Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Editorial

This issue of the *Knowledge Management for Development Journal* represents a new departure because it is the first issue which is not focused on a particular theme. Instead, it comprises 6 articles on a variety of different subjects. However, there are two elements which are strikingly common to these different articles: the importance of individuals and their networks in bringing about change; and the power of these different approaches to create bridges across different knowledge domains or cultures, including local and scientific knowledge, and science and practice.

The first article, 'The new enlightenment: a potential objective for the KM4Dev community', has been written by Sebastiao Mendonça Ferreira, a member of the journal's Editorial Board and also a member of the Knowledge Management for Development (KM4Dev) community of practice to which the journal is strongly linked. In this article, Sebastiao Mendonça Ferreira considers that KM4Dev has been growing around the idea that knowledge can contribute to the development of poor countries and groups in a disadvantaged situation. He argues that this idea has great potential because knowledge is the meta-resource of all resources. However, the role of knowledge in development refers to a systemic and macro phenomenon that goes beyond the field of management, and cannot be approached only from the micro perspective of management. For bridging the micro and macro perspectives of this problem, two experiences were analysed: the British Enlightenment in the eighteenth century and the current flow of emails in KM4Dev. The first experience was visited as a source of inspiration for applying knowledge in development, and the second was analysed to explore concrete possibilities. The conclusion reached is that KM4Dev can lead the creation of a new Enlightenment in the context of the twenty-first century. To reach synergy, the component of knowledge management should include the programmatic challenges that development agencies are facing currently, and the component of knowledge for development should focus on creating the right environment for making local innovation successful.

The second article, 'Evaluating knowledge sharing in research: the International Farmers' Conference organized at ICARDA' by Alessandra Galié, Bernhard Hack, Nadia Manning-Thomas, Andrea Pape-Christiansen, Stefania Grando, and Salvatore Ceccarelli describes the knowledge sharing which resulted from an International Farmers' Conference organized at the International Centre for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA) in Syria during May 2008. The conference involved over 50 farmers and researchers from Algeria, Canada, Egypt, Eritrea, France, Iran, Italy, Jordan, and Syria. Storytelling was chosen by participants as the method to exchange their knowledge. The main results of the evaluation of the conference were that more than half of the participants changed their agricultural practices, all respondents told stories about the conference to others; and almost three quarters changed their mind about women's knowledge and role in agriculture, while over three quarters stayed in touch with one or more participants.

The third article, 'The human factor in knowledge management for development: using theories from social psychology to investigate the predictors of knowledge

behaviour in development organisations', has been written by Johan Lammers. It examines the human factors that promote or impede effective behaviour of people within different knowledge processes. An overview of relevant psychological theories is provided that are then translated to the specific world of knowledge management in development. In addition to these theories, this article presents some of the main findings of a cross-cultural study on knowledge management in development conducted by weknowmore.org. The article's primary conclusion is that knowledge management is first and foremost a *people issue*. It argues that an organisation's primary focus should be on developing a knowledge-friendly culture and knowledge-friendly behaviours among its people, which should be supported by appropriate processes, and which may be enabled by technology.

The fourth article has been written by Brian A. Nejmeh and Bernard Vicary with the title, 'Lessons learned about design, monitoring and evaluation process definition and information management for international development programmes'. It reviews the theory and definition behind design, monitoring and evaluation (DME) models within international development and identifies issues to be examined in defining frameworks and developing information systems to support DME processes. A description of World Vision International's Learning through Evaluation with Accountability and Planning (LEAP) model and development of an information system 'proof of concept', a collaboration with Messiah College, USA, highlights important knowledge management and organisational learning principles.

Next, Laxmi Prasad Pant and Helen Hambly Odame are the authors of 'The promise of positive deviants: bridging divides between scientific research and local practices in smallholder agriculture'. This article is based on the understanding that agricultural knowledge is managed in sometimes highly contested environments where uncertainty characterises stakeholder interactions. It examines one dimension of the disorder, namely the role of positive deviants who act against the structures and 'rules of the game' in agricultural knowledge creation, application and regeneration. The context of the discussion is a case study of facilitated interaction and innovation between formal and informal knowledge systems in rice production in Nepal. The authors review the literature on positive deviance to demonstrate that positive deviants are helpful in introducing new approaches to old organisational structures and institutional set-ups and in challenging the *status quo*. Positive deviants believe in innovation through self-determination, self-control or self-realisation – the philosophy of positive liberty. The article concludes that positive deviants from the formal public and private organisations and rural communities substantially influence changes in agricultural research and rural development policies

The sixth article, 'Believing in the human capacity to respond to HIV and malaria: sharing experiences on an human level for global impact', by Gaston Schmitz and Philip Forth describes the International Knowledge Fair in Chiang Mai, Thailand, organised by the Constellation for AIDS Competence on 4–6 February 2009. The fair brought together 76 participants from 13 countries who shared their common experiences relating to HIV/AIDS. Gaston Schmitz and Philip Forth argue that local ownership of HIV is important and catalyses effective sharing and learning by communities. They argue that the Constellation works in a way that values local ownership and appreciates the strengths of a community. A mindset where facilitators start from a common humanity and come to learn themselves as the foundation for creating the right environment for a knowledge fair. Looking at the Chiang Mai Knowledge Fair, a three-step process was distinguished: from the facilitation of learning from personal experience, to sharing through story-telling and then to capturing the learning for others.

Finally, 'On producing and sharing knowledge across boundaries: experiences from the interfaces of an international development research network', by Claudia Zingerli, Claudia

Michel and Annika Salmi, explores the characterisitcs of co-producing and sharing knowledge in interfaces between development research, policy and practice of the National Centre of Competency in Research (NCCR) North–South, Switzerland. The article makes use of the conception of the interface which draws attention to the requirements and opportunities of combining different forms and sources of knowledge. The interface is not seen as a closed entity but as an expression of availability, as well as strategic positioning. The article concludes that NCCR North–South does provide institutional interfaces between the academic and non-academic realms but that the provision of interfaces alone is not enough. Whether these interfaces are created, used and productively managed depends on the activities of individual actors, their motivations and interests in co-producing, sharing and negotiating relevant knowledge for development.

Ivan Kulis and Sarah Cummings