin different views of development. It does so by juxtaposing a well-being analysis of development policy literature at the national level in Peru with findings from a pilot survey of latent well-being goals in economically marginal communities across the central part of the country. The main purpose of the paper is to argue the case for more empirical research into well-being as a foundation for better development theory, policy and practice.

The paper draws on research carried out in Peru between 2000 and 2005 by members of the Wellbeing in Developing Countries (WeD) research group.[1] One goal of the group was to conduct systematic and explicit analysis of the well-being discourse employed by different stakeholders in development activities. This partly builds on actor-oriented sociology (Long and Long, 1994) and can be linked to subsequent ethnographic research into congruence and disjuncture between stakeholders in the delivery of aid (e.g. De Vries and Nuijten 2002; Lewis and Mosse, 2006). It also resonates with the emphasis placed by advocates of participatory development on the importance of establishing shared values as a foundation for effective development intervention (e.g. Chambers, 2005; Burton and Kagan, 2005). In addition, the research draws on the psychology literature on well-being, emphasising the potential of eudaimonic over hedonic approaches - that emphasise goal achievement and living a meaningful life, rather than happiness (Ryan and Deci, 2001; Copestake and Camfield, 2009).

A second set of influences on the research comes from institutional economics. North (1990) emphasises how pervasive complexity and uncertainty force economic agents to select from a range of plausible mental models to inform their

actions. When shared, these become the value-laden and path-dependent foundation for the norms and rules governing human interaction as institutionalised patterns of activity (Denzau and North, 1994). The term shared mental model is broader than the concepts of paradigm, collective mindset and epistemic community (Kuhn, 1970; Goldsworthy, 1988; Haas, 1992). But it is also more precise than the loose amalgam of conscious and subconscious meanings, metaphors, images, stories and beliefs that constitute a discourse. Mental models reflect differences in material interests, and one definition of power is success in shaping those employed by others.

A third strand of literature that also emphasises the importance of competing discourses of development is associated with the Latin American coloniality study group (Escobar, 2004). This did not directly influence design of the research reported here, but does provide an interesting position from which to reflect upon it. A central concern of this group is the evolution of values and ideas that accompanied the material facts of European colonisation, or what Mignolo (2000) refers to as "colonial semiosis". This entails attempting to disentangle the hybrid influence on the Americas of colonial and modern ways of thinking associated with successive waves of globalisation, including Iberian Christianization, British led industrialisation and French/US inspired pursuit of citizens' rights over class interests and racial purity. Building on Wallerstein's idea of world systems theory and Quijano's concept of the "coloniality of power" Mingolo describes the geopolitics of knowledge as the persistent subordination of indigenous ideas and interests to the "global designs" of modern colonialism.

Mignolo suggests that authentic post-Occidental discourse, or what he calls "border thinking", goes beyond reflex opposition to modern/colonial views, not least because these are rooted in Europe and North America's own local histories. It also

amounts to something more creative than a *creole* refashioning of global designs to local context. It is trans-disciplinary and replaces Western separation of fact (*episteme*) from opinion (*doxa*) with contextually embedded knowledge (*gnosis*) or a fusion of globalized knowledge (associated with modernity, progress, technology, reason) and local knowledge and culture (associated with tradition, folklore and passion). One of the many examples of border thinking that he cites is Mariategui's adaptation of Marxist ideas (a global design) to Peruvian context (its local histories of racialised-class hierarchy) during the 1920s (Mignolo, 2000:140).

The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 2 draws upon the ideas of shared mental models of well-being to present a typology of four recent local adaptations of global designs guiding development policy in Peru. Section 3 juxtaposes these with a model of well-being based on primary data obtained through individual interviews that draw upon both actor-oriented social anthropology and quantitative social psychology. Section 4 compares the two approaches. Section 5 confronts the whole analysis with the idea of border thinking, and offers some initial thoughts on its potential relevance to development policy and practice.

2. SHARED MENTAL MODELS OF DEVELOPMENT IN PERU.

This section builds on a previously published review of literature on poverty, inequality and well-being in the national policy domain in Peru (Altamirano et al., 2004) by suggesting it can be classified into a typology of four shared mental models of development. Such typologies are many - other examples being those of Hunt (1989), Raczynski (1998), Pieterse (2001) and Clark (2002). While fixed in time and space, the typology presented here was not based on any formal method of textual analysis, and as an imperfect exercise in bounded rationality it can itself be defined as a mental model.

Its construction was informed by the assumption that a durable mental model of development necessarily encompasses a coherent view of well-being in three dimensions: normative (embodying a view of well-being as it *should be)*; historical (embodying a view of well-being as it *is*); and practical (concerned with how well-being *could be*). [2] Lack of internal coherence across these three dimensions would expose any such model to potentially devastating criticism as a guide to policy: a model lacking a coherent normative dimension would be open to the charge of being opportunistic, one lacking a historical dimension could easily be rejected as unrealistic, and one lacking a practical dimension as irrelevant to policy, for example.

Peru provides a particularly interesting country for this enquiry, as an arena for long and complex interaction of indigenous and external cultures and interests (Degregori, 2000). At the time of the research its economy had performed reasonably well for over fifteen years, during which it also experienced two democratic changes in government. But it remained one of the most unequal countries in the world, and its HDI ranking of 82 was 12 positions lower than its ranking according to GDP per person (Altamirano et al., 2004).

Table 1 presents the typology of four shared mental models. The <u>income first</u> model emphasises the importance of raising average output and income. After Fujimori's accession to the Peruvian Presidency in 1991 these policies can loosely be described as neo-liberal (Boas and Gans-Morse, 2010) in their emphasis on market deregulation, public sector reform and external trade liberalisation (Kuczynski and Williamson, 2003; Crabtree, 2006). A globally influential Peruvian contributor to this model was the economist Hernando de Soto, who advocates expanding the sphere of private enterprise through consolidation of property rights to unlock the "dead capital" of informal business operators (de Soto, 2001).

Second, the <u>needs first</u> model emphasises a direct approach to tackling multiple dimensions of poverty, defined as need deprivation or capability failure (Gasper, 2007:52-59; Gough and McGregor, 2007:11-16). It is particularly concerned with the role of the state in guaranteeing entitlement to services with public good characteristics including health, education, shelter, social protection and food security. In Peru -as elsewhere- it was promoted by the United Nations Development Programme (e.g. UNDP, 2002). The model underpinned criticism of the low proportion of government spending allocated to poverty and child welfare (e.g. Parodi, 2000; Vásquez et al., 2002) and of the poor design of social programmes that did exist (e.g. Tanaka, 2001).

The <u>rights first</u> model emphasises relational as well as material components of well-being, particularly the struggle against injustice and the potential for human rights discourse to mobilize marginalised citizens. This acknowledges the importance of personal agency and social relationships to well-being, as well as freedom from domination by others. In Peru, the model was influential among NGOs and in the health sector, gathering momentum through resistance to Shining Path and to Fujimori's authoritarianism, particularly the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (Wilson and Eyben, 2005; Youngers, 2006; Frisancho and Goulden, 2008). An analysis of how persistent inequality can be attributed to the difficulty of constructing a governing coalition committed to universal human rights is provided by Figueroa (2001). Achievement of rights, he argues, is a precondition for more equality of opportunity in access to public goods and to markets, and hence more egalitarian economic growth. But a stable feedback loop exists between racialised inequality of welfare outcomes, and culturally embedded clientelism that can only be broken through a "refoundational shock".

Advocates of a <u>local first</u> model affirm the importance of diverse local, vernacular and religious views of well-being. They regard the other three models as bound up with predominantly Western professional and bureaucratic interests that challenge cultural autonomy and diversity (Rahnema and Bawtree, 1997; Escobar, 1995). Rising income, need satisfaction and attainment of human rights can nevertheless coexist with apathy, alcoholism, depression and high rates of suicide within marginalised communities and ethnic groups. When generalised into a wider critique of globalised development the local first model can somewhat paradoxically also be viewed as another global design (Pieterse, 2001:211).

In Peru, <u>local first</u> can be linked to the idea of *"Lo Andino"* (e.g. Degregori, 2000; Apfell-Marglin, 2003; Masías, 2002). This refers to a social and cultural identity rooted in the uniqueness of the Andean environment and history that limits the possibility of fully translating into any other language indigenous concepts, such as *sumaq kaswsay*, a Quechua term for well-being. Despite being aware of the criticisms levelled at it by other Peruvian social scientists Mignolo is mildly supportive of the attempt of PRATEC and other groups to build a distinctive Andean ideology (2000:300), whereas his analysis is silent on Guzman's tragic adaptation of Maoist ideology to an Andean Peruvian context. The actor-oriented sociology and ethnographic literature referred to in Section 2 has also contributed to the debate over *Lo Andino*, particularly how cultural disjuncture (*desencuentros*) can undermine the goals of development agencies working in the Andes (e.g. De Vries and Nuijten, 2002; Trawick, 2003; Poole, 2004; Vincent, 2004; Bebbington et al., 2007; Radcliffe and Laurie, 2006). While Starn (1991) and other anthropologists warn against essentializing local experience, the renaissance of identity politics in the Andean countries is evidence of its enduring resonance (Yashar, 2005).

3. MEASURING INDIVIDUAL WELL-BEING USING LOCAL TERMS

(a) Methodology

As a counterpoint to the four "global designs" of development set out in Section 2 this section reports on design and piloting of a survey-based measure of well-being intended to permit quantitative comparison of individual perceptions of their well-being in a way that minimised imposition of the researchers' own values.[3] This was motivated by a lack of quantitative research into self-perceived well-being in poor or economically marginalized localities, including in Peru.[4]

A multi-stage data collection strategy was conducted in seven sites: a large shanty town on the outskirts of Lima, a poor neighbourhood of the Andean city of Huancayo, two rural district centres (one in the Mantaro Valley and one in Huancavelica) and three rural hamlets (two in Huancavelica and one in Eastern Junín). Data was collected by a team of six graduate anthropologists (four men and two women, including two native Quechua speakers) who spent more than a year living in the sites. Their first task was to collect data from which a profile of each community could be constructed (summarised in Alvarez et al. 2008). The relative material poverty of the sites was also confirmed by a household survey, from which it was estimated that two-thirds of selected households were below the national extreme poverty line (Copestake et al., 2008).

Next, the research team conducted 419 semi-structured interviews with a quota sample of men and women in each site. These were designed to elicit broad perceptions of respondents' quality of life using open-ended questions pre-tested for comprehensibility and equivalence in Spanish and Quechua (Alvarez, 2008:157). The researchers systematically recorded key words used in response to each, and this data

was subjected to content analysis to inform design of the questionnaire used in the next phase.

A key decision was taken at this stage to adopt a eudemonic view of well-being by defining it as the outcome of gaps between the importance or necessity attached to goals identified (through textual analysis of the qualitative data), and personal satisfaction with achievement of these goals. A third set of questions elicited information on resources with instrumental importance in achieving the same goals. Additional questions were also asked about prevailing values and personality and other factors, but these are not discussed in this paper (see Yamamoto et al., 2008). The resulting questionnaire was then used to interview 550 individuals across the same research sites.

The next step was to use factor analysis to reduce responses to questions about the importance or necessity of the 35 different well-being goals covered by the questionnaire to a smaller number of latent goals underlying them. The corresponding data on satisfaction with achievement of these goals was not subjected to a separate factor analysis. Instead, the preferred factor solution for goal necessity was imposed on goal satisfaction data also. This was possible because the goal and satisfaction questions were based on the same list of items, the only difference being whether respondents were asked how important each goal was or how satisfied they were with its achievement. This meant that goal satisfaction scores for each respondent were based on uniform weights reflecting the average view of the relative necessity of different goals across the whole sample.

(b) Survey findings

Starting with goal necessity, mean responses across the sample for the 35 items are shown in Table 2. This also reveals the preferred three factor solution. <u>Place to live</u>

better (PLB) was linked to three items: nice and clean neighborhood, tranquility (without violence or delinquency), and *salir adelante* (able to move ahead in the sense of resolving local problems). Raise a family (RAF) was linked to having a partner or spouse, and having children). Improvement with a secure base (ISB) was linked to having a salaried job, household goods, children's education, daily food and health, and better education.[5]

Table 2 also shows data on respondents' reported satisfaction with achievement of goals, while the last column indicates the difference in ranking of individual goals by necessity and by achievement satisfaction. There are at least three general reasons for expecting respondents to be generally more satisfied with those goals that they also regard as more important: first, they are likely to allocate more effort to important goals; second, their ranking of goals may reflect preference adaptation according to the feasibility of achieving them; third they may react emotionally to questions about the same goal regardless of whether framed by reference to goal necessity or to goal satisfaction. For these reasons, it is interesting to note those items for which the difference in ranking was greatest. In this case, satisfaction remained relatively low compared to necessity ranking for education of children, working for a salary and being a professional.

Analysis of additional questions about resources important to achievement of other goals revealed that seven items loaded onto a robust single factor solution: to get loans, to rent/lease land, saving, migration, inheritance, useful social contacts (e.g. for work), and *gestiones* (ability to secure support from organizations to help in such things as gaining access to electricity or water supply).

(c) Modelling satisfaction with goal achievement.

The next step in data analysis was estimation of structural equation models linking latent goal satisfaction to other variables. This is presented in full in Yamamoto et al. (2008) and in Yamamoto and Feijoo (2007). Here we discuss only statistically significant correlations between latent goal satisfaction, latent goal necessity and resources. Satisfaction with place to live better (PLB) was negatively associated with PLB necessity, suggesting low preference adaptation. It was also positively associated resources, a finding that could be explained by the importance of having good social contacts (a component of resources) and resolving conflicts (a component of PLB). Second, satisfaction with raise a family (RAF) was positively associated with the importance attached to this goal, a finding consistent with variation in individuals' decisions to prioritize finding a partner and having children. RAF achievement was also negatively associated with resources, a link that can be attributed to felt additional family responsibilities. Third, satisfaction with improvement from a secure base (ISB) among respondents was generally low, reflecting their relative material poverty. It was positively associated with resources, which also served as a link through which ISB goal necessity correlated with ISB achievement: the more important this goal, the more resources a person is likely to command and hence the more likely to be satisfied with their achievement of it. More surprisingly, ISB achievement was also correlated positively with RAF necessity. One explanation for this is that disappointment with achievement of ISB aspirations can be offset by devoting more importance to RAF instead.

 (d) Migration and individual well-being.

The above whole sample analysis was supplemented by analysis of differences between socio-economic groups, although scope for this was limited by the small sample size (Yamamoto *et al.*, 2008). Surprisingly few gender differences were

identified, whereas migration experience did emerge as a significant source of variation in responses. This is of particular interest because migration rates were very high within the study sites (Altamirano, 1984; Sorensen, 2002; Lockley, 2008).

For <u>place to live better</u> there was a much larger gap between goal necessity and achievement for people who had more recently moved. Conversely, those who had been resident in a place for fifteen years or more were both less concerned with PLB as a latent goal and more satisfied with its achievement (Yamamoto et. al, 2008:71). This probably reflects a combination of high initial motivation of recent migrants, very gradual preference adaptation, and frustration with the difficulty of building good relations with neighbours and solving problems without conflict when settling into a new locality.

For <u>raise a family</u> there was some dropping off in goal necessity for people who had lived longer in the same place, but no statistically significant link was established between residence period and satisfaction with achievement of this goal. However, it was lowest in the two urban sites, and both goal necessity and satisfaction rose significantly with the age of respondents. In-depth interviews revealed important but diverse life-cycle dimensions to the decision to migrate: many migrants moved primarily to establish an independent home and family with their partner, but many long-standing residents also delayed starting their own family in the hope of improving their economic situation first (Lockley, 2008).

For <u>improvement from a secure base</u> no clear pattern emerged from cross-analysis with residence period. This can again be attributed to the diversity of forms of migration. In-depth interviews a strong positive ISB motivation for migration to urban areas, particularly Lima (Lockley, 2008), and the same was true for migration to rural areas in search of better access to land for cultivation. But many longstanding

residents in rural and urban areas also had strong ISB goals. A clearer difference emerged in response to questions about <u>resources</u>, recent migrants being significantly less satisfied in this respect, particularly those who had migrated long distances.

Overall, what emerged from analysis of migration against the three latent goals (as compared to a single wellbeing indicator such as income) is the complexity of well-being trade-offs over time, and indeed between generations (cf. Richman et al., 1987). For many, the main cost of moving in search of a more secure livelihood was not so much delay in starting a family, but living in a more insecure and uncertain environment in the hope that future material prospects would compensate.

4. GLOBAL AND LOCAL PERSPECTIVES COMPARED

Section 3 described construction of a set of measures of individual well-being that combined normative measures of wellbeing (a three factor latent goal model) with a historical dimension (assessment of actual achievement of these goals and availability of resources needed to do so). The data was then used to analyse migration as one possible practical strategy for improving goal achievement. While external validity and scope for within-sample heterogeneity was limited by the small and non-representative nature of the sample, the results nevertheless provide a useful point of comparison with the normative, historical and practical dimensions of well-being distinguished within the four global designs of development summarised in Table 1. This section compares the two pieces of well-being analysis across these three well-being dimensions.

(a) Well-being as it should be: the normative dimension

Starting with the <u>place to live better</u> goal this is clearly most congruent with <u>local first</u>, particularly its emphasis on the importance for well-being of community harmony and social identity. The qualitative research phase also highlighted some

individual goals particularly associated with Andean culture, including community improvement, belonging to the communal association, and organising and attending fiestas. But Table 2 shows that average scores for these goals were relatively low.

Raising a family (RAF) as a well-being goal is strikingly absent from all four global designs. One explanation is that the first three reflect a progressive and secular view of development that would be weakened by explicit reference to 'traditional' family goals and associated values. In addition, since RAF reflects common but not universal aspirations, public policy discourse tends to subsume it under other goals. However, cross-tabulation revealed that RAF ranked significantly higher as a goal among those living in poorer households (Copestake et al., 2008:115). This suggests a case for more explicit discussion of family policy as part of development policy than is implied by the analysis in Section 2.

Turning to the goal of improvement from a secure base (ISB) this can be related most clearly to the needs first model, given that both emphasise the importance of food, shelter, health care and education. Securing these needs and being able to afford consumer goods also links it strongly to the income first model. By reflecting also on the aspiration to secure a salaried job and to achieve professional status, the ISB goal is reasonably congruent with a liberal Western view of development as modernisation.

Overall, there is substantial overlap in the well-being goals implicit in the global designs and survey findings. However, instead of taking these as axiomatic the pilot survey offers a quantifiable empirical approach to assessing their relative importance.

(b) Well-being as it is and how it could be: historical and practical dimensions.

The teleology of the four global designs distinguished in Section 2 centred on different implicit views of the need to constrain capitalism. The field survey did not directly ask about this, but average goal satisfaction scores are indirectly revealing. In particular, we noted low satisfaction with ISB achievement, along with large gap between goal necessity and achievement ranking for educating children, securing salaried employment and acquiring professional status (Table 3). This suggests a widespread and resilient perception of the importance of upward economic mobility despite relatively low satisfaction with its achievement, and perhaps helps to explain cross-country evidence that Peruvians report being less happy in general than other Latin Americans (Copestake et al., 2008:104; Guillen-Royo, 2007).

The emphasis on education and employment resonates strongly with the rights first model, with its emphasis on active processes of socio-political inclusion and exclusion as determinants of well-being (Figueroa et al., 2001; Figueroa, 2001; Copestake, 2007). Further evidence in support of this comes from the resources data, with its emphasis on the importance of having good relationships with economic brokers and officials, as well as those able to offer credit, land and inherited wealth.

Cross-tabulation of individual ISB satisfaction against income poverty classification of the respondent's household confirmed a significant negative correlation, though only for those living in urban areas (Copestake et al., 2008:118). In contrast, PLB and RAF satisfaction were found to be higher for families belonging to households below the extreme poverty line. These findings are consistent with a dichotomous view of individual well-being possibilities: either to opt for high risk pursuit of economic and social status improvement in the labour market (e.g. through migration), or to fall back on community, patronage and a more secure (in PLB and RAF terms), but poorer (in ISB terms), way of life. This in turn suggests local first

designs can be viewed in part as an adaptive affirmation of what has variously been described as a culture of poverty (Lewis, 1998), a Faustian bargain of dependent security (Wood, 2003) or an aspiration trap (Appadurai, 2004).

Alvarez (2008) offers a more nuanced analysis than this by examining how far each of the three latent well-being goals is supported by the full range of formal and informal state, market, community and family institutions present in the seven WeD research sites. He concludes that an open-ended well-being analysis, such as offered by the pilot survey, is necessary to reveal the diverse ways in which each institution contributes to development. This is not to deny that such institutions as *faena* and *fiesta* can help to perpetuate poverty traps, nor does it privilege a local first view by assertion. Rather it keeps open the possibility that so-called traditional institutions can serve more complex, holistic and thoroughly modern purposes (cf. Douglas, 2004).

5. CONCLUSIONS.

This section starts by assessing the relevance of the foregoing analysis of well-being to development theory by considering how they can be located in Mignolo's geopolitics of knowledge. It then briefly considers implications for development policy and practice.

Income first, needs first and rights first perspectives can all be treated quite straightforwardly as localised versions of global designs. In contrast, local models centred on the idea of *Lo Andino* can be described as border thinking: influenced by Western ideas, but at the same time at least partially resistant to them.

Locating the well-being measure described in Section 3 within Mignolo's analysis is more difficult. The methodology clearly draws on a Western tradition of positivist science. But at the same time the research team deliberately set out to find a way of understanding and measuring individual well-being that avoided reliance on

predetermined Western ideas about what respondents regarded as important. This prompted strong opposition to other methodologies proposed by their UK co-researchers, including those built on an established theory of universal needs (e.g. Doyal and Gough, 1991), measurement of happiness or utility on a single scale (e.g. Kahnemann et al., 1999), or of subjective well-being using an preordained typology of well-being domains (e.g. Skevington, 2008). The team also echoed Escobar (1995) in strongly supporting a focus on researching well-being rather than poverty as an antidote to the emphasis of much Western development discourse on deprivation, negativity and failure. Furthermore, the research approach sought to avoid ways of thinking about well-being that relied upon simplistic dichotomies, such as modern-traditional, quantitative-qualitative, individualistic- collective, objective-subjective and indigenous-Western. While closer to a global design than to border thinking, it nevertheless attaches more importance to local perspectives, and is perhaps able to do more justice to them.

Overall the key point of this paper is not to privilege particular individual, local, national, global or discipline-centric perspectives on development; nor simply to argue for confronting them against each other. Rather it is to find ways to do so that are both empirically grounded and build on ontological premises that permit systematic comparison and interpretation of different visions of well-being latent in development thinking

The relationship between this research and institutional economics is more problematic. On the one hand, North's concept of shared mental models is useful because it helps to explain the coexistence of a plurality of rational ways of understanding the same situation, as well as the multiplicity of institutional solutions to the same problem. On the other hand, his use of the concept primarily to analyse

the economic purposes of institutions (*fiestas* for example) risks a more limited analysis of development by neglecting the role these same institutions also play in the reproducing other aspects of well-being.

One way of summarising the implications of this argument for development policy and practice is to draw a distinction between what can be referred to as single gap and triple gap intervention models (see Table 3).[6] The single gap model starts with the predetermined and universal well-being goals of an intervening agency or secondary stakeholder. It uses standard indicators to identify how far the intended beneficiaries (or primary stakeholders) fall short of these goals (Gap 1), and employs best 'industry' practices to improve goal achievement. A triple gap model accommodates all of this. However, it also includes more open-ended enquiry into the separate well-being goals that primary stakeholders have for themselves, as well as their perception of how far they are actually achieving them, and their own strategies for reducing the difference (Gap 2). The final step is then to reflect on differences between the two perspectives (Gap 3), identify congruence and disjuncture across all three dimensions of wellbeing, and explore scope for conflict management or collaboration accordingly.

Such triple gap thinking is open to any actor, it neither requires nor rules out prior ranking of the contending mental models, and it can be extended to situations with more stakeholder groups. The outcome of the final step critically depends upon the capacity and willingness of analysts and actors to expand their understanding of the mental models used by others: as in the analysis of water privatization by Trawick (2003) or Turner's thinking on self-help housing (Bromley, 2003) to give to Peruvian examples. Such capacity for reflexivity remains one potentially binding constraint on

development, and one that more research of the kind presented in this paper can perhaps help to overcome.

Finally, where one mental model dominates others, then triple gap thinking resonates with Mignolo's emphasis on the coloniality of power and the importance of border thinking as a reaction to it. In this sense the core argument of this paper is to argue for research that informs development policy and practice with a deeper understanding of the plurality of aspirations, perceptions and ideas affecting well-being outcomes. At the same time the analysis itself retains a distinct global mental model of development in its implicit adherence to modernist ideas of rationality, pluralism and the possibility of progress through negotiation and broking based on improved mutual understanding.

ENDNOTES

1. The WeD group was formed in 2003 with a grant from the UK Economic and Social Research Council to carry out empirical work on well-being in four countries: Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Thailand and Peru. Peru's inclusion arose out of research links between staff at Bath University, PUCP (*Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú*) and UNCP (*Universidad Nacional del Centro del Perú*) through which a common interest emerged in conducting multidisciplinary research relating poverty to political and cultural processes of social inclusion and exclusion (Figueroa et al., 2001). The WeD group's officially stated purpose was to develop a conceptual and methodological framework for understanding the social and cultural construction of well-being in developing countries from a multidisciplinary perspective (Gough & McGregor, 2007). WeD adopted a definition of well-being as "…a state of being with others where human needs are met, where one can act meaningfully to pursue ones goals, and where one enjoys a

satisfactory quality of life" (WeD, 2007). A broad definition was adopted deliberately so as to offer discursive space for comparison of narrower interpretations of its meaning.

2. These three dimensions parallel the distinction between development as "hope, critical understanding and politics/administration" suggested by Lewis and Mosse (2006:5). A more detailed way of thinking about the historical dimension of development is provided by the idea of national welfare regimes (Wood and Gough, 2006). Copestake and Wood (2008:187) develop this idea further for the case of Peru, interpreting it as an "unequal security regime".

3. The methodology and findings are presented more fully by Yamamoto et al. (2008). Unlike the research in the previous section (instigated by the author) the principle architects of the research described in this section were all Peruvian: social psychologists (Yamamoto and Feijoo) and a team of social anthropologists led by Altamirano and Alvarez. And while the methodology was also influenced by intensive debates with other members of WeD the broad approach remained firmly in the hand of this team, and was indeed in part replicated in the other three WeD countries. Copestake and Camfield (2009) describe the process of methodological development in more detail and outline reasons for not adopting other approaches, including the WHOQoL (Skevington, 2008), self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci 2001) and satisfaction with life - or domains of life - scales (Diener et al. 1985; Veenhoven 2000; Cummins 2000).

4. Exceptions include Clark (2002) and Lever et al. (2005); see Gough and McGregor (2007) for a wider review. In Peru, DFID and World Bank (2003) focused on poor people's perceptions of poverty using focus group discussions. Graham and Pettinato (2002) compare subjective and observed economic well-

being, Herrera (2006) investigates subjective perception of poverty among those above and below the official poverty line, and Schuldt (2004) relatively low subjective well-being of inhabitants of Lima. Richman et al. (1987) also indirectly address issues raised here through empirical investigation into the process of acculturation of internal migrants in Peru.

5. Two criteria influenced selection of the preferred factor solution: the statistical properties of a structural equation model linking all the variables, and congruence with the field researchers' first-hand knowledge of the study area (this also being the basis for arriving at factor names or labels). The key criterion for aggregation across all sites was the statistical validity of the factor model thereby arrived at (and notwithstanding statistically significant differences in responses arising from the heterogeneity of respondents within the sample). In other words, the homogeneity implicit in presenting average results shown in Table 2 across the sample was found to be statistically valid. Extensive analysis of heterogeneity of responses (by age, site, gender, migration status, education) was also conducted and is reported in full inYamamoto et al. (2008). For example, despite the small sub-sample sizes, significant and interesting site-specific differences in goal importance and necessity emerged that can be related to observed features of each site (Copestake, 2008). However, it is beyond the scope of this article to report fully on findings at this level of detail here.

6. Copestake (2008) further explores the relevance of the concept of well-being for development policy and practice: as a discursive space for analysis of disjuncture underlying policy disagreements and conflicts, as the foundation for alternative approaches to stakeholder consultation, as the basis for personal reflexivity among development practitioners, and as critical to decisions over centralization or

devolution of power. Gulrajani and McCourt (2010) elaborate usefully on the last

point by exposing the ontological roots of the impasse between managerialism and

the goal of political empowerment in development management.

REFERENCES

Altamirano, T., Copestake, J., Figueroa, A., and Wright-Revolledo, K. (2004) Universal and local understanding of poverty in Peru. Global Social Policy 4:313-336.

Altamirano, T. (1984) Regional Commitment among Central Highlands Migrants in Lima. In: N. Long and B. Roberts, (eds) Miners, Peasants and Entrepreneurs: Regional Development in the Central Highlands of Peru Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Alvarez, J.L. (2008) Wellbeing and institutions. In: J. Copestake, (ed.) Wellbeing and development in Peru: global and local views confronted. New York: Palgrave macmillan, pp.153-184.

Alvarez, J.L., Arroyo, M., Carhuallanqui, L., Copestake, J., Jaurapoma, M., Lavers, T., Obispo, M., Paucar, E., Reina, P. and Yamamoto, J. (2008) Resources, conflict and social identity in context. In: J. Copestake, (ed) Wellbeing and development in Peru: global and local views confronted. New York: Palgrave macmillan, pp.31-60.

Apfell-Marglin, F. (2003) The spirit of regeneration: Andean culture confronting Western notions of development. London: Zed Press with PRATEC.

Appadurai, A. (2004) The capacity to aspire: culture and the terms of recognition. In: V. Rao and M .Walton, (eds) Culture and public action. Andhra Pradesh, India: Orient Longman, pp.59-84.

Bebbington, A., Hinojosa-Valencia, L., Munoz, D., and Lizarazu, R. (2007) Livelihoods and resource accessing in the Andes: desencuentros in theory and practice. In: I. Gough and J.A. McGregor, (eds) Wellbeing in Developing Countries: from theory to research. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.176-198.

Bromley, A. (2003) Peru 1957–1977: How time and place influenced John Turner's ideas on housing policy. Habitat International, 27(2):271-292.

Boas, T.C. and Gans-Morse, J. (2010) Neoliberalism: from new liberal philosophy to anti-liberal slogan. Studies in Comparative International Development, 44:137-61.

Burton, M. and Kagan, C. (2005) Liberation social psychology: learning from Latin America. Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology 15: 63-78.

Chambers, R. (2005) Ideas for Development. London: Earthscan.

Clark, D. (2002) Visions of development. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Copestake, J. (2008) Conclusions and implications for development policy and practice. In: J. Copestake, (ed.) Wellbeing and development in Peru: global and local views confronted: Palgrave macmillan, pp.211:230.

Copestake, J. (2007) Poverty and exclusion, resources and relationships: theorising the links between economic and social development. In: I. Gough and J.A. McGregor,

(eds) Wellbeing in Developing Countries: from theory to research. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.199-216.

Copestake, J. (ed.) (2008) Wellbeing and development in Peru: global and local views confronted. New York: Palgrave macmillan.

Copestake J, Wood G. (2008) Reproducing unequal security: Peru as a wellbeing regime. In: J. Copestake, (ed.) Wellbeing and development in Peru: global and local views confronted. New York: Palgrave macmillan, pp.185-210.

Copestake, J., Guillen-Royo, M., Chou W-J., Hinks T., and Velazco J. (2008) Economic welfare, poverty and subjective wellbeing. In: J. Copestake, (ed.) Wellbeing and development in Peru: global and local views confronted. New York: Palgrave macmillan, pp.103-120.

Copestake, J. and Camfield, L. (2009) Measuring subjective wellbeing in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Peru and Thailand using a personal life goal satisfaction approach. WeD Working Paper 09/45. www.welldev.org

Crabtree, J. (ed.) (2006) Making institutions work in Peru. London: Institute for the Study of the Americas, University of London.

Cummins, R.A. (2000) Personal income and subjective wellbeing: a review. Journal of Happiness Studies 1(2):133-158.

De Soto, H. (1991) The miracle of capital. London: IB Tauris.

De Vries, P. and Nuijten, M. (2002) Some reflections on the (mis)-use of the concept of culture in Andean studies. In T. Salman and A. Zoomers (eds) Imaging the Andes: Shifting margins of a marginal world. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.

Degregori, C. (ed.) (2000) No hay país más diverso: compendio de antropología Peruana [There's no more diverse country: a compendium of Peruvian anthropology]. Lima: Instituto de Estudio Peruanos.

Denzau, A.T. and North, D. (1994) Shared mental models: ideologies and institutions. Kyklos, 47:3-29.

DFID and World Bank (2003) Perú: Voces de los Pobres [Peru: voices of the poor], Lima: DFID / World Bank.

Diener, E., Emmons, R., Larsen, R., and Griffin, S. (1985) The satisfaction with life scale, Journal of Personality Assessment 49(1):71-73.

Douglas, M. (2004) Traditional culture, let's hear no more about it. In: V. Rao & M. Walton (eds) Culture and public action. Andhra Pradesh, India: Orient Longman.

Doyal, L. and Gough, I. (1991) A theory of human need. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Escobar, A. (2004) Beyond the Third World: imperial globality, global coloniality and anti-globalisation social movements. Third World Quarterly, 25(1):207-30.

Escobar, A. (1995) Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World. Princeton, NJ: Princetown University Press.

Figueroa, A. (2001) Reformas en sociedades desiguales. La experiencia peruana. Lima: Fondo Editorial, Pontificate Catholic University of Peru.

Figueroa, A., Altamirano, T. and Sulmont, D. (2001) Social exclusion and inequality in Peru, Geneva: ILO.

Frisancho, A. and Goulden, J. (2008) Rights-based approaches to improve people's health in Peru. The Lancet, 372(9655):2007-2008.

Gasper, D. (2007) Conceptualising human needs and wellbeing; In: Gough, I and McGregor, J.A. (eds) Wellbeing in Developing Countries: from theory to research. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.47-70.

Goldsworthy, D. (1988) Thinking Politically about Development. Development and Change 19:505-530.

Gough, I. and McGregor, J.A. (2007) Wellbeing in developing countries: from theory to research. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graham, C. and Pettinato, S. (2002) Happiness and hardship. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.

Guillen-Royo, M. (2007) Consumption and wellbeing: motives for consumption and need satisfiers in Peru. Doctoral thesis, University of Bath.

Gulrajani, N. and McCourt, W. (2010) The future of development management. Public Administration and Development, 30(2).

Haas, P.M. (1992) Introduction: epistemic communities and International Policy Coordination. International Organization, 46(1):1-35.

Herrera, J., Razafindrakoto, M. and Roubaud, F. (2006) The determinants of subjective poverty: a comparative analysis between Madagascar and Peru. Working Paper. Paris: Development Institutions and Analysis for the Long-Term.

Hunt, D. (1989) Economic theories of development: an analysis of competing paradigms. Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Kahneman, D., Deiner, E. and Schwartz, T. (1999) Wellbeing: The foundations of hedonic psychology. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kuhn, S.T. (1970) The structure of scientific revolutions. Chicago, The University of Chicago press.

Kuczynski, P. and Williamson, J. (2003) After the Washington Consensus: restarting growth and reform in Latin America. Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics.

Lever, P.M., Piñol, N.L. and Uralde, J.H. (2005) Poverty, psychological resources and subjective wellbeing. Social Indicators Research 73:375-408.

Lewis, D., Mosse, D. (2006) Encountering order and disjuncture. Contemporary anthropological perspectives on the organisation of development. Oxford Development Studies 34(1):1-13.

Lockley, R. (2008) Wellbeing and migration. In: J. Copestake, (ed) Wellbeing and development in Peru: global and local views confronted. New York: Palgrave macmillan: pp.121-152.

Lewis, O. (1998). The culture of poverty. Society 35(2):7-9.

Long, N. and Long, A. (1994) Battlefields of knowledge. London: Routledge.

Masías, P. (2002) El mito del capital: respuesta a Hernando de Soto [The myth of capital: a reply to Hernando de Soto]. Arequipa: Edimas.

Mignolo, W.D. (2000) Local histories/global designs: coloniality, subaltern knowledge and border thinking. Princeton: Princeton Studies in Culture, Power and History.

North, D. (1990) Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parodi, C. (2000) Perú 1960-2000: Políticas económicas y sociales en entornos cambiantes. [Economic and social policy in Peru, changing directions]. Lima: Universidad del Pacífico.

Pieterse, J.N. (2001) Development theory: deconstructions/reconstructions. London: Sage Publications.

Poole, D. (2004) Between threat and guarantee: justice and community in the margins of the Peruvian state. In: V. Das and D. Poole (eds) Anthropology in the margins of the State, Oxford: James Currey.

Raczynski, D. (1998) The crisis of old models of social protection in Latin America: new alternatives for dealing with poverty. In: V.E Tokman and G. O'Donnell G (eds) Poverty and inequality in Latin America: issues and new challenges. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

Radcliffe, S.A. and Laurie, N. (2006) Culture and development: taking culture seriously in development for Andean indigenous people. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 24:231-248.

Rahnema, M. and Bawtree, V. (eds) (1997) The post development reader. London: Zed Books.

Richman, J., Gaviria, M., Birz, S. and Wintrob, R. (1987) The process of acculturation: Theoretical perspectives and an empirical investigation in Peru. Social Science & Medicine 25(7): 839-847.

Ryan R.M. and Deci, E.L. (2001) On happiness and human potentials: a review of research on hedonic and eudemonic wellbeing, Annual Review of Psychology 52:141-166.

Schuldt, J. (2004) Bonanza macroeconomica y malestar microeconomico. Apuntes para el studio del caso Peruano, 1988-2004. [Macroeconomic bonanza and microeconomic misery. Points arising from a Peruvian case study.] Lima: Universidad del Pacifico.

Skevington, S.M. (2008) Conceptualising dimensions of quality of life in poverty. Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 17.

Sorensen, N.N. (2002) Representing the local: mobile livelihood practices in the Peruvian Central Sierra. In: N.N. Sorensen and K.F. Olwig (eds) Work and migration: life and livelihoods in a globalising world. London: Routledge.

Starn, O. (1991) Reflexiones sobre las rondas campesinas, protesta rural y nuevos movimientos sociales. [Reflections on community militia, rural protest and new social movements]. Lima: IEP.

Tanaka, M. (2002) Participacion popular en politicas sociales. Cuando puede ser democratica y eficiente y cuando todo lo contrario. [Popular participation in social policy. When it can be democratic and efficient and when it can be completely the opposite]. Lima: Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.

Trawick, P. (2003) Against the privatization of water: an indigenous model for improving existing laws and successfully governing the commons. World Development 31(6):977-996.

UNDP. (2002) Informe sobre Desarrollo Humano: Perú 2002 [Human Development Report: Peru 2002]. Lima: United Nations Development Programme.

Vásquez, E. (2005) Subsidios para los mas pobres: seran beneficiados los ninos en extrema pobreza? [Subsidies for the poorest: do they Benefit children in extreme poverty?] Lima: Save the Children and Universidad del Pacífico.

Veenhoven, R. (2000) Freedom and happiness: a comparative study in forty four nations in the early 1990s. In: E. Diener and E.M. Suh (eds) Culture and subjective wellbeing. Cambridge, MA, US: M.I.T. Press, pp.185-218.

Vincent, S. (2004) Participation, resistance and problems with the 'local' in Peru: towards a new political contract? In: S.Hickey and G.Mohan (eds) Participation: from tyranny to transformation. London: Zed Books, pp.111-124.

Wilson, F. and Eyben, R. (2005) Supporting rights and nurturing networks: the case of the UK DFID in Peru. In: R. Eyben (ed) Relationships for aid. London: Earthscan, pp.115-132.

Wood, G. (2003) Staying Secure, Staying Poor: The Faustian Bargain, World Development 31:455-471.

Wood, G., Gough, I. (2006) A comparative welfare regime approach to global social policy. World Development 34(10):1696-1712.

Yamamoto, J. and Feijoo, A.R. (2007) Componentes émicos del bienestar. Hacia un modelo alternativo de desarrollo [Emic components of wellbeing. An alternative model of development]. Revista de Psicología 25(2):197-231.

Yamamoto, J. (2008) Implications for wellbeing research and theory. In: J. Copestake, (ed.) Wellbeing and development in Peru: global and local views confronted. New York: Palgrave macmillan, pp.232-242.

Yamamoto, J., Feijoo, A.R., and Lazarte, A. (2008) Subjective wellbeing: an alternative approach. In Copestake, J (ed.) Wellbeing and development in Peru: global and local views confronted. New York: Palgrave macmillan, pp.61-102.

Yashar, D. (2005) Contesting citizenship in Latin America: the rise of indigenous movements and the post-liberal challenge. New York and London: CUP.

Youngers, C.A. (2006) Promoting human rights: NGOs and the state in Peru. In: J. Crabtree (ed) Making institutions work in Peru: democracy, development and inequality since 1980. London: Institute for the Study of the Americas. 2006, pp.158:184.

TABLES

Table 1. Four shared mental models of development in Peru.

	Income first	Needs first	Rights first	Local first
Normative dimension	Individual material income, leisure and choices.	Poverty reduction; satisfaction of multiple basic needs.	Social justice; equity of esteem and opportunity.	Community solidarity: local self-determination.
Historical dimension	Capitalism as an engine for economic growth delivered mostly through private enterprise.	Managed capitalism: public service response to deprivations arising from or ignored by capitalism.	Constrained capitalism: popular struggle for affirmation of universal values and norms.	Beyond capitalism: resistance of local groups to the hegemonic tendencies of globalisation.
Practical dimension	Create better conditions for pursuit of private material self-interest (market led).	Build capacity to enable everyone to meet a basic set of human needs (state led).	Establish basic rights in law and fight to ensure correlative duties are delivered (society led).	Build grassroots communities in harmony with local ecology. (community-led).

Source: Adapted from Copestake (2008:6).

Table 2. Relative goal importance and satisfaction with their achievement.

Latent goals and their component items	Importance mean[a]	rank	Satisfaction mean[b]	Rank	dr[c]
A place to live better	1.53		2.16		
• Clean and nice environment (0.79)[d]	1.47	14	1.9	23	-9
• Tranquility: without violence or delinquency (0.64)	1.54	9	2.21	16	-7
• Getting ahead / resolving problems (0.48)	1.56	8	2.35	8	0
Raise a family	1.07		2.08		
• Marriage (0.79)[e]	1.06	26	1.83	25	1
• Partner (0.79)	1.03	28	1.97	21	7
• Children (0.77)	1.09	25	2.23	15	10
Improvement from a secure base	1.68		1.99		
• Work for a salary (0.55)	1.59	6	1.28	28	-22
• Room or house (0.53)[e]	1.68	4	2.33	10	-6
• Consumer goods like television or liquidizer (0.53)	1.17	24	2.19	18	6
• Education for children (0.50)	1.77	3	1.91	22	-19
• Daily food (0.50)[d]	1.85	2	2.53	2	0
• Health (0.50)	1.88	1	2.53	3	-2
• To be a professional (0.38)	1.51	12	0.18	34	-22
Other individual items					
• Electricity, water, sanitation	1.63	5	2.32	11	-6
• Good family relations	1.57	7	2.65	1	6
• To be good with God and/or the church	1.53	10	2.28	13	-3
• To be of good character	1.52	11	2.5	4	7
• Education for yourself	1.51	13	2.26	14	-1
• Public transport	1.44	15	2.21	17	-2
• Improvement in the community	1.41	16	1.86	24	-8
• Household goods (e.g. pots & furniture)	1.38	17	2.34	9	8
• Getting on well with neighbours	1.37	18	2.46	5	13
• Recreational space, like sports complex	1.37	19	1.97	20	-1
• To teach others what you know	1.36	20	2.42	7	13
• Neighbours participate in an organised way	1.28	21	2.13	19	2
• Clothes	1.26	22	2.3	12	10
• Friendship	1.18	23	2.45	6	17
• Telephone or other form of communication	1.06	27	0.9	31	-4
• Shop, buying and selling (cattle, crops)	0.97	29	1.18	29	0
• Member of communal/community assocn.	0.95	30	1.61	27	3
• Own transportation	0.92	31	1.1	30	1
• To be in a position of authority	0.7	32	0.82	32	0
• Go to fiestas	0.42	33	1.76	26	7
• Participate in organising fiestas	0.29	34	0.71	33	1

Source: Adapted from Yamamoto (2008:68) and Copestake (2008a:213).
Notes: a. Item importance was rated by respondents on a three point scale (very necessary = 2, necessary = 1, not necessary = 0). b. Goal satisfaction was rated on a four point response scale (satisfied = 3, so-so = 2, not satisfied = 1, don't have = 0). c. dr refers to the necessity ranking less the satisfaction ranking. d. Figures in brackets are factor loadings for a confirmatory factor analysis with three factors. Other statistical parameters of the model are as follows: CMIN=40.765; DF=32; P=0.138; CFI=0.990; RMSEA=0.023; RMR=0.008; AGFI=0.972; PGFI=0.572; NFI=0.956. e. These items were combined in the model with the one immediately following.

Table 3. A triple gap model for well-being analysis of development initiatives

Stakeholder	Secondary		Primary
Normative aspirations (well-being as it should be)	'Universal' goals		Individual goals
	<<<<Gap 1>>>>		<<<<Gap 2>>>>>
Measurement of current realities (well-being as it is)	Standard well-being indicators		Satisfaction with achievement of individual goals
Norms and rules of action (how well-being can be improved)	Best 'industry' practices to close Gap 1		Socially embedded responses

(center column, vertical text: ^^^^<<<Gap 3*>>>>)

*Analysis of congruence and disjuncture between the three dimensions of the mental models of well-being of two (or more) different stakeholders.