ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION

REPORT OF TANZANIA PPA TRAINING

BAGAMOYO 5TH – 16TH FEBRUARY 2002

Prepared by the Training Team

Dr. Benedict Mongula (Team Leader)
Mr. Charles Lwanga - Ntare
Ms. Magdalena K. Ngaiza

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Training team acknowledges the support and understanding received from ESRF given especially the relatively short period for preparation. We would like to thank all the workshop participants from various implementing partners, Dr. Charles Ehrhart (the Technical Advisor to the PPA), Mr. Deo Mutalemwa (The PPA Coordinator), Bagamoyo District Authorities, Village Leadership and the Communities who contributed to the successful end of the training.

Dr. Benedict Mongula
Team Leader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Bagamoyo Training Report

18th February 2002.

1. Introduction

From 5th – 16th February 2002, a training exercise in participatory research methodology was carried out in Bagamoyo for 30 researchers[1] that are going to be involved in the Tanzanian Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA). The Economic and Social Research Foundation (ESRF), who are the implementing organization for the PPA, commissioned the training. The training was itself aimed at enhancing researchers' skills in undertaking participatory research with a focus on vulnerability assessment and drawing lessons for policy. Three facilitators were involved in the training, namely: Dr. Benedict Mongula (Institute of Development Studies, University of Dar-es-salam (Team Leader), Ms. Magdalene Ngaiza (Institute of Development Studies, University of Dar-es-salaam) and Charles Lwanga-Ntale (Development Research and Training, Uganda).

2. Training objectives

2.1. General objectives

According to the Terms of Reference that were given to the Training Team, the training programme was aimed at *"….building on trainees' current skills levels and challenge both experienced and relatively inexperienced researchers …"*[2]. Overall, therefore included:

- Enhancing the skills of researchers in undertaking participatory policy research

- Supporting individual researchers and teams thereof to develop a team spirit.

2.2. Specific objectives

More specifically the trainers aimed at:

- Developing skills in analysis of poverty
- Developing an understanding of poverty (and the dynamics of poverty)
- Equipping researchers with participatory skills for poverty assessment
- Linking participatory methodology to policy analysis
- Building positive team dynamics.

[1] See appendix for list of names.
[2] There were 4 interns.

This agenda was agreed to at a preparatory meeting held between the trainers (Ben Mongula, Magdalene Ngaiza and Charles Lwanga-Ntale) and the PPR Secretariat (Rose Mwaipopo and Charles Erhardt).

3. Process followed in the training

The training comprised of **six main stages**.

The **first stage** focused on getting participants to know each other better and to set "rules of play" for the time that the team would be together in Bagamoyo. Their expectations and fears were noted and taken care of in the training. At this stage also, the objectives of the training were presented and adjusted by the participants.

The **second stage** dealt with general introductions to participatory methodology: its origins, varieties, principles, applicability and challenges. The difference between conventional and participatory approaches was also clearly presented and discussed.

The **third stage** brought out various differences that research needed to grapple with in terms of vulnerability. Analysing difference focused specifically on children, youth, old age, gender, strata, location, and type of livelihood in relation to vulnerability. Methods of analysing difference were therefore explored, shared and practiced.

The fourth stage focused attention on outlining and sharing specific methods in participatory research and practicing how these methods can be used in the field.

The fifth stage dealt with analyzing field data stage by stage in relation to main research objectives (policy needs)

The **final stage** of the training was a field practicum that was intended to offer opportunity to workshop participants to practice acquired methods and skills..

3.1. Setting the climate

The training began with general introductions in order to "set the climate". The introductions included the self-introduction of participants, leveling exercises, exploring expectations, outlining of the training objectives as well as brainstorm about the "DOs and DON'Ts" of the workshop.

3.2. Introduction to Participatory Methodology

This stage of the training first took back participants to the objectives and meaning and purpose of "social research". Participatory research methodology was then put in context, its history and variety was explored drawing participants' attention to its increased use to supplement quantitative methods in poverty assessment and action as well as in policy analysis, especially in understanding policy gaps.

3.3. Specific methods

The main objective of this stage in the training process was, first, to introduce participants to specific methods in participatory enquiry, including their rationale, usability and shortcomings. Secondly, in this stage participants were encouraged to learn a wide range of methods and to try them out with a view to identifying challenges and opportunities in their application.

3.4. The field practicum

This stage was the "grand finale" or "high point" for most participants. It was the stage at which all participants not only had opportunity to try out their newly acquired skills in participatory research but also to identify gaps in "skills knowledge", as well as explore opportunities for making improvements and make innovations.

4. Participants

As previously indicated in the Terms of Reference for the Trainers, participants came from a wide variety of institutions, including national NGOs, international NGOs, research and academic institutions, Government as well as individuals. The participants had different levels of exposure to participatory research, in particular participatory policy research (PPR). Recognising this challenge (and opportunity), the trainers deliberately designed a training programme that was aimed at full utilization of and testing experienced participants' skills while at the same time giving basic training to relatively inexperienced participants.

On the whole workshop participants were very enthusiastic about their training, many working for long hours in order to ensure that their participation in the group yielded maximum benefits. Special mention, perhaps, should be made of all interns who approached the workshop with full determination, zeal and openness. Other more experienced participants also shared freely of their skills which made team work a positive reality during the workshop.

5.Training Content (key areas covered)[3]

5.1. Understanding Poverty and PPAs

The main objective of this session was to explain to participants what PPAs are about and to share with them the rationale for undertaking poverty assessments as in order to inform macro level planning and policy processes. The session was also aimed at sharing with participants the different ways in which PPAs can be carried out and to show how, in particular, some recent ones had been undertaken.

By referring to the Policy Week, it was also hoped that this session would enhance understanding of the concept, nature, and process of policy vis-à-vis PPAs thus enhancing participants' ability to link Participatory Policy Research findings to policy processes.

The session looked into the essence of PPA, its purpose being to involve the poor in collecting and interpreting data on poverty with the aim to inform pro-poor policies. Possible policy interventions using such data were outlined as influencing allocation

[3] This is only a summarised version of the contents. For more details please refer to the training handouts on each session.

of resources, influencing manner of service delivery, influencing regulatory frameworks and processes of governance.

PPA was defined during ensuing discussion as a program or process and not a methodology in itself. So that a major challenge PPA research actually lay in selecting from the range of existing methodologies such as Participatory Rural Appraisal, Participatory Learning and Action, Appreciative Enquiry technique, **etc.** those tools most relevant for assessing poverty with a view to inform policy rather than local action. The relevance of the traditional participatory research methodologies to PPA was questioned so that at some point even the idea of creating a basket of most relevant tools in order to generate our own methodology was considered.

The role of PPA as a poverty monitoring tool was clarified, essentially that PPA research findings will be used to inform policy on the poverty status and trend especially of vulnerable groups in society and their perceptions on best strategies and policy actions to overcome its causes.

5.2. Conventional and Participatory Methods

Participants' attention here was drawn to the fact that there are many methods for assessing poverty, both conventional and non conventional. This broad range of methods was briefly introduced and the advantages and disadvantages of the various methods shared. Conventional and non-conventional methods were compared, and participatory methods were situated in the context of the other methods. Overall, the complementarity of the methods was stressed, but so was also the need to be flexible in using one type of methods or the other.

In the discussion the history and evolution of participatory methods and the principles and issues/challenges of participatory methods were revisited. Participants actively reflected their use and experiences with both methods. Structured questionnaire methods were compared to the less structured and discussion methods, so was the idea of "extraction" of data rather than active engagement in generating and analysing data with community members and groups. Lastly was the aggregative statistical results versus a more holistic approach that provided greater information and was more sensitive to different social groups.

5.3. Introduction to Participatory Methodology

Facilitators made a brief introduction on the origins, principles and processes of various participatory methodologies. Possible limitations of the methodologies and difficulties in application were also discussed. In a later session, participants were asked to share:

- What they knew about participatory research methodology.
- What they did not know about participatory research methodology.

- What they wanted to know about participatory research methodology.

Participants were deliberately guided through groups to extract information from the manual and to identify the variety of PR methodologies, their characteristics, philosophy, process and output.

Many participants were not aware of the variety of participatory methodology. So they were happy to learn about PRA, RRA, PLA, PALM, SARAR and Appreciative Enquiry. In addition we were now trying to design PPA/PPR. This variety was seen as useful only if it could provide some very good non-conflicting research methods for the current PPA research task.

5.4. Analysing Social Difference including Gender

5.4.1 Identifying difference

The main objective of this session was to emphasise to participants the degree to which communities are divided and are therefore unequal, and how this was expected to be an essential part of their investigation in the field**.** It was pointed out that there were different inequalities of economic well-being, social status and power between different households. Specific mention was made that there were typically large differences between men and women, people of different ages, and distinct groups defined by ethnicity or social origin. This, therefore, needs to be reflected in the application of the participatory approach. It was also observed to have implications for the issues to be investigated.

Facilitators explained that the above differences had impact on the sequence of field enquiry. It was further observed that due to social differences and invisibility of various social groups, it is easier and more advisable to start off by tackling research questions that have to do with the entire community or larger group that constitutes the population of the area as a whole. However, if that is the case it needs to be kept firmly in mind that this is a practical expedient or negotiated compromise and not a point of principle. Hearing the "voice of the poor" almost always involves listening separately to the different groups that make up the poor in a particular setting. It follows then that the first task analytically is to establish what the different social groups are, including their households or even the individuals themselves.

Examples were given of some sub-groups that are important in almost all social situations, and which are easy to identify - men/women, old/young, etc. The identity of other relevant groups usually has to be established. Possible questions for the researchers to pose were also brainstormed. For example:

- Who are the vulnerable groups (within this community) and who are those who are not vulnerable? What constitutes vulnerability?
- What are the common things among vulnerable groups? Physical location, social identity, or other? Is vulnerability mainly a fixed characteristic, or mainly a condition into which different people fall at different times?

- In all of these cases, what are the characteristics that define people as vulnerable according to local understandings? And what are the factors that cause vulnerability?

Other questions that were considered include:

- What have been the principal changes affecting particular vulnerable groups over different periods of time, and what factors have influenced these processes?

- What resources, socioeconomic relationships, organizations and institutions are relevant to the group?

- What scope is there for improvement in public policies, institutions and regulatory frameworks, and what other changes would increase the opportunities open to poor and vulnerable people?

Answers to the above questions, as they apply to the different units of analysis, were in part aimed at producing a body of field findings that could be analysed in the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework. In turn this was expected to raise implications for policy.

5.4.2 Gender Analysis

Gender analysis refers to exploring and understanding how men and women in their various ages were doing relative to each other and within their cultural context. The relationships, which existed to the advantage and disadvantage of one over another, were to be explored and assessed with regard to poverty and vulnerability.
Key questions such as what is the issue? and how to explain it in a gender context were answered by the tools. In order to guide participants to do simple and complex gender analysis both simple and complex tools for gender analysis were introduced and practiced.

Simple tools included exploratory tools (Harvard tools) to record inequality of access to resources, control over productive resources and inequality in terms of roles performed by men and women. Complex tools included empowerment assessment tool (Sarah Longwe's framework), which helps to see empowerment at different levels of welfare, participation, conscientization, ownership and control. Also domain analysis tool was introduced which helps analysis to interrogate the character of the issue i.e. whether the issue is legal, political, economic or social and thereby its policy (or interventional) implications. Participants successfully practiced these tools with relative ease.

It was emphasized that gender is a crosscutting issue so that it has to be employed at every stage and that this was referred to as "employing a gender perspective" to all social classes.

5.5. The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA)[4]

The Sustainable Livelihood Approach was introduced to participants as one of the more comprehensive human development approaches to addressing poverty. The approach was noted to be inclusive, building on participatory approaches' work, as well as on governance, decentralization, and sustainability. Participants were invited to consider the rationale behind the SLA and, where possible and appropriate, to use this as one of their analytical frameworks.

Through discussion and further elaboration, the SLA was revealed to have principles that are akin to and consistent with participatory research, namely that they are:

- **People-centred**
- **Holistic**
- **Conducted in partnership**
- **Sustainable**
- **Dynamic**

In addition, and perhaps more importantly for the Tanzania PPA, the approach builds on positives and it links micro-level reality with macro-level policy making.

The different elements in the framework were summarized as:

> ***" .. the context … in which exist assets access to which is critically influenced by policies and institutions which also serve to influence the strategies which people adopt in pursuit of livelihoods and eventual poverty eradication".***

Key terms were outlined and the concept of assets and vulnerabilities was explained. Overall, it was observed, rural people not only have needs but also resources and assets, and recognising this provides a much more respectful and positive framework for dealing with rural people.

Participants' attention was drawn to the five main types of assets[5], namely:

- Natural capital
- Social capital
- Human capital
- Physical capital
- Financial capital

In considering how to apply the framework, the following questions were posed:

[4] A detailed description of the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach is available from DFID …
[5] A sixth one, political Capital (relating to power and powerlessness, governance, etc), has in recent discussion been added.

- **Assets:** Do we understand the resources, not just needs, that different rural people have? How is this information gathered in terms of a planning system, rather than ad-hoc PRAs? How can we understand the holistic nature of people's lives?

- **Outcomes**: How do different people's priorities vary? How should these be ascertained, once again in a systematic way?

- **Livelihood strategies**: In the light of assets and outcomes, what are the appropriate livelihood strategies that are likely to achieve the outcomes that rural people desire? What does this mean for services, policies and programmes?

- **Institutions and processes**: What institutional structures are appropriate to creating this holistic people-centred approach?

Participants were encouraged to consider these questions and to improve on them in the light of the research questions that they were going to address.

5.6. Data Processing, Analysis and Report Writing

Presentation of this session was based on notes provided in two detailed handouts on analysis and report writing. The session outlined the four most important levels for recording and reporting for researchers while they are in the field. These are:

- detailed notes during the Field Activity Reports (in note books)
- the Field Activity Report (detailing the process, findings and main conclusions from each field activity);
- the Daily Report (which gives a synthesis and summary findings of each day in the field); and,
- the Site Report (which is a synthesis of all Field Activity Reports).

Guidelines were given to participants on some of the practical aspects of writing reports, including structure, formats, contents, etc.

5.6.1 Data Compilation

Participants were also taken through a synthesis process from Field Activity Reports to Site Reports. The card-sorting procedure was shared, but participants were equally urged to explore the use of other synthesis processes and procedures provided they finally led to a clear articulation of "voices from below", were efficient and easy to use.

Researchers were also urged to assess the time available to them for the data processing and report writing exercise before deciding on which process or detail of steps to follow.

5.6.2 Data Analysis

Regarding analysis, researchers were reminded of the need to go beyond mere narration or description of information, but to keep asking the questions: "Why? What does it mean? How is it different from what we already know? What are the implications for vulnerable categories of people? What are the implications for policy, etc". Analysis was thus highlighted as one of the most important steps that would enable policy-makers to have an insight into the findings of the researchers, and "the better the analysis, the better the understanding that policy-makers would have". More important it was emphasized that data should clearly show the key determinants of vulnerability.

Here was an example from Fukayosi village where every social group and activities (education, economic, social etc) were clearly pegged on the presence or absence of the wild pigs and tsetse flies. It was hinted that a relational diagram/ flow diagram/mind map would show the wild pigs as a very strong determining factor in the vulnerability of people in Fukayosi and the surrounding villages

Common challenges in analysis were shared, including having too much or too little data, having poor sets of data, lacking analytical skills and not knowing how to make inferences from available information, having biases and/or prejudices, or even not allocating adequate time for analysis.

5.6.3 Key Guiding Questions

In order to help researchers to test their analytical skills while writing reports, the following specific guiding questions were given:

- What does it mean? (For instance if a respondent says: "Widowed women are more vulnerable to poverty than widowed men". What does it mean? What are the criteria that the source of information is using to assess the varying vulnerability? How has the situation been changing for both men and women (trends)? What else can be seen in the relationship between widowed men and women?

- Why? Why is the respondent saying that widowed women are more vulnerable than widowed men?

- Which threats are they facing?

- Are social support systems dynamic, threatened or eroded altogether?

- What are the consequences/ implications of the information collected? What is the perspective of the respondents on this? What is the researchers interpretation of the said consequences?

- What are the unexpected? What in the findings is contrary to "normal" expectations? What are the contradictions between what is expected and the reality on the ground?

- What is important? This refers to prioritization. What are the key issues that are coming out?

5.6.4 The "Six Helpers"

Participants were reminded about "the six helpers": what, why, when, how, where, who? Other tips for enhancing analysis were also shared, including providing enough time for analysis, ensuring that analysis was a gradual and cumulative process, guarding against biases, working with hypotheses, cross-checking, having a holistic view, linking questions and answers, drawing preliminary conclusions with the respondents, having good listening skills, and recording all relevant information with as much clarity as possible.
It was also pointed out that it was necessary to establish the causal relations carefully without being emotional. Is vulnerability due to gender, or lack of education or due to a remote location or lack of supportive agencies? What exactly combines neatly to exacerbate the situation?

Finally analysis should give direction like --which of the policy areas seems relevant to the situation?

6.0. Specific Skills and Methods

6.1. Skills:

Skills handled by the trainers included:
- Elements of good facilitation
- Communication skills
- Understanding and analysing difference
- Facilitating analysis with community members
- Choosing and selecting PLA methods
- Note taking
- Writing Field Activity
- Synthesising Site Reports
- Diffusing conflict

6.2. Methods

- Various kinds of mapping (social, resource, household)
- Community and Focus Group Discussions
- Trend analysis
- Daily and seasonal calendars
- Historical profiles
- Gender analysis matrices
- Solution, Decision and Problem trees
- Flow diagrams
- Observation
- Various ranking methods (wealth, well-being, assets, poverty)
- Appreciative enquiry
- Visualisation
- Transect walks
- Venn diagramming/institutional analysis
- Semi structured dialogue (and probing)
- Livelihood analysis

6.3. The Research Planning Process

This session was introduced for two main purposes. First it was aimed to emphasise to participants the need for detailed planning in any fieldwork. Secondly, the session was also aimed at preparing participants for the subsequent planning week in preparation of the actual fieldwork (Week of 19th February 2002).

The key issues were to identify the sites, design entry methods to sites, decide the population they want to meet in various social groups, and think about methods that would be relevant at various stages. In the session, participants were asked to work in their teams and focus on their research sites, develop their research questions and checklists, and to list all key activities that they knew were going to be carried out in fulfillment of their research design. A guide towards sequencing methods was provided as an example of a five days work so that they would select a two days work

They were then asked to prepare a matrix showing the research questions that they wanted to investigate, the categories of people from whom they wanted to seek the information from, and the methods that they planned to use.

In addition research teams were asked to assign time to the key activities that they planned to undertake in the course of the fieldwork

6.4 Team Dynamics

The main objective of this session was to encourage participants to begin thinking about team dynamics, that is, learning to work together as a team and accepting or accommodating the views of each member irrespective of their differences in experiences. The participants were however reminded that for successful team work they were required to have a sense of discipline, empathy, responsibility and commitment.

Owing to time limitation, this session was only very briefly addressed. The original idea of the trainers was to share with participants some of the most important skills in managing a research exercise and in promoting teamwork. The session was also aimed at equipping researchers with the skills in handling team dynamics. However, the earlier familiarization session had included exercises for group dynamics. Furthermore, the field activity brought out some of the practical examples that needed to be ironed out before fieldwork. During report writing in Bagamoyo facilitators besides giving guidance on writing also gave guidance on how to improve group dynamics. Examples included;

- How to be equal in giving ideas (always give a turn to everybody before anybody speaks twice)
- Not to silence a suggestion, but try it out to understand what a colleague has in mind (perspectives)
- If you have a good idea, try to lobby your friends than imposing your idea as it may lead to a stalemate or disappointment and frustration.

- Not to isolate any one OR to develop paring up! etc.

6.5 The Field Practicum

6.5.1 The Process

As already pointed out, the main purpose of the field practicum was to afford participants an opportunity to practice skills and to test out the various methods that they had learned in the course of the workshop. By default, the field practicum was also intended to get the field teams to begin working together.

Fieldwork was carried out in four locations, namely, Fukayosi, Kiwangwa, Mlingotini and Kiromo. Owing to difficulties in logistics, it was not possible to have five sites, hence one of the field teams merged with the other teams.

Team observers (training facilitators) who accompanied the teams reported that teams worked reasonably well together according to their field plans. However, it is also possible that the groups were not yet confident about their output because the fieldwork time was too short (one more day would have made a difference).

6.5.2 Findings

Findings from the field were shared back in presentations that were also attended by a representative from the District (Mr. Hamisi Kindiyo) and from UNDP (Ms. Susanne dem Hansen). Each group made a summary presentation of the site and the process before giving the findings. This procedure gave a chance to critique the process. Participants' comments on each team were very good. They reflected that each group was aware of what another group did well and vice versa. Comments reminding each group were very encouraging than having the good reports at that level.

The Site Reports that are being finalised by the field teams contain both process and content information, and these give a detailed account of the issues that the teams encountered, lessons learned as well as suggestions for future exercises.

Although two days in the field seemed like a very short period of time, overall participants commended the usefulness of the exercise in bringing them closer to the reality that they will be facing in the field.

7.0 General observations

7.1. Key achievements

Learning and hands-on on methods: The workshop offered opportunity to participants with less experience in the use of participatory methods an opportunity to learn and practice such methods.

Team building: Although by the time the workshop concluded composition of the field research teams had not been finalized, the opportunity for the various participants to work with one another both in plenary sessions and smaller groups on one hand and to practice together in the field on the other hand enabled "wider" team bonds to be created.

Appreciation of the task ahead: From discussions with various participants and based on comments in the final evaluation it was evident that the training workshop "brought home" the magnitude and complexity of the task ahead for all research teams with respect to conceptualization, adhering to the research agenda and unpacking this among team members, managing time, managing people, mastering tools, etc. As part of this appreciation a number of participants indeed raised specific issues for consideration in the research design week.

National Capacity Building: Training of twenty-five nationals in PPA was appreciated in that it had established a focused team and their institutions, which will address poverty with a common perspective. Trainers also appreciated their involvement as they are connected with many research networks and young students who need to learn about exit paths from poverty. Together they will continue to give support to government and NGOs' efforts towards poverty reduction.

Regional collaboration: Both trainers and participants fully appreciated the value of cooperation between Uganda and Tanzania in the development of the two countries' current PPAs. The close similarity between the two countries with respect to socio-cultural background even made this collaboration a more fruitful undertaking.

7.2. Constraints/challenges

Lack of Linkages between key pre-fieldwork activities: The Bagamoyo training was preceded by a "policy week" that was designed to stimulate understanding and discussion among researchers on issues of policy, especially as this related to poverty, people's livelihoods and vulnerability. It was not evident to trainers that clear links could be made by workshop participants between the outputs and outcomes of the policy week and the training that was delivered in Bagamoyo. Similarly, since the research design week was planned to take place after, but separately from the Bagamoyo training, clear links could still not be made "backwards and forwards". Any future training objective should thus seriously consider a harmonized approach to the entire training.

Time limitation vis-à-vis differing participants' experiences: The spread of participants was quite wide with respect to their experience in the use of participatory methodology. This spread, while bringing into the team a rich and varied experience, also imposed time pressures as not enough time could be devoted to supporting less experienced participants to a level that could guarantee confidence although they were properly placed and supported by experienced colleagues.

Training materials (handouts): While a number of materials (handouts) were made available in participants' files, they were not yet fully integrated as intended. This was due to failure of communications between the Tanzanian trainers and the Ugandan trainer. As a result some materials were seemingly missing while others were duplicated. In the end all the materials were available as seen in the final training manual. Another issue that was noted was lack of time on the part of the participants for reading all the file materials that the participants were loaded with before and during training. In future some time has to be created deliberately for reading.

7.3 Outstanding issues

Completion of the Field Guide: A field guide which broadly outlines the research questions, process and methods has been prepared. As the name suggests, this will only be a "guide" as researchers will be expected to respond more specifically to the Terms of Reference under which they were in the first place contracted. The guide was made available just before research teams went out into the field.

8.0 Participants' evaluation

At the end of the course a simple evaluation form was administered to the participants. The evaluation intended to see whether the participants absorbed what was being offered. Thirteen questionnaires were retrieved. Specific comments are worth reporting as follows;

- Most useful were:
    - methods of data collection
    - team building
    - participatory techniques
    - Understanding poverty and vulnerability
    - Participatory nature of training
- Least useful:
    - was time taken for administration issues than training
    - analysing difference
- Areas needing further support were;
    - Practice in data collection to be increased
    - More time for data analysis
    - Time to read materials and methodologies
    - Relevant methods for the community
    - Report writing skills/Analysis
    - Report Presentation/ presentation of ideas

During the planning week time was spared to go through some of the areas that needed more support. The evaluation indicated a score of 4 = very good. The order of scoring was: **4, 3, 5, 2, 1**. Table 1 below shows the actual values scored by each respondent.

Table 1: Training Evaluation Form Results

5 is highest and 1 is lowest

Score value / Respondents	5	4 Most popular score	3	2	1
No of times scored →					
X					
1	1	10	9	4	0
2	8	13	5	0	0
3	0	9	11	4	0
4	7	11	5	1	0
5	4	18	2	0	0
6	1	13	9	0	0
7	0	15	8	0	0
8	2	10	8	4	0
9	0	14	9	0	0
10	0	7	13	3	0
11	9	9	2	2	1
12	2	8	11	0	0
13	3	20	1	0	0

Note: The scores was prioritised as: 4, 3 5 2 and 1

8.0 APPENDIX 1: TIMETABLE FOR THE TWO WEEKS

DAILY SCHEDULES SHEET 1

DAY/ TIME	TUE 5th	WED 6th	THU 7th	FRI 8th	SAT 9th.
8.00-10.30	Opening and General Introduction.	Introduction to Participatory Methodology; Key Features	Analyzing Difference: Gender, Age and Other variables	Data Processing, Analysis and Report Writing.	Specific Methods.
10.30-10.45		**TEA BREAK**	**TEA BREAK**	**TEA BREAK**	**TEA BREAK**
10.45-1.00	Training Objectives	Conventional and Participatory Methodologies	Analyzing Difference: Gender, Age and Other variables	Data Processing, Analysis and Report Writing.	Sight Seeing Team Leaders
1.00-2.30	**LUNCH**	**LUNCH**	**LUNCH**	**LUNCH**	**LUNCH**
2.30-4.30	. Understanding Poverty and PPAs (including concepts and vulnerability	Conventional and Participatory Methodologies	Data Processing, Analysis and Report Writing.	Specific Methods.	Sight Seeing Team Leaders
4.30-4.45	**TEA BREAK**	**TEA BREAK**	**TEA BREAK**	**TEA BREAK**	**TEA BREAK**
4.45-6.00	Introduction to Participatory Methods	Analyzing Difference Gender, Age and Other	Data Processing, Analysis and Report Writing.	Specific Methods.	Specific Methods.

DAILY SCHEDULES SHEET 2

DAY/TIME	MON 11th	TUE 12th.	WED 13th.	THU 14th.	FRI 15th.	SAT. 16th
8.00-10.30	Specific Methods SSD	Field Work Preparation	Field Work Continues	Field Work And Site Work Continues	Report Writing	Presentations
10.30-10.45	**TEA BREAK**	**TEA BREAK**	**TEA BREAK**	**TEA BREAK**	**TEA BREAK**	**TEA BREAK**
10.45-1.00	Specific Methods SSD	Field Work Preparation	Field Work Continues	Field Work and Site Work Continues	Report Writing	Evaluations
1.00-2.30	**LUNCH**	**LUNCH**	**LUNCH**	**LUNCH**	**LUNCH**	**LUNCH**
2.30-4.30	Preparation for Field *Practicum*	Field Work Begins	Field Work And Site Work Continues	Report Writing	Presentations	End of Training
4.30-6.00	Preparation for Field Practicum.	Field work Begins	Field Work And Site Work Continues	Report Writing	Presentations	