

new

931-1020/17

- PD-AAN-605 -

ISBN 32695



**EVALUATION OF TOTOTO-KILEMBA and
PRRM-SAM AT MIDPOINT**

**An assessment of the
Nonformal Education Project cosponsored by:**

**World Education
The National Christian Council of Kenya
The Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement**



**EVALUATION OF TOTOTO-KILEMBA and
PRRM-SAM AT MIDPOINT**

**An assessment of the
Nonformal Education Project cosponsored by :**

**World Education
The National Christian Council of Kenya
The Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement**

July 1979

by

**Dr. Noreen Clark
Columbia University School of
Public Health**

**Mr. O. Gakuru
University of Nairobi**

**Dr. Pedro Acierto
University of the Philippines**

Data Collectors at Midpoint in Kenya:

**Mrs. Priscilla Mrabu
Mr. Rashid Nzalla
Mrs. Grace Juma
Mr. Manuel Raposo
Tototo Home Industries**

Data Collectors at Midpoint in the Philippines:

**Miss Marion dela Cruz
Miss Celia Gaspar
Miss Patty Maylem
Mrs. Lolly Morete
Miss Laring V. Nery
Miss Ching V. Viernes
The Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement**

AID-ta-e-1455

The Nonformal Education Project is a project of the Technical Services Unit of World Education, Director, Catherine D. Crone. It is supported under contract number AID-ta-1455 of the Technical Assistance Bureau of the Agency for International Development. The project director in Kenya is Elvina Mutua, director of Tototo Home Industries. The project director in the Philippines is Concepcion Madayag of the Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Evaluation Questions	5
Sources of Data at Midpoint	7
Tracing the Learning Approach	9
Tototo-Kilemba in Kenya	19
Project Outcomes	21
Analysis of Teaching Aids and the Learning Process	27
The Learning Approach—Rewards (or Not) for Participating Problems	35
Summary of Conclusions	40
	43
PRRM-SAM in the Philippines	47
Project Outcomes	49
Analysis of Teaching Aids and the Learning Process	57
The Learning Approach—Rewards (or Not) for Participating Problems	65
Summary of Conclusions	71
	74
Implications of Group Projects	77
Appendix	79
<u>Tables—Tototo-Kilemba</u>	
I. Responses: Type of Teaching Aid Recalled	33
II. Number of Meetings and Teaching Aids per Village Group	34
III. Responses on Type of Meeting Most Enjoyed	35
IV. Responses on Worst Event in Village Group	40
<u>Tables—PRRM-SAM</u>	
V. Responses: Type of Teaching Aid Recalled	62
VI. Number of Meetings and Teaching Aids per Village Group	64
VII. Responses on Worst Event in Village Group	72

iii

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the two-year training and evaluation project discussed here is to develop and refine an approach to participatory education for reaching and educating rural adults in order to improve the quality of their lives. The learning approach used is referred to as the "self-actualizing method" (SAM). In Kenya the approach is being used by the field staff of Tototo Home Industries, a division of the National Christian Council of Kenya. In the Philippines it is being implemented by the staff of the Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement. World Education, in New York, is assisting the project.

The program, which is based on the self-actualizing method, follows this sequence of activities:

1. Village leaders are consulted, and their cooperation and approval sought as prerequisites for initiating the program in their village.
2. Villagers select a local person to be trained as the village's "educational coordinator." He or she is provided a nominal sum by the project for an initial period of time.
3. The project field staff—both the full-time "facilitators," who have experience in community development, and the coordinators, who are village residents—take part in extensive training in the learning approach during a field operational seminar. Facilitators and coordinators review learner-centered methodologies, materials development, and evaluation procedures. As each of these is discussed, the trainees learn needed skills, and then have the opportunity actually to practice them and try out materials in a village setting.
4. The approach is then implemented in each village. The coordina-

tor explains to the adults in his/her village that the program involves a high degree of learner participation, both in the learning experiences, since there is no traditional teacher who supplies all the answers, and in the decision-making process (topics to be covered, program structuring). Also, the coordinator explains that literacy is not a prerequisite to participation, answers any questions about the program that may arise, and invites the villagers to attend the initial sessions and decide for themselves whether to join.

5. In carrying out an initial assessment of learners' needs in each village, a team composed of a facilitator and a coordinator sets a common meeting place and engages the villagers in a variety of informal, information-gathering activities (i.e., having them tell stories about pictures, react to taped, open-ended dramas, and answer projective questions).

6. In analyzing data from the needs assessment activities, the facilitator and coordinator look for common themes in learners' interests. Based on these themes, they develop initial learning experiences and materials that give the learners the opportunity to determine which topics are of greatest interest to the group and which, given the local resources available, are feasible to pursue.

7. The field team, consisting of a facilitator and a coordinator, then conducts the learning sessions, at a time and place chosen by the learners. In addition to providing new learning opportunities, each session serves as a needs assessment process for the subsequent one. That is, instead of designing the total curriculum in advance, the field team plans one lesson at a time, thus being able to pursue a specific learning interest as thoroughly as the group wishes, to change the focus of the sessions as the group identifies a new interest, and to assess the benefit of the project to the community in general on a month-by-month basis. Learners' interests often include, for example, nutrition, health care, generating income.

8. Learners not only identify the topics to be covered during group meetings, but also decide the structure of topic presentations. For example, the group handles such activities as forming small groups to pursue specific learning interests, using local technical resources and facilities, and compiling an inventory of community resources. This way learners gain experience in identifying and using local resources on their own. The facilitator and coordinator use innovative learning materials that do not require reading skills and that encourage group discussion, decision, and action, in order to help the

group set objectives, recognize problems to be solved, and plan strategies.

9. Field teams meet regularly with central project administrators to receive help in responding to changing group interests, identifying resources, and preparing materials. At these meetings, the field teams exchange and develop new ideas and techniques.

10. For the first few months the facilitator and coordinator work as a team, the coordinator, in effect, apprenticing with the facilitator. After six to eight months, the coordinator takes over and the original facilitator moves to a new village. The group begins to pay the coordinator for his or her services to the best of its ability at this point.

11. In order to assess the success of this approach an evaluation team composed of consultants and project staff conducts a comprehensive project evaluation. As part of an ongoing assessment instituted at the outset of the project, a feedback system was created requiring the field teams to complete weekly logs and the project director and field work supervisor to keep records during their frequent field visits for observation and monitoring. A critical part of the evaluation is the documentation of the village participants' goals and objectives at the outset of the project, as well as of existing conditions in the village. To accomplish this, 15 to 20 individuals in each village who elect to participate in the project are randomly selected at the outset, and their progress is followed for the project's duration. Outcomes attributable to project activities are documented at two major points during the operation of the project. In these evaluations, data are collected to determine whether the approach has helped the villagers achieve their goals and objectives and to discover implications of project outcomes for the community in general.

The project sponsor in Kenya is the National Christian Council through its member agency, Tototo Home Industries. Tototo is a handicraft marketing organization that works with low-income adults, particularly women, in the coastal area of Kenya. For the duration of the project, Tototo has added the self-actualizing method of learning to its other educational approaches. This part of the organization's work is called "Tototo-Kilemba." "Kilemba" is composed of letters from the names of the three provinces where cooperating village groups are located: Kilife, Kwale, and Mombasa. Project villages were

selected because they had already been identified as difficult areas, that is, previous projects had been abandoned or there was a previous lack of interest in group activity.

The Philippine sponsor, PRRM, is a community development agency with primary interest in education. In the Philippines, the project staff uses the acronym SAM, for self-actualizing method, to describe the approach. The project villages were selected with the cooperation of three community development agencies with which PRRM works; two are private, voluntary organizations, one is a government agency. Village groups taking part in the SAM project are ones where staff of the partner agencies were working before SAM but where little group activity was evident.

The PRRM system of working with a partner agency takes two forms. In four villages, the field team—a facilitator from the staff of PRRM and a coordinator from the village—works with the local staff member of the partner agency. The three will function as a team, with the facilitator and coordinator shouldering responsibility for assisting the group with the educational aspects of their chosen projects. In the remaining two villages, staff members of the partner agency were trained to be the SAM facilitators on the field teams. These organizational arrangements and the staff training are described at length elsewhere.*

*These will be included in Volume III of Education for Development and the Rural Woman, by Noreen Clark.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

As we set out to evaluate the impact and effects of the self-actualizing approach to education for community development, two interrelated and equally important factors must be considered. First, we must examine the learning process, to see the extent to which the process intended was in fact carried out, and whether any unintended processes or events influenced project outcomes. Next, we must examine project outcomes to determine first what they are, and, second, whether they address the development needs of rural individuals and communities.

In order to discover the extent to which the learning process operated as intended, we must know how well the learning events and the context of the learning actually met the criteria set for an ideal self-actualizing approach to education. We must determine the extent to which:

- the field team selected and used learning materials that consistently reflected immediate and specific learning needs and interests;
- the field team assisted group members to express their interests and identify and take action towards objectives;
- the field team aided group members to assess their progress continuously and select new objectives as old ones were met or discarded;
- members played a major role in the selection and retention of the coordinator who led the learning group;

- learning activities were closely linked with existing agencies, organizations, and services;
- groups had access to start-up funds or basic resources needed to meet their learning objectives.

We must describe and explain the evolution of the approach if we are to replicate it. Thus, two questions related to process that evaluators considered as they analyzed project data are: What is the success of the learning approach in achieving discussion, decision, and action? What problems hinder achievement of group goals, or, what happens to participants, project staff, and communities over time that enables or hinders learning groups in achieving their objectives?

When evaluating outcomes, we must measure and assess both verifiable and imputed results. Imputed results are those related to personal growth that group and community members report: increased self-confidence, willingness to collaborate, etc. To assess the imputed outcomes of the self-actualizing approach we must discover whether the learners feel that they have benefited, individually and collectively. To evaluate the verifiable results of the learning approach, we must document project outcomes and assess them in light of generally accepted development goals.* We must judge the degree to which group attainments hold promise for improving the health, income, and nutritional status of participants, their families, and their communities. Thus, two questions related to project outcomes that evaluators considered are: What are the rewards to individuals for taking part in learning groups? What are the outcomes of the approach in terms of income, health, nutrition, and other development issues?

In order to answer these and other important evaluation questions, data were collected in each participating village at three points in time: before activities began, six months after activities began, and again at the official termination of project staff involvement with the groups. In addition, data were collected each week during the life of the project describing learning meetings, group activities, village events, and project administration. Data are available, therefore, to describe not only the situation at the beginning, middle, and end of the project, but to describe the process of implementation each step of the way.

*These development goals are discussed at length in the opening chapter of Education for Development and the Rural Woman, Volume I, by Noreen Clark. This monograph contains the thinking and analysis that this project and educational approach were founded on.

SOURCES OF DATA AT MIDPOINT

Seven major sources of data describe the situation in each village at the midpoint of the project:

- 1. The field team's weekly logs.**
- 2. The field work supervisor's observation and external event forms.**
- 3. The project director's quarterly reports.**
- 4. On-site observations during the sixth month by two technical consultants to the project.**
- 5. Responses of each facilitator and coordinator to an extensive interview conducted by the two technical consultants in the sixth month.**
- 6. Responses of the project director and field work supervisor to a questionnaire administered in the sixth month.**
- 7. Responses of 77 out of 90 participants in Kenya and 106 out of 135 in the Philippines, who constitute the core evaluation group, to a series of questions posed by evaluators in the sixth month.**

An extensive amount of data was collected in the sixth month of the project. Technical consultants made observations in each village and also interviewed each facilitator and coordinator at length, using a guide list of 13 open-ended questions (see Appendix). In each village, project staff interviewed the 15 to 20 or so women identified initially by project planners as the project core group, that is, the sample to be followed over the life of the program. Seventy-seven of the 90 in Kenya and 106 of 135 in the Philippines were available and agreed to respond to a series of 14 open-ended questions (see Appendix). Project facilitators conducted the majority of these interviews, each working in a village where he or she was not known as a project facilitator. Technical consultants also conducted interviews.

The data from staff and participant interviews were organized and analyzed

according to the project's major evaluation concerns: What is the success of the learning approach in stimulating discussion, decision, and action? What are the rewards to individuals for taking part in learning groups? What are the outcomes of the approach in terms of income, health, nutrition, and other development issues? What problems hinder achievement of group goals?

This report will present the data compiled from the feedback system up to the project's midpoint, and those collected during the midpoint evaluation, in three ways: 1) tracing the learning approach as it occurred in one village; 2) a brief, narrative description of each learning group's status at midpoint, based on consultant's observations, administrative staff reports, and facilitator's logs; 3) an analysis of the interview responses of project staff, facilitators, and coordinators, and an analysis of the interview responses of group members themselves for each evaluation question posed. In this way we examine the perspectives of both learners and leaders on various aspects of the approach, and we are able to judge these in conjunction with the observable progress* made by each group by the project's midpoint.

*Indicators of a project's success are discussed in the project background monograph, Education for Development and the Rural Woman, Volume 1.

TRACING THE LEARNING APPROACH

Before describing project outcomes and processes in general, we will isolate the learning approach as it occurred in one village. This village was selected for tracing because the field team reports regarding its activities are particularly complete. We know from the preceding description that certain things characterize a self-actualizing method program.* The characteristics include community-wide support, learner-determined priorities, and an active learning approach. The self-actualizing method requires a certain set of conditions and a certain modus operandi in order to be effective.

In order to determine learner priorities and actively engage participants, the facilitator and coordinator must utilize materials and an approach in each learning session that are "situation specific," encourage immediate group problem solving in order to reach a group-identified goal, and foster learner independence and self-reliance. The term "situation specific" means here that the objectives for each learning session develop from one meeting to the next out of the real problems faced by the group in attempting to reach its goal. Problem solving here means reaching agreement through dialogue and discussion, developing the strategies, finding the resources, and carrying out the tasks necessary to move toward the goal. Independence and self-reliance mean that the group will act in its own behalf, make its own decisions, and maintain control over the process of reaching the goal it has set, using outside resources and expertise as it chooses.

It is helpful to understand how this kind of learning approach evolves in an individual group in order to see all of its dimensions. We will therefore look

*These characteristics are described at some length in the project background monograph, Education for Development and the Rural Woman, Volume I.

at one particular group, and trace its learning activities over several months' time, describing why and how materials and learning approaches were used by the field team in each meeting. In outlining the materials and methods used, we will not describe all the activities that occurred between learning sessions, nor will we attempt to describe all program characteristics. For our purposes here, we will concentrate on what was actually done by the field team when group members got together. In this way we hope to address the important questions: What happens in a self-actualizing method learning session? What does the teaching and learning interaction involve? What are the elements of the learning session itself?

The village we are tracing is Village 12 as described in the "Project Outcomes" section of the Philippine chapter of this report. The members of Village 12 have initiated two main projects: pig dispersal and broiler production. To see how the learning approach unfolded, we will outline the activities that took place at each meeting during a seven-month period.

Meeting One: The initial meeting was publicized in the area by the barrio captain, who is the local political leader, and the president of the barrio group, a parents' club choosing to collaborate with PRRM. The first meeting was held at the usual meeting place of the club near the center of the village. Prior to this meeting the group had selected a coordinator to send to PRRM for training and had been assigned a facilitator by PRRM.

Although members already knew each other, the facilitator/coordinator team felt it would be a good idea to begin the meeting with a warm-up activity that would give each person the opportunity to express his or her ideas aloud to the group in an easy, comfortable way. This was important since the team also wanted to ask group members to prioritize their learning interests during the meeting. It seemed a good idea, therefore, that everyone have the initial experience of speaking out in the group and giving reasons for selecting something that interested them.

The team chose to engage members in a group game called the "Get Me" exercise to provide this initial experience and create a relaxed climate for the meeting. Group members were asked to scout around the meeting place, select something they liked, and explain their choice to the other group members. There was much laughter and good spirit as everyone chose fruit, stones, a leaf, a can, or some other item to discuss.

After this game, giving members an opportunity to speak out, the team spread about on the ground 25 pictures drawn to show people performing a wide variety of daily activities all practiced in rural Philippines but not necessarily

in Village 12. Members were given ample time to look over the pictures, examine them closely, and discuss among themselves what the people depicted were doing and the relevance of such activities to them.

Then the team asked the group to select the pictures, if any, that showed things they were most interested in and might like to learn something about. Fifteen pictures were selected and group members gave their reasons for their respective, and frequently collective, choices. The team then asked the group to choose from the 15 pictures the one that most closely represented what they would like most to learn about or do as a group. After an extended discussion, the group selected an activity known to be lucrative, if difficult: pig raising. The team then asked the group if they would like to meet again in a few days to pursue this interest, and members said they would.

Meeting Two: After beginning a traditional Philippine warm-up activity, singing, and while it was taking place, the team put around the meeting place posters showing different kinds of pigs, systems (individual and cooperative) for caring for pigs, and materials needed for a piggery project. After the group had studied the posters, the team played a tape recording for the group—an open-ended drama about two women who raise pigs. One is knowledgeable about pig management, the other is not. The team then invited discussion on the fate of the two women and asked the group to consider in what ways the two women were different from each other. After a time the team asked the group what relevance the story held for them, and then members began to outline the kind of things one needs to know in taking on a piggery project.

The next activity introduced was a planning exercise called "Building a House," in which teams are required to construct a hypothetical village house and the elements of planning are illuminated. During this exercise, the group discussed several ideas: the benefits of careful planning; pros and cons of cooperative endeavor and individual projects; the range of materials needed to begin; and the need for initiating action and mobilizing existing resources. At the end of the discussion, group members agreed to scout around their community during the following week to discover resources available, if any, for the pig project.

At this meeting as well as the first one, many residents participated—nearly 40, if all of the curious passers-by who joined in the group are counted. The parents' club of 15 members was the intended learning group, but the meeting was open to the public. As a result many residents stopped by to see what was going on, and most of those who appeared for this second meeting were convinced that PRRM was going to give them pigs, although this was not the plan and had never been said to be the case. The expectation is not unwarranted,

since many agencies operating in the rural areas do give supplies to village residents. When it became clear during the second meeting that resources were to be found and mobilized by group members themselves and that no widespread giveaway program was in operation, the curious and those with minimal interest stopped coming. The fact that PRRM would not supply participants with pigs was fully discussed, as was the project premise of self-reliance and independence. By the third meeting, just the original group of 15, all members of the parents' group, were left.

Meeting Three: As so many participants had expected doleouts, the team felt it would be useful to underscore the project premise of self-reliance. For this purpose the team introduced a lively string game in which participants untangle themselves after recruiting specific assistance and information from other members. The team asked members how this game related to them. A discussion followed in which the group shared with each other ways in which the pig project could develop through self-reliance, and then identified sources they could tap to get materials needed for the project. The group decided to recruit the barrio captain to canvass, with the aid of the coordinator, three of the government agencies serving the community to discover how they might help out.

Meeting Four: Now that the larger group had settled down to its core of parents' club members, the team felt it would be a good idea to check whether piggery was indeed their primary interest, or if some of the initial participants had swayed the decision in hopes of being given a pig. The pictures used in Meeting One were again discussed and members confirmed their interest in the project.

A game called "Broken Squares" was introduced. This game requires optimum collaboration among participants. In a discussion that followed, members reiterated to each other the need for each one to take responsibility in the project. The coordinator reported that some assistance might be available from an official agency but that this was not certain. The group decided to continue to search for assistance and determined that if even one or two pigs could be secured (either native or imported), they would organize a "dispersal schedule." This meant that an individual would care for a pig and when the pig had a litter, those piglets would be distributed to other group members.

Meeting Five: The team and group president reported that the sponsoring agency of the parents' group had expressed some interest in the pig dispersal project and would be willing to receive a proposal from the group. The team led the group in an exercise called "Sinking Boat" in which participants are required to make decisions and set priorities. This process was then applied to the piggery project and group members outlined specific details of the way the

pig dispersal would work. Members agreed that, from a litter of eight, three piglets would be dispersed to other members, two would be sold with proceeds going to the club treasury, and three would be kept by the original owner. The team and president agreed to write down this outline in a proposal and deliver it to the parents' club's sponsoring agency the following week.

Meeting Six: The group now needed to make some important determinations. Their chances for assistance appeared good. The sponsoring agency said it could probably provide funds for the group to buy piglets. The team led members through another priority-setting exercise called "Traffic Policemen," which builds on earlier exercises. As part of the exercise, members had to analyze the implications of choices the game forced them to make and to describe the criteria they used to make each choice.

The group then used this same procedure to make decisions about the dispersal project: who should receive the first pigs (nine members were ready—the criterion was that they had built or would build a pen); what kind of pigs would be raised (four individuals selected native, three semi-native, and two hybrid—the criteria for choice were the difficulty in managing each and members' confidence to do so); how activities would be coordinated (the group selected three members to visit the nine people requesting pigs to determine if their pens were ready to receive pigs by the following week. These three people would also coordinate the pig project and be responsible for seeing that plans were carried out).

Meeting Seven: The team led the group in a discussion that centered on the events of the past week, on visits to completed pig pens, and on the arrival of seven native pigs the following day. During the week the three appointed project coordinators had, with funds provided by the sponsoring agency, purchased the required number of native pigs. Members agreed that those who were to receive pigs should sign contracts specifying their acceptance of the club's dispersal plan. Members initially receiving the animals signed these contracts, and the group decided to ask an expert on pig raising to their next meeting.

Meeting Eight: A local resident who knows a lot about managing different breeds of pigs was invited by the group to this meeting. She gave the members factual information and answered their questions about proper feeding, prevention and control of disease, daily care, and marketing. The group agreed to continue the session the following day, and at the end of that session they identified other individuals in and nearby the village who could be of assistance if group members needed help. The group identified a veterinarian living a few kilometers away as an important resource.

Meeting Nine: After a month's break, in which the first nine pigs were distributed and members had formed a daily routine of caring for them, the group held another meeting. In the interim, the team heard that a government agency was making monies available to community groups for special projects, and that because of its previous success, this group stood a good chance of receiving some funds for a second project. The team again began the meeting by displaying the range of pictures showing people engaged in various activities. After much deliberation and discussion over the drawings, group members decided that they wanted to begin a poultry project and raise broilers for sale. With their previous experience in project planning, they moved ahead rather quickly. They decided to devote their next meeting to outlining a broiler production proposal. In the meantime, they would scout the community for resources that might be mobilized, send two of their members to a workshop being held by the government agency to describe its criteria for funding community projects, and set up sessions to begin three weeks hence on the care and management of broilers.

Meeting Ten: The team began the session by introducing an exercise called "The Impertinent Pert Chart." This process illuminates eight major steps in planning. The group members used the procedure to plan their system for carrying out the poultry project. They decided that, initially, several individuals would care for the broilers under the club's supervision. Chicks would be given to other members when they had coops ready to receive them, and some proceeds from all sales would go to the club treasury.

Project coordinators were selected, and the group asked the team to write down their project plans, which would serve as a proposal to submit to the government agency. Members agreed to carry on with the project whether or not funds were forthcoming from this particular agency. They also selected a local person who knows about poultry raising to conduct care and management sessions. The group coordinator, who also knows a lot about poultry raising, was asked to teach these sessions.

Meeting Eleven: Group members who had attended the government agency workshop reported that the group's project did fit the criteria described and that they had been encouraged to send in their plans. The team then showed the group a large picture of an egg ready to hatch. Group members reflected that the drawing represented their group in two ways: their project was about to come alive, and they would soon be hatching broilers. Their discussion then focused on what the group needed to know in order to bring about the safe birth of both the project and the new chicks. The group decided that the lessons on broiler production should cover the following: materials needed, feeding practices and types of feeds, common illnesses and their prevention and control, responsibilities of the caretaker, local sources of chicks, and market outlets

and marketing. The group set the date for the first lesson and all agreed to attend.

Meeting Twelve: Group members convened as planned, but the people invited to lead the classes were unable to attend so members set another date for the initial session.

Meeting Thirteen: The team and group leader called this meeting a day or two later to show group members a letter from the government agency expressing interest in the club's broiler project. The letter stated that to qualify for funds the group would need to submit plans for conducting family planning classes as part of their project. This led to extended discussion. Most members felt the requirement was not relevant to them as they were "too old to worry about family planning," or already knew they "did not want any more children." The group determined that, nonetheless, they needed start-up funds and since a family planning component was required they would try to develop one, based on the government agency's outline and using the same planning steps that had helped them with their broiler proposal. They also agreed that the coordinator should go ahead and begin the poultry management sessions by himself as soon as possible since the other resource people they had invited were not forthcoming. Shortly following this meeting the typhoon Khading struck the area, causing extensive damage. Activities in this village and others came to a halt for almost a month as people worked to rehabilitate their communities.

Meeting Fourteen: To begin this meeting, the team led the group in a discussion beginning with questions designed to help members assess their progress. The group determined that it must reconsider and postpone poultry management sessions until a family planning proposal was developed. Members agreed that the next meeting would be devoted to this, and they asked one member who had attended the government agency workshop to present some ideas to the group at this meeting.

Meeting Fifteen: The group member who had attended the agency workshop presented ideas for family planning classes to the group, and plans were quickly approved. The group agreed that the proposal of their plans to hold weekly discussions on various family planning topics should be written down and submitted to the agency. The group also decided that the poultry management classes could now begin under the tutelage of the coordinator. By this time the coordinator had demonstrated that he could function well on his own and he assumed the lead role in the team. The facilitator began to withdraw, providing assistance only at the request of the group and/or coordinator.

Meetings Sixteen and Seventeen: The coordinator reviewed with the group members the five topics on broiler raising that they had outlined in Meeting

Eleven. Using posters and drawings made by agriculturists and artists at PRRM, he led the group through discussions and demonstrations related to each of their five learning concerns. A third session was scheduled (Meeting Eighteen) by the group to allow them to cover some of their additional questions.

Meeting Nineteen: The group leader reported that money for poultry was probably forthcoming from the government agency, but that it might take several weeks. Group members decided after some deliberation to submit their proposal to one or two other organizations while waiting for a response from the first, and to guard against a negative reply from this agency. Then an on-the-spot decision was made after limited discussion: to cultivate mushrooms while waiting for the poultry project to be funded. Members asked the coordinator to contact a resource person from PRRM to come to the group and demonstrate mushroom culture.

Meeting Twenty: Using a series of picture charts, the PRRM resource person and the coordinator took the group through the steps of mushroom planting and harvesting. Members agreed that during the next meeting the resource person would show how to prepare the culture and plant spores. The group leader and coordinator were appointed to find the materials needed, particularly the hay necessary for the culture.

Meeting Twenty-One: As members arrived, the coordinator and group leader informed them that there was not enough hay in the area to build a culture. They discussed this problem at some length and decided that the mushroom project should be postponed until after planting season, when more hay might become available. The facilitator and coordinator noted that this impasse, in their opinion, was the result of the group's failure to analyze all the implications of their choice of mushroom culture and to plan as carefully as they had done in the other two projects. According to the facilitator's log, some members seemed to agree with this premise, as evidenced in their comments during the discussion to postpone the project. The group decided that they would tell the coordinator when they were again ready to tackle mushroom growing, but they set no definite time.

Meeting Twenty-Two: Only three days later the group leader and coordinator called this meeting to tell members that they would receive start-up funds for their broiler project from the government agency. The coordinator then led an open discussion reviewing the initial steps of the club's plan for buying and raising chicks and posing questions about how the plans should be carried out. After some deliberation, the group made three major decisions: to scout for market outlets and other sources of stock; to identify the first recipients who would, as a criterion of selection, agree to build coops; to ask each recipient to sign a contract—based on the piggery project contracts—agreeing to abide

by the policies outlined in the club's poultry proposal. Initial funds would enable five individuals to begin to raise broilers; if these were successful, the agency would donate funds so five more members could begin production. Three members volunteered to raise broilers at this meeting. The coordinator and facilitator, however, noted a new hesitancy in other group members. They inferred from the discussion that this was due primarily to two things: members lacked the materials needed for the project, and they were afraid of being the first and failing; that is, they doubted their ability to manage broiler production, and were afraid that their failure might prevent others from participating. Repairing the typhoon damage forced most families to use all available resources to rebuild their homes; many had used up the bamboo they had set aside for chicken houses. The coordinator and group president asked the members to think over what had been discussed and to meet again the next day to identify two additional volunteers to begin the project. The meeting resumed the following evening but no new volunteers came forth. The group decided, therefore, to proceed with the three volunteers, and the president agreed to visit these individuals the following week to see how their coops were progressing.

It was at this point that the midpoint evaluation was conducted. We must wait, therefore, until data are available to present the next phase of the group's work. We can see from this description, however, that the Tototo-Kilemba and SAM approach is based on a "curriculum" that evolves from the decisions participants make. It relies heavily on techniques such as group exercises, visual aids, and stories that enable participants to make analogies, recognize things about themselves, and apply approaches to their group problem. This approach helps group members move from problem solving and decision making in group meetings, to performing individual and collective tasks as a result, and it builds on locally available resources and talents, using first those within the group and immediate community. We have looked in depth at one group; now it is time to review the activities of all 12 participating groups in Kenya and the Philippines to see general trends, problems, and outcomes by midpoint.

TOTOTO-KILEMBA IN KENYA

Project Outcomes

Group Progress at Midpoint

Analysis of Teaching Aids and the Learning Process

The Facilitator/Coordinator's Perspective

. Materials and Discussion

. From Decision to Action

The Participant's Perspective

The Learning Approach—Rewards (or Not) for Participating

The Participant's Perspective

The Facilitator/Coordinator's Perspective

Problems

The Participant's Perspective

The Facilitator/Coordinator's Perspective

Summary of Conclusions

Previous Page Blank

PROJECT OUTCOMES

Group Progress at Midpoint

By the sixth month of operation, groups participating in Tototo-Kilemba were experiencing various degrees of success. Some projects initiated in the six villages were operating fully, others were just getting started. Each group of women had confronted major obstacles in reaching its learning objectives. Some were better able to overcome them than others. Indeed, success ranged from quite high to limited. In order to determine what resulted from the learning approach at midpoint, it is useful to consider each village separately.

Village 1: The group of women in Village 1, compared to other village groups, was the least successful on all counts by midpoint. In the view of the project director, field work supervisor, and facilitator, the group has experienced difficulty in reaching decisions acceptable to all members. Other project data support this. By November the women had decided to raise chickens and had almost finished constructing a large poultry house. It took six months to reach this juncture. As one examines documents from the feedback system and data collected at midpoint, some reasons for limited progress grow apparent.

There is reason to believe the coordinator in Village 1 was not actually selected by the group but pushed forward by one member. Subsequently, as she is young and somewhat retiring, she does not enjoy the full confidence of the women in her group. Although one can observe that her abilities for group

discussion and use of teaching aids have improved somewhat since initial training, she exerts little presence in the group. She, as she describes her work, appears to view herself as a follower rather than leader among the women.

These village women appear to have long-standing interpersonal problems. One member, an officer in the group, is particularly dominant and often causes dissension. She donated the space where the poultry house is built and on occasion has threatened to renege if the other group members do not agree with her. Meetings in the beginning were held at this woman's house. During this period attendance was low and sporadic.

No doubt a lack of effective leadership contributes to the group's difficulty in reaching decisions. The group for some months vacillated between raising rabbits and chickens. They finally agreed collectively to begin a project with hens and began to build the poultry house. At this point they unexpectedly received six rabbits as a gift from an official agency. Some members were quite distressed, as they had decided against rabbitry. They built a small hutch for the rabbits next to the uncompleted poultry house. They had no training in rabbit keeping. Attempts by the facilitator to get extension workers to come to the village to teach rabbit care were not fruitful. Soon the rabbits and their litters began to die. At midpoint no litters had survived and three rabbits were dead. This appeared to add to an undercurrent feeling among many of the women that group endeavor is not worth the effort it requires. They have begun to show limited interest in learning about rabbitry and claim that they will "try" to succeed with rabbits.

In order to raise funds to complete the poultry house the women, under guidance from Tototo, have begun to make handicrafts. Several claim to enjoy this and Tototo staff feel that they produce good work. As yet no income has been earned by members from handicrafts. At midpoint the group intends to finish the hen house, begin poultry raising, and continue with craftwork. They have also begun literacy classes with a teacher from outside the group.

Village 2 : The group in Village 2 has fewer members than any other project group and enjoyed the earliest success, but has experienced some difficulty after a strong beginning. The group, literally within a month's time, initiated a successful firewood-selling project. In the past four months, however, it has experienced more limited success in building a kiosk to protect the wood from the weather, and in accelerating its business.

There is a striking similarity between Village 2 and Village 1 when one examines the situation to find reasons why progress has slowed. The coordinator in Village 2, it was discovered at midpoint, had not been selected by the women but sent to Tototo-Kilemba by a local official. She claims not to enjoy her work because the group is "difficult." She appears to carry out her coordi-

nator's role in a limited way and not to be recognized as a leader. As in Village 1, one member, chairwoman of the group, appears to cause dissension by trying to dominate decisions while refraining from full participation in activities. This seems to irritate some members and confuse others.

The facilitator in Village 2 is skillful and on one occasion kept the group from breaking up. Initially, she helped the women establish an accounting system for their business, and when they began to tabulate the results of their first sale they discovered they had taken a sizable loss. The group members were disheartened, but the facilitator encouraged them to continue their business, and she helped them obtain funds from Tototo-Kilemba, in the form of a small gift and loan from project seed money. Then, assisted by the facilitator, the group began to recoup its losses and buy more wood to sell. The facilitator has emphasized self-sufficiency and group members have by themselves accomplished things they were previously afraid to do, for example, securing licenses for selling, which entails trips to offices and dealings with bureaucracy. The facilitator had been working with the group, through discussion, to find ways to build a kiosk. Then an event occurred that was similar to the case in Village 1. An extension worker from an official agency unexpectedly informed the women that she would have a kiosk built for them by her agency as part of its yearly program of contributing to villages. Although this had not been done by the project's midpoint, the group members appear to have decided to wait for the agency to provide the kiosk.

The group has started a literacy class, motivated in part by the need to keep business records. Two members have become the teachers and are reimbursed for their work by the Ministry of Social Services. Attendance at classes, however, has dwindled as other group activities have slowed. The women have also opened a group bank account in which to keep the proceeds from their business; at midpoint this totaled approximately 500 shillings (US\$67.00).* The women decided against producing handicrafts for income, feeling that the return was not sufficient for the effort required.

Village 3 : Immediately following the training for Tototo-Kilemba facilitators and coordinators, there was a cholera outbreak in Village 3 and a virtual quarantine of the village for six weeks. Then the coordinator took ill and was unable to work for three months. Directly following this, just as the group began meeting, the president died and there was an official period of mourning throughout Kenya. Thus, by midpoint this group had been functioning for less than two months. Some progress, however, appears to have been made rather quickly.

The facilitator and coordinator face the ghost of past failures in Village 3. Over two years ago a group of women was encouraged by a visiting official

*7.5 shillings equals one U.S. dollar.

to begin a poultry project. It is customary for ministries to supply chicks and some feed on a one-time basis to village groups. The women took the hens, although they had no training or access to it, and they did not effectively organize themselves. Within a short period of time all the hens died. Since then the women of the village have been reluctant to work collectively. By November, after many hours of discussion, they decided to try again with a poultry project. This time, however, since they had gratis chicks once before, they had to raise money to purchase hens and feed. The women from Village 3 have made handicrafts for Tototo for many years, earning anywhere from 20 to 300 shillings per month. Proceeds from selling these enable many women to contribute to the project's financing. The coordinator has helped the women find new markets for their goods by canvassing possible sellers near the village. They have discussed how to organize themselves, which includes allowing six women who do not want to be involved in the project to remain part of the group. They have begun to study poultry keeping and have almost finished renovating and cementing the old poultry house, doing some work themselves and hiring a builder when needed. They began literacy classes by hiring the coordinator as their literacy instructor with funds provided by the Ministry of Social Services. The group also has a plan to build or buy a shop in which to sell their crafts. The coordinator appears to enjoy the full confidence of the group and can create an atmosphere in which they openly analyze their problems.

Village 4 : After four months of shaky going, the group in Village 4 had picked up momentum by November and completed two-thirds of an ambitious nursery school building.

The reasons for the slow start reveal that unless a project grows from the learners' needs and interests it will not succeed. The initial learning project undertaken by Village 4 was establishing a firewood-selling project. By mid-point there was evidence to suggest that the facilitator and coordinator had imposed this idea on the group as a good way to raise money. For two months the firewood business faltered due to the members' limited efforts to find markets, and was then abandoned. Although the women say they are interested in earning income, it is of lower priority to them than to the women in the other five villages. A reason for this, which is discussed at greater length in the project baseline survey, may be a general difference in the economic status of the village compared to other project sites.

For two more months the group discussed and considered how to achieve what they really wanted: a child-care center and nursery school for their children. This was felt by the facilitator to be too large an undertaking, and he tried to dissuade the group in several ways. They decided, however, to persevere, and in two short months a large cinder block and cement building was more than half finished. This entailed acquiring a variety of expensive resources including materials and a builder, and necessitated that members organize them-

selves to carry out much of the labor. Materials were acquired by purchase out of group contributions and donations from the community development ministry. Members have been able to contribute to group projects because they have their own income-generating activities. Some group members—50 percent from Village 4—make makuti roofing materials, which they sell for as much as 100 shillings per month. This is a sporadic business, however. Four women make floor mats, which they sell to Tototo, and can earn about 50 shillings per month. The group has made plans to use part of the building as a work area where group members will do tie-dyeing and sewing. A nursery school teacher has been identified and, among other topics, the group has been discussing child care. One co-facilitator, a community development assistant, has been particularly resourceful in finding materials and supplies. The coordinator seems to enjoy a fair amount of support from the group.

Village 5: The group in Village 5 had an active egg-selling business by midpoint. They have been collecting 98 eggs per day, all of which they sell at US 7¢ (50 Kenyan cents) per egg to vendors on the village road. Before Tototo-Kilemba began the women had constructed a poultry house, but activities came to a standstill as they confronted the problem of acquiring and raising the chicks. Over the six months since Kilemba was started the women have learned how to care for poultry, have acquired 100 hens, and are enjoying a high egg yield each day. They have also learned how to organize themselves for work, and how to package and transport the eggs, and they have secured a good market. Much of this has been financed through contributions women have been able to make from the handicrafts they sell to Tototo. Of the core group members from Village 5 who participated in the midpoint evaluation, 64 percent have sold handicrafts to Tototo, stating that they can earn 200 shillings in a month. On the other hand, four of these core group individuals claimed they had not earned money for several months.

The group coordinator gives members literacy lessons for which she is paid by the Ministry of Social Services. She reports increased class attendance as the business has progressed. The group keeps good records of its income and expenditures, and by midpoint it had on one occasion made enough profit to divide 600 shillings among the 15 members. By midpoint the women had formulated a plan to build a much larger poultry house and acquire many additional chickens. The coordinator enjoys the full confidence of the group. She continues to improve in her ability to create discussion and aid the group to analyze problems.

Village 6 : By midpoint the group in Village 6 had finished building a bakery—the first of its kind in a rural coastal village—and was selling bread. According to group members, they had been talking about building a bakery for several years and even they were surprised that with Tototo-Kilemba it was achieved in six months. Building the bakery entailed finding finances.

The group in Village 6 discussed learning to make handicrafts for the purpose of earning income to contribute to the bakery project. Of the core group sample from this village, 42 percent made handicrafts to earn start-up money, earning amounts ranging from 35 to 500 shillings for an average of two weeks' work. In addition, Kilemba loaned 700 shillings to them from project seed money, and the director of the National Christian Council of Kenya at the Kanamai Conference Center donated a used oven and a builder to install it. A local member of Parliament donated iron sheets for the roof. The women hired a builder to construct the complex parts of their bakery and did large amounts of the building work themselves.

The members contributed money to send two women to Kanamai to learn how to bake, and these two in turn taught all the other members. The group has built latrines some yards away from the bakery to maintain sanitary conditions. The coordinator, who is also the literacy teacher, reports that attendance is rising in literacy classes as business progresses. The group members keep good records and have learned to organize themselves for work. They are using profits to pay back their loan. They have a plan to build a tea kiosk and perhaps begin a poultry project.

The coordinator in the group enjoys full confidence of the members. She is resourceful and particularly able to create an open environment for discussion and resolution of problems.

ANALYSIS OF TEACHING AIDS AND THE LEARNING PROCESS

The Facilitator/Coordinator's Perspective

Materials and discussion. The nine facilitators and coordinators were each asked to report to evaluators the event in which a teaching aid "worked the best," and the incident when an aid "didn't work—was the worst" in generating discussion and decision. In every "best" incident save one, facilitators and coordinators described a situation in which the teaching aid led to a direct, observable outcome. The successful aids, in their view, were those that brought group members to an action and produced immediate results. The following three incidents are typical of this decision and action process:

I used drawings that I made of two different groups of ladies. In one series of pictures the group moved to action and completed a project. In the other the ladies just continue to talk. The women discussed how group one was cooperating and helped each other while group two just grumbled and discussed. This worked, I believe, because the next day when the women were to meet to work on the project they all came and collected makuti (dried palm leaves).

—Facilitator

I used a picture from a magazine of women working on a group farm. There are no roads to the village and there needs to be a small path. The discussion ended in the group's decision to make a small path themselves. They were encouraged because women in the picture were using big heavy tools. The same picture worked in Village 5 to have women clear away the grass that covers their road. Pictures of other Kenyan women encourage groups that they are not alone and can do things.

—Facilitator

I used flexiflan figures to show two groups: one group helping themselves and another being helped but not helping themselves. The second gets stuck when the outside help leaves. The first completes the project. The group discussed how to organize themselves and they learned they cannot always rely on others but must help themselves. I think this was learned because work had stopped on the poultry house but after this meeting members began to work again.

—Coordinator

Three facilitators/coordinators reported that their best aid was a tape. One tape told an incomplete story and participants supplied an ending. One described two businesses, one of which yielded higher profits, and the women in the story suggested ways to compute prices. One repeated back to the members the very problems they were experiencing as if it were of another group:

I recorded a speech explaining the problems that may fall on groups. I recorded my own speech but presented it to the group disguised as a speech made by a community development officer. The group was experiencing problems such as misunderstanding, misappropriation of funds, and leadership conflicts. So by using the taped explanations on how to go about solving such problems I thought it would solve the problem, which it did. I think that making them aware that the problems they experienced also affected other groups made them positive towards an acceptable way of solving the problem. After listening to the speech, they said: 1) it is as if this officer was observing us, and since he didn't, then we should look at the problems peacefully; 2) those who were causes of the problems kept a low profile during the discussions and also ceased to be a source of the problems that the group was experiencing.

—Facilitator

Three facilitator/coordinators reported that what worked best was a single drawing or magazine picture. Three found that two contrasting pictures led to the best discussion.

The nine "worst" aids reported fell mainly into two categories: incidents when the facilitator or coordinator in effect imposed an idea or solution on the group through the aids; and incidents where the aids were unclear, that is, the women could not understand them or misunderstood the "meaning" the facilitator had in mind. Two facilitators/coordinators describe examples of the former point:

I wanted to find out where people go for traditional dances and how they use those dances. I recorded a Kayaka song mainly sung during recreation but the instrument is also used during special occasions such as chasing away the evil spirits from the sick. The problem was that the participants talked about witchcraft instead of traditional dances. For instance, they reported the witchcraft that they believed existed. I took the view that they need not worry about it, but they would not agree. So I almost got myself rejected by my group.

—Facilitator

Handicraft pictures worked well in Village 5 but in Village 2 they didn't because women agreed to do handicrafts but they really didn't want to. The picture suggested handicrafts and they just went along with the idea. There is no market for the handicrafts they like to do. They don't want to do the crafts that will earn them money. They are not interested in learning a new handicraft that has a market.

—Facilitator

And these incidents are examples of unclear aids:

I used pictures to explain feeding of chickens; one showed fat chickens, one thin chickens. The women did not understand because they could not see the difference in the chickens. They thought the thin ones were just free-ranging chickens. So I had to explain and point out the differences and tell what the intention of the pictures was.

—Facilitator

One that didn't work was a drawing of a farmer and her big house and a drunkard and her ramshackle house. The picture was not clear, the message was not understood. I had to tell them what this meant for them to get the point. Drawing was vague.

—Facilitator

It is difficult to be certain why some aids work better than others to stimulate discussion and lead to action. Obviously, we can only make very tentative observations from such a small number of responses. Clearly, if a drawing or picture is not recognizable to the viewer it will not "work." If a chicken looks thin but not sick, the viewer will not assign the meaning intended. Similarly, if an aid is used by a facilitator or coordinator to moralize about things that may not be self-evident, it is likely not to work. Not all drunkards have ramshackle houses nor sober people big, important houses. Indeed, in a community with limited economic opportunity, drunkenness may be the least of a long list of factors associated with poverty. These aids are examples of attempts to depict distinctions and subtleties that may be difficult to present visually in an easily understood way. In addition, when a facilitator or coordinator uses an aid to direct the group to a predetermined conclusion, the material, regardless

of how well drawn or explicit, ultimately doesn't work well. In this situation, an aid is used not to elicit the learners' ideas but to sell those of the teachers.

Learning aids work because they are used successfully, not because of inherent characteristics. Nonetheless, the examples of "best aids" given describe materials that were developed to encompass two or three basic characteristics. They present a problem currently experienced by the group as a group. They depict situations where the decision needed to achieve a desired end rests with the group. In other words, success is directly related to what the group decides and does, and is not contingent on someone else's decision. In addition, the materials present situations where learners have an opportunity to "project," to compare another situation with their own. Analyzing the problem of the people in the drawing or on the tape becomes a vehicle for recognizing the problem as one's own.

These essential qualities appear to be criteria of success. Indeed, when a facilitator or coordinator selects materials in order to reflect these qualities the teaching aids come closest to those espoused by the self-actualizing approach, that is, aids that lead to discussion, decision, and action.

When asked to enumerate the advantages and disadvantages of using teaching aids, seven facilitators and coordinators offered ideas for the most part consistent with the analysis above. These ideas are summarized below.

Advantages:

- Teaching aids are most useful when introducing a new idea or topic.
- They increase the participation of members in open discussion.
- They enable members to share ideas related to the same thought or problem.

Disadvantages:

- Teaching aids may suggest and give importance to activities a group really does not want to engage in.
- They may not adequately reflect an idea the facilitator has in mind and thus confuse the group.
- If introduced when a group discussion is already active they can be distracting.

In summary, it appears that the facilitators and coordinators for the most part are able to make and use the aids to encourage discussion, decision, and

action; they are able to recognize when they have used an aid well; and they are able to enumerate what contributes to this success. In addition, each facilitator and coordinator appears to understand the concept of generating the teaching aid from meeting to meeting out of the immediate situation and the needs of the group. In this sense, the notion of ongoing needs assessment is understood by the facilitators and coordinators. And the way they subsequently select and use teaching aids shows that they act on this understanding.

From decision to action. The way a facilitator or coordinator assists groups to move from decision to action will vary. In order to learn how staff members view this aspect of their responsibility and to determine how they place emphasis, we asked them to describe the incidents that illustrate their most important contribution to the group and to the project. The 18 responses generally fell into two categories: actions within the group, and actions directed toward those outside the group who are influential to group success. In the first category, facilitators and coordinators describe four kinds of contributions:

- helping the group to get organized and develop systems for working together;
- enabling the group to find alternatives when they can see none;
- intervening when there are problems in cooperation or interpersonal relationships;
- helping members recognize problems getting in the way of their progress.

In the second category—actions directed toward those outside the group—facilitators and coordinators reported three major kinds of contributions:

- bringing in outside resource people;
- enlisting the assistance of village and political leaders;
- helping members find needed expertise, markets, and materials.

In moving from decision to action, then, it is clear that the group and individuals must mobilize a variety of resources. We asked facilitators and coordinators what person had been most helpful in this regard. Three of the nine named a Tototo-Kilemba staff member, two coordinators named facilitators, three named a community resident who donated materials, and one named an extension worker.

The degree of progress made by each group by midpoint shows that some facilitators and coordinators are more able to carry out their functions than others. In the main, however, facilitators and coordinators recognize the various dimensions of their role. The most effective facilitators and coordinators carry out the full repertoire of functions listed above. The less successful tend to fulfill only one or two functions of their multifaceted role.

The Participant's Perspective

A question was posed to the 77 participants who comprise the core group about the use of the teaching aids. It was posed as a critical-incident query, with each participant asked to describe a critical event: "The facilitator or coordinator sometimes uses pictures or stories or tapes in the group meeting. Can you tell me about one you remember and what, if anything, you learned from it?" In asking participants to recall one particular teaching aid, we intended to discover two or three things. One was to see if teaching aids were mentioned frequently enough for us to infer that group members recognized them as part of the learning process. If, for example, no one could describe any aid or recall its significance, we might conclude that materials played a relatively unimportant role in group processes. Another was to determine the range of subjects or topics reflected in discussions initiated by the aids, which appear to be important enough for participants to remember. We also wanted to learn about the nature of successful aids. Which ones—if memory is an indication of impact—had impact on most participants?

The responses to this question illuminated things in addition to the subjects and nature of aids each woman remembered. In every group a particular learning material tended to be remembered by several group members. There are probably a number of reasons why this is so. For example, certain teaching aids may have generated strong involvement because they hit on a problem most members recognized as immediate and important. Another explanation may be that a particular teaching aid led to a group commitment and as a result stood out in a woman's mind. Still another reason may be that certain aids were particularly clear and delivered a single, clear message. Remembering an aid did not seem to be related to the sequence of use, that is, some mentioned had been recently used, some used months before. So we feel safe in concluding that it is the nature of the aids and not the order of their use that leads to recall.

TABLE I
Responses: Type of Teaching Aid Recalled

<u>Type of Aid</u>	<u>Number Recalled</u>	<u>Percentage Recalled</u>
Subject Matter Aids	30	39%
- animal husbandry	17	22%
- sanitation and hygiene	5	6%
- child care	4	5%
- family planning	3	4%
- adult literacy	1	2%
Group Development Aids	35	45%
- cooperation and collaboration	18	23%
- decision making	17	22%
Described no aid	12	15%
TOTAL	77	99%

(error due to rounding)

In general, responses revealed nine kinds of descriptions of aids. Twelve participants, or 15 percent, said they could not remember any particular teaching aids at all. The most prevalent of these responses were qualified by such statements as "I have not been able to attend meetings," "I am old and my eyes are poor," "I don't remember such things." A few women also stated that "no aids have been used," "I have seen drawings and heard tapes but I did not learn from them."

Thirty participants, or 39 percent, referred to what we might call subject-matter teaching aids. Seventeen women recalled pictures or stories through which they learned things related to animal husbandry: raising rabbits and poultry. Five women remembered discussions related to cleanliness and sanitation that were stimulated by pictures. Four said they had learned something about child care from teaching aids. Three described aids that led to family planning discussions, and one woman mentioned adult literacy.

Thirty-five responses, or 45 percent, referred to what we will call group-development teaching aids. Eighteen women described aids that had "taught" them that cooperation was essential to achievement. These responses included such statements as: "The picture emphasized the need for our group to wake up and start working on a project," "I learned it is important to work hard, work together, cooperate," "The pictures helped me to learn how to work in a group, to work together so as to accomplish our tasks quickly," and so on. In the main these aids seem to be motivational. They led to discussions about ways in which members could collaborate, and implicit in these discussions was the message that it is good to work together.

Seventeen women referred to aids that reflected another aspect of group development: decision making. These responses alluded to the importance of the pictures, stories, and tapes in helping group members to analyze a situation and make choices. Included were ideas suggesting that pictures helped groups to make the decisions to "sell our (farm) products and get money for contributing toward the building of our nursery school," "begin a poultry project," "start a poultry project, as farming does not do well on our soil," "build a bakery as a group," "get a permit so as not to be chased by the police," and so on. These aids were used to illustrate a juncture that the group had reached and assist members to select a path to follow.

In summary, 85 percent of the participants could describe a teaching aid and relate in some detail what they had learned from the discussion generated by it. Those individuals who did not do this generally gave excuses related to old age or nonparticipation in meetings. We feel it is more than safe to say, therefore, that teaching aids play an important role in helping to stimulate discussion, and that these discussions, in the view of participants, not only led them to learn specifically about health, agriculture, and so on, but such aids also provided a primary opportunity for group members to examine options together and decide what individual and collective actions to take.

Table II below summarizes the number of meetings conducted and the number of teaching aids used by midpoint.

TABLE II
Number of Meetings and Teaching Aids per Village Group

<u>Village</u>	<u>Meetings</u>	<u>Aids</u>
1	16	13
2	21	13
3	15	10
4	10	6
5	13	7
6	18	9

THE LEARNING APPROACH—REWARDS (OR NOT) FOR PARTICIPATING

The Participant's Perspective

At midpoint evaluators asked each of the 77 women who comprise the core group of participants which meeting she had enjoyed the most. The intention of the query was to discover which group events provided rewards to participants, as it is assumed these rewards are the major reason for continued participation. Six percent of the respondents made negative statements such as "I've not enjoyed any meeting because I've not been very much interested," or "I attend very few meetings," or "I can't remember any meeting." However, the great majority, 94 percent, made positive remarks. Thirteen percent of the women made general statements, the most typical being "I like all the meetings because there are always some good discussions," and "all are equally enjoyable."

TABLE III
Responses on Type of Meeting Most Enjoyed

<u>Type of Meeting Most Enjoyed</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>	<u>Percentage of Responses</u>
Outside assistance or promise of assistance	11	15%
Developing ways to cooperate	6	7%
Income-related decisions and activities	23	30%
Decisions to take action	22	29%
All meetings enjoyed	10	13%
No meeting described	5	6%
TOTAL	77	100%

The rest, whose responses are perhaps more useful, discussed specific meetings, often in some detail, and four themes emerged from their descriptions. Fifteen percent of the core group most enjoyed a meeting when some outside person attended and provided or promised some sort of assistance: when the agricultural extension person brought rabbits; when the home economist taught women how to bake a cake; when Tototo-Kilemba project staff advised a group on developing handicrafts.

Seven percent of the women, on the other hand, described the most pleasing meeting as one in which the interaction among group members was the subject under consideration: "when we were discussing that in group work we must be faithful to each other, trust each other," or the meeting that had "encouraged me on working hard together with other members."

The rest of the women expressed more pragmatic views. Thirty percent described a meeting that clearly had to do with increasing a member's income. These descriptions were of three kinds: meetings where a group agreed to develop an income-generating project; meetings where money from activities was distributed; and meetings where the members agreed to contribute money to be given each week to a different member (this is a common practice among Kenyan women). Rating these income-related meetings as the most rewarding underscores the project premise that family finance is the learning interest most closely held by rural women. The remaining 29 percent of the group described a variation on this theme. These women talked about meetings in which members decided to take an action, and more often than not these decisions were related to money: "the meeting when we decided to open a bank account ... putting the money in a safe place," "deciding to keep poultry for the second time," "deciding to open a small shop," "when making necklaces was adopted as a project," and so on. These descriptions differ from those specifically mentioning income in that the reward appears to rest with the fact that the group agreed on an action to take. In general, well over half the core group—59 percent—are made happy by meetings where the discussion ends in a decision to take an action that will clearly move members toward their goal—a goal that is generally related to an increase in income.

Responses to the more general question, "What incident made you happiest to be a group member?" fell into three categories and echoed the above observations. Ten percent of the women were not happy to be a group member or claimed they did not attend meetings. Twenty percent mentioned an event that demonstrated the economic benefits of group membership: "when it comes my turn of getting money," "when I'm given money for handicrafts," "when I get some money from the project," and so on. Forty-eight percent described, as the incident that made them happiest to belong to the group, an event that was a major one in signaling movement towards the group goal: "when the oven was put in," "when we delivered the firewood," "when we agreed to build a shop," "when we were given the rabbits," "when the project started." Twenty-two

percent expressed happiness at the opportunity for interaction with others: "I get the feeling of belonging," "when our group is really cooperating," "seeing my friends working together," "when we all participate," "the unity of being with others," and so on. According to these responses members are not complacent or passive and they connect satisfaction with a sense of momentum. They clearly recognize which group decisions are important in progressing. An important reward for participating is moving toward a goal and sharing that goal with others.

We were also interested in knowing whether or not group members believed they were indeed learning new things from involvement with their group. The feeling that one is learning, we assumed, would also contribute to continued participation. Seventy-six percent of the respondents outlined specific things they attribute to group membership. Although responses to the questions discussed previously suggest that members are very much aware of the problem solving and decision making that goes on within their groups, no one mentioned learning new things directly related to these abilities. Each person described skills related to the substance of projects as opposed to the process of implementing the projects. New learning was described as learning to bake, learning construction skills, learning to feed and care for animals, learning to make handicrafts, learning how to determine cost and profit, and so on. We infer from these responses that "learning" in the definition of project participants is associated with substantive skills. We do not infer that group members did not improve their problem-solving or decision-making abilities, but rather that such skills are not recognized as what one "learns." A most interesting observation can be made regarding the eighteen respondents—or 24 percent—who claim not to have learned anything from their group project. Eleven of these responses come from the same village: the village that in all ways was experiencing the most difficulties by midpoint. Two other negative responses came from very old women in another village, who claimed not to participate much in their group. Five negative responses came from the village where a group project was just getting underway at midpoint due to a cholera epidemic and illness of the coordinator. Over three-fourths of the responses, however, support the notion that success and learning new things are intertwined. When a group has difficulty learning how to get organized, make decisions, and solve problems, the opportunity to learn technical skills is greatly diminished. This underscores the project premise that initially it is more important that learning activities focus on assisting learners to organize themselves, analyze options, and agree on actions to take. Without this, success related to the substantive issues (income, health, agriculture) is much more difficult to achieve.

When a group learns how to organize and take steps toward a goal in collaborative fashion, limited resources appear to be made optimal as group members teach each other or make more effective use of outside technicians. In direct opposition to the village where several group members "learned nothing" is the village where the group achieved most success by midpoint. Here, the group, in addition to identifying and recruiting needed assistance, sent two

members to learn technical skills (baking bread for commercial sale), which they subsequently taught the other group members. In this village almost every woman mentioned baking, including knowing ingredients and measurements, in her list of things learned. In a very real sense this group taught itself after securing effective assistance from outside technicians.

The Facilitator/Coordinator's Perspective

The teacher, of course, must also be rewarded if he or she is to maintain enthusiasm and interest. We asked nine Kilemba staff members, therefore, to describe to us the incident that by midpoint had made them happiest to be part of the project. The prevailing feeling of satisfaction had to do with playing a part in success. Both facilitators and coordinators expressed pleasure in helping the group to achieve. One or two comments will illustrate:

I was overjoyed when Tototo brought loaf pans and trays and the hook so the women could bake more bread and not burn themselves. This bakery has been a big achievement and I am very happy at the size of the success.

—Coordinator

When the work started, there was a lot of doubt that this ambitious program would ever start. Now, it has started and is progressing rapidly.

—Facilitator

To be associated with success is a most satisfying reward. Another is personal growth. Several individuals made statements that reflect happiness at the expansion of their own abilities. For example:

I was happy to be chosen to be the group leader. I learn from the women and they from me. There is an exchange of ideas. I have gained courage to talk to people—to face a group.

—Coordinator

I applied for materials for the group project and I succeeded. The materials were worth ten thousand shillings.

—Facilitator

Before (Tototo-Kilemba) I was asleep. Now I am awake, and am thinking of greater things. I've realized my abilities.

—Facilitator

At first I didn't know if I could discuss. After training I saw I could talk and advise, and my little business and nursing experience can be of help.

—Facilitator

The rewards of success and personal growth do not obviate the reward of gainful employment itself. The field work supervisor and project director, for example, noted a marked improvement in the performance of one facilitator when the person learned he would be permanently hired by the community development ministry at the conclusion of the project. Similarly, one coordinator who claimed not to enjoy her work and felt sure her group would not contribute toward a salary for her services at the project's end, nonetheless wanted to continue with her activities because of the money it brought. On the other hand, another coordinator sufficiently satisfied with the less tangible rewards pledged to stay with his group two years beyond the project's termination whether or not the group contributed to his income.

The query, "What incident made you most sad or disappointed to be a facilitator?" engendered responses generally consistent with the analysis above. What causes unhappiness? When the group fails to act after having agreed upon tasks, when a colleague doesn't work from his or her heart, or when one's efforts are not recognized or appreciated. Inaction and slowing of the momentum, however, ranks as the most disappointing thing.

PROBLEMS

The Participant's Perspective

Each of the 77 core participants was asked to report the incident that had been "worst" for the group. Interestingly, there was generally one occurrence with enough impact for several members to report on it. Individuals within a particular group tended to describe similar events.

TABLE IV
Responses on Worst Event in Village Group

<u>Type of Worst Event Reported</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>	<u>Percentage of Responses</u>
Impasse due to lack of funds	18	23%
Economic loss	20	27%
Failure to live up to group expectations	6	7%
One person benefited at group's expense	7	8%
An event prior to Kilemba project	10	13%
One of a kind events	7	10%
No worst event reported	<u>9</u>	<u>11%</u>
TOTAL	77	99% (error due to rounding)

Ten percent of the group members claimed that no time had been "worst" for the group, no incidents had caused problems. Another ten percent described singular events, that is, incidents not mentioned by any other person. There were patterns, however, in the responses of 80 percent of the participants. Twenty-three percent described an impasse when the group could not continue due to lack of funds or when members feared proceeding because of the economic costs or risks to them. Statements typifying this problem included: "when we talked of consulting a fundi (builder) but when the time came for the fundi to be informed there was no money," "how to get money to finish the nursery school building," "when we didn't have money to buy iron bars for the oven." In the four villages where women reported this type of problem, the lack of money appeared to be overcome one way or another. But there is little doubt a large number of participants see obtaining finances as a major hindrance. Twenty-seven percent of the women reported an occurrence when they experienced an economic loss, either directly or indirectly. These reports came from three villages: one where the group had initially lost money on a firewood project, one where two hens in the poultry project died, and one where rabbits supplied by a government agency died soon after their arrival in the village. In each situation the women did not know how to rectify a deteriorating situation or did not take steps quickly enough. Some of these responses included statements such as: "when the rabbits started dying it looked to me like it was a very bad beginning. This made me feel very bad," "the death of the two hens," "the rabbits involve a lot of work and yet they don't pay because they die," "the loss we got on the first sale of firewood." There is little argument that for individuals with limited resources, loss of money or income opportunity is a significant and critical incident.

Thirteen percent of the respondents described as the "worst time" an event that occurred before the Tototo-Kilemba project began. All but one of these reports were from the same village: a previous unsuccessful project and the losses—monetary, personal, to group spirit—that it caused. Interestingly, a major deterrent to progress of this particular group, in the view of project staff, was the fear, suspicion, and lack of confidence engendered among group members as a result of the reported failed project and two other unsuccessful ventures some years before. These responses add support to our general observation that just as success leads to further success, failure frequently leads to inaction—a benign form of failure. In other words, a most significant barrier to success, for learning groups, is fear of failure.

The balance of the responses, 15 percent, fell into two somewhat similar categories. Seven percent of the women described an incident where they or another member failed to live up to group expectations: "some members talk about another when sometimes she cannot afford cash contributions," "she was told she hadn't fed the poultry a good diet," "my handicrafts were returned as dirty and too small." The remaining eight percent described incidents that are essentially a variation on the same theme. These occurrences outline a

time when someone benefited at the expense or potential expense of the group: "a husband complained the bakery is where it is, because that is the leader's location," "some members made their own bread ... the bakery should be used to make bread for sale by the group," "when a member was given 90 shillings (from the group contribution system) then stopped attending," and so on.

These responses suggest that, as we would expect, group norms, positive and negative, are apparent and members exert influence over individuals to keep them in line with expectations. In addition, it is expected that members use group resources appropriately and benefits accrue to all members equally. This underscores that continuous maintenance of effective group process is an aspect of a successful learning group and, therefore, an ongoing concern for facilitators and coordinators.

The Facilitator/Coordinator's Perspective

Two questions were asked to elicit problems faced by the facilitators and coordinators: What incident caused the biggest problem for the group? and Who could have helped the project but has not? Eight of 18 responses described failure on the part of a person in an official position to give needed or promised assistance. One of the incidents involved inappropriate action rather than lack of service. One group was unexpectedly sent rabbits by an official agency when the group had decided to raise chickens. The other 10 problems described were one of a kind and ranged from lack of cooperation among members to two husbands who tried to convince others to prevent their wives from participating. In contrast, one coordinator described a particularly encouraging problem. Her group has been so successful that more and more women have joined. She now faces the problem of closing membership as the group is becoming unwieldy.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

The facilitators and coordinators in Tototo-Kilemba are able to define accurately the functions of their multifaceted role in helping groups to organize, to make decisions and take action, and to mobilize outside resources. At midpoint they vary in their ability to do this: four appear to be quite able, three appear to have moderate ability, and two appear limited in this ability. The most able are those working with the groups that have made the most progress since initiation of the project.

There is strong evidence that the teaching aids and discussion approach, as used by the facilitators and coordinators, have had significant effect on the groups, enabling them to decide and act. The facilitators and coordinators, for the most part, understand and carry out the approach as intended and generate aids from meeting to meeting in response to immediate situations. Some, as mentioned above, are more skillful than others in this regard. That skill coupled with appropriate outside assistance—assistance specifically recruited by groups and relevant to an immediate problem—seem to weigh heavily toward success.

Teaching aids used to date fall into two major categories, each apparently of equal importance: subject matter aids, addressing health, animal husbandry, etc.; and group development aids, those of a motivational and decision-evoking nature. Aids seem most effective when they either present a problem currently being experienced by the group as a group, address a decision that rests with (is in the control of) the group, or allow members to compare their situation with that of others. Aids are least successful when the drawings or situations have unclear meaning (a chicken looks scrawny but not sick) and when the facilitator or coordinator, even inadvertently, imposes his idea of a solution. Aids are most useful for introducing new concepts and generating full participation in discussion.

The majority of participants feel they reap rewards for participation in the project, mentioning most frequently their potential for increasing income, and the feeling of momentum they have when moving toward a shared goal. Over three-quarters feel they are learning new things. Those who outline the most specific learnings tend to be members of the more successful groups. There is evidence as well that learning in the area of organization and problem analysis precedes and enables learning in substantive areas. The benefits expressed by facilitators and coordinators parallel those described by participants. However, they speak more explicitly of the rewards of "helping," personal growth, and being associated with group success.

The problems expressed by 80 percent of participants are related to the costs or economic risks of starting projects. Cutting across these responses is the fear of failing: both financial failure for a member, or a member's failure to live up to group expectations. This feeling was expressed in all groups regardless of their project's success. It will be important to determine if this feeling persists at the time of final evaluation. For the facilitators and coordinators, the most difficult problem is securing outside assistance of the appropriate kind.

By midpoint all groups had moved toward a collective goal. Projects have ranged from having extensive to limited success; two have been highly successful, two enjoy a good amount of success, and two have had limited success. In projects with limited success certain factors appear in common: the coordinator is not a recognized leader; one or two group members try to dominate, which results in group dissension; or assistance from official sources has not been consistent with the strict self-determined, self-help concept of the approach. On the other hand, the two most successful groups have by midpoint had the benefit of skillful, resourceful coordinators and relevant, appropriate outside assistance.

Of the two projects fully underway by midpoint (poultry and bakery), both address development goals related to such needs of the community as income, health, nutrition, and literacy, and have high potential for being of increasing benefit to their villages. The same can be said for the potential of three uncompleted projects (two poultry and one child-care center). The benefits of the firewood project, other than potentially increasing personal income and group literacy motivation, were not evident by midpoint, although a more convenient source of wood may be of benefit to some village residents.

In most villages where projects were successfully underway by midpoint, individual women had not yet significantly increased their incomes, for the money they earned was used to build and support their projects. The majority of these women hope soon to increase their personal incomes through their village projects. This hope has been realized in Village 5, where women decided their financial position was sound enough to divide between them several shillings for members' personal use.

Handicraft production has enabled many women to contribute money to group projects. Though not every woman makes handicrafts, those who do say that they use their earnings for their contributions. In three villages, the majority of project participants have earned money by selling their craftwork to Tototo Industries. In two villages a number of group members have produced handicrafts, but this is not a group activity; and in the sixth village handicraft-making was not chosen at all as a means of earning additional income. Among the three village groups whose members are the most active craftmakers are Villages 5 and 6 , the two highly successful ones, and Village 3 , which has been making good progress after a late start.

PRRM-SAM IN THE PHILIPPINES

Project Outcomes
Group Progress at Midpoint

Analysis of Teaching Aids and the Learning Process
The Facilitator/Coordinator's Perspective
 . Materials and Discussion
 . From Decision to Action
The Participant's Perspective

The Learning Approach—Rewards (or Not) for Participating
The Participant's Perspective
The Facilitator/Coordinator's Perspective

Problems
The Participant's Perspective
The Facilitator/Coordinator's Perspective

Summary of Conclusions

Previous Page Blank

PROJECT OUTCOMES

Group Progress at Midpoint

During the first six months of the SAM project, the participating village groups confronted several obstacles, not the least of which was the typhoon Khading, which caused some loss of life and extensive damage in the Central Luzon area. Success in village projects varied. Some groups had made large strides toward reaching their objectives; some had come to a virtual standstill after a lively start. The following is a synopsis of group events in each village to midpoint.

Village 7 : The cooperating group in Village 7 is a women's group of 50 members with elected officers, organized by an official agency serving the village and interested in nutrition and home management. There is little doubt that the group in Village 7 experienced the most difficulty in adapting and using the SAM approach. After two discussions on home beautification and vegetable gardening in the first month, the group decided instead to start a dressmaking class. Members discussed this for another month, then the group switched topics again, choosing this time to study nutrition and food preparation.

The group's shifting interests and choice of nutrition as a learning topic appear to be, in part, a result of the influence of an extension worker who was one of the organizers of the group and is PRRM's partner agency representative. The group president, who is frequently described by the facilitator as dominant, is sometimes at odds with group members and is herself influenced by the extension worker. The president appears generally to wait for instructions from the local extension worker before carrying out group activities. The facilitator and coordinator have not operated in team fashion with this extension worker. She is knowledgeable about nutrition and some other home management topics. Her agency organizes classes in these subjects, and she is expected to carry out

such classes with groups in the several villages where she is assigned. Therefore, it is not surprising that she wished to see the group choose the topic of nutrition.

The extension worker proceeded to conduct nutrition lessons and cooking demonstrations for one month, and then several participants reopened the discussion about dressmaking. In response the facilitator led the group through several planning and organizing sessions, when the extension worker provided a resource. She helped the group immediately enlist a teacher from another barrio to teach dressmaking. However, several of the nine women who eventually completed the course had a lot of trouble paying their tuition costs, and it became evident that the vital consideration of finances had not been adequately addressed in planning this undertaking. This caused some friction with the teacher and added to an undercurrent of tension in the group. The relationship between the extension worker and the field team deteriorated over this time period.

A meeting was held among all three and their supervisors (including, as the next report will show, an agency extension worker from Village 8). At this meeting the official agency revealed that they viewed the group as "theirs" and the team was presenting problems to the agency worker. To avoid conflict, PRRM staff agreed that the facilitator would no longer work with the group, the coordinator would plan meetings in advance with the extension worker, and the extension worker would take the lead in all group meetings.

No meetings were held in November or December, the period of the typhoon and holidays. By midpoint in December no meetings and no new learning interests had been reported by the group. The local extension worker has instructed the coordinator only to make home visits, and not to convene the group without her. The coordinator in Village 7 does not appear to have the needed leadership skills, and is not viewed as a leader in the group. She is very young, and was not actually chosen by the members but was put forward by her mother, who is an officer in the group. She is shy and lacks confidence in using the learning approach. This, in addition to the presence of a dominant president, tension within the group, and difficulties with the local extension worker, has severely hampered her effectiveness. Similarly, the facilitator seemed somewhat unsure of her role and of how to use learning materials and techniques to assist the group in making decisions and solving problems. Both the facilitator and coordinator appear to use the learning materials and techniques for the group's amusement, and are unable to capitalize on them for learning. Exercises are used more as games than as tools for analyzing a group problem. Conflicts with the extension worker prevented the facilitator from fully developing her skills. The facilitator's perception of competition between herself and the extension worker caused her to withdraw in order to avoid conflict, and this no doubt reduced her opportunity to develop and refine her ability to use the SAM approach.

Village 8: The group cooperating with PRRM is a women's group organized by the agency described in the summary on Village 7. Events in Village 8 since the inception of the project are similar to those in Village 7. During the first month, in discussions led by the facilitator and coordinator, the group decided to form a dressmaking class. They found a teacher, and their extension worker helped them recruit this teacher from the official organization that is PRRM's partner agency in this village and was the partner agency in Village 7 as well. Group members, again led by the field team, planned the classes and arranged for such needed resources as material, machines, thread, and so on. The Barrio Council—that is, the appointed village political leaders—agreed to pay half the tuition of the 21 women who enrolled in the class.

From the beginning, problems like those in Village 7 emerged as the facilitator and coordinator attempted to work with the extension worker serving the group. An example of the kind of problem is the graduation ceremony planned for the conclusion of dressmaking classes. This was to be planned by group members, but the extension worker assumed the responsibility of instructing members on how to conduct it and whom to invite, and she essentially organized the event herself. This caused some bruised feelings among extension worker, group members, and the field team. The bad feelings on both sides were made worse by a visitor to the group (an ex-barrío official) who openly lauded PRRM and the work of its staff, and neglected to mention the extension worker, who was present at the time. From this point on, collaboration became next to impossible, and the extension worker openly showed her displeasure with PRRM to the group, making the group members feel they must take sides.

The next learning interest identified was gardening, but this was evidently selected by members to please the extension worker, who wanted a project to complement her cooking and nutrition classes. She encouraged the group to plant sweet potatoes, eggplant, other vegetables, and ornamental plants. These were planted (after a one-month break to work on the farms), in front of the Barrio Center (the official village community center).

Before any harvest was realized, the garden was destroyed by the typhoon Khading. By this time, a meeting was arranged between PRRM and the extension worker's agency (including the agency representative from Village 7). PRRM agreed to remove the facilitator, recognize the extension worker as the lead person in the group, and instruct the coordinator to plan meetings in advance with the extension worker. No meetings were held in November and December and as of midpoint in December no new learning interests had been reported.

The coordinator has the confidence of her group and uses the learning ap-

proach quite effectively. However, her difficulty in working with the extension worker and the requirement that this worker take the lead role in the group has curtailed the coordinator's opportunity to function. She has been approached by a local youth group and has agreed to assist them using the learning approach. The extension worker is not interested in working with the young people and has told the coordinator to work independently, so long as "no comparisons are made regarding the success of the women's group and the youth group." The facilitator, who is quite capable, appears to be a major source of the competition described by the youth worker and her agency. The facilitator, therefore, has been constrained in using or developing her skills. She has not worked in the area since the fifth month of the project.

Village 9: The collaborating group in Village 9 is a parents' group organized by PRRM's partner agency, a voluntary organization working with children. In the first project month, the group expressed interest in tailoring, but it soon became clear that the group did not mean tailoring classes for themselves but for the youth of the barrio. The group's real interest was providing training for unemployed children of group members. This situation—that those planning the project were not to participate in it—caused some difficulties for the facilitator and coordinator, given the basic notions underlying the SAM approach. The most obvious difficulty is that of trying to make plans for other people without asking them what they want or need. The field team encouraged the group to involve some youth in the discussions and this was done on a limited basis.

The field team helped the group plan a tailoring class, identify a teacher, and recruit 19 people to take the class (14 youth, five of whom are children of group members, and five adults, three of whom are group members). The group wrote a contract to hire the teacher, arranged her transportation, and contributed money to cover her board and lodging. All 19 individuals completed the 200-hour course, and a graduation was conducted. Three of the 19 are currently earning money from tailoring, one working at home, one in a shop in Munoz, and one in a factory in Manila.

The group then decided to send one person for advanced training in dress-making and tailoring, intending that she will teach the skills she learns to the other group members. One of the group members who took the basic course will attend an advanced course at Central Luzon State Polytechnic College. To cover part of the cost, the group held an exhibition of products made by the 19 who took the basic course. They charged 50 centavos (US 6¢) to enter the exhibit, and earned a total of 85 pesos (\$11.00). At midpoint, they were in final negotiation with Central Luzon Polytechnic College regarding the training of their representative, and were discussing new interests for the group to follow. They have discussed starting a mushroom culture project, but the team

feels that this was named in order to be polite towards an extension worker in the area who visited and encouraged the group to grow mushrooms. At midpoint, members had decided to postpone the mushroom project and had not had time to select a new project.

By late October, the fifth month, the facilitator in Village 9 and PRRM staff were having concerns about the coordinator, a young man of limited experience. He had not been chosen by his group, but had been told to attend the PRRM training by some barrio official or local agency staff member. His ability and commitment were questionable, and the facilitator felt unable to count on him to fulfill his responsibilities.

For several weeks, in the fifth and sixth months, discussions were held among the coordinator, group leaders, barrio officials, and PRRM staff to decide how to proceed. They considered it important not to hurt the coordinator or his family. The coordinator agreed that he was not carrying out the work as expected, and after delicate negotiations everyone involved decided that a new coordinator should be selected by the group. Members took some time to agree on a person, but they finally named a new coordinator by the end of the sixth month. After several meetings she appears to have gained the confidence of her group. The facilitator, who has strong skills, is working closely with her. The representative of the partner agency cooperates well with the team although she does not take an active role in learning sessions. She conducts her own meetings with the group to cover business involving her agency, such as arrangements to pay for children's school or clothes or to distribute commodities to the families. She leaves learning events to the field team, who state that she both verbally supports the use of SAM in the group and acts to assist the team and group.

Village 10: The cooperating group in Village 10 is a women's group organized originally by PRRM and currently assisted by a religious organization providing foodstuffs and giving other assistance. The facilitator is an employee of this organization. At the beginning of the project, the group members, led by the facilitator and coordinator, decided that home cleanliness and gardening were their learning interests. However, shortly thereafter they decided they would prefer an activity that would bring some income.

The group determined that a communal garden would do this, and arranged to use a plot next to the school for planting. They held some lessons in plant technology, organized a work schedule, and planned policies for operating the garden and selling its products. They had two harvests before the typhoon hit, destroying all plants except for a few munggo and other beans. After deducting costs of supplies, the group members netted 50 pesos (\$6.50) from their garden and have not yet decided what they will do with this money.

Because of the onset of the dry season, causing a shortage of water in the area, the group decided to discontinue the communal garden. Instead, the group chose a new project: a buy-and-sell club. In one or two group meetings members discussed the Cooperatives Manual published by the government, and considered organizing a formal cooperative under government policies. They decided to do this. At the same time, two group members ventured forth to sell fermented fish without getting the agreement of the rest of the group. This caused anger and dissension, but the two women pointed out that they were able to make a small profit for the group and that "buy-and-sell" could bring the group some money. After this defense, the other members calmed down and accepted the two entrepreneurs back into the group.

In December, just before midpoint, the women planned and carried out a benefit dance to raise funds for their cooperative. They earned 482 pesos (\$62.00) from the festivity. In January they organized a class on the formation of cooperatives. They spent three days studying government procedures for cooperatives and used as resource people individuals from successful buying clubs in another barrio. At midpoint they were negotiating with barrio officials about the location of their store, and making plans for beginning their precooperative, that is, a stage which precedes a formal cooperative. They were also starting to buy and sell fermented fish.

The coordinator appears to have the confidence of her group. Although she is young and somewhat shy, she has increased her skill and uses the learning approach quite effectively. The facilitator, who has also developed her skills, has worked closely with the coordinator, and she is well received by the group.

Village 11: The collaborating group here is a women's group organized by the religious organization working with PRRM. The group has its own elected officers. Initially, in discussions led by the facilitator and coordinator, the group decided to begin a piggyery project but soon determined that they do not have enough water to support animals year round. A communal garden was the next learning interest chosen, in part to take advantage of the rainy season. After protracted discussion from the middle of July to the middle of October, the group made some tentative starts at planting it. Members plowed and harrowed the land on three different occasions, and finally planted sweet potatoes and munggo.

During this time the group also made policies for organizing work. The long delay was partially caused by heavy rains but difficulties with the group president undoubtedly contributed to the time it took to take action. The president, who is described by the facilitator as dominant, frequently imposes her ideas on members. She and her family own farm equipment that other group members

often need to borrow, and the members, therefore, are reluctant to displease her. She tends to ignore decisions made by the group when she is not present. As a result, the group loses time making and acting on decisions, since these must be remade or revised quite often.

The group succeeded in organizing lessons on the care and marketing of plants. Just one week after the communal garden was finally planted, however, the typhoon hit and destroyed it completely. No meetings were held for two months as the community worked to rehabilitate itself, to keep up with agricultural work, and subsequently to celebrate the holidays. The facilitator describes this as a very low time. The group decided to abandon gardening as the dry season was beginning. Then, encouraged by visits and letters from the facilitator and coordinator, the women reconvened to decide what to do.

They identified a new learning interest: buying and selling fermented fish (bagoong). The members conducted a trial run and discovered they could make a profit. They organized a work system whereby the group treasurer secures the fish, and a leader in each neighborhood is responsible for selling in her area and keeping her accounts. The treasurer maintains the overall accounting, and has been assisted in setting up a system by a staff member from PRRM's partner agency. The business is ongoing and appears successful, averaging a profit of 18 pesos a week for the group from sales. This success encouraged the women to sell a second type of small fish and these bring an average of 14 pesos a week. At midpoint, after one month of fish selling, the group had accumulated 146 pesos (\$19.00). The members are now discussing developing a precooperative once they have accumulated more capital.

Just prior to midpoint, in the process of helping members fill out family profiles for PRRM's partner agency, the field team noted several interests expressed by individuals, specifically mushroom culture, and pig and poultry raising. The field team began to organize small groups to explore these interests, while the whole group continues to meet weekly to discuss the fish selling business. Nine members were interested in mushroom culture and, with assistance recruited from Central Luzon State University representatives, had cultivated the mushrooms and were ready at midpoint to harvest their first crop. Three other members joined this group once they observed its success, bringing the number of members involved in mushroom growing at midpoint up to 12. The group advanced money to two women so they could afford to buy materials; these loans were paid back after one week and the women built two mushroom plots. The group plans to begin piggery classes soon for those interested, and then poultry classes.

The coordinator, a young and somewhat quiet woman, has grown in her

ability to lead the group and she appears to have the confidence of its members. She and the facilitator, who has strong skills, have collaborated closely.

Village 12: The group in Village 12 is a parents' group organized by a voluntary organization for children. The group has its own elected officers. In June the group members identified pig dispersal as their project. By July they had written and submitted a proposal for a project to the children's organization that is PRRM's partner agency in this village. Subsequently, nine piglets were dispersed to nine members who either owned or constructed pig pens. Seven pigs were contributed by the agency and two by a civic-minded person outside the community who had been contacted by the group president. Group members developed policies for dispersing the litters of the original nine pigs, and in August they organized lessons on the care and management of the animals.

They then decided to follow their interest in broiler production. At that time they learned that a government agency was conducting a seminar and would consider funding their project if the group sent a representative. Two members attended the seminar and subsequently the group wrote and submitted a proposal for a broiler production project, although in order to qualify for funding this group had to agree to conduct a three-month family planning education project.

Lessons in poultry management were planned and conducted by the coordinator and another community resident who has experience in broiler production. In January the group learned their proposal had been funded for 10,000 pesos (\$3,300) which will allow five members to begin raising chicks. The agency will then consider giving an additional 10,000 pesos to the project so more members can be involved. The three members who will begin were in the process of building their coops at midpoint.

The coordinator in Village 12 has the confidence of his group and has exhibited strong skills in using the learning approach. He has also helped direct a community effort to form a learning group for youth. He has worked on his own since October as the group facilitator, and PRRM staff state that he functions very well independently. The president of the group, who is described as resourceful and well thought of by his group, works cooperatively with the coordinator. Indeed, the coordinator feels they make a good team because of the president's ability and experience. The staff member of the partner agency verbally supports the use of the approach although he does not actively participate in learning sessions. When necessary he convenes the group to handle business related to his agency's service such as payment of tuition fees for members' children and provision of some commodities.

At this point it is useful to review the learning approach as it is described by both participants and SAM facilitators and coordinators.

ANALYSIS OF THE TEACHING AIDS AND LEARNING PROCESS

The Facilitator/Coordinator's Perspective

Materials and discussion. Facilitators and coordinators were asked to report which teaching aid was most effective—which had worked best for them. As in Kenya, the facilitators and coordinators usually deemed an aid effective when it led to an observable action that brought the group closer to its learning objectives. Eleven of the 12 field team members reported that the "best" aids had helped their group to make a decision, develop part of its project plan, or organize a work schedule:

I showed a picture of an egg ready to hatch. The group wanted a poultry project but didn't know where to get funds or what members needed to know how to do to keep hens. I asked, "What do you see? What will you do with this egg?" They said, "We need to know how to hatch the egg and care for the chick. Our project is like this egg." From the picture alone all the things needed for the project were discussed. Even the schedule was set and resource people were identified.
-Facilitator

We did the "Building of a House" exercise. It is to show how to plan, and we used it to develop the proposal for the piggery project. The exercise helped the group discover answers to questions posed in the forms of the funding organization.
-Coordinator

The group did an exercise called "Cotton Blowing." Many must blow in order to keep the cotton in the air. They had to cooperate. They saw there was need to cooperate on the communal garden and they decided to organize a work schedule. They measured the garden and planned when each would tend it.
-Coordinator

Nine facilitators/coordinators reported that their best aids were group dynamics exercises. The group exercises were almost all the kind that encourage participants to draw analogies between a symbolic situation and their own actual situation. They were used primarily to help the group make decisions or collaborate more effectively. One exercise, for example, required a member to light a cigarette with a matchstick using only one hand. This is almost impossible to do alone and one solution is to seek another member's help. In describing the outcome of the exercise the facilitator stated:

... Group leaders were not strong to pursue their objective. After this they organized a schedule for the preoperative training and this they have finished. The exercise encouraged unity.

Two facilitators selected pictures as their best aid. One, the egg picture, has already been described. The other was a drawing of a multipurpose community center. The group had decided it wanted to build a center for the village. After viewing the picture and determining what their center should look like, members began to plan by listing all the materials they would need to collect.

One facilitator felt that a problem drama was her most effective aid. This was a tape recording that described a wedding where the family fails to make careful plans and everything goes awry. The facilitator reported:

... the group realized the need to plan their graduation (a community event related to the completion of the dressmaking class) and to have a division of labor. They then assigned tasks, and most carried out their tasks although some could not because of Khading (the typhoon).

The 12 reported "worst" aids fall into several categories. Half were considered poor for the same two reasons that most field workers in Kenya gave: aids were not related to a group's interest, or the aid was unclear and its point couldn't be seen. Three facilitators/coordinators describe the former situation:

... the planning exercise failed because the garden they were planning was not their real interest.

-Facilitator

... only a few were really interested in the topic of the problem drama.

-Coordinator

... they did not want to participate in the "Get Me" exercise. They were not so interested in a garden.

-Coordinator

And these comments refer to aids that aren't effective because their meaning is not clear:

... we were doing the string untangling exercise and most were disinterested. The point was not clear. The exercise seemed unimportant.
-Coordinator

... even when I showed members the two women in the picture they still could not see them. They couldn't see what the picture meant.
-Coordinator

I used The Impertinent Pert Chart for planning but the group didn't see why we must follow all the steps of the exercise. They wanted to jump to implementation.

-Facilitator

Two facilitator/coordinators reported that no aid had failed, while four gave individual examples of ineffective aids. One reported that there were too many babies on hand and mothers could not put them down to take part in an exercise. One reported that the exercise she used did not work well because it required people to be able to "read a big map and most could not." Another said the worst aid was a game. While it was in progress, she made a joke and some members felt she was laughing at them. They became unhappy. Finally, a facilitator reported that the "Traffic Policeman" exercise, which requires decision making, did not work well because the president was not there and members do not like to make decisions without her.

The most favored teaching aid among the Philippine facilitators and coordinators is clearly the "group dynamics" exercise. This type of aid is both used more frequently and mentioned more often as the most effective. This type of exercise creates situations that help members to understand more about the processes of decision making and collaboration. As in Kenya, Philippine staff members felt that successful aids were ones that led to discovery and movement toward group goals, ones characterized by discussion, decision, and action. It is interesting to note that although field teams reported group dynamics exercises as their most effective aid, participants themselves report they remember and learn most from pictures.

Nonetheless, the general characteristics of an aid and the way in which it is used most likely determine its success. If the aid is directly related to a learning interest, is clear in its analogy, is of immediate and recognizable use, and provides a basis from which to plan, make decisions, or take other important actions, it is safe to say it will be successful.

Drawing analogies from group dynamics exercises can be somewhat difficult because this process involves subtleties and nuances. The facilitators and coordinators vary in their ability to draw analogies, although for the most part all can use these kinds of exercises effectively to make one or two important points.

Several advantages and disadvantages of the learning aids were identified by facilitators and coordinators, and these are very similar to those enumerated by staff in Kenya.

Advantages:

- Aids start discussion and enable participants to express their ideas and needs.**
- They help group members see more clearly what they want to do.**
- They elicit insight from participants and help people see what's occurring in their own group.**
- They help members dictate what should be done rather than the facilitator doing so.**

Disadvantages:

- Sometimes it is hard to find aids that fit the problem in the group.**
- On occasion, aids direct the discussion: people will discuss the topic suggested by an aid even if they are not really interested.**
- Some exercises are difficult to use and their relationship to the group problem may not be too clear to the group.**
- One might plan to use an aid but when meeting time comes it's no longer appropriate.**

To summarize, most facilitators and coordinators understand how to select and use teaching aids, but their ability to do this varies greatly. From observations, project staff generalize that three are particularly able, six have good ability, and three have quite a bit of difficulty with teaching aids.

From decision to action. In order to describe the primary functions of facilitators

and coordinators in helping their groups to make decisions and act on them, we asked each to describe the way he or she had contributed most to the group and its project. The answers were strikingly similar, indicating much uniformity in both the way Philippine staff members perceive their roles and carry them out. These responses describe a slightly more narrow range of responsibilities than do the responses of the Kenyan staff.

Almost all field teams in the Philippines say their role within the group is to facilitate discussion, to help members get organized, set priorities, and do the planning necessary for carrying out projects. A function that field teams report equally as often is assisting members to find resources, make needed contacts for materials and expertise, and to coordinate with other organizations. The kind of attention given by the Philippine staff to coordinating with other agencies must obviously be different from that given by Kenyan facilitators and coordinators. This arises from PRRM's pattern of cosponsoring each village group with a "partner agency." On the one hand, this pattern makes valuable resources available. On the other hand, it requires greater efforts to harmonize and coordinate, since the partner worker and his or her agency are involved with the groups over time in each phase of group activities, and are not just providers of resources at certain points in time. Indeed, all the groups were originally organized by these partner agencies, and in this sense it appears to be up to PRRM staff members to make more effort to coordinate, as their history with the groups is shorter.

When field teams were asked to describe what person had been least helpful in assisting the group to act on its goals, the difficulties of coordinating with partner agencies became apparent. Five facilitators and coordinators identified the worker from the cosponsoring organization as the least helpful person to the group; only one mentioned the partner as the most helpful. Three facilitators/coordinators stated that barrio officials had been most helpful, while four reported that they were least helpful. Two staff members felt the group president had helped the group most. Others mentioned as most helpful were a group member (twice), the president of the local cooperative (once), and a facilitator or coordinator (twice). Two staff mentioned individual group members as least helpful.

The facilitators and coordinators are in general able to carry out the full range of their functions as described above. Some, as we would expect, are more able than others. Three facilitators and two coordinators have a high level of ability to work both inside and outside the group. One facilitator and three coordinators have a fair amount of ability and seem to be growing toward fuller skills. Two facilitators and one coordinator have experienced significant difficulty in carrying out their responsibilities. One coordinator, by agreement

of all concerned, resigned from his position. He was not able to act on the range of functions described here.

The Participants' Perspective

In order to discover whether the teaching aids had impact on participants, we asked 106 participants to describe an aid they remembered and what it taught them. We asked this because we also wanted to know what types of aids meant most to group members.

Interestingly, although the majority of field team members judged group dynamics exercises to be most effective, 61 percent of the participants identified pictures as the aids they could best recall that led to learning. Twenty-five percent identified group exercises, one percent chose a song and one percent a story. Eleven percent of the respondents reported that they did not attend meetings and/or could not remember any aid being used. Teaching aids fell into two major categories: those that concern group relationships and development, and those that concern subject matter.

TABLE V
Responses: Type of Teaching Aid Recalled

<u>Type of Aid</u>	<u>Number Recalled</u>	<u>Percentage Recalled</u>
Subject Matter Aids	35	33%
- cleanliness/keeping a model home	12	11%
- plant/vegetable/mushroom growing	9	8%
- family planning	5	5%
- tailoring	2	2%
- vices	2	2%
- piggery project	2	2%
- miscellaneous	3	3%
Group Development Aids	56	53%
- Identify and choose learning interests	16	15%
- cooperate, unify, work together	16	15%
- be industrious, earn income	13	12%
- plan, set priorities, organize selves	5	5%
- analyze, think on a problem	3	3%
- identify and locate needed resources	3	3%
Described no Learning from Aid	15	14%
TOTAL	106	100%

Fourteen percent of the members of the six groups could not describe any learnings from a teaching aid. Eleven percent could not describe an aid at all and/or claimed not to attend meetings. One-third of the participants reported having learned from aids that addressed particular subject matters. These aids had to do with "teaching us to clean up our houses and gardens," "to care for native pigs," "to plant a communal vegetable garden," and so on.

Over half the participants (53 percent) described aids that centered on aspects of group development. Fifteen percent remembered learning from the teaching aids that they could select the things they wanted to learn and make decisions about what they wanted to do as a group. Twelve percent described aids that led to a group discussion about ways to earn money, to increase income. Fifteen percent said that aids had taught them to collaborate—to tackle problems collectively and find ways to cooperate. Five percent could detail sessions in which materials had assisted them to develop a plan and to organize themselves to carry out needed tasks. Three percent recalled aids that helped them discover how to get assistance or materials, or helped them to analyze the implications of a problem they were confronting.

In carrying forth the decisions made, in large part, with the help of these teaching aids, participants report that many people had assisted them. In fact, 81 percent said no one had failed to help. Fourteen percent named no particular person. The people named most frequently were PRRM staff: 30 percent of the respondents believed they were the most helpful. Ten percent mentioned a staff member of a partner agency, and ten percent, the group president. Thirteen percent felt a barrio captain or a Barrio Council member had contributed most. Ten percent mentioned an individual in the village who contributed expertise or resources to the group project. Another ten percent stated that they themselves, as a group, had helped the most.

In summary, 86 percent of the participants could describe a teaching aid and the learning it enabled in the group. As in Kenya, these aids appear to play an important role in helping group members to make decisions and act on them. Slightly more participants (53 percent) derived group development messages than derived subject matter messages (33 percent) from aids. This may in part be because facilitators and coordinators more frequently used aids that address problems of motivation, decision making, and collective action.

Table VI summarizes the number of meetings conducted and aids used by midpoint:

TABLE VI
Number of Meetings and Teaching Aids per Village Group

<u>Village</u>	<u>Meetings</u>	<u>Aids</u>
7	15*	14
8	11*	6
9	25	10
10	21	14
11	18	8
12	23	8

*No meetings held since early November, 1978 (the sixth month).

THE LEARNING APPROACH—REWARDS (OR NOT) FOR PARTICIPATING

The Participant's Perspective

Each of the 106 respondents was asked to report on the meeting she or he enjoyed the most, to ascertain why people participate and what rewards them. The responses in Kenya and those in the Philippines were quite parallel, yet at the same time there appear to be significant differences.

Nine percent of the participants in the Philippines reported that they did not enjoy any group meetings (this includes those who claim not to attend regularly). Six percent say they enjoy all sessions and slightly less than five percent describe singular aspects of the meetings that they enjoy, including one person who most enjoys receiving commodities. This reveals a somewhat confounding variable in trying to assess the rewards to project participants for taking part. Each of PRRM's partner agencies provides commodities to group members. These generally take the form of food and school tuition for children, but may include other items needed by families. Obviously this practice runs counter to the strict self-help approach espoused by SAM-PRRM. In two barrios it has been possible to make a fairly clear separation between SAM learning group activities and the activities of the partner agency that involve commodity distribution, and members apparently understand that participation in one neither detracts from nor enhances one's standing in the other. In two other barrios, partner agency employees have been trained as SAM facilitators and it is impossible to separate completely the policies and practices of one organization from the other. Residents need not take part in SAM activities to qualify for commodities from PRRM's partner agency, but there is no way to tell the extent to which the doles from that organization might indirectly attract SAM participants.

In a third situation there has been no separation of SAM and agency meetings, although the SAM team is recognized as independent from the partner

organization. Indeed, in the two barrios concerned there has been some competition and strain between the SAM team and the partner agency representative as a result of other conflicting organizational policies such as who should determine learning objectives and select subjects. In these two villages attendance at meetings appeared to increase on days when commodities were distributed. In addition, the SAM facilitators have been withdrawn from these two villages at the partner agency's request, and meetings now appear to be held only when there are commodities to distribute. Although there is little to suggest that individuals participated in activities emanating from SAM specifically in order to receive commodities, there is no way to tell if participation in such things as tailoring or dressmaking classes might have been less had the partner agency not kept to its regular schedule of giving out commodities. One indicator that commodities were not the prime motivator, of course, is the number of individuals who did not enroll in classes and apparently knew they would continue to qualify for doles. Nonetheless, it is difficult to judge the extent to which distribution of commodities influences participation in the Philippines.

Midpoint evaluators also asked participants which learning session they had enjoyed the most, in order to assess what rewards they gleaned from the SAM approach. Twelve percent describe as the most enjoyable session the one where group members agreed on their common interest and decided to act. Slightly more (13 percent) stated that the best meeting was when the members were doing something to move the project along, for example, planning or actually carrying out a group task. Seven percent most enjoyed being shown how to do something—keep poultry, raise pigs, grow mushrooms. Five percent most enjoyed meetings when an outside person gave members assistance or information, while nine percent felt happiest when visitors came to observe the group. No Kenyan responses mentioned observers or visitors in this same way. Six percent in the Philippines enjoyed meetings in which there were income-related decisions or activities—a significantly lower percentage than that reported in Kenya (30 percent).

Another area of apparent significant difference between Kenya and the Philippines is that of social interaction. Although seven percent in both countries described interaction—that is, cooperating and being part of the group—as the group activity they liked most, almost one-fifth of the Philippine respondents described other social activities as the most rewarding. Six percent liked best the social events related to graduation or other festivities. Thirteen percent said they enjoyed meetings when there were singing and games (exercises). There are also evident differences between the two countries in what respondents report they learn. When participants in Kenya described what they had learned in the group no one directly described problem solving or decision making, but rather gave accounts of substantive skills such as poultry raising,

baking, etc. In the PRRM project, 20 percent of the participants said directly that they had learned problem-solving and decision-making skills such as steps of planning, finding resources, collaborating, and so on. However, 67 percent, by far the majority, reported learning substantive skills: animal husbandry, mushroom production (seven percent), sewing (13 percent), cooking (15 percent), planting (17 percent).

Although problem-solving and decision-making skills increased among Kenyan participants, none described them as something one learns. In the Philippines, however, one-fifth of the participants described these as skills they had learned. When asked directly what makes them happiest to be a member of the group, well over half of the participants answered that either being part of the group itself or learning new things made them happiest. Significantly more (40 percent) gave the former than latter (22 percent) reason. In Kenya, 22 percent reported benefits of interaction with their group as a strong reward and 20 percent mentioned economic benefits. In the Philippines, 13 percent mentioned economic benefits as the source of their happiness with the group, while eight percent said the doles or commodities given by the sponsoring agency made them happiest to be a group member. Six percent did not respond to the query, and six percent said they were not happy to be group members.

It is likely that participants' satisfaction with group membership is associated with the extent to which they feel the group will succeed. We asked core participants, therefore, whether or not they believed their group would achieve its goals. Three percent claimed not to have an opinion as they do not attend meetings, and 20 percent said they did not know the answer to the question. Seven percent reported "I think so, maybe." Twelve percent felt it was unlikely. Most of these individuals believed success would come only if changes were made, suggesting improvements like "we need to reorganize," "we need to unite," "we need guidance." Well over half (57 percent), however, were positive about success. Indeed, 22 percent stated that success had already been achieved: "we've completed our dressmaking class," "the animals are doing well," "our group is earning money," and so on. Thirty-five percent felt sure the group would achieve its goals "if we remain united," "if we continue to cooperate." For the majority, the view was clearly "we are doing well."

The benefits to members for participating in the project become more tangible as participants used products produced by groups and applied new skills learned in groups. Of the 68 respondents in villages where dressmaking or tailoring classes were given, one-third report that they themselves or a family member took the classes. One of these individuals now sews for money and earns an average of 100 pesos (\$13.00) a month. The other 21 participants all report they sew for family use; they estimate that in the two to three months

since completing the course they have saved between 14 and 20 pesos by making or repairing clothes. Two of the original group have been sent to the local polytechnic school to get advanced training in tailoring and dressmaking. These individuals will earn income as tailors and will teach courses to others in the barrio.

Of the 15 members in the pig dispersal project, nine received pigs. One pig died, but the owner is on the list to receive a new pig once a litter is ready for dispersal. It costs a family from five to 15 pesos a week to feed a pig, depending on the type of animal they have, native or hybrid. Litters will be sold once pigs have been dispersed to other members. A pig is in some ways considered a savings account for the family, to be sold or slaughtered in difficult times.

Among the 24 respondents in villages that have bagoong selling projects, 14 are regular buyers as well as sellers and most of the others buy on occasion. Only one or two state that they cannot afford the fish. Individuals who buy from the project pay slightly more for the fish than they would pay in town at market. However, as they would need to add travel costs (bus or bicycle) to the market price, they are, in fact, saving a small amount by bringing the fish in quantity to the village for sale. This, added to the convenience of having the bagoong nearby, makes the women feel the system is very cost-beneficial. In addition, the entire group benefits from the sales, earning from 15 to 20 pesos a week with the potential for an even larger profit. The business has been curtailed on one or two occasions by difficulties in buying the fish. At midpoint, group members were looking for alternative sources of bagoong as backup.

The group attempting to begin a precooperative has also succeeded in earning group money. A small harvest of vegetables from the cooperative garden saved from the typhoon yielded 50 pesos. To this the group has added 450 pesos earned through the village dance and festivity they organized at Christmas time. The group views this money as capital toward the establishment of a precooperative. Of the 28 respondents in this group, eleven completed the precooperative classes that the group organized, which included formulating policies and bylaws for operating the cooperative store they will establish.

The Facilitator/Coordinator's Perspective

Rewards enumerated by SAM-PRRM staff members show that helping people and developing their own abilities are the things that make them happiest to

be part of the project. Some facilitators and coordinators also felt that their biggest reward was to be of help and to be part of the group's success. A few comments illustrate:

I was happy when after the typhoon the group became active again. When I go to the barrio they show me what they have accomplished. They are happy with their effort. When one purok (neighborhood) was motivated to grow mushrooms, ... another caught the spirit. The group loaned some members some money to get materials for mushroom growing. The women paid it back in one week. We were all happy.

-Facilitator

I am happiest when group members are participating so the project will develop and they will succeed.

-Coordinator

[I was happiest] when the group realized they profited from their initial sale of fermented fish ... they totaled the amount and discovered a profit of 18 pesos.

-Coordinator

The comments of others illustrate the reward of personal development:

I've used many approaches but this one has developed my skills to work with people. This [approach] makes more active participation. I feel able to work with people.

-Facilitator

... I have developed my confidence. For example, I conducted the tailoring class for one week [when the tailor couldn't attend]. I'm not a tailor but I was confident I could help the group learn and I did.

-Facilitator

[I was happiest] when I first began to handle meetings and when the first project was approved. It showed that they [partner agency which gave funds] had confidence in the group and me.

-Coordinator

The unhappiest events for the 12 PRRM project staff members fall roughly into two categories: those revealing lack of progress of the learning group projects; and those suggesting that they were not effectively carrying out their

role as facilitator or coordinator. Five individuals reported they were made unhappy when group members failed to participate, make decisions, or carry out tasks they agreed to do. Seven reported difficulty fulfilling their role. Three people were unhappy because of miscommunications within PRRM staff or with a barrio official about group activities. Three people said the unhappiest event was a conflict with the partner agency representative. One said the most unhappy event was the death of a pig and his subsequent fear that the group's funding agency would lose confidence in him.

In summary, it is clear that for most facilitators and coordinators, the rewards of helping others to reach success and to see one's own abilities develop are the most compelling. We also noted that in describing their helping role staff members do not speak of doing things for a group. Almost all comments reflect the notion that being of help is assisting a group to use its own means to reach its own goals. This language indicates the extent to which facilitators and coordinators understand the fundamental principle of the SAM-PRRM approach.

PROBLEMS

The Participant's Perspective

In order to determine the most significant problems facing groups, evaluators asked members to describe the worst event in their project as of midpoint. Of the 106 respondents, 12 (11 percent) did not give an answer to this question. Over half (51 percent) reported that there had been no bad time or worst event for the group. Politeness and the desire not to offend may account for the large number of people who claim no problems have occurred. Of the remaining 38 percent, nine percent said the worst incident involved a member's failure to follow group policies or meet group expectations: for example, when one or several members misunderstood how group funds were to be used, violated an agreement on how to use project products, or didn't participate or follow through with tasks assigned.

Eight percent said the destruction wrought by typhoon Khading constituted the worst occurrence, and seven percent said that discontinuing group meetings was the event that was worst for the group (these eight individuals live in villages where facilitators have been withdrawn and coordinators work under the directions of the representative of the partner agency). Finally, seven percent report that their worst time was when the group discussed a problem but failed to take action to solve it.

One person directly mentioned the difficulty between facilitator and representative of the partner agency, and two reported that irregular attendance was a problem. Three said lack of unity and disagreement within the group had been the worst incident.

TABLE VII
Responses on Worst Event in Village Group

<u>Type of Event</u>	<u>Number of Responses</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Failure to follow policies or meet expectations	10	9%
Typhoon	9	9%
Discontinuance of group meetings	8	8%
Inaction to solve identified problems	7	7%
Dissension in group	3	3%
Irregular attendance	2	2%
Misunderstanding/faulty communication	1	1%
No worst event	54	51%
No response	12	11%
Total	106	100%

Unlike Kenya, there are no prevailing patterns in the majority of responses of the core participants regarding the major problem confronted by the group. As mentioned above, it is more likely that participants chose not to discuss a problem than it is that no problems were experienced. We found some similarities to Kenyan problems in the answers of those who did respond. For example, group norms related to how members are expected to behave are quite strong, and when these are infringed upon members view the infringement as a serious problem. On the other hand, no Philippine participant of the significantly less than half who reported problems mentioned any difficulty in proceeding with their project due to lack of resources, or any real or potential loss of money taken by the group. These were the "worst events" most frequently described by Kenyan participants. To understand the problems of SAM-PRRM more fully, we must look to the reports of staff.

The Facilitator/Coordinator's Perspective

Staff members were asked to report the worst occurrence in the group or the biggest problem members had confronted. Each person gave a different answer, with the exception of three individuals who described difficulty with the partner agency representative as the most critical problem:

... my problem with [the worker] is also a problem for the group. Even they cannot move without the consent of [this person]. Everything depends on her. We cannot decide anything.

-Facilitator

The quarrel with [the worker] was the worst thing. The members could feel the anger. The problem is now resolved.

-Coordinator

[The worst problem for the members is] being torn between us and [the worker]. They like the SAM process but she would intervene and try to get them to decide as she wanted. It was a problem.

-Facilitator

The rest of the staff reported other issues that presented obstacles to the group. These included, in one case, a misunderstanding with a barrio official over a permit to conduct a dance, and in another, the lack of involvement of barrio officials. For one group, the field team member reported finding capital for their project was the biggest problem. Three staff members said that Khading caused the major difficulty by ruining cooperative gardens. This meant monetary loss and, in the words of one facilitator, caused members to lose heart and disband for two full months. In one group, resource people failed to keep their commitment to teach members and this caused inconvenience and loss of time and money. Having to make a proposal for family planning in order to qualify for funds to begin a poultry project was the worst time for one group. And, finally, in one village some members undertook a project in the group's name and then failed to turn over their earnings to the group. This was very disruptive.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

The facilitators and coordinators of SAM-PRRM are all able to describe accurately both their role and the fundamental principles of the approach. They vary in their ability to carry out their somewhat complex responsibilities: most are quite able in this regard, while two or three have experienced difficulty. The pattern used by PRRM for collaborating with other organizations—to have a partner-agency for each group—seems to require a fairly high degree of political, coordinating skill on the part of staff.

Some staff members have had severe problems working collaboratively with their partners. In effect, PRRM works with three partner agencies. One of these has allowed PRRM to train two of its employees to be facilitators. This arrangement has worked very well and appears to have benefited both partners. Relationships with one partner agency also appear to have worked fairly well. In this situation, however, the partner workers have been uninvolved in the learning groups, meeting separately with participants to conduct business concerning their agency.

Relationships with the third partner agency have not worked smoothly. The representatives of this third partner organization have in the past worked actively with group members to teach them things the agency has identified as priorities. The SAM approach of letting the learners make their own decisions and direct their own learning appears to have disrupted the way representatives operate with the groups. In addition, the presence of two additional "teachers" (the facilitator and coordinator) appears to threaten the partner agency representatives; they view the field team as a potential challenge to their roles with the group. Consequently, by October effective collaboration with this agency became next to impossible. A joint meeting was held, and PRRM agreed to withdraw facilitators from the barrios where the representatives of this partner agency work. Perhaps as a result of this, no learning group meet-

ings have been conducted in these two villages since the decision was made. For the intents and purposes of the SAM project, the groups in these two areas were inactive at midpoint.

There is another somewhat confounding variable in the administrative pattern of the project in the Philippines. Because each partner agency provides commodities to group members it is almost impossible to determine how much this motivates the group's participation and/or actions or to assess the extent to which it detracts from the self-help, self-reliance notions underlying the SAM approach.

Notwithstanding, there is strong evidence that the teaching aids and discussion approach have been effective in assisting groups to decide and act, particularly where administrative problems in collaboration have not occurred. Nine of the facilitators and coordinators have been able to select and use aids effectively to address group problems and assist members to recognize what needs to be done to move decisions along. In one barrio we find, however, that the team has not been able to use aids skillfully. The aids appear to have been deployed most often as games rather than used to stimulate learning events. Even the number of aids used reveals this. The team appears to have used an aid in every meeting without carefully determining if and why an aid is needed. In this situation, the teaching aids appear to have been viewed and used by both participants and team primarily for entertainment. This fact, coupled with administrative problems with the partner agency, has resulted in little progress in the group in question.

In the other groups, however, team members appear to be able to see issues as they occur and use teaching aids and discussion to help the group with decision making and problem solving. Indeed, we find that the approach has not only led to group achievements but has engendered personal development of both team members and participants. As in Kenya, aids fall into two general categories: those that teach group development and those that teach substantive skills. Successful aids led to decision and action. Aids are least effective when they are unclear or address something that is not the real interest of the group. A primary vehicle for learning from successful aids, as we also find in Kenya, is analogy. Through analysis and discussion, participants are able both to gain insight about problems they are facing and to anticipate problems. In group sessions they apply their new skill to projects they identify as important—one example is the group that used the "Eight Steps of Planning" exercise later to develop a proposal for a poultry-raising project.

The majority of participants feel they reap both tangible and intangible rewards for participation. Many have learned new skills that have enabled them to earn or save money. An aspect of participation that seems important

is social interaction—both being part of a group and the social events associated with membership.

By midpoint all six groups had progressed toward a collective goal. Two of these, however, had virtually come to a standstill due largely to problems of collaboration between PRRM and a partner agency. The momentum was continuing for the other four, and three of these had in a short period of time made significant achievements. One had begun a successful fish-selling business. Another was at the point of formalizing a precooperative. A third had both begun a pig dispersal project and initiated poultry keeping.

IMPLICATIONS OF GROUP PROJECTS

To understand more fully the impact of these outcomes it is useful to consider their implications for development. It is sometimes the case that such small rural projects are considered marginal. Frequently this is the case because those doing the projects—poor, rural people and particularly women—themselves are considered marginal. In order to avoid this mistaken view, it is important to analyze these project outcomes briefly in light of how they parallel generally accepted development goals, and to discover implicit benefits, if any, for the broader community.

The most obvious related outcome of projects in which women begin to either earn or save money is the money itself. Previous experience demonstrates that when women have additional money they spend it on their children—most frequently for clothes and schooling. Indeed, improving the situation of children is a widely shared goal. The child-care center in Village 4 (Kenya) is a good example of this. A nursery school addresses not only educational needs but economic ones as well by ensuring supervision of children and freeing parents for a time to turn their efforts elsewhere. It also addresses health needs, as the nursery can become an entry point for basic services and health education. Similarly, it meets sanitation goals since latrines for basic hygiene must, by Kenyan law, be installed to protect the children. Indeed, social needs are also addressed, for the childcare center can be a focus for village parents to organize themselves around issues of common concern to their children. The dressmaking classes in Village 9 developed specifically to train out-of-school youth offer another kind of example of the strong interest in improving conditions for one's children. In the Philippines school leavers are a major social and economic concern and such a community project contributes to providing useful skills.

Similarly, a bakery addresses many nonmarginal goals. In Village 6 in

Kenya it has provided a new and safe source of food in the village that is particularly useful for children who must travel some distance to school. In Village 6 90 percent of the women interviewed at midpoint were purchasing bread for their own use. Here again the law required the installation of basic sanitation facilities—new latrines. In addition, the bakers must meet health standards. In Village 6 this entails health screenings of the 60 women who bake and sell bread. By midpoint, 23 percent of the sample group had been screened and certified fit by the regional health officer, and further screenings were being made.

A poultry project like that of Village 5 (Kenya) obviously provides a new source of food. Kenyans, who according to the National Nutrition Institute need to increase their protein intake, are encouraged to eat more eggs and chicken. As yet in Village 5 only 22 percent of the women say they buy eggs for their own use, giving cost as the reason. This is most likely because of the high market demand for the products relative to the current supply. We expect to see consumption change over time as production increases and women begin to feel that they can afford to use the eggs as well as sell them. Adding to the village market supply, no doubt, is linked to the village residents' increased use of eggs in general. In the Philippines' Village 7 the broiler production business holds high potential as a new village food source although by midpoint the project was just at beginning stages. The bagoong business in Village 11 creates easier access of villagers to one of their staple foods. Almost all (98 percent) of the group members in Village 11 purchase bagoong more conveniently and therefore more frequently.

Success in these small projects is also related to motivation for literacy. In each Tototo-Kilemba village, improved attendance in literacy classes as reported by coordinators, or the establishment of such classes, appears linked to the group's progress in general. In most groups it becomes a particular interest as the members' potential to earn income grows stronger. This literacy motivation has not been the case in the Philippines and this is likely due to the fact that Philippine participants have had more schooling, and although skill level appears very low claim already to possess literacy ability.

It is apparent thus far in the Kilemba and SAM project that it is possible to organize and facilitate education to address the real interests of village residents and that the learning objectives of the groups are consistent with generally accepted development goals. Furthermore, it is evident that all groups have moved toward these goals and it is clear that in those villages where the learning approach comes closest to the "ideal" one characterized as the self-actualizing method, success has been most apparent.

APPENDIX

Using 14 basic questions, interviewers were instructed to probe for specific descriptive material. Questions posed to project participants:

1. The facilitator and coordinator often use pictures and stories and tapes in the group meetings. Describe to me one picture or story or tape and what you learned from it.
2. Describe to me the meeting you enjoyed the most. Describe what happened, what went on in that meeting.
3. Describe to me an incident when you were happiest to be a group member. This could be when you were with the group or any other time.
4. Describe what specific things you have done in the project. Describe these in detail.
5. Describe for me an incident or a time that you think has been the worst for the group or the project or you.
6. What person has helped the group the most? What specific things has that person done?
7. Is there someone who could have helped the project who has not? Who is that person?
8. Have you learned some new skills in the group project? What are those skills? Be very specific.
9. Are you earning money from handicrafts? If yes, how much per month? What do you use this money for?
10. Are you earning money from the group project? If yes, how much per month? What do you use this for?
11. Do you use any of the products of your project? If no, why not?
12. Do you think your project will succeed? What things have made you feel this way?
13. Are you happy to be a group member? What things have made you feel this way?
14. What are the benefits to your group of your coordinator?

A similar set of 13 questions was posed to project facilitators and coordinators. Again each was asked to describe specific events or incidents that led to the conclusions, and interviewers were instructed to probe for specific descriptive information.

1. Describe to me the teaching aid that worked best with the group to stimulate discussion and decision.
2. Describe to me the teaching aid that didn't work well or at all. Which proved to be the worst that you used?
3. Describe to me your greatest contribution to the group. What specific things have you done that have been the most important to the group?

4. Describe to me your greatest contribution to the project. What specific things have you done that have been the most important to the success of the project?
5. What person has helped the group the most? What specific things has that person done?
6. What person who could have helped the group has failed to do so? What things could that person have done?
7. What event or incident made you the happiest to be a part of the project? Describe to me what occurred.
8. What event or incident made you the least happy or made you most disappointed to be part of the project?
9. Describe to me the event or incident that has caused the biggest problem for the group.
10. Describe to me the event or incident that has been the best for the group.
11. What do you believe to be the advantages of the teaching aids? What things do the aids enable you to do or to happen in the group?
12. What do you believe to be the disadvantages of the teaching aids? In what ways is it difficult to use aids or do they fail to do what you would hope?
13. What event or incident has surprised you the most about the project? Describe it and why you were surprised.

The project administrators were also asked at midpoint to respond in depth to a series of questions. These were answered in written form:

1. What is the greatest strength of the Kilemba project? Give examples of the strength.
2. What is the greatest weakness of the Kilemba project? Describe examples.
3. Which group is the strongest? Why? Describe specific things that illustrate the strengths.
4. Which group is weakest? Why? Describe specific things that illustrate the weakness.
5. What is the major source of technical information for a group? Give examples of how a group gets technical information.
6. What is the most difficult task for you as (job title) ?
7. Do the teaching aids really help learning? Give specific examples of what you have observed.
8. Describe the event or incident that surprised you the most in the Kilemba project—something that occurred that you did not expect.
9. What do you think will occur when the coordinators take on the groups alone? What will be most difficult for them? What specific things make you feel this way?

10. What is the one thing you could not do without in the project? The one thing you must have?
11. What quality is most important in a facilitator? Which facilitators have this quality? Describe an event where you observed this? What quality in coordinators? Which have this? Describe an event when you observed this.
12. When you think about the project, what worries you the most?
13. Do you feel the training in March worked as well as it might have to help facilitators and coordinators learn the approach? What could have been better?
14. Describe the best group meeting you observed. What specific things happened?
15. Describe the worst meeting. What happened?
16. What cooperation do you get from other groups and agencies? Describe some specific examples.
17. Are outside resource people a help or a hindrance? Describe how they help. Describe how they hinder.
18. Given the effort group members are making, are the rewards they get equal to the effort? Describe events that lead you to conclude as you do.
19. What, if anything, is different about the coast and coastal women's groups as compared, say, to other areas of Kenya?
20. Surely there are some other things we've neglected to ask that we should. Please discuss here important ideas we've overlooked.