

# SHEVAX+ PARTICIPATORY METHODOLOGIES IN KENYA, UGANDA AND RWANDA TRAINING MANUAL

Bagnol, Brigitte;

;

© 2022, HELLEN AMUGUNI



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction, provided the original work is properly credited.

Cette œuvre est mise à disposition selon les termes de la licence Creative Commons Attribution (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>), qui permet l'utilisation, la distribution et la reproduction sans restriction, pourvu que le mérite de la création originale soit adéquatement reconnu.

*IDRC Grant/ Subvention du CRDI: 109061-001-Action research to support women's agency and empowerment in livestock vaccine distribution, delivery and use in Rwanda, Uganda and Kenya*



# **PARTICIPATORY METHODOLOGIES**

## **TRAINING MANUAL**

### **2021**

**Author: Bagnol Brigitte**

## Introduction

The traditional education model of communication is conceived as a one-way linear process from sources to receivers. Early approaches were centralised and *top-down* (Carr and Wilkinson, 2015). This top-down approach, initiated by the educated, expert or intellectual (the “haves”) and directed towards the uneducated or ignorants (the “have nots”), aims to inform, educate, convince, “enlighten,” or persuade individuals to change behavior or activities based on an expert’s decision of what is desirable. Brazilian educator and activist Paulo Freire’s developed a problem-solving approach where communication is conceived as a dialogue and a participatory process for social transformation. His seminal work “Pedagogy of the Oppressed” (1972) has had a strong influence on current participatory approaches, community development and education communication. In 1983, Chambers publicised the idea of “putting the last first”. By the late 1980s, there was a shift towards a more participatory approach to research, communication and extension services, particularly in the context of development activities (Díaz Bordenave, 1976, 1994, 1998; Chambers, 1983, 2007). As a consequence, participatory methodologies have been increasingly used in agricultural and livestock research development programs. Their use emerged in response to the failure of ‘normal’ research and extension to yield sustainable improvements to production and livelihoods in resource-limited, rural settings because of its inability to describe and intervene effectively in the complex and changing experiences of farmers and others involved in rural development (Pretty, 1994). This led to demand-led extension, a process by which the information, advice and other extension services should be tailored to the expressed demands of the clients or users of the service (Scarborough et al. 1997; Garforth et al. 2003; Rivera et al. 2004), although marginalized communities are often unable to identify their “strategic needs,” as opposed to more tangible and immediate “practical needs”. Currently, participatory tools are being adapted for an increasingly wide range of settings and endeavours, including food and nutrition security programs (de Bruyn et al., 2017; 2019; Wong et al. 2018); One Health activities (Suseno et al., 2019); wildlife disease surveillance (Ryser-Degiorgis, 2013); epidemiology (Catley 2005aa, 2005b, 2020; Catley and Mariner 2002; Catley et al. 2008, 2012, 2018, Alders et al. 2020) gender analysis (Bagnol, 2009; 2013); communication (Alders and Bagnol, 2007; Bagnol et al., 2016a); and for monitoring and evaluation (Bagnol, 2014).

The **SheVax+** project intends to support and promote women’s agency for increased input and decision making on livestock vaccine distribution, delivery and use in Rwanda, Uganda and Kenya. The model of communication for social change – as adopted by this project – is conceived as a **horizontal, symmetrical relationship with a series of networks and nodes involving the sharing or exchange of information between two or more participants at all levels from the field** (for example, the participants of the outcome mapping) to the international level. All participants have the potential to act on the same information, none are passive receivers. Increased contact, communication and eventually trust among the different VVC actors will improve the efficiency and impact from livestock vaccine distribution and use in small holder settings.

This module will train livestock vaccine value chain stakeholders to successfully use qualitative participatory methods (such as: seasonal calendar, livelihood matrix, focus group discussion, peer wise ranking – simple ranking, jar voices, photo voice, focus meal discussion, visioning of future, matrix on role of men and women and different diagrams that were carried out with participants during the action research baseline) to correct previous assumptions about other VVC actors, and coordinate activities to achieve mutually beneficial goals.

**Target groups:**

- The trainers (specifically module 1 and 2 about participatory methodologies)
- Animal health service providers (public, private vets, AHA, CAHW, community vaccinators, livestock production officers)

### **Process of the training program**

- Adult education learning (exercises, group work, debate, etc.)

### **Objectives**

1. Describe the advantages of a participatory approaches and disadvantages (cost, time, lack of support or reward in bureaucracies/ institutions; longer term relationship with communities;
2. Identify and use the tools used in participatory approaches
3. List barriers that smallholder farmers, especially women, face when involved in participatory approaches
4. Describe ways to eliminate barriers to participation, especially women
5. Explain how to analyse and present data collected during participatory approaches
6. How to use the data to plan interventions
7. Practice and feedback

### **Modules description**

**Module 1:** The history and philosophy behind gender sensitive participatory methods and their characteristics and advantages

Advantages of participatory methods

**Module 2:** Participatory methodologies for trainers

(This module is specific for the Training of Trainers (TOT))

- Characteristics of good communication
- Adult learning exercises
  - Lecture
  - Case studies
  - Role play
  - Simulation
  - Group work
  - Instruments
  - Games /Dynamics
  - Demonstrations
  - Field visits

**Module 3: An overview of the most commonly used tools to obtain specific information**

Methodologies used in adults' education, gender analysis, data collection, in giving feedback, in project planning, in monitoring and evaluation

Table 1. The most commonly used tools (Adapted from Alders et al. 2020)

Use & Information sought	Type of tools	Tools
Any information Training/ Feedback meeting M&E, impact assessment	Informal interviewing (semi-structured)	Key informant interviews Focus-group discussions Jarr voice Focus meal Group conversation and exercise Case studies
Preferred types of livestock reared Relative livestock ownership Income from livestock M&E, impact assessment	Ranking and scoring tools	Simple ranking Pair-wise ranking Proportional piling Matrix scoring Wealth ranking
Ecosystem boundaries Veterinary services Seasonal variations in livestock disease M&E, impact assessment Training/ Feedback meeting	Visualisation tools	Participatory mapping Venn diagrams Seasonal calendars Timelines Radar diagram Photo voice 5 forms of capital
Gender issues, division of roles, access and control, decision making M&E, impact assessment	Matrix	Roles carried out by men and women Access, control and benefits Decision making in the households

Exercise: How can we use the participatory methodologies in different contexts for different objectives? Prepare a training on impact assessment, a feedback meeting to stakeholders, a training on chicken vaccination for farmers

#### **Module 4: Gender issues in participatory approaches**

Identify barriers that smallholder farmers, especially women, face when involved in participatory approaches and ways to eliminate those barriers

#### **Module 5: Data analysis and feedback**

Ways to analyse and present data collected by participatory methods  
How to use data to make decisions  
Practice and feedback

## References

1. Alders Robyn G., Ali Syed Noman, Ameri Aluma Araba, Bagnol Brigitte, Cooper Tarni L., Gozali Ahmad, Hidayat M.M. (Andi), Rukambile Elpidius, Wong Johanna T. and Catley Andrew (2020). Participatory epidemiology: principles, practice, utility and lessons learnt . *Frontiers in Veterinary Sciences*, V.7, article 532763.
2. Alders R. G. and B. Bagnol. (2007). Effective Communication: The Key to Efficient HPAI Prevention and Control. *World's Poultry Science Journal*, 63, 139-147.
3. Bagnol, B. (2009). Improving Village Chicken Production by Employing Effective Gender Sensitive Methodologies. In: Alders, R.G.; Spradbrow, P. B. and Young, M. P (eds). *Village Chickens, Poverty Alleviation and Sustainable Control of Newcastle Disease*. Canberra: Australian Centre for International Agricultural Research. ACIAR Proceedings N° 131, pp. 35-42. Available at: <http://www.aciar.gov.au/publication/PR131>
4. Bagnol, B. (2013). *Advocate gender issues: A sustainable way to control Newcastle Disease in Village chickens*. Good Practices for Family Poultry Production. International Network for Family Poultry Development, IFAD, FAO. GPFPP Note No. 3. Available at: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/018/aq630e/aq630e.pdf>
5. Bagnol, B. (2014). Conducting participatory monitoring and evaluation. In: FAO. Decision tools for family poultry development. FAO Animal Production and Health Guidelines No. 16. Rome, Italy. Available at: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/019/i3542e/i3542e.pdf>
6. Bagnol, B., Naysmith, S., de Bruyn, J., Wong, J. and Alders, R. (2016). Effective animal health programming requires consideration of and communication with those at the human–animal interface. *CAB Reviews*, 11, 1-7.
7. Carr, A. and Wilkinson, R. (2005). Beyond Participation: Boundary Organizations as a New Space for Farmers and Scientists to Interact. *Society & Natural Resources*, 18: 255–265.
8. Catley, A. (2005a). Participatory Epidemiology: A Guide for Trainers. African Union/InterAfrican Bureau for Animal Resources, Nairobi. Available at: <https://www.livestock-emergency.net/userfiles/file/veterinary-services/Catley-2005.pdf> (Accessed November 28, 2019)
9. Catley, A. (2005b). Training Course in Participatory Epidemiology. Ganyiel, Western Upper Nile, South Sudan. Summary Report, July 2005. Available at <http://www.vetwork.org.uk/userfiles/Catley-PE-S-Sudan%20summary-report.pdf> (
10. Catley, A. (2020). Participatory epidemiology: Reviewing experiences with contexts and actions. *Preventive Veterinary Medicine*, 180, 105026.
11. Catley, A., Alders, R.G., and Wood, J.L. (2012). Participatory epidemiology: approaches, methods, experiences. *The Veterinary Journal*, 191, 151-160.
12. Catley, A., Burns, J., Abebe, D., Suji, O. (2008). Participatory impact assessment: A guide for practitioners. Feinstein International Center Tufts University, Massachusetts. Available at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257816175\\_Participatory\\_Impact\\_Assessment\\_A\\_Guide\\_for\\_Practitioners](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257816175_Participatory_Impact_Assessment_A_Guide_for_Practitioners)
13. Catley, A., Lotira, R., and Hopkins, C. (2018). Hidden Peaks: Women’s knowledge on the seasonality and root causes of child malnutrition in Karamoja, Uganda and their programming preferences. Karamoja Resilience Support Unit, USAID/Uganda, UK aid and Irish Aid, Kampala. Available at: <https://karamojaresilience.org/publications/item/hidden-peaks-women-s-knowledge-on-the-seasonality-and-root-causes-of-child-malnutrition-in-karamoja-uganda-and-their-programming-preferences> (Accessed January 29, 2020)
14. Chambers, F. (1983) *Rural development: putting the last first*. London: Longmans.
15. Chambers, R. (2007) *Creating, evolving and supporting participatory methodologies: lessons for funders and innovators*. <http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/handle/123456789/746>

16. de Bruyn, J., Msuya, J., and Ferguson, E. (2019). Evaluating pictorial charts as a means of collecting participant-recorded data on household dietary diversity in low-literacy communities in Tanzania. *British Journal of Nutrition*, 122(2), 1432-1440.
17. Díaz Bordenave, J. (1976) Communication of Agricultural Innovations in Latin America: The Need for New Models. *Communication Research (U.S.A.)*, 3(2): 135-154.
18. Díaz Bordenave, J. (1994) Participative Communication as a Part of Building the Participative Society. In: Shirley A. White and Nair K. Sadanandan (eds.), *Participatory Communication: Working for Change and Development*. New York: Sage Publications.
19. Díaz Bordenave, J. (1998) Relation of Communication with Community Mobilization Processes for Health. In: Beltrán Luis Ramiro and González S. Fernando (eds.), *Community Mobilization for Health: Multidisciplinary Dialogue*, JHU and SAVE, pp. 94-98.
20. Freire, P. (1972) *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.
21. Garforth, C., Angell, B., Archer, J., and Green, K. (2003). *Improving Farmers' Access to Advice on Land Management: Lessons from Case Studies in Developed Countries*. Agricultural Research and Extension Network (AgREN). London, Great Britain: Overseas Development Institute, Paper No. 125.
22. Rivera, W. and Alex, G. (Ed.). (2004). *Demand-Driven Approaches to Agriculture Extension. Case Studies of International Initiatives* Washington, USA: World Bank. The World Bank Agriculture and Rural Development Discussion Paper 10 Extension Reform for Rural Development 2004, V 3.
23. Ryser-Degiorgis, M-P. (2013). Wildlife health investigations: needs, challenges and recommendations. *BMC Veterinary Research*, 9, 223. DOI 10.1186/1746-6148-9-223
24. Scarborough, V., Killough, S., Johnson, D.A., and Farrington, J. (1997). *Farmer-led Extension: Concepts and Practices*. Intermediate Technology Publications, London, Great Britain.
25. Suseno, P. P., Jatikusumah, A., Husein, W. F., Sawitri, E., Wicaksono, A., Gozali, A., and Alders, R. (2019). Global Health in action: One Health approach to rabies surveillance and control in Indonesia. Global Health Security Conference, Sydney, Australia, 18-20 June 2019.
26. Thompson Klein, J. (2004). Prospects for transdisciplinarity. *Futures*, 36(4), pp.515–526. <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0016328703001903>
27. Wong, J.T. (2020). *Discovering the links between village poultry health and maternal and child diets and nutrition in Timor-Leste*. PhD Thesis, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia. (Submitted)
28. Wong, J.T., Bagnol, B., Grieve, H., Jong, J., Li, M., Alders, R.G. (2018). Factors influencing animal-source food consumption in Timor-Leste. *Food Security* 10: 740-762.