

# **CENTRE FOR APPLIED SOCIAL SCIENCES \***

University of Zimbabwe

P O Box MP 167

Mount Pleasant

HARARE

Zimbabwe

(CASS Working Paper - NRM Series ; CPN 91/1997)

**Report on Community Baseline**  
**Socio-Economic Training Needs**

Survey Conducted in Nyaminyami,  
Gokwe North and Guruve Districts

By

P.A. Hobane

March 1997

(Printed November 1997)



"This publication has been possible through the support of the US Agency for International Development (USAID) under the Natural Resources Management Project (NRMP) Phase II - Zimbabwe. The opinions expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID."

- A Member of IUCN - The World Conservation Union

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Focus of the Study.....	1
1.3 Research Findings.....	1
1.4 Recommendations.....	1
2. BACKGROUND / INTRODUCTION .....	3
3. TERMS OF REFERENCE .....	3
4. RESEARCH METHODS .....	4
5. RESEARCH FINDINGS.....	5
5.1 Information To Be Collected.....	5
5.2 Uses Of Baseline Socio - Economic Data.....	6
5.3 Data Collection Tools.....	6
5.4 PRA Tools Which The Communities Opted To Use For Their Surveys .....	7
5.5 Who Should Facilitate The Exercises?.....	10
6. DISCUSSION.....	11
7. THE TRAINING PROGRAMME .....	12
8. RECOMMENDATIONS .....	13
APPENDIX 1 .....	15
APPENDIX 2 .....	17

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This work was made possible by logistical support for the field work and report writing provided for by CASS. My sincere thanks go to the Chairman of the Department - Dr. Calvin Nhira, the Administrator - Mr. David Mangemba, and Ms. Nontokozo Nabane for their assistance throughout the research.

I am also indebted to the following people for their time and input into this research:

- Chief Executive Officers - Nyaminyami and Guruve districts
- Wildlife Manager - Gokwe North District
- Councillors - Negande A & B, and Kanyurira Ward
- VIDCO members in all the three areas
- Traditional leaders (Headmen and Kraalheads) in all the three areas
- WWF Resource Management Facilitators in Nyaminyami and Gokwe North
- Ward Wildlife Management Committee members in all the areas
- Community members in Negande, Madzivazvido and Kanyurira wards

# **1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

## **1.1 Background**

The USAID funded NRMP II Project document describes the training programme for communities and RDCs under output 1 (April, 1996: 9-10). This entails developing training materials and courses for baseline socio-economic studies.

The training programme is aimed at enabling communities to generate their own socio-economic profiles. It is envisaged that data gathered would be used by the communities to plan, make decisions and evaluate their community-based natural resource management programme.

This research was conducted in Nyaminyami (Negande Ward), Gokwe North (Madzivazvido Ward) and Guruve Districts (Kanyurira Ward) to establish the training needs of these communities participating in CAMPFIRE to conduct their own socio-economic baseline surveys.

## **1.2 Focus of the Study**

The study sought to establish communities understanding of baseline surveys and whether they would be willing to conduct them on their own. If so:

- which information they would want to collect
- the method and tools which they want to use in conducting their surveys; and
- the possible uses of such information.

Focus was on the possibility of conducting participatory community research and defining the units which are feasible for such an exercise.

## **1.3 Research Findings**

The study found out that in all the three areas where investigations were conducted, the communities were enthusiastic about conducting their own surveys and viewed such an exercise as generating information that can be valuable in their CAMPFIRE activities. Community research is generally favoured because of its simplicity in collecting and analysing data. However, need for co-ordinated supervision during the exercises was expressed.

## **1.4 Recommendations**

- i) There is need to define the units that are feasible for conducting community studies as they vary from area to area. Such units are determined mainly by the size and history of the areas. The feasible unit identified in Kanyurira ward was the traditional village (kraal head) level because the administrative village structures (Village Development Committee - VIDCO)

are not well developed. The VIDCO was opted for in Negande because the traditional structures have been eroded by resettlement. Data from all these units will be combined at ward level.

- ii) Given the fact that the surveys are going to be conducted through fragmented units within the wards, there is need to identify co-ordinators for the surveys at each ward. The role of these co-ordinators will be to standardise the information collected and compile the data for the whole ward.
- iii) Key actors in CAMPFIRE at district level (e.g. Institutions Development Officers and Wildlife Managers) need to be involved in the Participatory Rural Appraisal skills training in order for them to co-ordinate the exercises at district level and provide assistance to communities when need arises.
- iv) WWF has facilitated the conduct of resource surveys in Nyaminyami (Negande wards A & B), Gokwe North (Madzivazvido) and Guruve (Kanyurira) districts. It would be helpful to liaise with WWF in conducting baseline surveys as information they generate compliments that from resource surveys.
- v) Communities should be equipped with problem identification and prioritisation skills. An attempt to practise some of the participatory tools used for such a task was appreciated in Gokwe North and Nyaminyami. Kanyurira ward did not seem to portray problems with prioritising their decisions, probably owing to the fact that they have been exposed to the skills by WWF.
- vi) There is need to include some more tools e.g. matrix ranking or matrix scoring to qualify information generated by linkage diagrams and rankings in the training sessions.
- vii) There is need to include ethnic minorities in the exercise. For instance, villagers in Kanyurira pointed to the need to include the vaDoma/Tembomvura. Most ethnic minorities are still treated marginally though they reside in the CAMPFIRE wards.

## **2. BACKGROUND / INTRODUCTION**

The USAID funded NRMP II project document describes the training programme for communities and RDCs under output 1 (April, 1996: 9-10). This entails developing training materials and courses for baseline socio-economic studies.

The training programme is aimed at enabling communities to generate their own socio-economic profiles. It is envisaged that data gathered would be used by the communities to plan, make decisions and evaluate their community based natural resource management programme.

This paper reports on the research findings of a field study conducted in Nyaminyami (Negande), Gokwe North (Madzivazvido) and Guruve (Kanyurira) Districts from 12-22 January, 1997. One of the objectives of the study was to establish communities understanding of baseline surveys. Another was whether communities would be willing to conduct the baseline surveys on their own. If willingness was expressed then:

- who should facilitate the exercise (outsiders or insiders)
- how should the survey be conducted (household questionnaire or participatory community exercises); and
- what are the potential uses of data from baseline surveys.

## **3. TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Technical assistance was required in assessing the training needs of communities participating in CAMPFIRE and drafting of a training plan that would enable communities to carry out their own baseline socio-economic studies. The objectives of the assessment were:

- to identify community training needs to enable them to conduct their own baseline surveys
- develop a training programme with communities
- define the composition of a baseline socio-economic profile with communities; and
- identify possible utilisation of data gathered for management and monitoring purposes.

## **4. RESEARCH METHODS**

Participatory training needs assessment exercises were conducted in Negande (Nyaminyami), Madzivazvido (Gokwe North) and Kanyurira (Guruve) wards. At each site discussions were held with local government officials who are involved in the CAMPFIRE project.

In-depth interviews were held at community level with key actors in general development activities and CAMPFIRE. These included Ward Wildlife Management Committee (WWMC) members, Councillors, Village Development Committee (VIDCO) members and traditional leaders (Chief, Headman and Kraal Head). This group was tasked with:

- establishing the rationale of conducting a baseline survey
- identifying information to be collected in the survey and possible uses of such data
- identifying persons who will be tasked with facilitating the conduction of the survey; and
- identifying and selecting tools that can be used for collecting, analysing and presenting the socio-economic survey results.

## **5. SURVEY FINDINGS**

### **5.1 Information To Be Collected**

Communities in all the three areas expressed willingness and enthusiasm in conducting their own baseline socio-economic surveys. They viewed such an exercise as an opportunity for them to get a better understanding of their social conditions. They were clear on what information they can collect and the potential uses of such information. From the discussions the participants made it clear that there is information that they can collect at community level and that which is household specific. They listed the following data they could collect for individual households at community level:

#### **A. Demographic data**

- household name, location and description (e.g. female headed - divorced or widowed)
- ethnicity of residents
- number of people per household broken down into number of adult male and adult females, number of children (male and female) and number of children under the age of 5
- number of children in school

#### **B. Agriculture and livestock production**

- livestock numbers
- availability of fields for agricultural activities
- crop production
- farming implements e.g. tractors, ploughs and cultivators

#### **C. Community natural resources profile**

- types and availability of natural resources, for example: water, wild animals, soils, and vegetation. Having this information will assist communities plan for appropriate management and use of natural resources.

#### **D. Income**

- income-generating activities
- employment levels

#### **E. Community infrastructure profile**

- infra-structural development and services measured by availability and number of :

- a) schools
  - b) clinic
  - c) transport
  - d) roads
  - e) shops and butcheries
  - f) grinding mills
  - g) standard of housing
- literacy levels
  - general community problems and needs
  - disease prevalence

Some members of the WWMC in Madzivazvido Ward, through their own initiative, have started compiling basic data from their areas which includes livestock numbers and numbers of households and people per household.

## **5.2 Uses Of Baseline Socio - Economic Data**

Information from the survey would be used for planning and evaluation purposes. In their evaluations, the respondents said they wanted to measure improvement in their quality of life. Indicators for this were:

- more children attending school and resultant improvement in literacy levels.
- increased number of schools (all the three areas expressed a desire to have secondary schools within their wards)
- improvement in income levels and more people in wage employment
- increase in number of houses constructed from brick and asbestos or iron sheets

Demographic and agricultural activities data would enable communities in the formulation of their own land use plans. For instance, if they know how many male children there are in the ward they can have an indication of future land requirements for residence and arable agriculture. The data would also enable them to decide whether to accept immigrants or not.

Participants in Kanyurira noted that knowledge of ethnic background of residents in the ward would enable them to identify eligible members of CAMPFIRE. It would also help them improve their relations with immigrants since they have different cultural beliefs and practices.

Identifying and prioritising problems would enable them to establish which ones they can address on their own, using their wildlife revenues.

### **5.3 Data Collection Tools**

After brain-storming and discussions, participatory data collection approaches were opted for to conduct the surveys. This was after weighing the pros and cons of individual household surveys versus participatory group interviews. It was noted for example that while questionnaire surveys generate "accurate" information for individual households, they have limitations because:

- paper to print individual household questionnaires is expensive
- enumerators might feel too lazy to walk to all households and as a result fill in information on their own
- questionnaires might get lost
- questionnaire surveys take a long time to complete and people might lose interest in the process
- data from the questionnaire might be too complex to analyse at community level; and
- when people are asked questions as individuals, they may give false information.

Participatory community surveys were said to be faster, easier to handle and data can be analysed instantly. Although the information generated here might be general, it tends to reflect an average picture of the whole community as many people contribute their knowledge, views and opinions. The problems with this approach are that:

- some people might not see the importance of the exercise and as a result stay away from meetings (however, it was noted that such people can have others responding on their behalf)
- in some areas it might be difficult to do one exercise for the whole ward or VIDCO, owing to their sizes. In this case it might be necessary to fragment the community and by so doing the exercise would take longer to complete.

All the areas have experience in conducting participatory surveys through similar exercises facilitated by WWF. In these surveys, WWF concentrated on natural resources and the reports have since been compiled and are kept at WWMC offices.

### **5.4 PRA Tools Which The Communities Opted To Use For Their Surveys**

The tools were selected after the participants had indicated what information they wanted to collect. The objective of the exercise was to establish whether communities could handle the tools and also to establish how well the information could be generated by the tools. All communities chose to draw social maps for their areas though they differed on the nature of information they felt could be easily shown on the map. For instance, in Gokwe North

there was concern that while it was possible to identify all the households, knowing the size of each household was difficult.

Generally, it was observed that the following tools could be used:

**i) Social / resource map for:**

- location and identification of households in relation to natural resources available in the area. Description of households, for example: household head name, his/her marital status and ethnicity
- size of the household
- household with people in wage employment and their numbers
- infra-structural development in the areas e.g. schools, clinic, roads, dip-tanks
- location of resources such as safe water points for households, water for livestock and wild animals, grazing areas and wildlife habitat
- physical features in the ward e.g. game fence, rivers, culvert bridges and streams
- households owning cattle and their (cattle) actual or estimated numbers

For Madzivazvido and Negande it was suggested that the maps would be drawn for individual VIDCOS because the wards are too large. This would enable the communities to easily identify those VIDCOs that are lacking in resources and identify problems faced by individual villages. It was observed that some of the problems they have been facing in terms of deciding which projects to embark on using wildlife revenues have been largely a result of the ignorance of varying situations in different villages.

**ii) Demographic data sheet**

This would be used to generate and summarise demographic data that cannot be shown on the social map. This includes information such as:

- name of household
- description of household head e.g. (male, female-widow, female-divorced or female-single)
- number of male and female adults (the definition of adult should come from the communities as these vary by areas)
- number of children above the age of 5
- number of children under 5
- number of children in school

The data sheet can be compiled at VIDCO or kraalhead level, but should then be combined to make up the data for the ward (see Table 2, Appendix 2).

### **iii) Natural resources profile summary data sheet**

This would be used to generate and summarise information on resources available in the area and the levels of availability, i.e. abundant, average, and scarce (see Table 3, Appendix 2). This may also be done at VIDCO level and then compiled at WARD level.

### **iv) Interviews**

Consultations and discussions were identified as the most useful tool for gathering information at both group level and household level. It was noted that group exercises had the advantage of recording information that had been cross-checked by different individuals. Some participants observed that when people are asked questions as individuals they may give false information because they might not be sure of the motives of the interviewer. Community leaders and key actors were identified as the most important key informants. It was observed for instance that kraal heads know all the households in the villages by virtue of being their leader and the fact that they have been involved in the grain loan exercises which involved identifying all the households in the areas.

### **v) Linkage diagrams**

Sources of income, list of diseases, general community problems and crops grown would be generated by this tool. Here the community can only list the diseases, sources of income or community problems without ranking them.

### **vi) Ranking, pairwise ranking and scoring (e.g. Table 1, Appendix 1)**

These tools will be used for such topics as sources of income, diseases and crop production. The tools enable communities to establish, for example, which diseases are most prevalent in the area. It was noted that some diseases such as malnutrition are related to the development level of the area. The tools also enable them to qualify their choices for the ranks. For example in Negande participants ranked various sources of income based on the number of people involved in that activity, average income generated and the reliability of that activity in generating an income.

### **vii) Secondary data**

Information generated during group exercises could be further qualified by referring to secondary data. For example in Kanyurira it was suggested that information on patterns of diseases could be obtained from the clinic or from the Environment Health Technician (EHT).

### **viii) Problem identification and prioritisation**

Communities should be equipped with problem identification and prioritisation skills. Problems identified should be grouped into, for instance, agricultural, wildlife, water or forest related categories.

The need for such an exercise was identified in Madzivazvido ward where villagers pointed out that they had problems in deciding what projects to develop using their CAMPFIRE funds. This was attributed to the lack of skills in identifying problems that need urgent attention and can be addressed by using income generated from wildlife.

An attempt to practice some of the participatory tools used for problem identification and privatisation was appreciated in both Gokwe North and Nyaminyami rural district councils. Kanyurira ward did not seem to portray problems with prioritising their decisions, probably owing to the fact that they have been exposed to the skills by WWF.

### **5.5 Who Should Facilitate The Exercises?**

Madzivazvido and Kanyurira wards did not feel confident enough to handle their own surveys. Their fear was that other members of the community might not see the importance of such an exercise if it is done by locals. They argued that people have been used to having all the important tasks done for them by outsiders. There were suggestions that if CASS cannot provide someone on a full-time basis to help them with the exercises then they should employ a locally based facilitator to oversee the conduct of surveys. However, after much discussion it turned out that the concern was not so much lack of confidence in conducting the survey but that such an activity should be able to provide temporary employment to some members of the community. They felt that it would be difficult to get anyone from the community to do the work entirely on a voluntary basis. In Kanyurira, there were indications that the WWMC could consider remunerating any local person(s) with co-ordinating the surveys in the Ward.

## 6. DISCUSSION

Participatory tools are not exactly new; most of them are a modification of the conventional tools used in Social Research. PRA tools are used for creating dialogue and for collecting information. However, these tools emphasise a shift from solely verbal to a combination of both visual and verbal communication in the process of data collection. For example, the dialogue that accompanies the preparation of maps is as much an objective as the end product. Furthermore, the process of data collection is not an end in itself but analysis takes place during the process. The exercises enable communities to unravel and analyse their own situations and, in optimal cases, to plan and act on their premises. Given that no PRA situations are the same (i.e. in terms of the people who participate, their cultural context, their problems and their ideas), the tools are characterised by ingenuity and flexibility as the situation dictates.

There are various tools used in PRA. These can be used for:

- i) collecting data and information
- ii) analysing data
- iii) both collecting and analysing data
- iv) communication

Diagrams and maps summarise data in such a way that they can be used for different purposes: exploration and problem identification for planning; and the analysis and future for monitoring and evaluation. However, the maps and diagrams present the communities' knowledge and not that of experts. Thus, they may not be statistically accurate. Scoring (ordinal) and ranking (cardinal) provide relative values as opposed to absolute figures. The advantage of the results of these exercises is that they reflect input by various members of the community. Thus, information is verified by many people.

However, for a PRA exercise to be successful, the facilitator has to possess an attitude and conduct that will encourage participation by communities. For example the facilitator should encourage all participants to voice their opinions and cross check information. There is a danger that if participation by different individuals and groups is not encouraged, the results will only reflect the opinions of the powerful and most vocal members of the communities.

## **7. THE TRAINING PROGRAMME**

Given the number of wards participating in CAMPFIRE per district, the training programme can best be conducted in two stages:

### **STAGE 1**

From the three Districts that have been identified for the pilot work, nominate 3 wards initially. From each ward, 2 persons nominated by the ward residents will be trained by CASS (as per the NRMP II project document) in PRA tools and techniques. However, there is need for Institutions Development Officers and Wildlife Managers to participate in the training. These officers will provide back-up support when need arises and supervise the exercises in their areas.

### **STAGE 2**

The two persons from the ward will further train other facilitators from their wards (nominated from VIDCO or kraal head level) in the tools and techniques for conducting the baseline surveys. However, CASS should be available to provide support during the training.

The above arrangement is meant to minimise the number of participants during the training. Given the participatory nature of PRA training, about thirty participants can be accommodated in each training.

## **8. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 8.1** It may not be possible to conduct one detailed group survey for the wards. For finer details for the study such as number of male, females or children under the age of 5, there will be need to fragment the areas into smaller units. These can be either traditional villages or administrative villages (VIDCOs) In Kanyurira the group opted to work at kraal head level because the kraal heads have been involved in compiling household numbers for the grain loan exercise. In Negande A and B the option was that the surveys be conducted at settlement cluster level because a) the administrative villages are too large, and b) people are not necessarily settled in the same area as their kraal heads.
- 8.2** There is need to identify someone at ward level to co-ordinate the surveys in order to standardise the information collected and compile a ward report.
- 8.3** Key actors in CAMPFIRE at district level (e.g. Institutions Development Officers and Wildlife Managers) need to be involved in the Participatory Rural Appraisal skills training in order for them to co-ordinate the exercises at district level and provide assistance to communities when need arises.
- 8.4** There is need to liaise with WWF who have been involved in participatory resource surveys. There is need to compliment information from the resource surveys with that from social surveys. Communities should be able to see the complimentary relationship between the two exercises. Information from the two exercises can be useful in decision making that bears on natural resources. For instance after a practice session on compiling demographic data for the ward in Kanyurira people were already noticing that their population growth rate does not match the availability of land for arable agriculture. They also indicated that they can actually use their demographic information to bar further immigration.
- 8.5** Communities should be equipped with problem identification and prioritisation skills. An attempt to practise some of the participatory tools used for such a task was appreciated in Gokwe North and Nyaminyami. Kanyurira ward did not seem to portray problems with prioritising their decisions, probably owing to the fact that they have been exposed to the skills by WWF.
- 8.6** There is need to include some more tools e.g. matrix ranking or matrix scoring to qualify information generated by linkage diagrams and rankings in the training sessions.

- 8.7 There is need to include ethnic minority groupings, e.g. vaDoma / Tembomvura, in Kanyurira. They are still treated marginally though they are part of the ward. Many people are not sure of their population and problems as it is said that they are not forthcoming with such information.

## APPENDIX 1

**TABLE 1: Scoring And Ranking For Different Sources Of Income At Ward Level By Participants In Negande Ward**

Source of Income	Score	Rank
KULIMA	33	1
tonje	15	
zipoka	6	
mayila	9	
mhunga	3	
KUVHUBA	17	2
mpongo	11	
nkuku	3	
mbelele	2	
madada	1	
KUNYAMA	11	4
KUBELEKA	5	9
muminzi	1	
mumadolopo	1	
mumapulazi	1	
muma "hotel"	2	
KULABULA BASVI	2	10
HAWKERS LICENSE	2	11
KUZHA TOMBWE	10	5
KUZHA ZIDINA	6	7
KUBEZA	6	8
zhunu	3	
nchili	1	
mwingo	2	
KULUKA	13	3
masasa	8	
nsuo	5	
KUKWASHA	10	6

## APPENDIX 2

TABLE 2: Example Of A Demographic Data Sheet

Household	Male Adults	Female Adults	Male Children	Female Children
Zengeretsi, L.	1	2	5	1
Kanyurira, C.	1	3	2	2
Chaukura, R.	3	3	4	5
Dzomba, S.	3	6	6	9
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>

TABLE 3: Natural Resources Summary Data Sheet

Type of Resource	Uses	Availability	If scarce, give reasons and possible solutions



This work is licensed under a  
Creative Commons  
Attribution – NonCommercial - NoDerivs 3.0 License.

To view a copy of the license please see:  
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

This is a download from the BLDS Digital Library on OpenDocs  
<http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/>