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Summary

Does Participatory Development Communication (PDC) create dialogue and empowerment? This is the main question that the research paper searches to answer. The analysis of PDC as a phenomenon inside Communication for Development within this paper focuses on community-based level interventions in Latin America and Africa, which use participatory video or participatory photography and group discussion as the main tools of action with the intention to create dialogue and empowerment.

The methodology used to explore how PDC functions theoretically and in practice included literature review, interviews with eight development practitioners that have been in the field in the last five years, and case study analysis of eight projects implemented in Latin America and/or Africa in the last 12 years built on primary sources of information (internal NGOs’ documents and interviews with planners and/or trainers).

In theory, as it is analyzed in chapter 2, PDC does facilitate dialogue and empowerment. Being a methodology that was born from communication for development and participatory processes, it proposes a horizontal knowledge-sharing approach through media and interpersonal group communication that combines the ‘mirroring’ features of video and photography with a space to ‘imitate’ grassroots communication through group discussion. The media provides the focus on what is worth looking at and the group discussion allows stages of exposure needed in decision-making processes to critically and collectively analyze abstract topics of reality.

In relation to practice, the challenges that the field presents are clear in chapter 3, while the lessons related to real-context are illuminated through the case studies in chapter 4. Research should be the backbone of the field project to involve the community in the decision-making and planning stage. At the same time, it is key to understand local realities, grassroots communication and socio-political context. This can guide the NGOs involved to set the objectives with the participants in relation to the place that the project has in the ladder of participation. Without clarity in this stage, the superficiality may lead the process to an unsuccessful end. In addition, an explicit discussion among the partners related to the
meaning of empowerment should guide the planning and training process to clarify the connotations behind the buzzword.

The theoretical and practical analysis has left some other implicit considerations for future contributions towards improvement of PDC to facilitate dialogue and empowerment. Academia discussions related to participation generally place themselves in favour of or against top-down and bottom-up approaches, with a naive optimism or a highly critical position, almost in a black or white discussion. The case studies have shown that reality is grey, and not black or white. Depending on the stage that the community or beneficiaries are in the ladder of participation, a mixture of both approaches is needed to successfully enhance them in a social change process that may be already taking place.

Note

Number of words: 12,367

(Main text in the chapters excluding summary, headings, footnotes, figures and tables, text in boxes, the table of contents, acknowledgements, the list of references and bibliography for the methodology and annexes)
Chapter 1: Introduction to the research

1.1 Topic

This research is focused on the use of participatory development communication (PDC) to facilitate dialogue and empowerment in community-based level interventions in Latin America and Africa.

Within the phenomenon of communication for development, PDC has been used for the last thirty years as a tool to achieve dialogue and empowerment in development projects, particularly through video, photography and group discussion. To be able to analyze this phenomenon, this research unpacks the mechanisms working behind PDC, their connections and challenges, as well as the intended outcomes, both in theory and practice.

1.2 Aim and questions

Aim:

The research aim is to explore how PDC creates dialogue and empowerment, particularly with the use of video and photography as selected participatory media, and the use of group discussion as the interpersonal group communication tool.

Questions:

1. Does PDC facilitate dialogue and empowerment?
   a. How is it achieved in the field?
   b. Is it key to combine participatory media and interpersonal group communication to achieve dialogue and empowerment?
   c. Is there a difference in results when interpersonal group communication is used?
   d. Does the analysis present differences for video and photography?
1.3 Methodology

The research methodology\(^1\) includes literature review, interviews and case study analysis to explore the phenomenon of the use of PDC to achieve dialogue and empowerment.

The literature review provides a platform for the research and a summary of the debate related to PDC and each of the components involved in the process, both in relation to theory and practice. The interviews, on the other hand, are used to obtain development practitioners’ opinions and experiences related to the field, through structured open-ended questions to standardize across interviewees. The eight development practitioners selected had direct field experience in the last five years.

Finally, the case studies were selected to illustrate and explore the phenomenon in a real-life context, built from primary sources that include internal documents from the organizations involved and an interview with the planner or facilitator of the process. They are community-based projects carried out in Latin America and Africa in the last 12 years.

1.4 Structure of the paper

The research paper is divided into five chapters:

- **Chapter 1:** Introduction to the research; which describes the topic, aim, questions and methodology.
- **Chapter 2:** Literature review; which analyzes and unpacks the concepts behind the phenomenon of PDC as part of the communication for development area of knowledge. The analysis includes participatory media and interpersonal group communication as the two main components of PDC.
- **Chapter 3:** PDC in practice; which analyses and unpacks the process in the field through literature review and interviews with practitioners. The analysis includes the

\(^1\) See bibliography used to build the methodology after the list of references.
stages of participation, planning, training, local management system and intended outcomes.

- **Chapter 4:** Case studies; which explore how NGOs and development practitioners search to achieve dialogue and empowerment in a community-based project. The cross-case analysis is done through eight cases from Latin America and Africa.
- **Chapter 5:** Conclusions; which highlights the main learning points from the research as well as the questions and challenges that should be taken into account in the future.
Chapter 2: Literature review

2.1 Participatory Development Communication: the evolution of Communication for Development

2.1.1 Introduction

This chapter briefly presents the concepts that sustain participatory development communication (PDC). As an introduction, the main theories and contributors to the field of communication for development are mentioned to settle the ground for the understanding of participatory communication. As the discussion advances, the relationship between PDC and communication for social change appears as a significant contribution to the understanding of the first, as well as some of the issues that form part of this study: participatory media - focusing on video and photography - and interpersonal group communication.

As a first step in the review, it is important to clarify the meaning of communication for development. Fraser and Restrepo-Estrada (1998, p. 63) conceptualized it as “the use of communication processes, techniques and media to help people towards a full awareness of their situation and their options for change, to resolve conflicts, to work towards consensus...”

During more than 50 years, this area of knowledge has developed in parallel to development theories.

In this sense, during the first decades where the modernization approach was part of the dominant paradigm, the communication for development field sustained a behaviour change approach through the theories of communication effects, mass media and modernization, diffusion of innovations and social marketing created by Berlo, Schramm, Lerner, and Rogers², as the main thinkers. But in the 1970s, Latin American scholars challenged the theories and

---

methods of modernization and created the space for alternative approaches to development, explaining dependency and underdevelopment.\footnote{Among them are Frank, Cardoso, Goulet, dos Santos, Baran, Sunkel and Amin.}

This new space challenged the communication theories too, which were ‘replaced’ by models focusing on social marketing, entertainment-education programming and media advocacy. Soon after this shift of perspective, the criticism of both modernization and dependency theories originated a new viewpoint on development and social change: the participatory paradigm, self-development or bottom-up perspective. Ramirez has comprehensibly pictured the evolution in Figure 1 - Family Tree of theories and approaches in Communication for Development (Cardey, 2007).

This was the start of the communication for social change (CSC) approach. This perspective shifted the focus from individual to social change centring itself in community action through empowerment of local voices, proposing respect on ownership and basing its tools in dialogue. According to the Communication for Social Change Consortium (2008), “communication for social change is a process of dialogue through which people define who they are, what they want, what they need and how they can act collectively to meet those needs and improve their lives.”

As Waisbord (2001, p. 35) clearly points out, “CSC stresses the importance of horizontal communication, the role of people as agents of change, and the need for negotiating skills and partnership”. Although this approach emerged in development a few years ago, Fraser and Restrepo-Estrada (1998, p. 39) remind us that “communication for social change is as old as organized society. The great philosophers and teachers, the custodians of people’s spiritual well-being, and the leaders of great social movements in the past, have all used communication in various forms to influence the values and behaviour patterns of the societies in which they lived.”
It did not take long before participatory communication was built from communication for social change and the new participatory paradigm in development. The main influences were White and Patel, with the people-centred approach for participants’ engagement; Freire, with his vision of participatory pedagogy; and Pretty and Allen, acknowledging that beneficial participatory projects empower people by building skills, interests and capacities. (Murphy, Balka, Poureslain, Leung, Nicol, & Cruz, 2007, p. 387). At the same time, Latin American scholars such as Beltran and Diaz-Bordenave were the main influences behind communication for social change theories. (Cardey, 2007)

Furthermore, Melkote and Steeves (2001, p. 339) identified communication in the participatory paradigm as “a vehicle for liberation from mental and psychological shackles that bind the people to structures and processes of oppression. Used in this way, communication is performing its true action: communicare – the Latin root of communication – which means building commonness among the members of a group or community striving to change their
present situation”. And this might come true if the natural flow of communications of human beings is understood, allowed and fostered. Because “this approach to community change seeks to mimic the everyday cumulative way the social influence occurs” (Dearing, 2001, p. 305).

According to Jacobson and Kolluri (1999), Nair and White contributed to deepen the concepts of opening dialogue, source and receiver continuous interaction, thinking constructively about a situation, identifying developmental needs and problems, deciding what is needed to improve the situation, and acting upon it. Besides, they highlight Ascroft for his research related to knowledge sharing and creation of beneficiary comprehension of benefactor intentionalities.

The strong and defining position of participatory communication as the dominant approach in the last decades is documented by Fair and Shah (1997) in their research about continuities and discontinuities in communication and development research, where they stated that “in the 1987-1996 period, Lerner’s modernization model completely disappears. Instead, the most frequently used theoretical framework is participatory development, an optimist postmodern orientation which is almost the polar opposite of Lerner…”

This brief introduction to the evolution of communication for development and participatory communication approaches opens the way into the main area of interest of this chapter: participatory development communication.

### 2.2 Participatory Development Communication

#### 2.2.1 Conceptualization of PDC

It could be said that participatory development communication was born from development communication and participatory research (Bessette, 2004, p. 12). This `child’ was defined by Bessette (ibid, p. 8) and ratified by the Communication for Development Roundtable organized
by FAO in 2005 (p. 29), as “a planned activity based on the one hand on participatory processes, and on the other hand on media and interpersonal communication, which facilitates a dialogue among different stakeholders, around a common development problem or goal, with the objective of developing and implementing a set of activities to contribute to its solution, or its realization, and which supports and accompanies this initiative.” The similarities with participation are manifested: the realization of an intervention that generates dialogue and collaboration towards a better life. But, in this case, it is specifically achieved through communication tools.

Melkote et. al. (2001, p. 352), McQuail (1983, p. 97) and Jacobson et. al. (1999, p. 265) concur that participatory development communication is based on horizontal knowledge-sharing between participants at grassroots level, through media and interpersonal group communication, creating a climate of mutual understanding between participants. Besides, as Johansson (1999) explains, “most researchers agree that participatory methodology works well in yielding problem description and generation of new perspective and ideas through visualization and group analysis.”

Gumucio-Dagron (2001), on the other hand, emphasises that participatory communication is based on a process with instead of for the community, which gives them the ownership of the project and shows a consciousness and deep understanding about social reality – a point strongly criticized under the modernization approach. Kane (1995, p. 22) goes deep in the analysis and explains that participatory methods “are based on the phenomenological paradigm which accepts that ‘knowledge’ is the result of an interaction between people”, sustaining the confidence on self-development theories.

Power and identity are key elements that are part of a project of participatory communication. Gumucio-Dagron (2001) stresses them explaining that participatory approaches contribute to put decision-making in the hands of the people, strengthen internal democratic processes, and install cultural pride and self-esteem. But this presents its challenges for development professionals as well. According to Odutola (2003), scholars like Craig and Porter recognized the irresolvable contradiction between participation and effective management that does not
give space to free discovery and requires meeting pre-set objectives. This will be discussed in the next chapter, as part of the implications of participatory processes in the field.

According to Servaes (1996), the notion of multiplicity in one world is key in participatory communication, rejecting universal approaches, putting emphasis in diversity and pluralism, and suggesting that goals should emerge from the participatory process itself. “Rigid and general strategies for participation are neither possible nor desirable. It is a process that unfolds in each unique situation.” (ibid, p.23)

As mentioned before, PDC projects are sustained by media and interpersonal communication, in particular group discussion. In the following sections they will be described and analyzed, including the particular media on which this research is focused.

### 2.3 Participatory Media

#### 2.3.1 Introduction

In the process of participatory communication people speak for themselves. Community members control different tools and techniques of communication, considering the particular voice and perspective of each person, promoting bottom-up approaches. Among those tools is participatory media (PM), a subset of direct media that uses participation and self-determination to enable feedback or exchange. (Stuart & Bery, 1996, pp. 199-200) Why is it different from massive media? Because “it focuses on who is communicating” (ibid) instead on doing it on the final product.

Okunna (1995, p. 620) highlights that this type of media leads to action and change, while Stuart & Bery (1996, p.200) go beyond that analysis specifying that it has a function in training, organization and advocacy as well as mobilizing or rising awareness and confidence. “Participatory media are practically oriented and build on the strengths of local organizers.” (ibid p.201)
In relation to the research done in this area, Servaes (2008, pp. 190-192) explained that Latin American scholars (like Berrigan 1981, O’Sullivan Ryan and Kapluri, 1978) jointly with UNESCO have identified the concepts of access, participation and self-management in media development establishing the ground for further research. From that point other topics were added: PM, audience involvement in message creation, identity construction and institution building. Within the communication discipline, there have been both approval and criticism for PM. On the one hand, Garnham criticised it as ‘naive utopianism’, while Herman & McChesney defend it as “the best response to media conglomeramation”. (Huesca, 2003, p. 64)

This research is focused on two particular types of media among the variety of PM: video and photography. Both are analyzed in the following sections.

### 2.3.2 Participatory Video

Participatory video (PV) has been called a broad variety of names: alternative video, independent video, popular video, community video, grassroots television or video of popular movement. It has crucial differences with conventional video that are contrasted in Table 1 - Differences between community video and conventional video. Lazerus & Tomaselli (2007). A definition that reflects the concept of PV describes it as “an iterative process, whereby communities use video to document innovations and ideas or focus on issues affecting their environment and community.” (Lunch, The Most Significant Change: using participatory video for monitoring and evaluation., 2007, p. 28)

As Braden explains (1998, p. 94), “video pictures act as a mirror. Participants can see and hear themselves talking and they can retrieve what was said in the way that it was said. This process of reflection has a resonance with Lacan’s idea that image is outside self and that identity is constructed through language. Hearing oneself talking on a video screen can offer the opportunity for retrieval of one’s own language and self, which is afforded by few other media.” And this can happen because, as Odutola (2003) says, the objects and subjects of production are the same. Some of the characteristics that make video a useful tool for
participatory development communication projects are reflected in Table 2 - Characteristics of video for PDC according to different authors.

PV has several advantages. On one hand, its small format helps participation and decentralization, based on flexibility, immediacy, low running cost and widespread availability (Jain, 1991, p. 42). Ogan (1989, p. 2) agrees with Jain emphasising that it takes away control from central authority and gives it to people. Some critics compare PV to home movies with limited interest to the viewers, to which Lazerus and Tomaselli (2007) agreed: “audiences of community video have high political expectations of what the video should achieve, while home movie audiences expect very little. Community videos are oriented to a mediation of the processes of class struggle in the forging of a fundamentally different society.”

Table 1 - Differences between community video and conventional video. Lazerus & Tomaselli (2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community video</th>
<th>Conventional video</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produce knowledge</td>
<td>Restrict knowledge or repackages and reconstructs it in new ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recoup local histories</td>
<td>Emulate dominant view of the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasise relationships</td>
<td>Fragment relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal / participative working relationships</td>
<td>Fragment relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empower: creates active response</td>
<td>Disempower: creates passive response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to processes beyond the community</td>
<td>Literal significance: if processes not shown, they do not exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew not alienated from its labour</td>
<td>Crew alienated from its labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making power vested in the subject community</td>
<td>Decision making power retained and secured in the production crew and / or producers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial power relationships exposed and negotiated</td>
<td>Nature of power relationships mystified by crew in its relations with the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between crew and subject community</td>
<td>community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community networks strengthened</td>
<td>Community networks exploited and/or weakened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production cannot be executed in term of predetermined schedules</td>
<td>Production must be executed in terms of predetermined schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community must take responsibility for completion of video</td>
<td>Crew takes responsibility for completion of video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate both video and political theory building</td>
<td>Prevents theory building by concealing processes of production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective decision making</td>
<td>Hierarchical decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producers are part of subject community or are drawn</td>
<td>Producers are outside subject community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>into it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term relationships between crew and</td>
<td>Short-term relationship develops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 No page number, online source.
community develops

Viewers have political expectations  Viewers want to be entertained
Process more important than product  Product is only goal. Process is concealed
Non-profit motive  Profit motive
Develop human relations  Develop techniques
Develop local audiences  Develop national and international markets
Retain local cultural uniqueness in terms of subjects  Homogenise local cultures in terms of markets and techniques
Empowerment takes place, if differentially, at every level of production: from production techniques, to recovery of local histories and catalysisation of community organisational networks
Participant video makers are part of local distribution networks  Video makers are alienated from their audiences through independent distribution

Several authors expressed a similar point of view in relation to PV expectations. Caldwell (2005), on the one hand, stressing that the video in PV is a mean to participation in itself and not an end; Cizek (2005) mentioning that PV helps express and move forward the community decision-making processes; Lunch & Lunch (2006) stating that PV is a way of bringing people together to explore issues and voice concerns; and on the other hand, Shaw and Robertson (1997) describing that PV helps development of participants’ abilities to support the transfer of responsibility to voice opinions and make choices.

Table 2 - Characteristics of video for PDC according to different authors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education support</td>
<td>Horizontal knowledge exchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural identity reinforcement</td>
<td>Creativity and capacity to adapt to the changing cultural and social context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal stories produce powerful emotional impact</td>
<td>Emotions are touched</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle for building coalitions</td>
<td>Dialogue facilitator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach a wide range of people</td>
<td>Dialogue promoter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy is not required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mirror to scrutinise community problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roncagliolo (1991) and Gumucio Dagron (2001) went beyond that analysis explaining that PV allows different communication experiences: where the process before the video is essential,
where the video is the end result and where the process after the video is produced represents the important experience. This argument is related to the cumulative and variety of experiences gained using PV since 1967, when the “Fogo Island process” happened in Canada. Protz (1991) summarizes the uses in several functions: training of facilitators, promotion of local action, awareness with similar groups, expression of grievances to authorities, reinforcement of existing projects and documentaries or reports. Lunch (2007, p. 29) adds to these the monitoring and evaluation of the PV process itself, a project as it progresses and its completion.

2.3.3 Participatory Photography

Similar to PV, participatory photography (PP) democratizes the image-making dynamic and gives non-professionals the power to show and speak their own realities, as Clover (2006, p. 275) explains. “Whereby marginalized or disadvantaged people are provided cameras and the opportunity to document, analyse, and make meaning of their own experiences and realities through images and symbols of their own choosing” (ibid, p.276). She sustains her argument stating that several scholars have agreed upon this - including Daniels 2003, Evans 2001, Gallo 2001 and Wang & Burris 1994 - as well as affirming that PP is a tool that emerged from documentary photography in anthropology, based on learning for empowerment, action and agency. (ibid)

In the same line, Wang & Burris (1994, pp. 175, 177) reflect on the history of PP explaining the first known case were non-traditional photographers were trained to record their own lives. They comment on the work of Wendy Ewald in 1975 with children in Kentucky as well as on the approach of the Center for Documentary Photography at Duke University, highlighting that both recognized the importance of the photographer’s integration within the community to achieve a level of imagination and observation that exceeds experienced photographers.

Image is the main concept behind photography. “Images do seem to have a remarkable ability to particularize an abstract concept and provide a new platform for self and social reflection”. (Shakotko & Walker, 1999) Over this idea Clover (2006, p.282) sustains that PP is a tool of agency and identity. Shakotko & Walker (1999), on the other hand, go deep in their analysis
explaining that “PP is grounded in symbol and metaphor, and these are powerful expressions that convey through a single image a diversity of feelings, dreams, fears, or thoughts which play an important role in reasoning and attempts to understand the world.”

PP has been used specially in participatory research to balance power relations among researcher and participants and to assess community needs. In the first case, Bate (2003, p. 436) explains that “the one in power has full control over the process of image making and the conditions of its consumption”, while Cook & Hess (2007) stressed the role of PP in balancing the power of adults to establish what is the perspective of reality according to children. In the second case, there are several authors like Prins (2006), Widener (2007), Singhal & Rattine-Flaherty (2006), Carlson et. al. (2006) and Cook & Hess (2007) who highlight the role of PP in documenting aspects of community life as well as being an effective tool of research. Singhal & Rattine-Flaherty, for example, reflected upon its combination with sketches and drawings, while Carlson et. al. presented PP as a useful tool to engage the community in dialogue around community health concerns. Cook & Hess, at the same time, analyzed PP in three projects that placed it as the main tool for research with children, especially for its capacity to unpack adults’ understanding of childhood.

On the other hand, Wang & Burris (1994, pp. 180, 184) sustain that PP promotes dialogue, encourages action and informs policy, highlighting that “photographs provide both evidence and validation of shared concerns” and stating that PP is “a process of self-knowledge, creative expression and critical consciousness”. They deeply analyze this concept of critical consciousness, particularly from a Freirian perspective, arguing that “photographs serve as one kind of code that reflect the community back upon itself, mirroring the everyday social and political realities that influence people’s lives” (ibid, p. 172).

As in PV, the key component of the PP projects is the lack of expectation of a ‘professional’ image quality in the media outcome but, instead, the connotations and process of reflection that those pictures can create. “Photographs are not, as often assumed, a mechanical record...although every image embodies a way of seeing, our perception of appreciation of an image depends also upon our own way of seeing” (Berger, 1972, p. 10). As Cook & Hess (2007,
Sontag (1978, p. 3) wisely argues that “in teaching us a new visual code, photographs alter and enlarge our notions of what is worth looking at”. Price (1998, p. 209) agrees explaining that the act of taking a photograph implies making choices about meaning and giving a reason to things, people and circumstances. Wang & Burris (1994) sustain this concept too starting their analysis with a quote of Andre Kersetz: “The camera is my tool. Through it I give a reason to everything around me”.

2.4 Interpersonal group communication

2.4.1 Introduction

The combination of media and interpersonal communication to achieve effective interventions has been recognized in development communication, as Waisbord (2001) highlights referring to research done by Flay and Burton in 1990 and Hornik in 1989. As Fraser and Restrepo-Estrada (1998, p. 277) explain, “people exposed to information material may understand its significance in different ways, but the analysis and discussion that follows will help to clarify the issues and lead towards a consensus view.” For this reason, interpersonal group communication “seems to be a prevalent strategy among participatory communication projects”. (Inagaki, 2007, p. 18)

According to Inagaki (ibid, p.17), “group communication is a form of interpersonal communication and takes place in settings where people engage in discussion on matters of collective or communal importance”. Fraser and Restrepo-Estrada (1998, p. 275) affirm that group communication (GC) is key in the process of an effective intervention because localized information needs to be analysed and debated. On the other hand, Mezzana (1996, p. 191) highlights that GC is important for its relationship with grassroots communication, being a way of making an effective connection and integration with the communication network already present in the community.
How has GC being blended in participatory development communication projects? In the case of PV, for instance, local viewings after the production of the video set the ground to discussion and exchange of ideas (Lunch, 2007, p. 28). For Okunna (1995, pp. 620, 621) GC acts as the formal instance of feedback for the community and is the cornerstone of the project. “People get to hear and see what people like them are doing, and this helps them to organize activities for their own development”. Moreover, Wang & Burris (1994, p. 172) explain that this space allows participants to critically and collectively analyze their reality providing them with knowledge that results in practical and directed ways of action.

In the case of PP projects, Wang & Burris (ibid, p.177) exemplified their position with a case were rural Chinese women were able to find similarities and differences in their lives through discussion related to their photographs, concluding that “the goal of the large and small group dialogues is to cultivate people’s ability to take individual and collective action for social change”. Cook & Hess’ analysis (2007, p. 32) emphasises a different aspect of the process, stating that “photographs provide an opportunity to have group discussions around a visual prompt which makes it easier than trying to talk about something in the abstract”, which allows the main actors of the project to explore the reasons behind those photographs without the intervention of an outsider.

Some of the advantages that have been recognized by scholars in the use of GC are:

• Its function as a forum to get people involved (Cohen S., 1996, p. 241)
• Its generative function allowing identification and acknowledgement of common community problems, self-reflection, bottom-up solutions, and commitment to social causes (Inagaki, 2007, p. 37)
• Its creation of an environment that allows stages of exposure critically needed in learning and decision-making processes that affect attitudes and behaviours (Fraser & Restrepo-Estrada, 1998, p. 271)
But to understand the challenges behind the use of GC, it is important that projects analyze small groups’ dynamics as well as the group discussion technique in itself. Both issues are subject of study in the following sections.

2.4.2 Small groups

As it was recognized by the World Communication Association - WCA (1973, pp. 1, 2), “the small group is the most common setting for interpersonal oral communication”, being a vital space in our personal lives and “essential in the conduct of our democratic society”. Hartley (1997, p. 19) agrees with WCA adding that belonging to social groups is part of the personal identity of any human being.

WCA considers a small group “two or more people in physical proximity who dynamically interact orally about a common concern.” (1973, p.3) And to be able to analyse the interactions that the members experience, it is vital to understand that there are different levels of analysis, stages and factors that influence their interaction. The proposal of Hartley (1997, p. 29, 30) to evaluate interactions in three levels of analysis (Figure 2 - Levels of analysis of group interaction), emphasizes the forces that affect the surface behaviour level and the meaning of interpersonal underworld (pattern of likes, dislikes, admirations, resentments and other emotional attachments which exist between group members).
In relation to the stages of development of a group, Hartley (ibid, p. 54) takes the classification that Tuckman created in 1965 (Box 1) as the one agreed by social psychologists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of group development (Tuckman, 1965):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Forming</strong>: a period of uncertainty and confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Storming</strong>: a period of conflict about the task and hostility between the members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Norming</strong>: the period where group cohesion emerges along with consensus about the task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Performing</strong>: the period where the group can achieve successful performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 1 - Stages of group development

Furthermore, Hartley (ibid, p. 71, 112, 127) focuses on different factors that influence group interaction, such as conformity, the development of norms, communication and its consequent structure, power, status and authority, as well as liking and roles. Curtis et. al. (1979, p. 19), on the other hand, emphasise group ecology (group size, meeting facilities and room arrangements) as an important part to determine group’ structure, interaction and results. At the same time, they detail several roles that can be found in problem-solving discussion in small groups (Table 3 - Roles in problem-solving discussion in small groups (Curtis et. al. 1979, p. 98, 99).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Functions of the role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Effective listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giving orders and offering direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stimulating and developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summarizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information seeker</td>
<td>Thinking critically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analysing situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asking for elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggesting other areas to explore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information giver</td>
<td>Supplying necessary facts and data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion giver</td>
<td>Offering personal reaction to statements discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion seeker</td>
<td>Encouraging group members to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraging free expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifier</td>
<td>Presenting ideas that are ambiguous in a clearer way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensuring everyone understands the discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group coordinator</td>
<td>Showing relationships among comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienter</td>
<td>Channelling the group to the appropriate areas of discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energizer</td>
<td>Being concerned to the continuity of the group’s work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraging group action and members contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiator</td>
<td>Offering suggestions and new ideas about how the group could consider problems or solutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 - Roles in problem-solving discussion in small groups (Curtis et. al. 1979, p. 98, 99)

### 2.4.3 Group discussion

Once the characteristics and factors involved in small group interaction were discussed, the technique of group discussion will be presented as the interpersonal group communication activity to be researched in the context of participatory development communication. Group discussion can be defined as “a communication process involving a group of people usually under the direction of a leader, who are working together towards a solution to a problem. It involves sharing, participating and interacting in a group context.” (Curtis, Mazza, & Runnebohm, 1979, pp. 2, 7)

Group discussion is presented as a more effective technique towards problem solving, in comparison to individual thinking. According to Bligh (2000, p. 13), psychologists have given a number of possible explanations for this affirmation (Box 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why is GD more effective than individual thinking in problem solving?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The sum of a group’s knowledge is usually greater than the knowledge of any individual in it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Groups check and reject errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Able group members have most influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Group work maintains attention better than individual work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• And their superiority is a statistical artefact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 2 - Why is GD more effective than individual thinking in problem solving?
Besides, he suggests (ibid, p.27) that discussion has a role to teach self-awareness and awareness of others, as well as to promote personal and social adjustment. On the other hand, he reminds us that “social experience of group discussion creates fear for some and opportunities for enjoyment, co-operation and achievement for others” (ibid, p.119). Among the factors that influence group discussion, he mentions interpersonal perception, verbal communication, non-verbal communication, patterns of communication and group cohesion (ibid, pp. 180-187).

Curtis et. al. (1979), instead include tension (primary and secondary), congruence, group cohesiveness, productivity and commitment, among those factors. WCA (1973, pp. 22, 23) and Klopf (1974) agree with this perspective, while WCA adds that these forces are caused by the interaction of the personalities of each group member, which may move the group along or impede its progress (Figure 3).

![Figure 3 - Forces that interact in a group discussion. WCA, 1973, p.22](image-url)
2.5 Conclusion

2.5.1 Final comment

After half century of evolution, communication for development presents PDC as a crucial driver of the participatory paradigm. Originated from theoretical contributions of development, communication, anthropology and social psychology, PDC has been introduced by development practitioners as a possible pathway towards creation and support of social change. Particularly participatory video and photography plus group discussion have been transformed in the ‘magic formula’ applied in community-based projects. The challenges that these tools present in the field are the next step in the analysis emerged in chapter 3.
Chapter 3: PDC in practice

3.1 Participatory Development Communication in the field

3.1.1 Introduction

As Braden (1998, p. 67) stresses in her PhD thesis, “the potential values of the participatory uses of video and photography do not automatically resolve all the problems of management, planning, intention versus reality, timing, sustainability, training and facilitation that affect other participatory learning approaches.” Richardson (1996) agrees saying that it is not a simple matter. The planning and training process should consider multiple variables: a participatory context in contraposition with the traditional top-down approach in training; field experience and reflection to promote attitude and behaviour awareness as well as change (Chambers, 2005, p. 165); analysis and clarification of the intended outcomes through the process of asking and answering questions; identification and consultation to the diversity of stakeholders involved in the planning stage; and the exploration of indigenous communication activities that are functioning in the heart of the community.

It is in this sense that this chapter analyses the planning, training, and local management system stages, as well as the intended outcomes of empowerment and dialogue. The analysis is sustained with secondary sources as well as eight interviews done to development professionals who have been working in the planning and/or training stages of participatory video and/or photography during the last five years.

As a starting point, it is important to consider in which level people participate and really take decisions in a project. Veneklasen and Miller (2002) have proposed a ladder that shows the variation from the ideal level of self-mobilization to the narrowest conception of manipulation or token participation; that is presented in Figure 4 - Ladder of participation (Based on Veneklasen and Miller classification, 2002, p.88).

---

5 Italic words added.
6 See interviews summaries in annexes.
This ladder passes through participation as a simple pretence, people following directions, or answering questions, or participating in exchange of resources or services (the first four categories), towards people having a small space to take decisions, a bigger space to do so and form or strengthen local institutions, up to their own creation of interventions without external organizations (the last three categories). Why is it important to clarify this? The answer is connected with the first stage of a project: how and by whom the planning process is managed and driven, and what are the implications.

3.1.2 Planning

“The underlying principle of participatory processes including PV is that it is participants themselves who are in control of the process. The extent of this decision-making power –and its balance with the decision-making power of the facilitator- will depend on the purpose of the process, the level of confidence and ability of the participants in that field, and the desired outcome.” This is the opinion of Menter et. al. (2006, p. 109), while they recognize in their project that they took the decision to use video and set the agenda of the issues to be
discussed (leadership), although “in ideal circumstances, the participants themselves would choose the end product”, being this video, photography or whatever other medium. This is one of the first challenges development professionals face: up to what level is the community involved in decision-making?

The majority of the functional participation cases, for instance, limit the medium (video or photography) and the subject of analysis (leadership, health, water, etc.) allowing the participants to take decisions but under those parameters. They had the space to decide what to film or shoot, how to do it, and what to put into the final product (edited video or photographic exhibition). It is important to clarify in this stage what is the level of participation that the intended beneficiaries of the project will have to be transparent in the procedures in the next stages of the project.

At the same time, the planning process generally is carried out parallel to funds application, so the level of participation and the principles that will guide the process (values, objectives or behaviours) should be presented as non-negotiable to achieve mutual respect (Chambers, Ideas for development, 2005) in the relationship established between the parties involved (NGOs, development agencies, donors, CSOs, beneficiaries).

Bracht and Tsourous (1990), on the other hand, suggest some factors that influence participation and should be considered in the planning process: the complexity of social structures and demographic components, values in the community related to a common history, the approach of the community to achieve common goals and community life, the accountability and identification of the facilitator and the group to promote change, and the perception of the group related to their control over the future. How do development professionals learn about these social structures and power complexities?

The eight professionals that have been interviewed agreed on this point expressing the importance of time and space to live in the community, talk to each group that belongs to it, research about previous experiences and adjust the project to the social changes that are already taking place. Hugh Snelgrove, project manager of Shooting Jozi in South Africa,
commented about time and space saying: “Having to immerse oneself intensely in someone’s culture to such a degree to win their trust naturally and organically reveals very poignant aspects about the community and its members”. Rachel Ellis, coordinator of Fotolibras in Brazil, highlighted the deep importance of adjusting the project to social changes that are already taking place: “At the end of the day, the idea was conceived to support their development (and development processes in general) in one way or another, not for the professional or personal development of development professionals.”

This research and the previous decision of the level of participation should guide the set of objectives, with or without the intended beneficiaries, but being clear and transparent about the process and the expectations of the development professionals. In this case, the interviewees recognized their own expectations before a project, the importance to negotiate the objectives with the donors and the beneficiaries, as well as to establish in which areas of the intervention the participants will have freedom of choice. This is key not to end up imposing our own views to the participants, which is one of the greatest risks that is critiqued by Otsyina and Rosenberg (1997, p. 90) expressing that “there is an assumption of development practitioners that their own logic and world view is correct, universal and applicable to all”.

“Any participation process seems to have two components irrespective of the context, situation or objective: a decision-making process and action-process to realize the objective decided upon.” As Desai (2002, p. 117) clearly explains, the decision-making process is accompanied by an action-process. And for this each organization has its own manual. Insight (Lunch & Lunch, 2006, pp. 18-21) for example, presents ten points of their reflection on field experience that should be done in the planning stage of a participatory video project. PhotoVoice (2007), on the other hand, presents in its manual topics as timeframe, research, partners, funds and budgeting, sustainability, project design, exhibition and dissemination strategies, among others, for participatory photography projects.

Another factor that should be analyzed in this stage is the groups involved: the stakeholders. “The development practitioner needs to identify the different community groups or categories of people concerned with a given problem or with a given development action, and to identify
the best way of making contact and establishing dialogue with each of them.” (Bessette, 2004, p. 60) To be able to identify these groups, the following social characteristics should be considered: life course and age, gender, language, ethnicity, religion, common livelihood strategies or socio-professional categories, income, educational level, localization, culture, and common interests.

What methodology could contemplate all these challenges? One that is done in the field at the same time the project is carried out is the suggestion of Anyaegbunam, Mefalopulos and Moetsabi (1999), who developed a methodology that could be applied to any participatory intervention. They named the method *Participatory Rural Communication Appraisal (PRCA)* and designed it to help mutual understanding and dialogue between development practitioners and grassroots people, being able to take place at the same time the development project is facilitated. “The research and training methodology is intense and multifaceted, but most importantly, it includes in-built field practice providing development field-workers with facilitation and communication skills as well as appropriate attitudes and behaviour to work more effectively with grassroots people.” (ibid, p. 208) More details about PRCA are shown in Box 3.

**Box 3 - PRCA characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRCA: (ibid, pp. 209-212)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• This methodology provides information on rural people’s perceptions, their interests, preferences, needs, and aspirations. Traditional and modern communication networks and information requirements can be identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It reveals alternative ways of designing messages for the grassroots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• UnCOVERs strategies and materials to enable people to create their own messages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Through dialogue, both the traditional and modern communication processes in the community are discovered and mapped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It ensures that the facilitators and the community do not have varying perceptions of the issues or problems that they are trying to resolve, to avoid “the conspiracy of courtesy” (Ascroft, 1978, “treat outsiders nicely without revealing themselves”).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whatever methodology the development organization chooses to use, it should contemplate several key factors in the planning process: the nature of the expected outcomes, the indigenous communication systems and the stakeholders that are involved in the process. As a result of a consultative meeting organized by the International Development Research Centre of Ottawa, Canada (Richardson, 1996), in their programme in development communication a group of professionals brainstormed about the questions that should be answered in this stage of the process. These three key factors were included in their analysis and some of their questions were adapted to be used in the interviews with development professionals for the research of this chapter.

As PRCA contemplates, the local communication systems should be discovered, analyzed and assessed. “Indigenous communication includes the transmission of entertainment, news, persuasion, announcements and social exchanges of every type.” (Mundy & Compton, 1991) As Mundy and Compton (ibid) described, indigenous communication is an important aspect of local culture while its channels are ubiquitous, credible in the community and conductors of change. Some of its forms are folk media (festivals, plays, dance, songs, storytelling, poetry, etc.), social gatherings (religious groups, village meetings, clubs and associations), informal education (from parents to children, elders to youth, adolescents initiation rites), unstructured channels (the role of informal network, i.e. talk at home, in the well or in the field), and direct observation (of people behaviour, or surrounding circumstances like weather or nature).

Once these considerations have been taken into account, doing the training itself is the next stage in any participatory development communication project and in particular in participatory video and photography, as well as group discussion. The implications of this stage are the main topics to be addressed in the next section.

3.1.3 Training

Once the planning process is completed, the training itself takes place in the field. Through workshops or any other activities, the facilitator/s has the role to create and maintain a participatory environment where the trainees can learn, have fun, discuss, build relationships, work in groups and, in some cases, learn to be trainers. At the same time, the facilitator should
consider “the relative importance that is attributed to process impacts and product impacts” (Menter, Roa, Beccera, Roa, & Celemin, 2006, p. 114), outputs and outcomes that are expected by the participants and the organizations involved in the project.

Empower others, ‘give the stick’ and ‘sit on your hands’ are the “must” that a facilitator should face. These are the biggest challenges for a development professional: to be disempowered. Chambers (2002, p. 8) developed a guide with tools and advice for facilitators. Some of them are shared by the PRCA methodology (Anyaegbunam, Mefalopulos, & Moetsabi, 1999, p. 217) and one of the field-level handbooks developed by FAO (2001, pp. 32-33): use your own best judgement, establish rapport, respect, ask them, support, acknowledge that they can do it, be sensitive, share, watch, listen, learn, embrace error, learn from mistakes, unlearn, abandon preconceptions, be self-aware and self-critical, triangulate, seek optimal ignorance, improvise, try new things, and many more. It is just five lines of verbs that take years of human learning to achieve. That is why Richardson (1996)\(^7\) explains that “training begins with ourselves and is an ongoing life process”. Besides, it is key to remember that the place where the training should be conducted is not supposed to be a comfortable hotel but a rural setting with “mild discomfort and congenial conviviality.” (Chambers, 2005, p. 178)

Of course this presents many challenges for development professionals. Braden, in her PhD thesis related to participatory video acknowledged this in 1998 (p.68): “The facilitation of local groups in a process of participation, representation and communication demands a transparency informed by self-knowledge on the part of development practitioners, if they are to be equipped to enable others to gain new insights. The process involved is complex and analytical and has little to do with the mechanical application of one participatory method after another.”

With these difficulties in mind, many NGOs and development agencies tried to create handbooks or manuals to help those in charge of facilitation. Particularly related to PV and PP, Communication for Social Change, Insight and PhotoVoice had included them in their publications (see some examples of the advice in Table 4). At the same time, other

---

\(^7\) Online e-book. Page cannot be cited.
organizations have developed handbooks ad-hoc for particular programmes, sometimes basing themselves in the previous handbooks, like the one written by Oxfam Novib and Equal in Rights for a project in Somalia/land (Sydenham, 2006); and many researchers and practitioners had published their own experiences in books and journals, like Shaw and Robertson (1997) in PV and Carlson et. al. in PP (2006, p. 840).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>C4C – Communication for Change</strong> (Bery, 1999, pp. 231-240)</th>
<th><strong>Insight</strong> (Lunch &amp; Lunch, 2006)</th>
<th><strong>PhotoVoice</strong> (Blackman, 2007, pp. 101-102)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equalize the relationship from the beginning (with the physical space distribution)</td>
<td>Keep instructions simple and brief - nothing too technical. Get straight to the action.</td>
<td>Offer activities that lead people logically through a learning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start with a demonstration</td>
<td>Gauge group dynamics and let that determine the pace of the activity, e.g. if nervous, move quickly into using camera to ‘break the ice’</td>
<td>Set pace through structured learning exercises and assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow discovery, do not turn into an ‘answer provider’</td>
<td>Keep filmed messages very short</td>
<td>Focus participants on tasks and act as a time keeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use different methods to include the different ways in which people think and learn</td>
<td>Spend time discussing the footage with the group after the first viewing</td>
<td>Provide educational resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a ‘learn it-teach it’ approach (become teachers of other to reinforce knowledge)</td>
<td>As you watch the footage keep a mental note on what technical learning can be drawn from the experience.</td>
<td>Organize excursions and/or invite speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the environment and tasks to keep active process</td>
<td>Congratulate them</td>
<td>Explain how to access other sources of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alter group sizes</td>
<td>Give lots of encouragement</td>
<td>Answer participant’s questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t forget that both trainers and participants are resources</td>
<td>Listen more, talk less</td>
<td>Make sure participants know they are the ‘experts’ on their own lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use indigenous communication and knowledge in the process</td>
<td>Stress that everyone has a story to tell and a right to be listened to</td>
<td>Be open and approachable, and be aware of your own cultural and social assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulate creativity with open-ended questions</td>
<td>Let the group own the story; don’t instruct or suggest.</td>
<td>Encourage mutual respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn by watching other</td>
<td>Ask group members what they have learned from the activity</td>
<td>Present all the sides of a situation or a problem without making judgements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical appreciation: it stresses positive reinforcement through positive feedback (there is no rights and wrongs answers)</td>
<td>Everyone in the group has something unique and of value to offer.</td>
<td>Use images and metaphors creatively to present new ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage participation promoting the involvement of others in their creative processes</td>
<td>Active listening means focusing on what someone is saying without trying to think of how to respond</td>
<td>Practice good listening skills and learn to identify the key point to summarize what other have said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing participation: who is involved, how the ideas are developed, and who makes the decisions.</td>
<td>Getting up and moving around can help inject fresh energy to a discussion</td>
<td>Be aware of subtle or overt relations of power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4 - Comparison of facilitation considerations**

How do facilitators transcend other stakeholders and their own top-down learning approaches? This was one of the main questions discussed with the interviewees. More than half agreed that it should be based on negotiation between the different stakeholders involved in the process (donors, NGOs, local grassroots organizations, facilitators and participants) but, at the same time, each one referred to different strategies: discuss the meaning of power with participants, generate space for bottom-up approaches through previous research, have personal integrity as guidance for the facilitator as well as the knowledge of the place, plus personal reflection and the placement of the community over the project. Related to this last point, Vincenzo Cavallo –from Cultural Video Foundation- explains: “We focus on the community rather than on the project itself. We go to a community without focusing on one particular problem and we want to know from them what is their best way of using video, what they want to express and/or increase in visibility.”

On the other hand, all the interviewees recognized having criteria established before the training process to select the trainees and the importance of explaining participatory approaches through action instead of the traditional ‘lesson’. In this sense, Isabelle Lemaire, Insight Associate, commented: “I guess you can see who’s a good facilitator quite quickly. They’re respectful, able to give up control and genuine about encouraging social change”. At the same time, all of them mentioned the importance of negotiation when asked about gatekeepers acting as blockers of change. Clarity and trust were the other two concepts discussed with negotiation. In this sense, Anna Kortschak -project coordinator of ‘Searching for Eldorado’ Brazil- states: “You have to try to negotiate conflict, but there are no rules, you have to analyze each situation”, while Leslie Knott -coordinator of a participatory photographic research in Faryab, National Solidarity Programme, Afghanistan- comments: “You spend a lot
of time explaining the project to the gatekeeper. You have to go top-down to be able to work bottom-up.”

Not only the activities related to PV and PP have influenced the facilitation approach, but those related to Group Discussion particularly too. As Bligh (2000, p. 189) explains: “learning to think requires a developmental sequence of discussion methods.” In this sense the author argues that one should carefully plan how to introduce the technique and which type: tutorless groups, tutorless groups with procedures for particular tasks and tutor participation in discussion. His maxim is: “start with simple tasks in small groups for short periods of time, and then gradually increase their respective complexity, size and duration. It also should be moved from simple cognitive tasks to complex ones and then to tasks that are concerned with feeling, attitudes and values” (ibid, p. 266).

At the same time, Carlson et. al. (2006, p. 849) refer to the essential role of using storytelling and how this is supported by several scholars (Mankowski & Rappaport, 1995; Mattingly & Garro, 2000; Pennebaker, 1997). Moreover, the IIED Trainer’s Guide (Pretty, Guilt, Thompson, & Scoones, 1995, p. 35) highlights the importance of giving “significant time to sharing experiences amongst the group”, as well as the implications of life cycle of groups for facilitators (see in Box 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications of life cycle of groups for facilitators: (IIED Trainer’s guide pp.39-44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Before a group of people can function well together, they must pass through a series of stages. The challenge of every good trainer is to help their trainees move through the various phases of group formation until they reach this final stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As a trainer, you will need to balance any tensions between group and individual identity to encourage continued shared learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A way to deal and/or avoid conflict can be ‘The Agreement Frame’, using positive verbs as appreciate, respect or agree, plus the word and to add the facilitator’s point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitator needs to be aware of group dynamic to form groups of different sizes and composition during the training. The recommendation of group sizes is given according to Jenny Rogers 1989.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 4 - Implication of life cycle of groups for facilitators
3.1.4 Local management system

As the IIED Trainer’s Guide (ibid, p. 64) clearly states: “participatory field methods are likely to be abandoned unless there is institutional support or a learning environment.” Institutional support can create a learning environment or vice versa, but one of them should exist to pass from training to a sustainable local management system that recreates the use of PV or PP and GD. Watts et. al. (2003) agree explaining that the key factors involved include: developing a supportive external environment, fostering a culture of learning and change, reorienting management systems and developing and enhancing individual awareness, knowledge and capabilities.

At the same time, Cooke and Kothari (2001, p. 14) recognize that “the language of empowerment marks a real concern for managerialist effectiveness”. Development organizations and professionals face challenges to plan a project and a training stage based truly on participation, but the post-training period does not become easier. As Cooke and Kothari mention in the examples of their research, participation can easily turn into the new tyranny or fail to be a participatory process.

Several authors explain the importance of long-term approaches in participatory projects. One case, for example, is Martin (2001) who -in words of Carlson et. al. (2006, p. 850)- suggests that “attention to healing must take on a central role in communities with historically dysfunctional patterns of cognitive emotional interpretations. This means that an ongoing supportive infrastructure is required to provide a context for continuous examination of intrapersonal and interpersonal power dynamics.” In this sense, the project should not end when the training ends, and for that the beneficiaries need local institutional arrangements that foster the use of PV or PP and GD. Isabelle Lemaire commented in the interview about continuity saying: “the long term is out of our hands, that’s why good local partners are important, people that can support the process of learning and communicating in the long term”.
For not changing one system of oppression for another, the development organization should consider several factors to help the grassroots organizations or local social movements in their creation of a local management system for the project sustainability. “The different systems are analysed for the type of selection process and criteria, support and training, role of the community-based worker, incentives provided, systems of accountability, role of facilitating agent, institutionalisation, and external links.” (CARE Lesotho-South Africa, 2002, p. x) The system proposed by CARE after the Symposium organized in Africa in 2002 is presented in Figure 5.

Figure 5- Local management systems: relationship of components (CARE Lesotho-South Africa, 2002, p. vi)

This stage should start contemplating recruitment; acculturation and appraisal, which should include grassroots people (Chambers, 2005, p. 80). One example is the process taken into place by Action Aid: where possible, poor and marginalized members of the community and partners are directly involved in recruiting and appraising members of front-line staff, for both
partners and Action Aid (ActionAid, 2000). In this sense, it is important to define community-based worker.

For example, the definition achieved by CARE Lesotho-South Africa (2002, p. v) says that “it is a para-professional that is based in and is drawn from the community he/she serves and therefore understands the local context.” Some of the roles of the community-based worker are listed in Box 5.

### Box 5 - Roles of the community-based worker


- Being a conduit for information and technologies (and sometimes inputs),
- Being a bridge / link person between the community and service providers / facilitating agent,
- Mobilising the community for learning activities and people into groups,
- Engaging in training activities with the facilitating agent, and training community members with follow up,
- Working on their own activities and providing demonstrations,
- Animating the community by providing energy and enthusiasm for development activities and maintaining the momentum of development activities.

Another crucial point in this process is that the problems and solutions should come from the grassroots people. “A typical PRCA with facilitation from the team enables to different groups in the community themselves to develop a profile of the community, define and prioritize its problems and needs as well as discover their communication networks, systems and requirements” (Anyaegbunam, Mefalopules, & Moetsabi, 1999, p. 221). This aspect is related with training, which should help the beneficiaries to start walking. If the training helped the grassroots to “transcend perceived boundaries, people begin to see and explore the infinite possibilities for implementing change in their lives and communities” (Bery, 1999, p. 242).

At the same time, evaluation is key to push this stage forward. During the whole process and at the end the development organization should promote an assessment of participation using, for example, the framework “Descriptive ranking scale for the assessment of
community participation” designed by Rifkin, Muller and Bichmann (1988). In a review of Rifkin et. al. (2000) they explain that the framework contains five factors which characterise the participation of the community and for each factor a continuum is developed, ranging from wide participation on one end to narrow on the other. Wide means the community is responsible for the decision-making and action, while the development professional act as resources. Figure 6 shows an example of the framework in a graph.

![Figure 6 - Example of descriptive ranking scale for the assessment of community participation](image)

With any participatory evaluation that is decided by the development professionals and the beneficiaries to put into place, the project could generate ways to create the institutional support and the learning environment. When the interviewees were asked about doing research before and after the project, the majority answered that before the project research is usually done, but after is not that often, for time and funds constraints. In the cases that they answered positively, all except one recognized using top-down methodologies like questionnaires or focus groups. The exception was Monica Oguttu, director of the Kenyan grassroots organisation K-MET, who explained that a community advisory committee was formed by parents, youth, a teacher, a police officer (who works in gender base violence), and a service provider, who has regular monthly meetings to assess the work of the NGO and present recommendations.

The development organization should be responsible in a long term process for enhancing the local management system. “Those from development organizations who are responsible for facilitating a community-managed programme must have relevant skills. They must be willing
to commit seven to ten years to a particular group. Their role is not to supervise and evaluate but rather to coach, advice and help set up locally appropriate administrative systems in an attitude of nurturing, fostering and caring. What is recommended is a series of visits to the local area with appropriate gaps, once a specific process has been started and local people have been left to get on with it.” (Joseph, 1998, p. 86)

3.2 Outcomes

3.2.1 Introduction

“The evaluation of participatory campaigns has a dual focus because these campaigns have two sets of goals. They seek to achieve some specific development end, referred to as an outcome and evaluated by ‘outcome indicators’, and also empower communities via participation, referred to as a process and evaluated by ‘process indicators’.” (Morris, 2003, p. 232) As Morris clearly explains, participatory projects generally have two types of goals or two types of outcomes, as they will be called from now: those related to ends and those related to the process itself.

PV and PP generally aspire to have both types of outcomes, while GD is focussed on process outcomes. On ‘the ends’ outcomes side, we can find tangible things like photos, videos, exhibitions, documentaries, screenings, articles in the press, books, reports, postcards, dvds, websites or blogs, policy changes, trips, meetings, social movement formation or grassroots local organization creation. But intangible ones like attitudes and behaviour changes could be part of those ends-related outcomes too.

On ‘the process’ outcomes side, we can only find intangible ones. This research is particularly addressing two of them: dialogue and empowerment. “Because dialogue and debate are the immediate objectives and are difficult to measure or attribute to any particular intervention, and because it is recognized that social change is likely to take a long time, this work is very difficult to assess and evaluate” (Rockefeller Foundation, 1999, p. 19). The same happens with empowerment.
Although development, communication, anthropology and psychology had made theoretical contributions to the understanding of PV, PP and GD –as it was analysed in chapter 2- today many development professionals and organizations find difficult to implement an evaluation or research to show quantitative or qualitative indicators of empowerment and dialogue. Anna Kortschak raised a really interesting point in the interview arguing that “you can’t speak about efficiency with human lives. I try to improve experiences of human life”. Both process-related outcomes implied working with human agency, and as Carlson et. al. (2006, p. 849) explains: “our purpose in raising the issue of agency is to point out that the outcome goals of any project affect implementation procedures, evaluation objectives, and the determination of success”, which means that all the stages of the project should be subordinated to the search for these two outcomes.

Despite the challenges that development practitioners are facing to achieve that, some researchers are optimistic in their analysis of the experiences gained up to now. This is the case of Inagaki in the World Bank Working Paper 120 published in 2007, recognizing that “programmatic outcomes that are more generative than inductive -empowerment, coalition building and resource generation- are the domains in which participatory projects made much greater contributions than modernization or diffusion projects” (p. 38). In the last two sections of this chapter, both dialogue and empowerment will be briefly defined and discussed to clarify the intended meaning.

### 3.2.2 Dialogue

Dialogue in development has different meanings for different contexts and projects. This research is not focused in dialogue as it could be understood in intergenerational, intercultural, inter-religion or gender and development dialogue, but as a previous step towards empowerment. “Knowledge empowerment is based on the premise that all human beings have the innate ability to create knowledge through dialogue.” (Carmen, 1988, p. 269)
Dialogue, in this sense, is directly related with the concept of ‘critical consciousness’ developed by Freire. For him, “dialogue is the encounter between men, mediated by the word, in order to name the world. Hence, dialogue cannot occur between those who want to name the world and those who do not want this naming – between those who deny other men the right to speak their word and those whose right to speak had been denied them.” (Freire, 1972, p. 61).

Carlson et. al. (2006, p. 838) clearly underlined that the social change theory of critical consciousness had evolved from “the idea that social oppression results in a culture with limited capacity for analysis and initiative”, referring it to several authors (see Wallerstein & Sanchez-Merki 1994; Watts, Griffith & Abdul-Adil 1999). In this sense, they explain that critical consciousness had become the theory through which “attitudes of personal responsibility and behaviours of participation based on the ability to perceive social reality” had been related to individual choices.

In this sense, the process could be explained in Figure 7, with the premise that “each time the individuals move to a higher level of critical consciousness, they change their cognitive-emotional interpretations of events, they change their behaviour responses to these interpretations, and they become a possible catalyst for social change” (ibid, p.850). In their analysis, besides, they (ibid, p.838, 850, 851) call for attention to the limited number of case study analyses and the lack of theoretical development and explanatory understanding, as well as to the need of active facilitation “to engage and maintain participation in historically marginalized and oppressed communities”, confirming the need for a sustainable long-term process through local management systems.
Julie Denommee, coordinator of a youth empowerment project through arts and media from PLAN International, explained in her interview that their first stage in several projects related to youth participation in West Africa was to create space for participation that did not exist, having critical consciousness as the intended outcome.

3.2.3 Empowerment

“Empowering the poorest class or simply, those with the fewest resources is a dramatic idea, one that would turn the tables of local power. As a result, actual participation of local poor in social change rarely happens because it would mean political change as well” (White, 1999, p. 850-851)
The shift of power from one set of people to others is faced in any PP or PV project with empowerment as an intended outcome.

That is why White points out that real participation it is not always achieved, but on the contrary, success is the exception. In this sense, the planning process of any participatory development communication intervention should contemplate, analyze and accept the political implications that the intervention generates. Some scholars disagree with the optimistic perspective stressing the problems to alter power relationships, the risk of turning PDC into a self-indulgent exercise and even reproducing in-egalitarian power structures. (Hedebro 1982, Lozare 1994, Nerfin 1977, Escobar 1999, O’Connor 1990, Wikins 1999, 2000)

In this sense, Anna Kortschak commented in her interview that “power is inevitable and is not going to go away. It should be questioned and discussed instead of avoided. It’s important to acknowledge people’s ideas of power and get them to think of power.” According to Huesca (2003), power has been theorized as multi-centred and asymmetrical by Servaes (1996) and Thehranian (1999) among others, and as the force of institutions and structures but, at the same time, as the role of human agency in transformation of them.

Some researchers focused only on the analysis of empowerment related to self-confidence and agency. Gallo (2001, p. 110), for instance, highlighted that “empowerment in this context means providing learning opportunities for the disempowered: to take up their own cameras and create photographs that can be used as autobiographic artifacts in telling one’s story and finding voice.” Mezirow (1998) and Scott (1998), on the other hand, discussing PP explained that “this new skill has instilled a much greater sense of confidence in all of the participants that in turn fosters a type of power comprising agency, skill, and identity. These are among the factors that are believed to be vital to learning for transformation as well as for changing relationships with others.” (Clover, 2006, p. 287)

“At the core of the concept of empowerment is the idea of power.” (Page & Czuba, 1999) In this research, empowerment will be addressed using the categorization of power over, power
to, power with and power within, that has become a normative typology in the development literature. The concepts can be briefly explained as (Veneklasen & Miller, 2002):

- **Power over**: often defined as ‘relational’ because the gaining of power of someone entails the loss of power of someone else.
- **Power to**: implies the concept of capacity. It is the power to grow by working on the improvement of one’s abilities, skills, and capabilities.
- **Power with**: is the power of trust; the power shared by people within their own organisation in order to achieve common goals and build collective strength.
- **Power within**: is the self confidence to develop individual and group awareness of the existence of rights, entitlements, and opportunities.

### 3.3 Conclusion

#### 3.3.1 Final comment

As it was explained before, although PV, PP and GC have been recognised theoretically as important tools to create space for dialogue and empowerment, they present many challenges and difficulties in the field for development professionals. The intended outcomes should be placed at the centre of the discussion among the stakeholders involved in the process of change before starting the implementation of the different stages. This may conclude in a positive and sustainable space for the ‘community’ or intended beneficiaries that are striving to create social change and become drivers of that change.
Chapter 4: Case studies

4.1 Case studies analysis

4.1.1 Introduction

How do PDC community-based projects achieve dialogue and empowerment? This is the question that fosters the analysis of multiple case studies with an exploratory perspective in this chapter. It is key to analyze which place is given to the intended outcomes of dialogue and empowerment in each stage of the field implementation of PV or PP and GD.

For this purpose, eight community-based projects that use PV or PP and GD and have taken place during the last twelve years in Africa and/or Latin America were selected as units of analysis, based on primary sources (NGOs’ internal documents and interviews). The case studies were selected with the intention of showing examples of the variety of experiences and development issues in which PDC has been involved in the last decade to achieve dialogue and empowerment. In this sense, the projects cover: children and youth, disabilities, agriculture and pro-poor markets development, advocacy, and gender. Table 5 briefly describes them:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>NGOs – Planners</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Country/ies</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Development area of work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sight of Emotion</td>
<td>Sight of Emotion</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Communication, Sensitization and Integration</td>
<td>Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Foto Libras</td>
<td>FENEIS – GEMA</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Personal and professional opportunities for young deaf people, visibility and deaf rights</td>
<td>Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shooting Jozi</td>
<td>Global Studio 2007</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Work in collaboration with local community members, creative documentation</td>
<td>Advocacy in urban and periurban development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Documentation of rural</td>
<td>AGRECOL Andes Foundation</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>Knowledge management for</td>
<td>Agriculture and pro-poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participatory research was not included due to the differences and particularities of research processes. All the case studies are related to participatory processes.
The cross-case analysis will be presented in the next section, according to the dimensions of the analytical framework and the template that has been used to document each case study: goals, outcomes, planning, training, and evaluation & continuity.\(^9\)

### 4.1.2 Cross-case analysis

Several dimensions were set to create an analytical framework for the first part of the cross-case analysis, which is complemented with a description using a template to facilitate comparison. Table 6 shows each case study by its correspondent number in each dimension. In relation to the level of participation, only one case study used participation by consultation, while two implemented functional participation, four cases are based on interactive participation, and the last one was born from self-mobilization. This means that all of them are or tend to be long-term processes of different graduation, except the one related to consultation.

\(^9\) See the analysis of each case study in the annexes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>&lt;&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of participation</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 5, 8</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2, 6, 7</td>
<td>1, 4, 5, 8</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>3, 6, 7</td>
<td>1, 5</td>
<td>2, 4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment definition</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 6, 7</td>
<td>5, 8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Latent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue definition</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>1, 3, 6, 7</td>
<td>2, 4, 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Media as output</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4, 6, 8</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous research</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>1, 6, 8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2, 3, 5</td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 6, 8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td>Formally organized</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Media exclusively</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2, 6, 7, 8</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local management system</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 5, 8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 - Analytical framework for the cross-case analysis

**Goals**

In relation to the set of the goals, the majority of the cases (five) had a top-down approach, while two cases had contributions from the participants in the process; only one adopted goals completely set in a bottom-up process. Due to the diversity of development areas of work, they offer a range in focus from media to process at different levels.
All the cases except one include ‘power to’ as one of their goals, while half of them include ‘power within’ and/or ‘power with’, and only one includes ‘power over’ (Table 7). At the same time, three of them mention dialogue and sustainability and six include advocacy as goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Power within</th>
<th>Power to</th>
<th>Power with</th>
<th>Power over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 – Empowerment as a goal

**Outcomes**

Six of the eight cases mention empowerment as an achieved outcome. Table 8 shows them as they have been reported. At the same time, three cases included dialogue as an outcome and five mentioned advocacy too. Other outcomes that were reported consist of: networking, creation of livelihood opportunities, peer educators, creative documentation, media itself, motivation, participation, commitment, responsibility and confirmation of the need of an improved internal coordination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Power within</th>
<th>Power to</th>
<th>Power with</th>
<th>Power over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 - Empowerment as an outcome
Planning

At different levels of formality or informality all the cases except one have done some previous research to plan the projects but their commonality is that all have used a top-down approach. In relation to the definition of both intended outcomes –dialogue and empowerment- half of the cases present clear definitions in their project descriptions, while the other half are distributed among those who describe them indirectly and those who implied their meaning in the goals or intended outcomes description. How are these definitions set? In the case of empowerment, all the case studies with only one exception defined them with a top-down approach. Dialogue presents more variety of approaches by combining NGOs and participants’ perspectives in different graduation, with only one case differing (top-down approach only). In Table 9 the meaning associated with empowerment and dialogue can be appreciated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power within</td>
<td>Power to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 - Meaning attributed to empowerment and dialogue

Some particularities of the planning process to be highlighted from the experiences include clear and formal identification of different facilitator roles and task division per role and/or per
stage of the project, as well as pilot processes to extract learning points and readjust the approach and/or the participants targeted.

**Training**

In relation to the training stage, all the cases have mixed training in media and the participatory approach, including group discussion formally in the plan. The only exception is the short-term project that has had a media focus and has used group discussion with an informal approach with some guidelines to follow. Table 10 presents the points to highlight in each case related to the approach towards empowerment in the training process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Training – Points to highlight in relation to empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1**    |  ‘Power within’ was approached with fun and freedom-related activities without a media as an output goal; participants selection of topics; encouragement to go out from ‘comfort zone’, psychological support in training; group discussion.  
‘Power to’ was approached with media as an output goal and technical training; related to working skills and livelihood opportunities. |
| **2**    |  ‘Power within’ was approached in the first stage of the training; diverse and multiple use of group discussion; participants selection of topics.  
‘Power to’ was approached in the peer-educator stage with technical training. |
| **3**    |  ‘Power to’ advocate was approached through participation by consultation; creative documentation with freedom of topic; no formal training or formal implementation of group discussion. |
| **4**    |  ‘Power to’ and ‘power within’ were approached at the same time, with focus on a participatory approach and tools to be a local facilitator, as well as skills related to ICTs (digital camera and computer); group discussion formally addressed. |
| **5**    |  ‘Power to’ was addressed with focus on a participatory approach and tools to be facilitator. The use of games and group discussion was formally addressed, with particular emphasis on participatory storyboard to generate community dialogue. |
| **6**    |  ‘Power within’ was approached in the first stage of the training, with participants decision-making on topics and workshop administration (ex. timetable and places); group discussion and group dynamics exercises formally implemented.  
‘Power to’ was approached in the second stage with technical training, networking and
creation of livelihood opportunities, as well as peer-education training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7</th>
<th>'Power within' and 'power to' addressed at the same time. Fun-related activities, participatory mapping, formal implementation of group discussion, media and ICTs training.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 8 | 'Power within', 'power to', 'power with' and 'power over' addressed at the same time. Participants’ decision-making on agenda setting and issues to be trained on in relation to community interests and their commitment for being chosen as community workers, what provides a redistribution of 'power over' decision-making and leadership positions for the participants (women) inside their communities. Training related to video and ICTs skills plus issues selected by them. |

Table 10 - Training related to empowerment

**Evaluation and continuity**

With exception of the short-term project, all the cases have carried out evaluation at different levels of formality. Five cases have mixed bottom-up and top-down methodologies, while the other three have set top-down approach. The methodologies used in each case are presented in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Methodologies of evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ongoing process. Psychological, quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Psychological tool particularly to measure ‘power within’. Evaluation with each stakeholder involved in the planning, training and advocacy/fundraising related activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elaboration of lessons learnt for next phases. Qualitative methodologies and participatory evaluation. Evaluation with each stakeholder involved in the planning and training stages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mass media and exhibitions hits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Elaboration of lessons learnt for each phase. Participatory evaluation moving the project from interactive participation to self-mobilization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Qualitative methodologies and participatory evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Psychological, quantitative and qualitative methodologies applied to the different stakeholders involved. Psychological tool to measure ‘power within’ and tool to measure skills improvement for ‘power to’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Daily informal evaluation during the training; quantitative and qualitative methodologies applied to the different stakeholders involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Participatory video used as evaluation methodology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 - Evaluation methodologies
Finally, a majority (five cases) have fully implemented a local management system, while two cases are in the process of implementation. Only the short-term case has not implemented it. In Table 12 the description of the steps taken towards the implementation of a long-term process is summarized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>Local management system – Steps towards implementation of a long-term process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fundraising events as part of the participants’ role in sustainability and livelihood opportunity, generating advocacy and visibility. Peer-educators training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Peer-educators training; creation of their formal space for planning, meetings and generation of the next phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Local facilitators trained; follow-up advice and support; third stage of self-mobilization and community development planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Trainers are training local facilitators. Implementation of PV in some communities. NGO re-adjustment of internal procedures to fully implement PV in their projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Networking for livelihood opportunities. Peer-educators training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Equipment support through local partners or groups already in place. Online network for advocacy and creation of global youth space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Community worker signs a commitment to fulfil the role for which the community has presented her and agrees knowledge transference to the community. Network of community workers for exchange and support. Livelihood opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 - Local management system. Steps for implementation.

**4.2 Conclusion**

**4.2.1 Final comment**

From the cross-case analysis we can establish that the wider the participation, the longer the period of time needed for implementation. The focus, moreover, can vary from media to process according to the context and development issue(s) addressed by the project. Surprisingly, for participatory processes, the previous research is done with a top-down approach, in contrast with the evaluation, which in many cases was done through participatory methodologies.
In relation to empowerment and dialogue, both concepts are formally addressed in the planning and training stages, but empowerment particularly is conceptualized in a top-down approach. During the training, group discussion is formally addressed in both PV and PP, while it involves not only media but participatory approach capacity building in different graduation.

Finally, the majority of the projects that have implemented or are implementing a local management system for a long-term process, the main constraints highlighted by the sources are funds generation and access to infrastructure (including physical space, electricity, films, computers, printers, cameras, among others).
Chapter 5: Conclusions

5.1 Discussion

5.1.1 Does PDC facilitate dialogue and empowerment?

In theory, as it was analyzed in chapter 2, PDC does facilitate dialogue and empowerment. Being a methodology that was born from communication for development and participatory processes, it proposes a horizontal knowledge-sharing approach through media and interpersonal group communication that combines the ‘mirroring’ features of video and photography with a space to ‘imitate’ grassroots communication through group discussion. The media provides the focus on what is worth looking at (Sontag, 1978) and the group discussion allows stages of exposure needed in decision-making processes (Fraser & Restrepo-Estrada, 1998) to critically and collectively analyze abstract topics of reality.

After the unpacking of each of the concepts involved in the theoretical base of PDC, it could be argued that it is key to combine PM and IGC to achieve dialogue and empowerment. Without one of both in the process, the results would not be the same. The particular attributes of media to engage through images and audio makes easier for participants to start discussing abstract issues. But the decision-making processes, as well as change of attitudes and behaviours that leads to cultural norms changes would not happen unless the mimic of grassroots communication takes place. In this sense, the analysis does not present differences for video or photography combined with group discussion.

In relation to practice, the challenges that the field presents are clear in chapter 3. Research should be the backbone of the field project to involve the community in the decision-making and planning stage. At the same time, it is key to understand local realities, grassroots communication and socio-political context. This can guide the NGOs involved to set the objectives with the participants in relation to the place that the project has in the ladder of participation. Without clarity in this stage, the superficiality may lead the process to an unsuccessful end.
At the same time, research can create the space for free discovery of the objectives, what can confront one of the main critics of participation. Moreover, the information extracted from the process can illuminate social characteristics of the intended beneficiaries to avoid classification with a Western perspective, for example, who is a child or a young person and what are the characteristics of the social construction of that stage in life course. Being 10 years old in Ecuador, South Africa and the US is not the same.

In addition, the process should be planned to give a long-term space for community growth and advancement on the ladder of participation, not to create false expectations, disempower and/or generate negative effects through the project. It could be appreciated in some of the case studies -Bolivia, for example- that the long-term processes allowed the community to achieve self-mobilization and become independent from the NGO. The pilot projects’ space proved in this sense to be a profound need for the NGOs and communities in their learning processes. This stage avoids the massive blueprint application that took development processes to achieve half-century of failure.

On the other hand, facilitators face particular challenges to pass the planning to the training. Some of the points discussed in chapter 3 include self-knowledge, disempowerment and understanding of the complexity of the process where negotiation of interests –particularly with gatekeepers- is key to overcome possible conflicts. Besides, the facilitator should have knowledge of group dynamics to formally plan GD methodologies, taking into account the difficulties of group formation and creation of a positive environment according to the characteristics of the participants.

Furthermore, evaluation should be an unavoidable part of the project, as an important tool in the learning process of both parts. Formally or not, evaluation may guide not only the planners and trainers but the community itself to enhance the social change process and achieve a higher level of participation and decision-making.

This may encourage, in parallel, the implementation of the local management system (LMS). First, it could provide the information needed to understand if there is institutional support
and a learning environment in place or not. Second, this can guide the steps needed to fully implement a system in a long-term process and give the space for the community to decide who the community worker or local facilitator will be, as well as to establish his/her tasks.

In relation to the intended outcomes of dialogue and empowerment, they should be interconnected through definition and activities in the training an LMS. The change in cognitive emotional interpretation that can influence cultural norms and produce social change (Carlson, Engebretson, & Chamberlain, 2006) should be the guiding process that ends up in empowerment.

At the same time, a clear definition of empowerment should be established with the participants. As Anna Korstschak expressed in her interview “power should be questioned and discussed instead of avoided”. This discussion should take place among the planners and trainers too, particularly to recreate the semantics of a buzzword of the development industry and evade confusion (see Muñiz & Volpi, 2008).

Some interesting lessons that the cross-case analysis left are:

- ‘Power to’ as the main concept behind empowerment, with a complementary of ‘power with’ and ‘power within’ in the goals;
- Research carried out through non-participatory methodologies;
- Pilot projects being an important space for learning, what confirms the need of time for a project;
- GD being formally addressed in all the long-term project;
- The concepts related to empowerment guided all the training stages;
- Evaluation was done with a mixture of participatory and non-participatory tools;
- LMS is in place in some cases and in others is in the process of starting implementation, what highlights the need of long-term commitment from the partners of the project;
- To secure the tangible resources needed for the LMS implementation is critical. This should be negotiated in terms of partners’ contributions in the planning process.
The theoretical and practical analysis has left some other implicit considerations for future contributions towards improvement of PDC to facilitate dialogue and empowerment. In one hand, academia discussions related to participation generally place themselves in favour of or against top-down and bottom-up approaches, with a naive optimism or a highly critical position, almost in a black or white discussion. The case studies have shown that reality is grey, and not black or white. Depending on the stage that the community or beneficiaries are in the ladder of participation, a mixture of both approaches is needed to successfully enhance them in a social change process that may be already taking place.

At the same time, some of the non-negotiable aspects that partners should consider are research, participation in goal setting of the intended beneficiaries, commitment towards a long-term process to avoid manipulation of the intended beneficiaries, and recreation of the concept of empowerment through a clear participatory definition of the meaning attributed to the buzzword.

In addition, the project agreed among the partners should lead the process of funding, and not the other way around. This was particularly clear in the cases that manage to implement a long-term project as they were the ones leading the funding conditions, and not adapting the project to the aid system.

5.1.2 Questions for future research

Some of the questions that have arisen from the analysis and could be considered in future research are:

- To whom the project belongs?
- How the beneficiaries describe dialogue and empowerment?
- Which are the non-negotiable aspects from each partner?
- Why the research and evaluation are non-participatory in a participatory process?
- Is there a long-term commitment of the partners to follow-up the process of LMS?
- Is it possible to extract learning points from self-mobilization or is it context-specific?
5.1.3 Limitations of the analysis

It is important to clarify that the research is the results of a desk-process that has been done involving only planners and trainers, without consultation of the participants who were the actors of each one of the case studies. This is the main limitation that the researcher faced due to time and funds in an MSc level research that has to be done in four months.

5.2 Conclusion

5.2.1 Final comment

PDC presents an easy-going and fun process for the participants, giving them space to increase their local participation and achieve empowerment. However, it is key to create an honest and long-term commitment among the partners involved to truly foster social change. If this is not the case, PDC can turn itself in another failure of the development industry.

“Be the change that you wish to see in the world”.

Gandhi
6 Annexes

6.1 Summaries of interviews to development practitioners

6.1.1 Interview by phone - Anna Kortschak

i. How can you transcend prior "top-down" learning, attitudes, and values of facilitators, planners, gatekeepers, evaluators, funding agencies, and other stakeholders (including yourself)?

Power is inevitable and is not going to go away. It should be questioned and discussed instead of avoided. It’s important to acknowledge people’s ideas of power and get them to think of power.

ii. How can you as trainer and facilitator learn about local community dynamics and power structures? How important are social and political change goals to the project?

In a project in Brazil I lived three years, so it’s important to live there and be part of that. It takes time. It’s important to talk to people and try to understand what is happening, and meet different stakeholders.

iii. What, exactly, do you expect to happen as a result of an intervention?

I tried not to have expectations. They close off opportunities that can arise, but it’s very difficult to put it like this in a funding proposal. I hope the participants enjoy the project and they learn and got what they want to. I consider myself a participant too and hope the same things for myself. Most of the projects have a broad goal. I would like to have more specific products, for instance anti-racism activities pack (in Check Republic).

iv. Do you give people objectives? Or do you assist people in setting their own objectives? If the latter, how do you relate this to the demands of funding agencies?
In the case of Brazil I had a lot of freedom, but we had some objectives: to create a website for youth to give people outside of the community information from that community and to raise awareness about them (because they had a negative image), as well as to do an internal exhibition in the community. But the people decided to carry out the exhibition not only in the community so they travel to other parts of Brazil. Some participants are interested in using photography only in the frame of the project, but others (one case) used it as a livelihood strategy.

You can’t speak about efficiency with human lives. I try to improve experiences of human life.

v. What are the criteria for selecting trainees and participants? How do you recognize and incorporate the different training needs and requirements for diverse groups of trainees?

We targeted kids in Brazil living at risk to move to the street. We knew the families profile. First we asked ourselves: What is the problem we are addressing? In this case was risk migration. Generally you have more people than they can participate. So you analyze their profiles and try to create diverse small groups.

At the beginning of the project we discussed what they wanted and the project in general. You talk with them in their level of understanding (kids). Especially we spoke about how they relate to media and to the images that they see in television about violence.

Because they were children they didn’t wanted an income generation activity but they wanted to play.

Selection it’s not such a big problem. It depends on your objectives. Example schools project: they asked to one class about their interest to participate. It’s different for instance with HIV/AIDS projects.

vi. How do you facilitate a grassroots, participatory approach and work with gatekeepers?
This is an ongoing problem. Sometimes the participants are insulted by the gatekeepers (example in Australia). Some people clearly are not happy of trying to change things. You do what you can, but some things can’t be changed. Power shifts and changes, but it’s not going to go away.
You have to try to negotiate conflict, but there are no rules, you have to analyze each situation.

vii. How do you explain the "participatory" approach to participants?

You explain participatory approaches through actions but not speaking.
For me participation is to be there and not to be told what you have to do.
Working with people in grassroots organization you can create the space to use participatory approaches. In Australia I was working for the local council, so that’s not possible.

viii. Do you do research before and after a project?

We haven’t done official evaluation of the project in Brazil; I know what is happening in their lives because I kept in contact with them regularly by email. But I don’t know if it achieved the results that we wanted to (kids not to live in streets).
Evaluation was a big problem with the organization in Brazil. They were resistant to institutionalize evaluation techniques. They didn’t want to waste time and energy to record things. They sometimes do that informally but they don’t record it formally.

ix. If yes, how do you design evaluation methods based on objectives derived from grassroots, participatory approaches?

No
6.1.2  Interview face-to-face - Leslie Knott

i. How can you transcend prior "top-down" learning, attitudes, and values of facilitators, planners, gatekeepers, evaluators, funding agencies, and other stakeholders (including ourselves)?

As each problem emerges, you have to deal with it. Ex: Nobody wants to take pictures. I have to get it done to report to my boss. You negotiate with the village. With the photography choices, for instance, I defend the point of the people, for example, in relation to the boss election of photographs. You are accountable to your personal integrity. I have my printer and the generator is in the village. I have to go beyond my working day to print them and continue the process, to push them to continue, with the photographs printed. At that point the process was not participatory.

You have to explain the process to the people in the community. This takes a minimum of 2 weeks per village; I had to do it in 3 days; it was like a factory. It’s really difficult to put yourself at the level of someone that has no education and is illiterate.

ii. How can you as trainer and facilitator learn about local community dynamics and power structures? How important are social and political change goals to the project?

I don’t think it’s possible before you go. You learn the dynamics while you are there, and you may even realise that you are not as open-minded as you thought and that you have a bad attitude towards someone (ex. Men). You need at least two or three weeks minimum to familiarize yourself with the place.

Depending on the place, sometimes you can develop the ideas and their interests to incorporate them in the project. Once you find the people, you have to try to analyse if they are all included or you have to try to include those who are not there (ex. marginalized) in the process.

This is a learning process: some people are truly interested, others are not, and the ones with education are sometimes more interested.
iii. What, exactly, do you expect to happen as a result of an intervention?

You expect something to happen. Change has to happen. You have to organize it. It is more training than a free participatory process. They don’t get paid to participate, so those who are there are motivated to be there.

iv. Do you give people objectives or do you assist people in setting their own objectives? If the latter, how do you relate this to the demands of funding agencies?

I ask them to take photographs about 4 themes that are related to the intervention but nothing else. They discuss the related issues (health, water, etc.) and then they take the pictures from their point of view.

v. What are the criteria for selecting trainees and participants? How do you recognize and incorporate the different training needs and requirements for diverse groups of trainees?

An NGO working in the community selects trainees and participants. They build the trust to get the project into the community. This is important for the project being accepted but can have its negative points too. Ex: Women who are really interested, but the interviewee couldn’t work with them because the NGO facilitator said that she had to work with others for security reasons. You can’t incorporate the needs of everyone. You need a minimum of 6 months with one person to understand just that person. When do you advise and when you facilitate? Sometimes you have to do one or the other.

vi. How do you facilitate a grassroots, participatory approach and work with gatekeepers?
You spend a lot of time explaining the project to the gatekeeper and when you have them on your side you can work with them. You have to go top-down to be able to work bottom-up.

It’s really important to know who is your interpreter and what political party he/she belongs to and what he/she does.

vii. How do you explain the "participatory" approach to participants?

The projects I’ve been involved in used PP as a research tool, not as an intervention per se to establish the system at local level.

viii. Do you do research before and after a project?

Before, yes but not after because the project didn’t have the funds for that and it was a pilot project.

ix. If yes, how do you design evaluation methods based on objectives derived from grassroots, participatory approaches?

No answer

6.1.3 Interview by email - Hugh Snelgrove

i. How can you transcend prior "top-down" learning, attitudes, and values of facilitators, planners, gatekeepers, evaluators, funding agencies, and other stakeholders (including yourself)?

To me if you were implying how I can provide more innovative participatory projects such as what you are describing, then in this respect I think one can only really transcend all the stakeholders you mentioned above at least initially, not by coming up with a more ‘unique or creative’ idea or concept but through ones creative capacity, energy, contacts and resources (human and financial) in order to produce a better project. In short In my opinion 9 times out of 10 if one believes that everything has already been invented then the
only way one can separate oneself and create a point of difference and overcome project hurdles to create an effective and lasting project is through ones in/ability to produce a project i.e. pull together scarce resources into a combination that is equi beneficial to all parties involved.

Key to working in these communities is the intention to always aim towards giving something back immediately at the conclusion of the project or if that is in the long term, at least small things along the course of the project. This could be as simple as developing the photos and organising a public exhibition of photos, so that each photographer could increase self esteem and feel like they are contributing to a greater good. At the conclusion of shooting jozi we gave copies back to 98% of photographers who took part. 2% represented those we couldn’t find given the fact many could not afford mobile phones and hardly anyone had a fixed house phone or email address.

ii. How can you as trainer and facilitator learn about local community dynamics and power structures? How important are social and political change goals to the project?

Personally I found out about community dynamics and power structures not by simply analysing the final shots that participants took but by coming to terms with the fact that you had to operate a project in a dynamic environment where there is a very established power structure in place. For example each facet of producing this project, everything from travelling to and from the project site each day to distributing camera’s in certain suburbs and to certain people in Johannesburg revealed different facets of their community and power structures that anyone from any other context could never have revealed to oneself.

Having to immerse oneself intensely in someone’s culture to such a degree to win their trust and interest to devote time to your project naturally and organically reveals very poignant aspects about the community and its members.
LEARNING FROM DAY TO DAY: TO AND FROM PROJECT SITE/S

Each day we travelled to and from site it was quite risky as in Johannesburg the travel routes are dictated by established ‘taxi associations’ which in its brutest form was actually a local mafia controlling specific transport routes in a specific area. Transportation is an obvious daily activity for these groups to take advantage of and from which to skim money. They in turn provide a service to the residents and a relatively safe way to travel to and from work and social engagements. However, one day when one of our local taxi’s from one suburb stopped for petrol in another suburb he was immediately taken out of the taxi and threatened with being shot. The project participants were taken hostage for 3 hours about 100 meters from where we were staying at Wits University.

Again, when one project group was distributing camera’s to a group in downtown ‘old’ Johannesburg they were kindly shown around by residents. However, it quickly became apparent that these residents were in fact illegal immigrants from countries such as Zimbabwe. This revealed to us the dynamic of ‘slum landlords’ who effectively provided ‘protection’ and board in derelict buildings with minimum sanitation or running water, to these desperate people who had no choice but to accept extremely poor living conditions at exorbitant prices so they were not revealed to local authorities.

LEARNING FROM THE PHOTO’S

One quickly found out from the photo’s the degree to which all facets of everyday life is orchestrated on the street; from moving from one point to another, to social gatherings and events, to public protests, to eating dinner, to chatting with an old friend. The photographs in many of our projects consisted of these rich lively scenes largely missing in modern contemporary suburban housing projects, hermetically sealed and behind tall walls.

The most amazing thing was the degree to which children were allowed to roam free either due to parents choice, lack of money to keep them occupied or irrelevance to the topic altogether. It was like a scene out of England in the 1800’s - Oliver Twist in some respects.
As mentioned in our articles on the project, the main goal was to awaken many of other South Africans to the harsh realities of life in these communities. Even so life for many in South Africa is ever so slowly improving. Very quickly many middle and upper middle class Africans of all colours are moving into gated communities 20 meters from the worst that the 3rd world has to offer and they block themselves from this reality. By engaging with an issue dynamically and with strong established institutions such as Global studio and Sydney University (along with 30 other national sites and 50 universities who represented the rest of the conference goers) who suddenly get an amazing collection of motivated and skilled individuals addressing broad societal problems and thus has an appeal across many national sites and can therefore be accepted by most nationalities where you work. These pictures don’t profess to change the status quo but rather enlighten other motivated individuals and groups as to what else needs to be done as well as (if another photo project is done in the future) how far things have progressed for the better or the worse.

You also get to hear other people’s stories as well and learn about their specific experience. One woman participated in the project because she had cancer and wanted to publicize the fact that too much popular attention is placed towards solving the AIDS epidemic when other ailments and diseases are left wanting.

iii. What, exactly, do you expect to happen as a result of an intervention?

Please see outcomes of the project in our project aims and objectives

iv. Do you give people objectives? Or do you assist people in setting their own objectives? If the latter, how do you relate this to the demands of funding agencies?

Please see the above mentioned document. We started with specific goals but quickly realised that perhaps these were not broad enough as situations
change and opportunities and threats present themselves very quickly on the ground that the relatively short time frame of a project can mean very quickly if you are going to get things going well from the start or if the project will always be an uphill struggle.

It is important, we believe, to let the photographer photograph what they wanted, how they wanted and when so that the photo’s were not contrived. Also, specific characteristics of each participant local community member dictated when they could take images ranging from when they had to go to work and when they had free time to when and where it was actually safe to take pictures of certain things and people that anyone else coming from the outside would have been seriously jeopardising their safety to do so without the local community’s trust and respect. I think it wouldn’t have suited our projects objective nor be efficient with the project if we let people take photos of whatever they liked. Instead we chose themes broad enough to appeal to most participants but also still be representative of a general theme we were trying to capture so we could achieve our objectives.

TECHNIQUE INSPIRED BY PRECEDENT & MEDIUM:

It was interesting to note that because we received product donations from FUJI AUSTRALIA in the form of disposable cameras we didn’t have the luxury for our project participants to take millions of photos as you can with a digital camera. This is why we used a precedent from another project in Kenya where they strung 4 sticks together to create a frame that mimicked that of a normal camera so participants could get an idea of the final photo they would be taking.

v. What are the criteria for selecting trainees and participants? How do you recognize and incorporate the different training needs and requirements for diverse groups of trainees?
Our training of participants (local community members) and facilitators of the photographic project (conference goers of Global Studio Johannesburg 2007) was minimal at most.

This was due to the limited time of the conference (4 weeks) and the need to produce something to give back to the community within that period.

I just assumed through gut instinct that the broad group of people that were participating with their collective experience and expertise would be able to satisfactorily pull off this project. Each conference goer was chosen to participate from over 600 applicants of whom only about 100 were chosen to attend. This ensured a high standard of people were attending, self motivated individuals who valued team work and the ability to produce results.

vi. How do you facilitate a grassroots, participatory approach and work with gatekeepers?

Who are gatekeepers? I facilitate grassroots participatory approaches by always stressing the ‘win win’ situation you get from the organisation I’m working with to fund such a venture that they’d be leveraging off my expertise while I’d be leveraging off their multiple financial and human resources and brand name. This would then produce a project for the greater good and benefit of a third stakeholder, i.e. the community participants.

You need to stress that magical things can happen when people are empowered and are given the right circumstances under which to work. By outlining clearly certain ways of working, creative decisions and products such as photography will emerge.

vii. How do you explain the "participatory" approach to participants?

No answer

viii. Do you do research before and after a project?
We produced a global travelling exhibition that was in Sydney then Finland and eventually going to Kenya. There is another team presently back in Jo’burg who are following up on our outcomes to see if the project has had any impact.

ix. If yes, how do you design evaluation methods based on objectives derived from grassroots, participatory approaches?

Simply ask questions based on your objectives and don’t put a ceiling on the way each person being evaluated responds to you. This allows flexibility for the person being evaluated, eg: verbally, via the net, artistically etc.

6.1.4 Interview by phone - Monica Oguttu

i. How can you transcend prior "top-down" learning, attitudes, and values of facilitators, planners, gatekeepers, evaluators, funding agencies, and other stakeholders (including yourself)?

We have worked since 1996 and we are a local indigenous organization. We designed a broad project related to reproductive health. That took us to work in HIV/AIDS. The girls here generally remain at home. Some are teenage mothers who are HIV positive. We establish those characteristics before we accept them in the project.

In 2003 we started the project related to the slum. We have different components of the programme. First they are trained with information to be able to take care of themselves and have access to all they need in relation to reproductive health. The second part allows them to be trained in vocational training: (For example: beauty and hairdressing, catering and photography). Those who participate in photography do pictures as photojournalists and as a livelihood strategy. We have a component of microfinance in the project. To negotiate our entrance, we meet before with the chief of the area and the parents of the girls, to achieve their trust and confidence and avoid conflict.
The community meet once a month in a committee to review what is happening.

ii. How can you as trainer and facilitator learn about local community dynamics and power structures? How important are social and political change goals to the project?

The community find themselves as helpless so we tried to create the space for the girls’ empowerment. They were happy that their girls were able to benefit from that.

iii. What, exactly, do you expect to happen as a result of an intervention?

We want to develop them into photography to strengthen them and compile their stories to share with others.

iv. Do you give people objectives or do you assist people in setting their own objectives? If the latter, how do you relate this to the demands of funding agencies?

When we carried out the project, the members established what they wanted without a topic. They compiled their own stories and then they shared them with the school or other groups.

v. What are the criteria for selecting trainees and participants? How do you recognize and incorporate the different training needs and requirements for diverse groups of trainees?

They are first part of the group to learn the reproductive health issues and then become trainers to pass it on to the community.

vi. How do you facilitate a grassroots, participatory approach and work with gatekeepers?
Because we worked in the community for a long time we got lots of support from the schools and parents. When we find opposition we try to explain the benefits of the programme.

vii. How do you explain the "participatory" approach to participants?

Yes, that is included so they can become trainers.

viii. Do you do research before and after a project?

We do an indoor evaluation programme and also it’s done by the community advisory committee. They have a meeting once a month and their members include: parents, youth, a teacher, a police officer (who works in gender based violence) and a service provider.

ix. If yes, how do you design evaluation methods based on objectives derived from grassroots, participatory approaches?

The most important one is developed by the community through the committee, who acts as our watchdog to assess monthly progress.

6.1.5 Interview by email - Isabelle Lemaire

i. How can you transcend prior "top-down" learning, attitudes, and values of facilitators, planners, gatekeepers, evaluators, funding agencies, and other stakeholders (including ourselves)?

I’m not sure there is really a short answer for this one... I guess through setting precedent, proving wrong some misconception, encouraging dialogue where all parties are at an equal level and challenging power but in a way which doesn’t make people turn their back on the process.
ii. How can you as trainer and facilitator learn about local community dynamics and power structures? How important are social and political change goals to the project?

As a facilitator I can definitely do quite a bit of research about a place before I go, even though that sometimes has the disadvantage of building preconceptions. I wouldn’t advocate going blind, since you can never really just have a blank perception of everything. In terms of specific community structures, power, etc., you can see that quite quickly just through people’s body language: who is present first, who stands back, who you hadn’t noticed at first, etc.

The importance of social and political goals depends on the project. For me, it’s always important because I see that these forces shape inequality. Where it becomes tricky is whether agencies that employ you want to know about them, want to get involved in a process of reflection and change. That’s the key. If the participants can be brought to look at that, then those forces can shed light upon with PV, then it can get interesting.

iii. What, exactly, do you expect to happen as a result of an intervention?

I guess little can happen in the grand scheme of things with just one intervention. But at the same time, there can be multipliers whereby one action can lead to another. I think that I expect just small changes. Then I would try to push for the video or message that the community has come up with to be perfected so that it can reach its intended audience. This is one area in which we often fail. We give the community a chance to speak without always building in the support to craft their message or take the message further so it resonates with people who are making decisions.

iv. Do you give people objectives or do you assist people in setting their own objectives? If the latter, how do you relate this to the demands of funding agencies?
I think that making a film in itself is a pretty good objective sometimes. My own objective would be to have the community participate as fully as possible. Then, I would hope for the community to show some enthusiasm, or interest and help them in collaboration with the local organisation and see where this can be taken.

v. What are the criteria for selecting trainees and participants? How do you recognize and incorporate the different training needs and requirements for diverse groups of trainees?

Selecting trainees can be tricky since we often get recommendations. I guess you can see who’s a good facilitator quite quickly. They’re respectful, able to give up control and genuine about encouraging social change. Of course speaking the same language as them and them speaking the local language is a plus! It’s also important but difficult to know what type of relationship exists between the trainee and the community. I remember training NGO staff in Bangladesh who acted very kindly in the workshop and treated the local community poorly. They had a pre-existing relationship where the NGO in question was “giving AID” to the community, so the relationship of patronage was strong. It would have been difficult to know that in advance and politically difficult to get out of training that particular member of the NGO since he was our main contact.

As far as participants go, it’s more about making sure that people can have the same access, participate equally, prevent people from dominating too much, as opposed to selecting them.

vi. How do you facilitate a grassroots participatory approach and work with gatekeepers?

I’m not sure I really understand the question. I think this one totally depends on context.

vii. How do you explain the “participatory” approach to participants?
I don’t explain it per se. I just say that everyone is welcome to join, that mistakes are good. But it really comes down to what you do, not what you say. You do have to have a clear purpose that has to be stated and well explained. This avoids confusion, expectations, etc.

viii. Do you do research before and after a project?

There is of course research before but it is harder to do after since once we leave a community there is rarely money to go back. The way we structure projects now is in view of returning later on for follow up. But the long term is out of our hands, that’s why good local partners are important, people that can support the process of learning and communicating in the long term.

ix. If yes, how do you design evaluation methods based on objectives derived from grassroots, participatory approaches?

Insight is in the process of designing PV monitoring and evaluation tools. Nick can give you a much better answer than me for this one. See their work with Practical Action for more details.

6.1.6 Interview by email - Rachel Ellis

i. How can you transcend prior "top-down" learning, attitudes, and values of facilitators, planners, gatekeepers, evaluators, funding agencies, and other stakeholders (including ourselves)?

This is a tough issue to address, although a crucial one. After several years working in development and on diverse development projects I think firstly, one has to appreciate the positions of power, influence and control that exist and will continue to exist in all development projects and/or initiatives at some level, within the current development context. Unfortunately, generally one has very little control over how others chose to impose themselves, although you can set positive examples and set up working conditions that
enable all stakeholders to put forward their opinions so that they are not the victims of mere top-down development approaches and participate proactively in development processes. I think that people are often very idealistic about this though and it is important to be realistic about the constraints to truly bottom-up, participatory development. One thing that is absolutely essential is that those people or groups that are going to be impacted by an action and/or their representative bodies are involved from the very beginning of a project, from the moment that an idea emerges and they are then involved, in some way, in all decision making on the project/initiative. However, I would say that even if you know this in theory and try and apply it in practice, it doesn’t guarantee that you eliminate top-down approaches. In the worst case scenarios it merely masks them. How successful participation is, comes down to personal philosophy, approaches and beliefs as well as individuals’ capacity to work collectively.

It is crucial to reflect on how you are seen by others that you are working with and to be very clear about your own objectives. If you strongly believe in something don’t try and hide behind participatory approaches to make your point of view more legitimate. Communicate clearly what you believe in but provide others opportunities to put across contrary points of view. Listen and be open to change (very difficult for most people).

I personally believe that in implementing any initiative, the starting point should ALWAYS be local knowledge but be aware that as an outsider the local knowledge that is presented to you will generally be filtered knowledge (people present what they want you to know or what they think you want to know and not necessarily what is really happening). It is crucial to be aware of these kinds of dynamics in elaborating and working on projects and to be hyper aware of how you are seen by others that you are working with. It is also very important to work on group dynamics and communication so that people can develop ideas together. I strongly believe that what we need to aim for is collective learning and action. This takes time, a lot of self-reflection and regular reality checks!
Just one more point on this, every individual and group holds values and beliefs about the world that we have to work with. I think it is idealistic to think that just because an idea or suggestions emerges from a ‘bottom-up’ scenario that it is correct. For example, many deaf people in Brazil believe that deaf people are by nature lazy (even deaf leaders). We have fought against this stereotype by outwardly telling the group that deaf people are not inherently lazy and that this is a stigma that they have come to believe in due to not being given responsibility for anything nor their own actions because family members and society think they are not capable. Obviously we have been careful about how and when we push this discussion. You have to have peoples’ confidence to confront them. This belief has also been broken down over time through providing them with more and more responsibility and chasing them up when they don’t do things they have committed to. They have begun to believe in their own abilities and that they are not lazy! We have worked with them on the need to fulfil not only rights but also responsibilities as well.

ii. How can you as trainer and facilitator learn about local community dynamics and power structures? How important are social and political change goals to the project?

You have to do your research! I believe that it is essential that you spend a significant amount of time working with the local group/community that you are planning to develop a project/programme/initiative with. Ideally you want them to be co-authors of the initiative and this demands that they are involved from the very beginning, as soon as the idea is conceived. I don’t believe that the idea has to come from the group or community necessarily, but they have to have full buy-in and feel a part of the development of that idea and its implementation, this includes being involved in all decision making. At the end of the day, the idea was conceived to support their development (and development processes in general) in one way or another, not for development professionals, professional or personal development.
Social and political change goals are central to the project. The overall goal of the project is to increase the self-esteem, creativity and critical analysis of the participants and to give visibility to the deaf community and deaf rights. As such the objective of the project is two-fold, on the one hand recognising the need to invest in the personal development of individuals so as that they can become protagonist of change, whilst also implementing activities that directly challenge the status Quo and stimulate debate and ideas that can also lead to social and political change. This could be seen as change in the short term, focusing on the development of the individuals involved in the project and on disseminating information on the project and its outcomes to as wide an audience as possible (resource restrictions restrict this at times).

The other part of the objective relates to longer term social change and refers to the need to break down stigma related to the deaf community and supporting the implementation of deaf rights. For example, we aim to promote understanding that the only difference between deaf and non-deaf people, is a different language. If society was prepared to speak sign language – the official second language in Brazil – the deaf community would not be so excluded. In terms of the implementation of deaf rights, the legal framework for promoting deaf rights in Brazil is extremely progressive; the problem is in the practice. This is where this project hopes to make a difference by promoting the visibility of the deaf community and individuals’ capacity to defend deaf people’s rights as well as strengthening links between deaf groups and organizations and government bodies and promoting more appropriate educational methodologies.

iii. What, exactly, do you expect to happen as a result of an intervention?

I think that I have partly answered this above. I am attaching an outcomes report that was done for one of our funders that should help. I have also attached a recent report to “Abilis” which has some interesting points.
iv. Do you give people objectives? Or do you assist people in setting their own objectives? If the latter, how do you relate this to the demands of funding agencies?

We spent a year developing the project proposal with the deaf community. As such the objectives were set with the target group of the project. Fundraising happens in parallel.

Inevitably, demands of funding agencies aren’t always exactly in line with what you are proposing to do. For example, we did not want to restrict the course to only young people. However one of the initial funders only funds projects of up to 26 year olds. As such we adapted the project to the demands of the agency otherwise we would have lost the funding. This was not necessarily a negative experience. I think that the key is to try not to depend on only one source of financing. If you can diversify your funding sources you can be more flexible about how you apply the funding to your project, whilst simultaneously accompanying with the demands of each funder. Also I believe that a lot of funding agency demands are valid, such as equal numbers of male and female participants etc. However, what is crucial is that funders are open to you arguing against some of their conditions. We found that IDCS and Abilis were very flexible and accessible.

N.B. I do not believe that there is any situation where by you should simply give people objectives. People that are going to be affected by a development project should ALWAYS be involved in the process of elaborating objectives, even if at a distance. The only exception to this may be mass vaccination, or similar such health programmes, which are one off interventions. But even with these types of programmes, it is advantageous to involve people locally, to know how best to outreach to isolated communities etc.

v. What are the criteria for selecting trainees and participants? How do you recognize and incorporate the different training needs and requirements for diverse groups of trainees?

The deaf coordinators were responsible for disseminating the course amongst the deaf community. Posters were put up in all areas that are commonly frequented by the deaf community. We also realised that flyers were needed
as any family members did not believe their deaf children when they told their families about the course; having flyers to show family provided legitimacy. (This was a lesson learnt as we didn’t initially think about producing flyers). In terms of selection, we invited all those who signed up to the course to come to an introductory talk about the course. Around 30 people turned up. The course was for 20 people but we ended up letting the 26 people who decided to continue with the course participate. We discovered that one of the reasons why more people didn’t sign up to the course was because people simply didn’t believe that it could be true! And also because we disseminated during the school holidays, another lessons learnt – you need to disseminate during term time. All this indicates that future courses will have a much higher rate of subscription and will have to apply the criteria develop previously to selected participants. The criteria for selection was developed after a lot of discussion between the young deaf coordinators and photographers and included a good knowledge of sign-language, an interest in photography, basic level of education, only state school participants and to have an equal number of male and female participants (among other criteria). It is important to make sure that an interpreter is available to help people fill in the application forms, or record applicants on video.

vi. How do you facilitate a grassroots, participatory approach and work with gatekeepers?

What are gatekeepers?!

Following the first course it was crucial to train peer educators to ensure that the project was taken forward by the deaf community and that young deaf people would continue to work jointly with hearing coordinators in the development of the project and the realization of future activities. Two deaf participants of the first course were employed as coordinators. All decisions are made jointly with the young deaf coordinators and, when necessary, with the group of peer educators (currently a group of 06 young people). I believe that you facilitate a participatory approach by involving people as actively as possibly. You need to remember to do this ALL the time, constantly asking yourself ‘have I involved people sufficiently in this action/activity/decision?’ I also believe that everyone has a role in a project and the key is to value and
emphasize the contribution of every individual and to create a strong group dynamic and trust and confidence and mechanisms for effectively sharing information. When I say involve people in everything that doesn’t mean that everybody does everything! Everyone has their own strengths and weaknesses. In this project the presence of interpreters at all times was crucial (the involvement of interpreters has improved dramatically during the course of the project). Also, the need for all information to be translated into sign language, so that all deaf people involved in the project understand what project proposals are being developed, that information is disseminated effectively to the deaf as well as non-deaf community etc. This does not mean that absolutely everything has to be translated, this is not feasible. For example, this questionnaire won’t be translated in its entirety into sign language but I will communicate to the group that I have responded to questions from a Masters student in the UK etc. Sharing this information promotes interest, trust and confidence.

vii. How do you explain the "participatory" approach to participants?

In terms of the course and the project we reiterate on numerous occasions the importance of the young people to participate in the construction of the project, repeating that this is THEIR project and that without their participation the project doesn’t make sense. If the young deaf people didn’t continue believing and participating in the project we would not carry on with the project. This is very clear from the beginning. We try to avoid, as much as possible development language, introducing this only as the group develops, so as not to confuse and alienate people.

viii. Do you do research before and after a project?

Yes. This is essential. See reports attached

ix. If yes, how do you design evaluation methods based on objectives derived from grassroots, participatory approaches?
In developing objectives one should in parallel identify indicators to monitor progress towards those objectives. The methodologies that are used to measure the indicators depend very much on the group that you are working with. In the case of this project we learnt some very interesting lessons through experimenting with new monitoring and evaluation methodologies, in particular with video. We are writing up our experiences on this which I can pass on at a later date if you wish.

6.1.7 Interview by phone - Julie Denommee

i. How can you transcend prior "top-down" learning, attitudes, and values of facilitators, planners, gatekeepers, evaluators, funding agencies, and other stakeholders (including yourself)?

For one of the projects, we carried out a sociological and anthropological research during a year in relation to life of young people and children in 5 countries of West Africa. With the results we could try to understand the values and expressions of children and adults. So we based the project on those results. The tools for research were only for children and we realized that they had many obstacles to be able to participate. We highlighted this as an issue affecting their ability to engage in the project. That was our way of dealing with top-down attitudes.

ii. How can you as trainer and facilitator learn about local community dynamics and power structures? How important are social and political change goals to the project?

The previous research was carried out by a team that works with us in the NGO and not by myself. So I base my planning in the office on the research that explains those existing power relations.

All the projects are focused on sustaining social change that is already taking place in a society.
iii. What, exactly, do you expect to happen as a result of an intervention?

I expect that the community is going to own some part of the project. I try to keep that as my only expectation, not to impose the whole plan from an office.

iv. Do you give people objectives or do you assist people in setting their own objectives? If the latter, how do you relate this to the demands of funding agencies?

In a community there are many power relationships. Because of that we choose to work with young people who do not have the right to speak or to critical analysis. At present they can’t decide the goals, so through the project we try to give them tools so in the future they are capable of taking those decisions. Our idea is to be able to fulfil the goals of the young people and then with the help of discourse convince the funding agencies that we did what they expected.

v. What are the criteria for selecting trainees and participants? How do you recognize and incorporate the different training needs and requirements for diverse groups of trainees?

We used to work only with youth groups that were already formed in the community, like committees or clubs, that were created by an NGO. However we realised it was too artificial and always participate the same people. That recreates the power dynamics. So now we work with groups of friends and with those who don’t go to school, like girls in many cases.

To incorporate the different needs you have to trust the facilitator. Everything depends on the facilitator, he/she has to analyse deeply and know how to listen.

vi. How do you facilitate a grassroots, participatory approach and work with gatekeepers?

The problem that we faced was money. Some people ask for money to participate. The only way to remove that idea was dialogue to explain the
purpose of the project. Besides we have to work with local people that can speak their language and not arrive as a foreigner in the village and try to discuss these issues. We work with children so, on the one hand, the adults are suspicious, but on the other hand, once they pass to a second phase knowing the project and us, they trust and are proud of the children.

vii. How do you explain the "participatory" approach to participants?

We tried to do that in a project where we worked for 6 months training in video but it didn’t get there. I think the youth is not used to speaking and organising themselves, so you need more than 6 months to be able to create that space.

viii. Do you do research before and after a project?

We carried out previous research and evaluation. Our main goal is to create critical spirit and thinking, so we try to measure if it is achieved.

ix. If yes, how do you design evaluation methods based on objectives derived from grassroots, participatory approaches?

We decided the evaluation: close questionnaires and focus groups. In the project we focused on artistic formation and discussion. We had a group using rap, another one, theatre and another one, video. At the end of the project they did a show together for the community.

The result of each media was really different. In the case of rap, the discourse was really aggressive due to the music style. The theatre created the space for youth to use masks and denounce things about the community that without the masks they wouldn’t do. But video was a surprise for us, it was a deception. Children couldn’t develop a critical spirit. They are used to negative documentaries to make society sensitive. They filmed themselves poorer than they are, even with fake clothes, to earn money and interest. They couldn’t show positive aspects in their life.

Additionally, television has a strong influence. They watch lots of soap operas, so they copied their style when they filmed themselves.
6.1.8 Interview by phone - Vincenzo Cavallo

i. How can you transcend prior "top-down" learning, attitudes, and values of facilitators, planners, gatekeepers, evaluators, funding agencies, and other stakeholders (including yourself)?

We focus on the community rather than on the project itself. We go to a community without focusing on one particular problem. And for example we want to know from them what is the best way of using video for them, what they want to express and increase in visibility. We want to know more about their specific problems because for us the important part is the process itself so they can rationalize through video.

One case: the community is running a community project for tourism, so they want to use the video to increase their visibility.

The first problem is that they want you to do the video because they know you are a professional and they want you to do it for them. It took us a week to make them understand the importance for them of the process.

One of the main successful cases achieved the community to create their organization (on their own) after the project. That is a concrete reality for them.

ii. How can you as trainer and facilitator learn about local community dynamics and power structures? How important are social and political change goals to the project?

There is a gap between people who do participatory management and participatory media. I think participatory media professionals should contact participatory management projects to go hand by hand. This is what we are doing now in Kenya. Another case is participatory video as the new logic framework.

To understand community dynamics I research what is already happening in terms of development projects there, and try to work together in the same line. It’s like a river; you just get into the river.
iii. What, exactly, do you expect to happen as a result of an intervention?

At a personal level, I want the people that I’m working with to get the skills of any average young adult or elder in another part of the global information society. So they are able to have IT literacy (video, internet, blog, etc). Depends on where you do the project if you can only dedicate to the process or to the media skills (contrast among a developed and a developing country). When they need to learn how to use the tools, the project tries to find capacity building.

When the level of literacy in IT is different, the expectations are different.

iv. Do you give people objectives? Or do you assist people in setting their own objectives? If the latter, how do you relate this to the demands of funding agencies?

You have to write expectations in a way that can be measurable for the formal project. When the expectations of the donor, community and development professional are different the project fails. It happened to me in many projects.

When the facilitator is not in contrast with the community, and tries to find a donor that is interested in the community goals, that is a good situation. Or the best situation is when the funds come from the same community. Or the funds come 50/50 or 60/40, for ex. the community contributes with food and accommodation for the project, and the donors with technology and transport. That compromises both parts. The expectations should be similar for a project to be successful.

v. What are the criteria for selecting trainees and participants? How do you recognize and incorporate the different training needs and requirements for diverse groups of trainees?

It’s about space and time. You need the space that the community can give you to know them and time to do brainstorming with them and see if everybody is involved. Then, you follow the different suggestions.
It’s more difficult for the editing part. I saw few projects where they are included in the edition part. And it’s honest to say it from the beginning that their ideas are going to be involved but there is one person (the facilitator) who is going to do the edition, for example. That’s why it’s better to use someone that knows nothing about video to do the facilitation, so it does not interfere with the ideas of the people.
You need people who have training in participatory management to be able to do it successfully.

vi.  How do you facilitate a grassroots, participatory approach and work with gatekeepers?

In the African context I didn’t have this problem because we work in really small communities. So maybe those who are not going to be happy are people from other communities; that can happen. You negotiate that another group will be able to access a similar project if they are interested in that.
You have to be sure that a project is not going to cause tribal conflicts.
You can find different commercial interests, like sustainable tourism between local people and big tourist investors. A change always brings conflict.

vii. How do you explain the "participatory" approach to participants?

Yes, we try to train not only about video but how to recreate the process. You leave them the camera and the tools to be able to grow on that. You don’t explain them; you just do it involving them in action.

viii. Do you do research before and after a project?

We haven’t done any serious evaluation process. From my point of view the evaluation for participatory media is to look if there is a correlation of the media they are producing and the problems that the community face. For ex: media production related to HIV/AIDS and post reaction towards that topic.

ix. If yes, how do you design evaluation methods based on objectives derived from grassroots, participatory approaches?
No response

Other comments:
It’s a responsibility of the facilitator to be able to understand if the community is ready to create that change or whether the project is going to bring conflict and even disempowerment.

6.2 Summaries of interviews for case studies

6.2.1 Interview by phone – GEMA (Foto Libras)

1. How long did the project last?

The research face started in December 2005 searching funds and creating the proposal. At the beginning of 2007 the project itself started. The project went on officially with funding until October 2007; it has been carrying on informally with small amounts of fund with the group of peer educators.

2. Who set the objectives?

The objectives were developed by the NGO in a broad perspective. In the NGO both deaf and non-deaf people participate.

3. Was empowerment defined? By whom? What was the definition?

Empowerment was defined as ‘self-esteem’ with deaf people who belong to the NGO plus the team. Six of the participants from the first phase created their own proposal to undertake phase two. The organisation is working to find funding for them.

4. Was dialogue defined? By whom? What was the definition?
Dialogue was defined as critical reflection and related to several activities. For example, to be able to read pictures, interpret images, photo essays (related more to documentary photography than to the advertisement style), pictures of themselves and of others (professionals too). Besides, the feelings invoked by the images were also discussed.

5. What were the main outputs and outcomes of the projects?

The peer-education group and the visibility were the most important ones in terms of securing continuity.

6. Had any research been carried out before the project? By whom? Which tool or technique was used?

Basic research about other organizations in Brazil and internationally in relation to photography and to deaf education was carried out.

7. Has evaluation been carried out? By whom? Which tool or technique was used? Do you think empowerment did in fact happen? What evidence for this can you point to?

During the initial course, we carried out evaluation on the initial course in the middle and at the end of the course. At the same time, with the peer educators we had evaluation at the end of the formation. Educators and facilitators evaluated the project results too. A discussion was held every week since the start of the training.

The evidence of empowerment is related to the possibility of the participants seeing their pictures in an exhibition, sharing the pictures and discussions with their families and discussing the outcomes with external people.

8. Have you used group discussion? Was it part of the formal planning?

We tried lots of different ways. We used projection of photos and then talking together in the group. At other times they would reflect on something in particular individually and then discuss in small groups, or one-to-one (with the facilitator) then in small groups again. The process was cyclical and open to diversity in relation to what the participants were interested in doing.
9. What topics were included in the training?

They photographed whatever they wanted and after that we worked on topics related to deaf rights and communication through formal workshops separately.

Now, with the peer-educators, we are doing photographic essays on those topics.

You have to be flexible, although the project needs to be written in a way that you can negotiate interests of everyone.

10. Did you include a local management system for long-term implementation by the community/local NGO?

We had the objective to create peer-educators to give sustainability and strengthen the project. For them, it was important to maintain links and for the NGO to strengthen the project. At the same time, the group of peer-educators managed to have control of decision-making over the next phase (2) of the intervention. They would, of course, have access to the cameras and a place to meet and work together.

6.2.2 Interview by phone - PhotoVoice and JUCONI (Beyond Vision)

1. How long did the project last?

The first project was three months in 2005. In 2008 we started a second project for a complete year. The activities started in January.

The planning was done by PhotoVoice and JUCONI.

JUCONI hired me as facilitator and coordinator of the project in Guayaquil, Ecuador.

23 teenagers were chosen by JUCONI to take part in the process and today (after 6 months) 13 continue for the final part.

JUCONI is an organization that gives personal assistance to street kids and teenagers, in relation to psychology and education. Through a project called “friendship operation”, the educators make contact with the children in the street and create a space of friendship going to their houses and being visited by the kids in their own homes too. So they know the kids for
months or even years. And they explained the PP project to them before inviting them to participate.

The project started with a basic workshop (from February to June 2008) which ended with an exhibition on the 12th June because it’s the day that commemorates the eradication of child labour.

After that they do a small workshop to learn “Photoshop” to be able to modify their pictures. Then follows the second part of the project, which is the one the 13 participants are now doing. This is the advanced workshop in photography (it started in July). Once the children advance in their projects, they are going to participate for three months in an internship in companies that work in photography or design to have working experience. When that is finished, they will do another exhibition.

Finally they are going to be trained as peer-educators to replicate the project in their communities doing a workshop of one or two months for their peers.

2. Who had set the objectives?

Both NGOs (PhotoVoice and JOCONI) have set the objectives. They reflect on an alternative form to show feeling and express reality; the acquisition of skills, self-esteem, personal growth and development; and the option of having a livelihood strategy through the skills learned in PP.

3. Was empowerment defined? By whom? What was the definition?

We ask them what they think they can do through photography and what they would like to be in the future. From that we start guiding them to show the use of photography in their lives. Each one of them explains what they want to do and what dreams they have, in relation to photography or not.

4. Was dialogue defined? By whom? What was the definition?

The children have the space to discuss what they want to speak about and take photos about, and other activities are organised and defined by the NGOs.

As facilitator I motivate them and ask them what they want to do to plan each day. We use body expression, group dynamics, creativity games and individual dynamics to express their feelings, memory and creativity.
5. What were the main output and outcomes of the projects?

The most important outcome is the motivation and interest of the children to participate in the project and the workshops. They are committed, they establish the activities, take responsibility such as taking care of the equipment, establishing the topics to discuss and photograph and even the timetable for the week that they prefer. You can appreciate their motivation to achieve their goals.

6. Have you done any research before the project? Who did it? Which tool or technique was used?

In 2005 JUCONI did the pilot project that served as research to create a broader base for this project, re-plan it and widen it. The first one was done with children of a younger age, while this one was planned for teenagers.

7. Have you done evaluation? Who did it? Which tool or technique was used? Do you think empowerment did in fact happen? What evidence can you point out for this?

As a facilitator and coordinator I produce a monthly report of the activities and each day after any activity we have an informal evaluation with the children. We also did a formal evaluation at the end of the first workshop (in June) for the children, their parents and the educators, to listen to their opinions and analyse whether we had to change something for the second stage.

In the case of the children’s evaluation, we asked them what they liked and what they didn’t, what they have to improve and what they are hoping to get from the next stage.

We explained them that without them this project does not exist. They took it seriously, they committed themselves and their presence after 7 months plus their continued motivation to work shows their interest and personal growth.

8. Have you used group discussion? Was it part of the formal planning?

Yes, it’s a main part in the first workshop and part of the formal planning, as was explained before.

9. What were the topics included in the training?
The children took the first stage pictures in their own areas of the community. They choose their topics, decide together in discussions and they go to take the pictures. So all the ideas come from them and we follow their decisions.

Now, they ask us to start taking pictures outside their areas and go to other public spaces that they choose. At the same time, they decided, for example, to participate in a competition and send their pictures, and we supported their wish.

10. Did you include a local management system for long-term implementation by the community/local NGO?

Once all the activities are finished, we want them to continue as peer educators in their communities facilitating a workshop of one or two months for 15-30 children. We expect them to generate a positive role model to follow. This could give them a space to guide and transmit their knowledge to others, as well as pass on their skills to the community.

Other comments:

The organizations involved are: PhotoVoice/JUCONI/Instituto Tecnologico Lexa (where the activities take place)

6.2.3 Interview by phone – NUTZIJ (Popular indigenous communicator)

1. How long did the project last?

The Association was formed from a first workshop organised in 1997, after a research to try to understand the needs of Mayan Women.

Today we generally organised two workshops a year, with approximately 40 people in each one. The workshop involves learning IT and video, and after that a second stage related to gender and rights.

We work in relation to gender equity from the use of PV. Women open up a space in their communities to discuss about any issue the community wants to do, what gives then a space as facilitators in their communities.
The workshops are constantly organised but depends on funds. Sometimes they have a length of 12 months, and other times of 18 months. Sometimes we have funds from the Ministry of Education of Guatemala.

2. Who had set the objectives?

We go out to the communities and we ask them what they are interested to discuss about. The same when the participants propose their interest on doing the workshop. We ask them their interests and then we organised the activities in relation to our possibilities and areas of work.

Their ideas (participants and community members) set the topics of the workshop. For instance, we had a youth group from one community asking us to prepare something special for them including AIDS.

One example of a video (asked by one community) is a documentary related to the Peace Treaty. With that documentary the community then pressed the government to give responses of the advances of the Treaty. The community generated the space to discuss this topic and propose the action.

3. Was empowerment defined? By whom? What the definition was?

The participants who decide to participate define what they want to do and why. For example, they are generally interested in generating the space for community discussion around the screening of videos. Sometimes they also define their interest in relation to their proud to be able to collaborate with their communities with a documentary or video about their reality.

Now the Association has the long-term vision of achieving a community TV channel to have a permanent space for Mayan content.

4. Was dialogue defined? By whom? What the definition was?

There are discussions among the participants and the facilitator, and at the same time there is a space for consensus about what they are expecting.

After the filming, we have spaces of community screening and festivals to extend the dialogue about the issues within the community.

5. What were the main output and outcomes of the projects?
The video itself is one of the main outcomes because it’s a strong way of communication because it can be used at community, national or international level.

Community pride is another one. The members feel satisfied that they can share problems and search solutions for those community problems together. The video helped to create a space for dialogue in the Mayan communities.

6. Have you done any research before the project? Who did it? Which tool or technique was used?

The Association was created after a research. We did it with other university classmates and a professional from the US who came to help us. We did questionnaires to ask the Mayan women what their needs were. Their answer was the creation of a space for Mayan women, and communication and video was selected as one of the main tools.

7. Have you done evaluation? Who did it? Which tool or technique was used? Do you think empowerment did in fact happen? What evidence can you point out for this?

We use video as the main tool of evaluation to show what they feel, think and experience. At the same time, we had recorded some of the workshops and activities in paper, with their comments and testimonies. Last year we did a video about the Association with some of this material.

The women and the community managed to create a space for dialogue and today approximately 500 women have done the workshops and became community facilitators to create videos and documentaries of issues decided by their communities.

8. Have you used group discussion? Was it part of the formal planning?

Yes, it’s part of the formal planning. In the workshop they discuss what they would like to learn and do as well as to decide the video that they are going to produce.

9. What were the topics included in the training?

The topics are decided by the participants when they ask us to do the workshop.

10. Did you include a local management system for long-term implementation by the community/local NGO?
Yes. Each participant of a workshop is transformed in a multiplier of knowledge. Those who want to participate have to bring letters from their communities that support their participation as community facilitators. In addition, they sign their own letter committing themselves to train other people in their communities.

Now the women that have participated in the activities are in contact through the Association (500 approximately) but our next objective is to create an online network because they have IT skills that they learnt during the workshops.

Each member is today a community worker generating videos in their own communities, according to what the community wants.

6.2.4 Interview by phone - Sight of Emotion (PP Sight of Emotion)

1. How long did the project last?

The research started three years ago with a personal interest in blind photography (research and training)

After 6 months, I contacted one association for blind people in Mexico and with donations of people I carried out the first workshop. Due to the reactions of the participants and their families I decided to start an NGO to create this space.

After participating in “dialogue in the darkness” (a global exhibition) we decided to take that idea to create a bridge between blind people and those who can see. That took as to create a fundraising space call “Dining in the darkness” to raise funds for the workshops (where people who can see participate and those who are blind organised it, and everything is carried out in darkness).

In 2007 we did 7 workshops and this year we decided to do only two to evaluate and recreate the activities through evaluation.

In each workshop 20 people participate. Sometimes only blind people and others a mixture. From all the participants this year we are going to select those who are interested in being peer educators.

2. Who had set the objectives?
The NGO does it. The aim is to try to remember the essence of communication.

The first photographic workshop has the objective of trying to break with the paradigm that they can’t take photographs because they are blind. Inside this objective we have those of having fun and free themselves from the fear of going to the street and taking a picture. The production of the image is not the main interest.

The second part of the programme is a technical workshop on photography. The objective is to give them tools so they can conduct sensitivity workshops in companies to close the gap between blind people and those who can see.

All the activities we do have three main objectives: to communicate, to create a sensibiliser space and to integrate.

3. Was empowerment defined? By whom? What was the definition?

It was defined by the NGO and the participants. The first stage the NGO defines is that through photography they can create a dialogue with the visual world, be self-sufficient and independent.

After feeling confident with themselves, they asked us to continue with the use of photography to improve their skills and have a livelihood. In that sense, the space for sensitive workshops (with active dynamics that are related to live and feel with all the senses) was created and they became facilitators for companies to mediate blind people and those who can see.

4. Was dialogue defined? By whom? What was the definition?

It is crucial allow them to express themselves. That’s why we take them to public spaces to do the training and take the pictures. Generally they choose what to do, although sometimes we propose some lines of action.

There is a space for dialogue that is personal with psychologists to express their feelings and what they wanted to communicate with a special picture, or why they took that picture. Then they discuss their photographs in groups describing them to the others.

They also discuss with professional photographers and they have space to study material related to photography.
5. What were the main output and outcomes of the projects?

The most important is the security and self-esteem that the participants achieved. They are used to overprotection and lack of control to take personal decisions (in relation to their family context and the society itself). They have lost the fear to interact with people that can see.

At the same time, there are participants that choose to stay in their comfort zones. They are used to having everything done for them and they prefer not to be self-sufficient.

Another outcome is the number of people interested in the project, participating in the fundraising events and exhibitions and who are interested in being updated about the activities in the project. This includes the family members that start to leave the participant free to act and take decisions by themselves.

Another outcome is teamwork and the networks created nationally and internationally.

6. Have you done any research before the project? Who did it? Which tool or technique was used?

Personal research before the NGO started was done through theoretical analysis, workshops and interviews with blind and non-blind photographers.

7. Have you done evaluation? Who did it? Which tool or technique was used? Do you think empowerment did in fact happen? What evidence can you point out for this?

In 2007 we did a psychological, quantitative and qualitative research with the participants, their families and the society as well.

This year we evaluated particularly, which of the activities were functioning and what needs to be changed in terms of management. We have some external experts acting in the monitoring process that help us with their opinion.

The evidence of empowerment is that the camera turns into an instrument for them to have an excuse to go out into public spaces, interact with the outside world and with people who can see. This is particularly important because they were spending too much time inside their association instead of sharing time with other people. This was corroborated with their own testimonies.
In relation to the society, the high level of interest and attendance to the exhibitions and activities generated a demand for space for understanding with other senses and technical advice in relation to images and Braille diagrams.

At the same time, the blind participants earn a livelihood through the activities and fundraising events that they organize. This exposes them to responsibilities and opportunities that later created long-term livelihoods (one participant, for example, after this experience managed to find a permanent job in a company)

The psychological reports that are done by the psychology team through the process about their emotional changes is another way of understanding their evolution.

8. Have you used group discussion? Was it part of the formal planning?

Yes. During the workshop they decide what to do but in some cases you find groups that are afraid and need to be pushed or guided, while others can quickly define what they want and need in those discussions.

9. What were the topics included in the training?

Some of the topics are proposed by them, like their life, their families, food they like, etc. At the same time, they have some activities with professional photographers that choose topics to work with them.

The workshops are almost completely done in public spaces to create a comfort zone for them in the outside world and to enjoy their city.

Once the workshop finishes, an exhibition is held (in the NGO, museums, universities, etc.), they create a Braille card for each picture and another one in black, and if we have the budget we create a tactile diagram with audio to create an accessible exhibition for everyone.

One particular case was an exhibition of blind and non-blind photographers, with this method of accessibility and without mentioning which photographer could see and which one is blind.

10. Did you include a local management system for long-term implementation by the community/local NGO?

Some of the participants became peer-educators to train others in photography, facilitate dynamics in the workshops for companies and create a complementary space (they always
work together one blind and one non-blind facilitator to complement each other and show integration and different sensitivities to the participants of workshops)

At the same time, each one of them can generate their own workshop, and of course we support them with training.

We also generated a networking space to assure the quality of the workshops that are created.

6.2.5 Interview by email - Foundation AGRECOL Andes (Documentation of rural experiences through PP and TICs)

1. How long did the project last?

Currently the project has three phases. The first started in 2003, continuing until 2005 funded by IICD; a second phase from July 2005 until September 2006 was funded by COSUDE; the last one was from April 2007 until June 2008. I attach the reports from the first and second phase.

Each phase had its own challenges in relation to the interest of the people, the conditions of implementation and the characteristics of the area. Initially we discussed only documentation and exchange of experiences; next was knowledge management and lastly local development, involving topics like risk management, school involvement, etc. Each part had a different and new challenge related to ICTs.

2. Who had set the objectives?

It is interesting how the project and its goals arise. It is a learning process of the people, their efforts to record information (audio recorders, note taking) and then participate in the experiences of exchange. This made us think in which part of the process ICTs can help in taking this information to the communities when they return from exchange as, for example, a photographic image or audio. At the same time, to give a major dynamic to the exchanges taking something prepared for those meetings. From this process the goals were born, as an initiative of the technical team involved.
3. Was empowerment defined? By whom? What was the definition?

We had not defined the concept of empowerment nor had an agreed definition. In an implicit way when we speak about knowledge we speak about empowerment, particularly in relation to local knowledge. This increases the self-confidence of people who are capable of solving their problems. Besides, the fact of being in contact with ICTs that probably they haven’t had before, for the difficulty in access and the level of illiteracy (particularly women), generates increments in self-confidence and motivates them to create their own ideas and initiatives to improve their lives.

4. Was dialogue defined? By whom? What was the definition?

For us, it is important from the beginning of the project to establish some rules that are explicit in an agreement signed by the communities plus some requisites to select the local facilitators that lead the documentation process until the exchange of experiences.

5. What were the main outputs and outcomes of the projects?

Tangibles: publication of documented experiences, magazine articles, videos, interactive CDs, two Telecentres functioning (Sacaca and Chipaya), ICTs equipment given to the communities and producers organizations.

Intangibles: Increased self-confidence of the rural communities, motivation to document the experiences, empowerment of the participants, new challenges to incorporate the documentation process in the school curricula, application of ICTs in climate risk management and as an instrument in rural local government planning, among others that are being explored (more information in the second report).

6. Have you done any research before the project? Who did it? Which tool or technique was used?

We haven’t done.

7. Have you done evaluation? Who did it? Which tool or technique was used? Do you think empowerment did in fact happen? What evidence can you point out for this?
We carried it out at the end of the second phase (attachment of event memory) using group discussion. Particularly, empowerment is shown in the case of Ayllu Majasaya Mujlli, that they’ve been elaborating their strategic plan since last year with many of their initiatives and results of the project as, for example, to incorporate contextualised education, documentation of experiences, risk management, increasing information about economic resources of the local government, more training to elaborate and execute the project themselves. This promotes a wider dynamic to the institutional management of communities.

8. Have you used group discussion? Was it part of the formal planning?

It’s a technique that we always use.

9. What were the topics included in the training?

We used knowledge management, local knowledge, innovation, ICTs management, documentation of experiences and exchange of experiences.

10. Did you include a local management system for long-term implementation by the community/local NGO?

In the last phase, Committees of Telecentres Management were formed, integrated by participants, authorities, and those who represent grassroots organization. They have a financial plan and rules and regulations for the use of the telecentre.

6.2.6 Interview by phone – PLAN US (Empowerment through Arts and Media)

1. How long did the project last?

Some of the projects that were pilots, part of a first stage, started in 2005 and finished in 2007, while the second phase started this year (2008) and it will end in 2010.

2. Who had set the objectives?
PLAN has set the objectives. The second phase was related to the first, the first was started at the local level and we set the objectives. At local level we involved the network of partners in each country.

3. Was empowerment defined? By whom? What was the definition?

We started to adopt the PV methodology in 2001 and from the experience gained we set the aims. Within the organisation a concept is installed of how we should be working to create space for empowerment (like facilitating instead of directing).

Empowerment concept: to give the youth we work with the possibility to talk more with other members of the community and give them tools to be more involved in decision making in the community in relation to what they want. At the same time, to give a space to critical understanding of the issues happening in their communities. “We don’t set an agenda related to development but the issues that are important for that community are those that the youth choose to discuss.”

They have the opportunity to speak about whatever they want and at the same time gain skills.

4. Was dialogue defined? By whom? What was the definition?

In Dominican Republic and Togo, the training was done in 9 days. The first days are dedicated to getting to know each other and establish the environment with games. After that, we show examples of others communities we worked with before that project, for example the Uganda project, and we generate a discussion of similarities and differences with young people in the other country to see how they engage themselves to speak about their community. We give freedom to the facilitator to guide it. The young people start asking the questions and we just give the space to discuss about their interests.

A meeting with the community is then held so the young people explain to the community what the project is about. Then, they start the process, going to the community to research the topics chosen, taking notes sometimes. When they come back they share what they found and they share what ideas they would like to work on. Then they prioritize the ideas together. We put that information on a map they already made about the community so they all can see it (the community).
The process is facilitated by local staff. They explain all the topics related to filming so that the youth may then carry it out.

5. What were the main output and outcomes of the projects?

Outcomes: changes in young people in their perspective of what they are able to do and confidence that they can do a video. They have confidence about their abilities and they improve their relationships with other members of the community, in some cases having the space to discover groups that they never were in touch with (example Dominican Republic with immigrants in the community).

The first projects were lacking from the follow-up to see what they are doing afterwards with video. That is what is changed in this new project through the internet component. (Secondary impact with the videos themselves)

6. Have you done any research before the project? Who did it? Which tool or technique was used?

We combined research methodologies and extracted best practices from previous experiences. Uganda: combination of kids from abroad and local. Dominican Republic: local people alone. Togo: idem DR. That gave us the experience to build on the next project. The project was well grounded at community level, but we wanted to add the worldwide part of including youth in a global community sharing videos through internet (that is the secondary impact).

7. Have you done evaluation? Who did it? Which tool or technique was used? Do you think empowerment did in fact happen? What evidence can you point out for this?

Daily evaluation: at the end of the day, each participant says something about what he/she learned and what does she/he feel. The same happens in relation to the videos filmed on that day; the participants discuss what they think about after a screening to close the day.

That help as to adapt the next day agenda related to what they said and be flexible to what they are expecting. For us, it is important to facilitate their participation, ensuring that everybody is happy and doing what they want. For example, they felt frustrated in one case with editing, so we changed it to do any other activity they felt comfortable with. We evaluate the staff participating as well.

8. Have you used group discussion? Was it part of the formal planning?
Yes, at the beginning it is key and that builds on the rest of the group and community discussions.

9. What were the topics included in the training?

The topic is a free choice, not specific. From the start they set the topics that they want to discuss. Only in Togo, the young people were only doing interviews to adults or men; so we told them that they can include kids, women and that all the opinions are important and useful and everyone has something important to say.

In the editing process they choose what to use and they do it themselves. Generally 3 or 4 choose to do that and the rest of the participants say what to use while they do it.

10. Did you include a local management system for long-term implementation by the community/local NGO?

It’s different in each place because it depends on the community and local partner. In DR, for example, they were an organised group and we wanted to help them to strengthen what they were already doing. In Togo there was already a group too and they wanted to train other groups to whom they belong to be able to use the equipment. At the same time, they started thinking what other things they can use video for as income generation for them.

In this second stage (2008-2010), internet gives them the possibility to continue the project locally and engage globally with other young people.

6.2.7 Interview by phone – Global Studio 2007 (Shooting Jozi)

1. How long did the project last?

Four weeks for the activities on the ground, three months before that for the planning process and six months after for the exhibitions. This project was done in parallel with others related to improving living conditions (like drawing a map of the community and architecture related improvements to houses in the slums), in the context of Global Studio 2007.
2. Who had set the objectives?

The project manager had set them, inspired by the Academy Award winning documentary ‘Born into brothels’ whereby a similar photographic project was produced in the red light district of Calcutta. The objectives were aligned to those of the Global Studio meeting but they were broad enough to be able to have flexibility in the ground.

3. Was empowerment defined? By whom? What was the definition?

Yes, it was defined by the organisers. Definition: to give them a voice to show their lives and raise their issues publicly (the meeting was going to be in national and international media).

4. Was dialogue defined? By whom? What was the definition?

Each group was free to choose how to create the dialogue around the issues before taking the pictures. Each facilitator was a participant of the Global Studio meeting (90). They chose locals, and those locals chose others to take the pictures and participate.

5. What were the main output and outcomes of the projects?

Photos and exhibitions, mainstream their photos in the media and a seed to spread the project with their own university students in the future.

6. Have you done any research before the project? Who did it? Which tool or technique was used?

The research before the project was done by the project manager through informal gatherings with locals to understand their interests. “I don’t believe in academic research alone, so I had the freedom to go and live there for some time and learn about people in that way.”

7. Have you done evaluation? Who did it? Which tool or technique was used? Do you think empowerment did in fact happen? What evidence can you point out for this?

Global Studio published a book with all the parallel projects results plus the meeting. Now 10 from 90 people participating in the projects went back to evaluate (due to lack of resources this was not accessible for the rest). The organisers did the evaluation. They decided to stay longer in one place/area to see if the project can have a long-term approach.

“The images don’t lie, are what they are. The media were more than happy to publish them. The people planned what to picture and they were very conscious of what they wanted to say through them. I think that is the evidence of empowerment.”
Besides, each person wrote why they took the picture and shared that with the organisers to explain why, for them, they were important.

8. Have you used group discussion? Was it part of the formal planning?

Yes, it was considered, but those who acted as facilitators had the freedom to do anything in each group.

9. What were the topics included in the training?

There was an introduction at the beginning of the meeting with a quick speech about the background. Then we explained the project to the participants of Global Studio (who were going to act as facilitators) and we gave them the information about the precedents (Photo Voice, and the project in which it was inspired and fortunately some participants had previous experience in South America)

10. Did you include a local management system for long-term implementation by the community/local NGO?

No answer.

6.2.8 Interview by phone – Practical Action and Insight (Markets & Livelihoods in Peru)

1. How long did the project last?

In 2007 we carried out a pilot project training future trainers in Practical Action Peru, to see if we can formally incorporate PV as a work methodology.

The training was done in Cuzco, Peru, and mixed Practical Action Peru staff with Kamajucz – local agriculture experts.

Today we are evaluating the changes that have to be done in the internal procedures to fully implement PV in the work methodology, not only in Peru but in other countries in Asia and Africa too.

2. Who had set the objectives?

Practical Action UK and Insight, as partners in this project. We want to build the capacities of PV so the Peru offices can use it to improve horizontal technological transference (farmer-to-
farmer), improve the coordination and cooperation, dialogue, learning process inside the community (particularly using participatory storyboard) promoting debate and consensus to empower themselves for the difficulties of negotiation processes in the markets. At the same time, to improve their dialogue with other actors of the markets and influence on policies.

3. Was empowerment defined? By whom? What was the definition?

It is implicit in the PV methodology, particularly with the participatory storyboard that generates dialogue and negotiation inside the community, and in the community screening activity, as another discussion space. At the same time, the filming process and the feedback they can give in every step is an important generator of empowerment.

The main problems related to markets are the lack of connexion between the actors. This tool can help build trust.

4. Was dialogue defined? By whom? What was the definition?

Directly related with the previous concept as a main part of achieving empowerment.

5. What were the main output and outcomes of the projects?

The main outcome is the confirmation that we need to implement a coordination process between the project manager and the communication team to generate flexibility. At the same time, the project manager should be aware of the use of the tool and decide when it is important to implement it.

Another outcome is the confirmation that the people feel really motivated using video and encouraged to participate much more than with other tools. Particularly, young people are really enthusiastic and more predisposed to participate. Each one that learned to use the camera turned into the teacher of another one, who helps knowledge transference in their own language.

Another outcome is self-confidence. People start to express what they are interested in, maybe things that a project manager has never listened before. For example, this was the case in Sri Lanka, where the farmers asked to interview a Buddhist Monk to tell the historic origin of the community. This topic wouldn’t have been detected as important for the community without the PV process. And this community dialogue empowers them to improve their markets negotiations.
6. Have you done any research before the project? Who did it? Which tool or technique was used?

The research was done in meetings and planning between Practical Action UK and Insight, with Practical Action Peru that were the first office that wanted to implement it.

7. Have you done evaluation? Who did it? Which tool or technique was used? Do you think empowerment did in fact happen? What evidence can you point out for this?

We carried out meetings with the teams to evaluate how beneficial this process was for them. They were all very interested but we are analysing the level of access to equipment to create long-term spaces.

Some of the lessons that this pilot project left us with are: the PV tool should be guided by the communication team and the project managers should be aware of the features to ask the communication team training the community members when it is appropriate in a project.

The office in Cajamarca, for example, started to replicate the process and train local facilitators in PV in the project “Infolactea” (for milk producers). In this office the use of the tool quickly spread because both communication and project management functions under the same area.

8. Have you used group discussion? Was it part of the formal planning?

Yes, as it was explained previously.

9. What were the topics included in the training?

Participatory storyboards were used to promote group discussion in the community. This was one of the main topics. In the case of Kamajucz, they decided to make a film about potatoes for a participatory mapping meeting they had. In the meetings it is difficult for them to express their opinion orally, so the video was their ‘weapon’ to represent the community and communicate their ideas.

10. Did you include a local management system for long-term implementation by the community/local NGO?

Yes. The main objective is to build local capacities and that is our main current work.
Comments from Maria Sol Blanco from the Cajamarca office about the replication of PV in Infolactea:

Infolactea is an integral project related to a milk producing chain. The local promoters (facilitators) were chosen from the communities. We trained them in three media formats: newsletter (print and photography), radio programmes (scripts) and participatory video.

They have a Centre to process rural information. They administrate information about the communities as they have the understanding of local needs and reality.

The promoters are generating storyboards with the communities and producing videos. Up to now they have done 5 (accessible in www.infolactea.com). Today they are asking us to include editing training so they can have independence in the production of information.

They meet with the community in an assembly where they ask people about their interests for producing videos and achieve consensus for the topics according to their needs. The use of video generated more interest and motivation in the community to dialogue about other topics like natural disasters and tourism, not only in relation to milk production.

Some of the lessons learned up to now: necessary technological investment to secure the equipment that is needed in relation to the particular context (for example, if they have electricity or solar panels, if it’s a windy region the equipment has some particularities, editing training, etc.)

Until now, PV had started to facilitate the knowledge transmission in the communities and among the producers.

Comments from Nick Lunch, director of Insight and partner of Practical Action for the PV training:

Training trainers: the most difficult part is the participatory ethos. That is key to a long-term sustainable project because the video-related learning points are quick and easy to incorporate.

Today for us long-term strategies are the main priority. It is really important to clarify this between the partners and to achieve a shared commitment.
In relation to the pilot project in Peru, we could see that the tool was magical at ground level because of the emotional energy you get back from the people. But, in the bigger picture you need to be strategic to change things in a sustainable way.

In this sense, the problems appear in relation to the internal procedures of the NGOs. We think that once a community is trained, a local Hub should be put into place so community members are self-sufficient and have the technology at hand to use it continuously.

The workshop in Peru had the following steps:

- 3 days of games and participatory approaches and video learning process
- 3-4 days for field filming
- Evaluation and community screening

The group mix was a challenge because it was formed by both staff members and Kamajuqs. The evaluation we carried out was mid-term and end evaluation. We always use non-literate tools like circle evaluation and group discussion to identify each topic to be evaluated. We use participatory evaluation through video, cartoons and audio. In particular we asked them questions about being a facilitator because they were going to be future trainers.

The cartoons and voice messages, for example, show challenges related to access to the communities, communications problems, logistics and rising expectations of the community. All of these problems should be addressed before and during the replication of the training process.

6.3 Case studies

6.3.1 Project Sigh of Emotion – Participatory Photography in Mexico

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>&lt;&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;&gt;</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of participation</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment definition</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue definition</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sight of Emotion

Sight of Emotion is a Mexican association whose mission is inclusion of people with different characteristics into the social, educational and working environments by training them and at the same time sensitizing society through artistic experiences.

Introduction

A personal project of the photographer Gina Badenoch in blind photography ended up in the creation of Sight of Emotion, a Mexican Association that uses PP to revitalize the true meaning of communication. After half a year of research and training, she decided to conduct the first PP workshop for blind people in Mexico at the beginning of 2006 in the Comite International Prociegos.

Due to the 18 participants and their families reactions, during the rest of 2006 they decided to carry out several exhibitions and fundraising events called “Dinner in the darkness” to create the Association; with an active role of the workshop participants in the organisation. In 2007 the NGO was created thanks to those funds.

During that year, seven workshops were organised, each one for 20 participants (both visually and non-Visually impaired), as well as exhibitions and sensitizing events in companies. In 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top-down</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Bottom-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Media as output</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous research</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td>Formally organized</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Media exclusively</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local management system</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sight of Emotion is in the process of evaluation and recreation of the workshop, as well as training peer-educators selected from the workshop participants of 2006 and 2007.

Goals

- **Overall objective:** to communicate, to create a sensibiliser space and to integrate.
- **Specific objectives:** to offer people with different characteristics the tools to communicate through Art, so as to improve their self-esteem, independence and safety while stimulating and developing their emotional, intellectual and creative potential to the maximum; to make society aware of the potential communication inherent in the other senses “smell, touch, taste and sound”; to provide people of different characteristics, the tools to change them into productive members of society; to create a network of alliances to take advantage of the workshop results and to provide continuity to the social, educational or working integration.

Outcomes

- **Outcomes:** security and self-esteem of the participants who achieved control over personal decisions and across the borders of their ‘comfort zone’ (in relation to self-responsibility and relationship with others in public spaces); increasing the number of non-visually impaired people interested in participating and supporting the vision of Sight of Emotion; networks created nationally and internationally; livelihood opportunities generated by the workshop participants (with or without direct relation to photography and the project itself).

Planning

**PP workshops:**

- The first photographic workshop has the objective of “trying to break with the paradigm that they can’t take photographs because they are blind. Inside this objective we have those of having fun and free themselves from the fear of going to
the street and taking a picture. The production of the image is not the main interest.” (Gina Badenoch, 2008) 

- The second part of the programme is a technical workshop on photography. “The objective is to give them tools so they can conduct sensitivity workshops in companies to close the gap between visual and non-visual impaired”. (ibid)

Both empowerment and dialogue were defined by Sight of Emotion in the planning process before the project, conceptualizing them as:

- **Empowerment definition**: self-sufficient and independent participants that can create dialogue with the visual world, as well as improve their skills and livelihood opportunities. This implies power within and power to.
- **Dialogue definition**: crucial space for participants to express themselves individually and in relation to others (both visual and non-visibility impaired).

The activities planned for the project include:

- **Preparation stage**: work to improve their self-esteem through art; provide access to technology; provide tools for an improved personal, educational and professional development, making sure that they fulfil the profile required for them to enter a private or governmental enterprise.
- **Sensitizing stage-sensory appreciation**: starting with the Human Resources team, sensitize private and governmental enterprises; sensitize the educational sector represented by the staff in schools and universities.
- **Investigation stage to determine the socially responsible companies**: choose a group of private and governmental enterprises to study their profile; identify the work areas where people of different characteristics could integrate and contribute with their work. Some of these areas could be: call centres, banks, universities, translators, research, cultural spheres, etc.
- **Partnership and consulting stage**: through consulting and partnerships, this formula to integrate people of different characteristics into the social, educational and work forces can be replicated on a national and international scale.

---

10 See interview with Gina Badenoch in the annexes.
Training

The training in the different workshops is conducted by facilitators specially trained in blind photography with a psychology team of the Association. The topics discussed and shot are chosen by the participants, generally in relation to their own life; while in the advanced photography part, the photographers invited may set lines of work.

The spaces for training are public spaces to enhance the participants enjoyment of their city and the outside world. They start discussing what to do, passing through the group decision making, and taking the photos. Once they took them, they have individual meetings with the psychologists to express their feelings and the meaning they give to the pictures; followed by group discussion to share their descriptions and ideas with the participants.

Once the workshop finishes, an exhibition is held in the NGO, museums, universities, etc. They create a Braille card for each picture and another one in black, and if they have the budget, they create a tactile diagram with audio to make the exhibition accessible for everyone. In one particular case, they prepared an exhibition of blind and non-blind photographers based on this accessibility concept without mentioning which photographer was visually or non-Visually impaired.

Evaluation and continuity

During 2008, the Association conducted a psychological, quantitative and qualitative research with the participants of the workshops, their families and those participating of exhibitions, events and sensitizing activities. At the same time, external experts participate in the monitoring process. One particular tool that they used to measure the participants emotional evolution is “Pensamiento Global Constructivo”, that focuses on experimental and emotional intelligence. The increment in this area shows a broader flexibility in thinking structure, acquiring abilities to adapt their processes of thinking to new ways and different situations. At the same time, it shows the increase of self-esteem and capacity to build relationships with others.
According to Gina Badenoch, the evidence of empowerment is that “the camera turned itself into an instrument for the visually impaired to have an excuse to go out into public spaces, interact with the outside world and with people who can see. This was corroborated with their own testimonies.” Approximately 100 people participated in the workshops during 2007 (Sight of Emotion, p.2). The psychological reports that are done by the psychology team through the process about their emotional changes is another way of understanding their evolution.

In relation to the society, the high level of interest and attendance (710 people in 2007) to the exhibitions and activities generated a demand for a space for understanding with other senses and technical advice in relation to images and Braille diagrams. At the same time, the blind participants earn a livelihood through the activities and fundraising events that they organize, what exposes them to have responsibilities and opportunities that later create long-term livelihoods (one participant, for example, after this experience managed to find a permanent job in a company).

Finally, the project is implementing a long-term management system in which some participants of the workshops become peer-educators to train others in photography and facilitate dynamics in the sensitizing workshops for companies in a complementary space (two facilitators: one visually and one non-visual impaired to show the integration and different sensitivities). At the same time, each one is encouraged to generate its own activities with support from the Association. In this sense, Sight of Emotion is building a networking space to ensure the quality of the workshops created by peer-educators in their own spaces and organisations.

Sources:


Phone Interview with Gina Badenoch, President and Manager of Sight of Emotion.
### 6.3.2 Project Foto Libras – Participatory Photography in Brazil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>&lt;&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of participation</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment definition</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue definition</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Media as output</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process as output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous research</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td>Formally organized</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Media exclusively</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media and participatory approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local management system</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FENEIS

FENEIS is the Federation of Education and Integration of deaf people in Brazil, whose major purpose is to divulge Libras (Brazilian sign language).

The project was established as a partnership between FENEIS and a group of professional photographers in Recife (who have since set themselves up formally as GEMA- Group for Education and Change through Visual Arts).
Introduction

At the beginning of 2007, FENEIS and GEMA started the project Foto Libras with a workshop for deaf people after issuing an open invitation to the local community in Recife, Brazil. There were 23 participants, the majority of whom (19) being young people between the age of 16 and 23, all in state schooling. The workshop was developed from February to October 2007 and after its completion 16 participants continued in a second phase to become peer educators.

The planning of the project was carried out by a team of coordinators: four hearing (photographers – two female, two male), two male (deaf) coordinators and the overall coordinator of FENEIS (a woman). Following the peer educators training, more responsibility, especially in terms of representing the project in events, has been handed over to the peer educators.

Goals

- **Overall objective:** To increase the opportunities for personal and professional development of young deaf people whilst simultaneously increasing the visibility of the deaf community in Recife. As such, the project has the higher aim of contributing to the fight for the realization of the rights of deaf people and valuing diversity as an integral part of inclusion.

- **Specific objectives:** to train 20 young deaf people in basic photography using participatory photography methodologies; to increase the self-expression, creativity, critical analysis and communication skills of course participants; to raise awareness amongst the deaf and non-deaf community of deaf rights and culture through the process of elaborating and disseminating photographic assignments on the reality of the deaf community; to increase the visibility of the deaf community and of FENEIS in general; to raise awareness and understanding about themes chosen by the participants and explored through thematic seminars; to stimulate and support the emergence of protagonists and peer educators to
disseminate information and develop further participatory photography projects with young deaf people; to increase the capacity of coordinators of the culture section of FENEIS in project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

Outcomes

- **Outcomes**: increased self-expression, creativity, self esteem and critical analysis of participants through participation in participatory photography project; increased visibility of the deaf community and FENEIS and awareness raised amongst about the rights of deaf people and deaf culture; emergence of deaf peer educators to disseminate information and develop further participatory photography projects with young deaf people; coordinators of the culture section of FENEIS trained in basic project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

Rachel Ellis, project coordinator, explained that another important outcome was the participant’s family involvement in the project. “Usually, other hearing family members do not know sign language and the photos provided an alternative channel of communication”.

Planning

Before starting the team planning meetings research was conducted about similar experiences in other organizations in Brazil and internationally, as well as about PP and deaf education.

Both empowerment and dialogue were defined by the Foto Libras team in the planning process before the project, conceptualizing them as:

- **Empowerment definition**: Increased self-esteem. This implies power within.
- **Dialogue definition**: Critical reflection related to different activities: read and interpret images, photo essays, themselves and others in those pictures and the feelings related to those reflections.
After the evaluation, the Foto Libras team have generated a list of the lessons learned through the process:

- **Planning / fundraising:** consider time for dissemination; provide flyers for the participants’ families; designate a time to get baseline information (through video or written); budget for film and developing photos ensured; training of interpreters and hearing staff on deaf awareness; communication materials in English, local language and sign language.

- **Implementation – coordination:** clarity of responsibilities and tasks for each member of the team; locate a suitable place for regular coordination meetings; ensure interpreters availability full-time.

- **Implementation – educational aspects:** make accessible the education material limiting text and adapting it to the needs of the group (baseline information is crucial for this); establish the focus on provoking thinking to read and interpret images and what this says about the world around them through group discussion; use different supports to show photos to try what works best for the group; ensure space to work individually, in small group and as a whole group too; use the cameras from the start point and assure availability to be taken home; in case of film camera, establish an appropriate system for storing negatives and printed photos before giving a second film to the participants; ensure involvement of the family, as subjects of photographs or with whom participants discuss their production; encourage student-to-student learning working in small groups; involve participants in the choice of thematic seminars (in case they are part of the course).

- **Monitoring and evaluation:** collect baseline data using video; have a mid-way and final evaluation with the group leading the discussions; encourage students to record their impressions of the course in video; provide enough time for reflective discussion.

- **Communication:** wide dissemination of the activities; regular newsletter in local and sign language.

- **Sustainability/continuity:** ensure course components related to peer educators; ensure feeling of co-ownership from the participants; early search for alternatives forms of funding; search alternative ways to raise awareness about the project that can raise funds (sale of photographs or postcards, for example).
Training

During the training, the coordinator asked the participants which thematic seminars they wanted to do. The group voted for two, one on deaf rights and the right to communication and another one on deaf culture and identity. Besides, the group decided that they wanted to focus on photography as much as possible, so the coordinator arranged visits from invited photographers to discuss their work and photographic essays.

The techniques used in the training were diverse: projection of photos and group discussion; individual reflection followed by small group discussion; one-on-one discussion with the facilitator followed by small groups. The process was cyclical and open to diversity in relation to what the participants were interested in doing.

In relation to the topics, the seminars were run separately from their discussions around photography to give them freedom to shoot whatever they agreed to. Now, in the second phase, the peer-educators are doing photographic essays on topics related to the seminars.

Finally, the coordination team recognised after the process which were the main challenges of the training process. Time and a fixed space for the project meetings were the two major challenges acknowledged. In the first case, they particularly mentioned in a report (Foto Libras, 2008) that it could be useful if more time was allowed for planning the classes and meetings between interpreters, educators and coordinators, as well as to better develop the educational material.

Evaluation and continuity

The methods of evaluation used included: information about participants that was collected in the application forms; weekly meetings of the coordination team to discuss the training; monitoring in video that was elaborated in the first round of interviews of 12 participants; a mid-term participatory evaluation and a final evaluation including participants, educators and
facilitators. Besides, after the course for peer-educators, Foto Libras conducted a formal evaluation in relation to the training.

Rachel Ellis, project coordinator, commented in the interview\(^\text{11}\): “the information collected in the application forms was not complete due to lack of Portuguese written ability of participants and restriction of time in relation to interpreters. Ideally the first session of the course should be dedicated to this and should be done in video”.

On the other hand, she highlighted that “something else worth bearing in mind is that participants had not previously been exposed to monitoring previously and thus this was a new concept to them, this also made doing monitoring and evaluation in a participatory manner absolutely crucial. We explored ways of collecting this information through stimulating group discussion and reflection, with and without interpreters and hearing coordinators present”.

In relation to continuity, after the peer-educator training, six participants have continued working to improve their photographic skills and to develop project proposals to enable Foto Libras II to be possible. Besides, early in 2008 two of them were recruited as coordinators of the project and are working part time to strengthen the project within FENEIS and to elaborate strategies to ensure that all aspects of the project are fully accessible to the deaf community.

Sources:


Phone interview with Rachel Ellis, project coordinator of Foto Libras.

\(^{11}\) See interview in the annexes.
6.3.3 Project Shooting Jozi – Participatory Photography in South Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>&lt;&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of participation</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment definition</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue definition</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Media as output</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Process as output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous research</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td>Formally organized</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Media exclusively</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Media and participatory approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local management system</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Global Studio**

“Global Studio was spearheaded by the United Nations Millennium Project Task Force on Improving the Lives of Slum Dwellers in 2004, and has been developed by Universities. Through participatory design and planning Global Studio addresses the need for design professionals to learn to work effectively with communities experiencing disadvantage or social exclusion, with the overall aim of developing more equitable, sustainable and liveable cities.” (Global Studio, 2007, p.3)

**Introduction**

Global Studio Johannesburg (GSJ) 2007 brought together over 100 students, teachers and practitioners of architecture, planning, landscape architecture, industrial design, community development and international relations from 52 universities and over 20 countries, to take
part in the international conference, People Building Better Cities (June 25-28) and the Global Studio workshop (July 4-19). The workshop included a range of community events (July 14/15) to engage the public in a dialogue on possible futures and a Future Directions Forum was held on July 19. (ibid p.7) The students worked in three communities in Johannesburg: Alexandra, Diepsloot and JoVi (Marshalltown).

Parallel to the conference and workshop, the participants were engaged in several activities. The PP project Shooting Jozi was among them, coordinated and planned by a student of the University of Sidney, Hugh Snelgrove.

**Goals**

- **Overall objective:** to work in direct collaboration with local community members, groups and leaders irrespective of age, sex, religion and/or socio economic standing.
- **Specific objective:** to use the x100 cameras donated to Global studio by FUJI Australia to document specific facets of the communities of Diepsloot and Alexandra. We will be working from the perspective of the local community members.

**Outcomes**

- **Outcomes:** photos and exhibitions; mainstream participants photos in the media; creative documentation of Alexandra and Diepsloot to help inform both locals and outsiders further activities.
- **Intended outcomes:** to establish a seed to spread the project with their own university students in the future; to help Global Studio participants and policy makers in South Africa identify recurring themes that will help improve the understanding of the local community.
Planning

Empowerment was defined by Shooting Jozi in the planning process before the project, conceptualizing them as: to give them voice to show their lives and raise their issues through media and exhibitions (power within). This was not the case of dialogue.

The activities planned for the project include:

- **Prior to Global Studio beginning**: touch base with local community groups before Global Studio begins through informal gatherings with locals to create interest in the project and build trust; give incentives for the local community to participate in the project (permanent record of their photos); group email all Global Studio Participants before Global Studio begins to inform them about Shooting Jozi, send them a presentation of previous successful projects ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Born_into_Brothels](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Born_into_Brothels) & [www.kidswithcameras.org](http://www.kidswithcameras.org)) and identify those who may have had experience working in the same medium in similar communities.

- **During Global Studio**: (July 1st-July 18th 2007) take time to win the trust of the local community spending time with them; frame shots before taking a photo discussing in the groups about the picture topic and using a frame to look through which mimics the final image (similar to “Growing up in cities” model [www.unesco.org/most/guic](http://www.unesco.org/most/guic)); identify opportunities and threads during the implementation to distribute the cameras in the community overnight or even returned after a few days.

- **After Global Studio**: media publication and exhibitions around the world, ensuring digitalization resolution for the Global Studio participants that wish to create an exhibition in their home country.

Training

As it was explained by Hugh Snelgrove, project coordinator, once Global Studio (GS) started, the participants of GS were briefed about the project and the methodology of work to become
facilitators. Each team created working groups with locals and chose an aspect of the community that they were working on to complement that project.

The teams had to communicate regularly among each other to share tips and maximise the effectiveness of using the cameras. Each group was free to choose how to create dialogue around the issues before taking the photographs.

**Evaluation and continuity**

Global Studio made a publication about the results of the meeting and all the activities. In 2008 some GS participants (10 from 90) went to evaluate the projects and try to continue them. But Shooting Jozi did not have formal evaluation.

The local participants shared their impressions with the facilitators and wrote about the meaning of their pictures. On the other hand, national and international media published the photos that, according to Hugh Snelgrove, gave locals the opportunity to advocate and express their opinions.

Continuity was not formally addressed, although students from South African universities who could continue it into the future, took part in the project.

**Sources:**


Internal planning documents of Shooting Jozi.

Phone interview with Hugh Snelgrove, project coordinator.
### 6.3.4 Project Documentation of rural experiences through PP and TICs – Participatory Photography in Bolivia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>&lt;&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;&gt;</th>
<th>Level of participation</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Interactive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Latent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue definition</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Process as output</td>
<td>Media as output</td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous research</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>Formally organized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Media and participatory approaches</td>
<td>Media exclusively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local management system</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AGRECOL Andes Foundation

AGRECOL Andes Foundation is an NGO from Bolivia that seeks to contribute to the diffusion and implementation of agro-ecological systems to improve the food security in rural societies from Los Andes, through knowledge management services and the creation of strategic and synergistic networks.

### Introduction

The project was carried out between June 2003 and July 2005 in five areas of Bolivia in 15 productive groups with the purpose of encouraging knowledge management of ecological
agriculture through documentation of experiences validated by the producers themselves and for exchange of these experiences.

The methodology developed promotes producers to involve themselves as main actors of this process of generation and exchange of knowledge through ICTs and farmer-to-farmer methodology. Particularly in ICTs, the project includes photographic digital camera to shoot pictures and film and the creation of PowerPoint presentations.

After its completion, a second phase was started in relation to knowledge self-management until September 2006. The needs and interests of the communities generated a third phase from 2007 until June 2008 that was focused on local sustainable development.

Goals

- **Overall objective**: knowledge management as a process to facilitate generation, recreation and diffusion of knowledge through methods like experimentation, training, exchange of users and media.

- **Specific objectives**: to give the communities space for manifestation of tacit and hidden knowledge –experiences, ideas, visions- through their own expression and visualization; to generate documentation of successful processes or experiences to be diffused among procedures and promote replication and adaptation; to influence favourable change related to policies in ecological production; to systematize the project allowing the monitoring of the strategy through the analysis and reflection of the lessons learned.

Outcomes

- **Outcomes**: farmers’ inclusion of the digital photographic camera as a regular management tool for community development; more than 600 rural families participating in the project through training, documentation and exchange; farmers’ became main actors of the participatory communication process assuming the principal role to rescue, value and promote the generation of local content in relation
to practical experience and knowledge from the community that are examples of sustainable natural resources management; 30 documented experiences carried out by the farmers and the communities; increase in community members self-confidence shown in the motivation to document their experiences and the interest to create new spaces to sustain the project (second and third phase).

Planning

AGRECOL Andes Foundation started the process of identifying the different actors involved in participatory documentation with a gender and life course approach to involve each one of them in the process and include their visions (leaders, men, women, youth, elders, etc.). After this identification, they implemented a cyclical and spiral process:

1. **Presentation and preparation:** institutional and community contact, presentation of the project, identification of the experience to document, selection of local facilitators and organization of activities.

2. **Training of local facilitator and field documentation:** module one –learning to manage ICTs-, module two –learning to create a presentation.

3. **Validation and final elaboration of products:** validation in the communities and elaboration of the final products.

4. **Exchange of experiences:** institutional contact, first visit, socialization of experiences exchange, replication and adjustment of the experience in the field, second visit.

Empowerment and dialogue were not formally defined, but according to Luis Carlos Aguilar\textsuperscript{12}, coordinator of ICTs in AGRECOL Andes Foundation, both concepts were implied in the methodology:

- **Empowerment:** he stressed in the interview that the revaluation of local knowledge generates self-confidence in the members of the community, who start to feel capable

\textsuperscript{12} See interview in annexes.
of solving their own problems. At the same time, he recognized the important role of learning to use ICTs as a photographic digital camera that gives farmers new skills with an inclusive perspective (considering levels of illiteracy) and increases self-confidence too. This implies power within and power to.

- **Dialogue:** As part of the methodology, the local facilitators have to fulfil some requirements that involve the different actors of the community in the process, to achieve representation of local knowledge and validation.

**Training**

The project in the field starts with the identification of the main actors in the process:

- **Local facilitators** (documentation team): they represent the communities where the documentation takes place. They are trained to use the ICTs (photographic digital camera and laptop), they collect and document the information, testimonies and images; and they participate in the exchange and diffusion process showing their fields as examples.

- **Women and men producers and their organisations:** they are the main actors in the documentation process, generating ideas and exchange of knowledge in the learning process.

- **Institutional facilitators** (technicians that work with the producers): They participate in the process of documentation as support in the different activities.

- **Technical ICT facilitator:** Trainer of local facilitators in the ICTs use and supporter of the team with participatory tools. He/she elaborates the final materials and help in the diffusion and exchange of experiences process.

Activities conducted in each part of the documentation process:

1. **Meetings with coordination:** meetings and workshops with NGO directors and field technicians to coordinate activities.
2. **Visit to the field:** community trip, brief diagnosis of experiences to be documented, participatory analysis and evaluation of the experience.

3. **Training workshop in audiovisual documentation:** participatory training workshop for local facilitators, that includes guided practices, basic concepts of photography, participatory script about the topic of the experience and the essential content with places and people responsible for the documentation, editing and management of photography in power point, exchange activities with a participatory approach to promote interrelation of farmer experiences.

Group discussion is formally used and established as one of the main tools in the process.

**Evaluation and continuity**

During the first year, the project elaborated 12 steps as a first methodology of documentation. Due to the lack of referential experiences, the documentation processes were complex and did not manage to change farmers’ reality. In the second year, the level of participation included both women and men. This allowed learning processes to take place and adapt the process to each local context. The methodology was changed from 12 to 4 steps, involving the local facilitators actively in the use of tools and equipment to generate the contents to share in the farmer-to-farmer trainings, for the promotion of products and project management. The methodology started to be applied in a cyclical way to generate new content and abilities to initiate new processes of documentation, exchange and learning.

In the first phase (2003-2005) the project involved 15 NGOs. In the second phase (2005-2006) the project involved 4 NGOs in a deep process to establish new work methodologies. They are formal independent organizations that apply formally to be part of the project and with whom AGRECOL Andes Foundation signed a commitment agreement to elaborate a joint plan for experiences documentation. Each NGO collaborated in the funding of the project with resources. At the same time, AGRECOL Andes Foundation followed up the processes done by the participant’s organizations from the first phase.
At the end, the organizations were involved in a participatory evaluation about experiences gained up to now and planning process for the next stage. The third phase (2007-2008) engaged them in a local self-development planning process involving other actors of the community (government, schools, etc.). In this stage, Telecentres Management Committees were created, with the participation of community members, authorities of the community and those who represent each grassroots organization, and the creation of a financial plan and rules and regulations for use and implementation.

Some of the lessons learned by AGRECOL Andes Foundation in the first stage of the process involved:

1. **Need of sustainable application of the ICTs** (digital cameras and laptops): The short-term training proved to be insufficient, requiring time and dedication, particularly in communities with lack of formal education and few possibilities to be in contact with ICTs. Only with a solid base the community could be self-sufficient in the management of technology. At the same time, the process provoked inter-generational cooperation among young and elder members of the community in the exchange of knowledge that generally is only done by adults and elders.

2. **The documentation processes help increase self-confidence** of the participants involved in the generation and socialization of knowledge.

3. **Collective process of reflection**: the photographic documentation, its validation and presentation generated collective reflection on the processes related to natural resource management in rural communities, what achieved an improvement in agro-ecological practices.

4. **Equipment organization**: the organization of the use of equipment is crucial to facilitate the process. A neutral space that everyone can access facilitated the participation of the different actors.

5. **Monitoring**: The monitoring should be carried out by the local participants with support of the technical organizations that are/were part of the process.
### 6.3.5 PV training of trainers Markets & Livelihoods, Practical Action & Insight – Participatory Video in Peru

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>&lt;&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of participation</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment definition</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Latent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue definition</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Latent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Media as output</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Process as output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous research</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td>Formally organized</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Media exclusively</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Media and participatory approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local management system</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Practical Action and Insight**

Practical Action works with poor communities to help them choose and use technology to improve their lives for today and generations to come.
Insight is a UK/France based organisation pioneering the use of Participatory Video as a tool for empowering individuals and communities.

**Introduction**

Practical Action and Insight implemented in 2007 a pilot project to train trainers of participatory video in Cuzco, Peru. The main interest of Practical Action is to involve PV in participatory market systems development, particularly in the areas of farmer to farmer technology transfer, farmers dialogue and coordination (through participatory storyboarding), and farmers influence on market actors and policy-makers.

The training was done to a mixed group: members of staff of Practical Action Peru and Kamajuqz, the local agriculture experts. Later the Peru Communications team trained the staff of Infolactea—a dairy info centre in Cajamarca promoted by Practical Action—who followed the same lines and trained farmers to become local facilitators and produce information for the community. On the other hand, the Kamajuqz produced their own video to share their position in a participatory market mapping workshop.

Today Practical Action is evaluating the changes that have to be done in the internal procedures to fully implement PV in their work methodology, not only in Peru but in other countries in Asia and Africa too.

**Goals**

- **Overall objective:** to build the capacity of the Peru staff and Kamayuqz to effectively use participatory video for pro-poor market development
- **Specific objectives:** to improve horizontal technological transference (farmer-to-farmer), coordination and cooperation, dialogue and learning processes to empower farmers in the market negotiation process, and collaboration of a wide variety of actors and policy-makers to work together to improve markets functioning.
Outcomes

- **Outcomes:** confirmation of the need for coordination among project managers and communication team; encouragement to participate more proactively in other projects in relation to the video motivation, particularly young people; local knowledge transference through the technique (becoming a teacher of others); self-confidence and dialogue to express community interests and improve market negotiations.

Planning

The concept of dialogue and empowerment were defined in a connected perspective:

- **Empowerment and dialogue:** generation of space for dialogue that results in self-confidence and community capacities for negotiation through particular activities (participatory storyboard, community screening, group discussion, filming and feedback processes). This implies power within and with.

Training

The training for trainers was conducted from the 14th to the 29th April 2007. The main focus was on participatory approaches to become facilitators, the use of a participatory storyboard to promote group discussion in the community and the use of PV to communicate community ideas. At the same time, the process was filmed to create a DVD for the area Markets & Livelihoods from Practical Action, to be shared in all of the country offices that the project is taking place (Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Sudan and Zimbabwe).

After an introduction with games, some theoretical background and learning about participatory approaches, the participants did the ‘hands-on training’, the production of a PV and the community screening, as well as reflection and evaluation.
According to Nick Lunch, co-director of Insight and facilitator of the training, the most difficult part of the training is the one related to the participatory ethos. “That is key for a long-term sustainable project, because the video-related learning points are quick and easy to incorporate”. The group mix was a challenge, according to him, because it was formed by both staff members and local agriculture promoters.

**Evaluation and continuity**

The training team from Insight carried out mid-term and final evaluation during the workshop. They have used non-literate participatory tools, like cartoons and audio, among others. They particularly asked questions in relation to facilitation. The cartoons and voice messages have shown challenges related to access to the communities, logistics and communications problems, and rising expectations of the community.

After the workshop, Practical Action carried out meetings with the Peruvian team to evaluate how beneficial was the process for them. According to Luis Osorio\textsuperscript{13}, international coordinator of Markets & Livelihoods, one of the lessons that the pilot project left them with is that PV should be internally guided by the communication team and the project managers should be aware of the features and utility to ask for its use when is appropriate for a project.

The Peruvian office in Cajamarca, for example, started to replicate the process and trained local facilitators in PV in the project Infolactea (for milk producers). In this office the spread of the tool was quickly because both communication and project management function under the same area.

The promoters from Cajamarca are generating storyboards with the communities and producing videos. Up to now, they have done five and today they are interested in learning edition so they can have independence in the production of information. At the same time, the office of Cajamarca has detected the need to provide particular equipment for a region

---

\textsuperscript{13} See interview in annexes.
where many use solar electricity and it is windy (special cameras and microphones for these conditions). The use of video generated more interest and motivation in the community to discuss about other topics like natural disasters and tourism, and not only in relation to milk production.

Sources:

Practical Action UK and Insight. Internal documents related to the planning and evaluation processes.

Practical Action website: [http://practicalaction.org/?id=participatory_video1](http://practicalaction.org/?id=participatory_video1)

Phone Interview with Luis Osorio, Practical Action UK, Maria Sol Blanco, Infolactea Peru, and Nick Lunch, Insight.

6.3.6 Project Beyond Vision – Participatory Photography in Ecuador. PhotoVoice & JUCONI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>&lt;&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of participation</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment definition</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Latent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue definition</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Latent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Media as output</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Process as output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous research</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td>Formally organized</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Media exclusively</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Media and participatory approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local management system</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Photo Voice and JUCONI

PhotoVoice’s mission is to bring about positive social change for marginalised communities through providing them with photographic training through which they can advocate, express themselves and generate income.

JUCONI (Junto con los Niños or Together with the Children) was founded in 1995 as an Ecuadorian not-for-profit organisation that provides specialised educational and therapeutic services to street-working children and their families.

Introduction

As it was described by PhotoVoice, Beyond Vision is a “self-advocacy and vocational training photography project for street children in the slums areas of Guayaquil, Ecuador.” (Photo Voice, 2007, p. 3). The project was done in two phases. The first one in July 2005 was a 3-month workshop and the second one has started in 2008 after a process of evaluation and research during 2006-2007.

Up to date, they had trained 35 street children in three of Guayaquil’s slum areas. The children’s photographs from 2005 project were exhibited in each township in Guayaquil, at the International Gallery of Children’s Art in London –where local children participated in a workshop for an exchange programme through photography- and at the New York’s Children’s Museum of the Arts.

In September 2006 the project coordinators conducted a feasibility study to create the networks and develop the structure of the project. In February 2007 an 8-week pilot project was run in partnership between JUCONI and The Chantal Fontaine School of Photography for 15 young people. On this base, Beyond Vision entered in the second phase in which has the goal to train 45 street and working children during 2008-2009. The activities started in January 2008.

The activities include two beginner courses and one advanced course in photography, in which peer educators will be trained enabling them to run photography workshops and beginner courses with up to an additional 50 young people a year. Participants will be placed in work
placements, internships and mentoring schemes within local photographic businesses and in partnership with Ecuadorian professional photographers. Income generation schemes will be developed to ensure the project in the long term becomes self-sustaining.

Goals

- **Overall objective:** to offer highly marginalised children in Ecuador opportunities for self-development, self-advocacy and vocational training.
- **Specific objectives:** to provide 45 marginalised children with professional vocational training in photography; to provide 15 participants of the advanced photographic training with work placements, internships and networking opportunities within the professional Ecuadorian photography industry; to empower 45 marginalised children by encouraging creativity, building self-confidence and enabling them to speak out about issues of importance to them; to build transferable and sustainable life skills by providing marginalised children with a training that will lead to increased communication, literacy, computer and digital media skills; to create a team of 15 peer educators with the skills and resources to run photographic workshops for wider groups of young people (over 50 between 2007-09, many more beyond this); to produce a body of work that gives the participants a public voice, that challenges stereotypes and raises awareness of the experiences of marginalised young people in both their local community and internationally; to promote the children’s imagery through exhibitions, the internet and a publication.

Intended outcomes

- **Self development outcomes:** enhanced self-esteem and confidence for all participants.
- **Vocational and employment outcomes:** photographic vocational training for 45 young people with limited educational and employment opportunities, increasing literacy, visual literacy, communication, computer and digital media skills; employment opportunities for graduates of the advanced vocational training; 15 internships and work placements in local photographic industries; a team of 15 peer educators that will run workshops other young people through JUCONI.
• **Advocacy outcomes:** a major exhibition of the children’s photography and artwork will be held in the city museum in Guayaquil and to travel round the capital cities of Latin American countries as well as the UK, to generate awareness of the lives of street children in Ecuador; a booklet and website that will showcase the participant’s work and generate income for ongoing project costs beyond the grant end.

**Planning**

JUCONI, that gives personal assistance to street children in the areas the project is taking place, selected the participants from those who already are taking part of the “friendship operation” of the association. JUCONI’s educators make contact with the children in the street and create a space of friendship with visits to their houses. They know the children for months or even years, so they invited them to participate in Beyond Vision. As a result, 23 teenagers (15-18 years old) were chosen to take part in this second phase of the process and today (after 6 months) 13 continue for the final advance workshop.

According to Edison Eloy Mata Vélez\(^\text{14}\) -project coordinator- the learning process from the first workshop in 2005 helped them to re-defined the intended participants, and instead of children from 8-12 years old this time they selected teenagers (15-18 years old) for the second phase of the project, who are more prepared for a 10-month process and working opportunities.

Both empowerment and dialogue were defined by PhotoVoice in the planning process before the project, conceptualizing them as:

- **Empowerment definition:** enhanced self-esteem and confidence for all participants and acquisition of educational and employment skills. This implies power within and power to.
- **Dialogue definition:** participants space to define what they want to speak about and take photos about.

\(^{14}\) See interview in annexes.
The activities planned for the second phase of the project include:

- **January – August 2007**: pilot 12 week advanced photographic course held in partnership with the Chantal Fontaine School of Photography; pilot course to include outshoot trips, darkroom and digital training and work placements and to culminate in an exhibition; Juconi to carry out extensive evaluation of the pilot course

- **September – February 2008**: recruitment and training of local project manager; recruitment of 15 young people for first beginners course; training for the Chantal Fontaine facilitators; first 3 month beginners course begins – including outshoot trips, darkroom and digital training, township exhibition of work produced on the beginners course, evaluation of the first beginners course and recruitment for the 2nd beginners course

- **March – July 2008**: second 3 month beginners course begins - including outshoot trips, darkroom and digital training, township exhibition of work produced on the beginners course; evaluation of second Beginners course; networking and building of partnerships within the Ecuadorian photographic, industry - sourcing and confirmation of internships and work placements

- **August 2008 – March 2009**: recruitment and selection of participants for the advanced course; 3 month advanced course; 4 month work placements / internships for advanced course participants; local township exhibition of work produced on the advanced course; evaluation of the advanced course

- **April – September 2009**: employment opportunities and mentoring relationships established for participants; seeking to earn income from the photographic industry; peer led participatory photography workshops for 50 young people; production of website and booklet; high profile exhibition and linked media work in Ecuador (Guayaquil and Quito) and to travel within Latin America; exhibitions internationally – UK and USA; final monitoring and evaluation and recommendations for self-sustainability.

Some of the responsibilities of the project manager include: building networks within the Ecuadorian photographic industry to ensure Beyond Vision secures high level partnerships providing participants with valuable opportunities to establish themselves to earn an income through the photographic and related industries; establishing mentoring relationships to
ensure the project networks are sustainable and that participants gain from one-on-one support; engaging the participants in their own income generating photographic activities – making products to sell (prints / postcards) and doing studio portraiture and wedding and event photography.

Training

The beginner courses were prepared for 30 participants with duration of three months each. The participants acquired introductory training in digital and analogue photography, studio skills and darkroom techniques. The courses combined theoretical training with practical outshoots and editing and discussion around images, and they culminated with a local exhibition for friends and families.

For each course, three students from The Chantal Fontaine School of Photography were chosen to co-ordinate the Beyond Vision courses as a key module of their final degrees. These student-facilitators were supported by Chantal Fontaine, JUCONI staff and Beyond Vision project manager to ensure the training is of high standard.

In July 2008 the advanced course has started with 13 participants. This will have duration of three months, in which they will learn advanced photographic skills and computer skills to construct and keep the website updated with their current photographs. There will be lectures on both professionalism and working within the photographic industry given by local photographers/artists and the participants will be encouraged to enter into photographic competitions and exhibitions to help raise their profile and professionalism whilst broadening their opportunities for employment on completion of the advanced course.

Edison Eloy Mata Vélez explained: “As facilitator I motivate them and ask them what they want to do to plan each day. We use corporal expression, group dynamics, creativity games and individual dynamics to express their feelings, memory and creativity.” In the first part, the participants have chosen to take pictures on their own areas, deciding together the topics to cover. Now they are starting to take pictures in other public places that they asked to be the
settings for this second part of the year. At the same time, they decided to participate in a competition and take pictures on the topic asked as a pre-requisite for entry.

**Evaluation and continuity**

According to the project coordinator, the most important outcome of this first part of the year is the motivation and interest that the participants have shown. In this sense, he explains: “they are compromised, they establish the activities, take responsibilities like taking care of the equipment, establish the topics to discuss and picture; they even set the timetable they prefer for the weekly activities. You can appreciate their interest to achieve their goals.”

The formal evaluation contemplates monthly reports from the project coordinator to PhotoVoice, and after each workshop they used different techniques (questionnaires, written reports, interviews, small group discussions, tape recordings, written diaries, comment boxes, ‘graffiti’ walls, drawings, observation, and a display of the work in progress) to listen the opinions of the participants, their families and the educators involved.

At the same time, JUCONI will create profiles of each child participating to monitor their individual progress using the Goodman Childrens Model of Psychosocial Self-Esteem. Finally, at the end of the project a survey will assess the vocational objectives using quantitative tools to compile data related to number of job/placements secured, income generated, networks and partnerships established. Skills audits will also be carried out to monitor skills improvements.

In relation to continuity, the long-term sustainability of the project is one of the priorities of the PhotoVoice and JUCONI. In this sense, the networks with the industry and the local income streams are thought to provide funds for future training and local activities by the peer-educators trained in the advanced course. At the same time, if the project model is proven successful, JUCONI aims to replicate it in sister organisations working with street and working children in other Latin American cities.
The workshops trained by peer educators will be concentrated on photography as a creative outlet to enable children to speak out about the issues affecting their lives. According to the project coordinator, they expect the peer-educators to generate a positive role model to follow and to be able to transmit knowledge and skills to other children and the community.

Sources:


Phone interview with Edison Eloy Mata Vélez, project coordinator of Beyond Vision in Ecuador.


6.3.7 Programme Empowerment through arts and media – Participatory Video in Africa and Latin America. PLAN International

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>&lt;&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of participation</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment definition</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Latent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue definition</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Latent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Media as output</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Process as output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous research</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussion</td>
<td>Formally organized</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Media exclusively</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Media and participatory approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local management system</td>
<td>Implemented</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Not implemented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLAN

“PLAN works to achieve lasting improvements for children living in poverty in developing countries, through a process that unites people across cultures and adds meaning and value to their lives.” (PLAN Mission: http://www.plan-international.org/about)

Introduction

PLAN has developed a programme for youth empowerment through arts and media in two stages: 2005-2007 and 2008-2010. During the first stage, they piloted the project in Uganda, the Dominican Republic and Togo. The second stage will be carried out in eight African countries that requested the programme: Senegal, Ghana, Mali, Niger, Kenya, Egypt, Rwanda and Mozambique.

Youth groups in different communities learn to map the place they live in, identify cultural traditions and the challenges the community face producing videos around those topics (PLAN, 2008). Once they finish the filming and editing, they upload those videos in a website called “Visit a Village” to create a network and exchange communities profiles and experiences among peers from around the world.

PLAN has been working in the areas of protection and participation with young people through local partners. This particular project is focused on youth (ages 12-24) in rural communities using participatory video to create media capacity building and arts programme to include the wider community (through arts workshops and curricula for schools, including the interactive website).

Goals

- **Overall objective:** empower youth to use arts and media to research, analyze and resolve issues at the local and national levels and to engage their peers locally,
nationally and globally in understanding these issues and helping resolve them by 2010.

• **Specific objectives:** a) build lasting media and arts-based research, analysis and communications skills among youth and communities; b) allow youth worldwide to share their culture, traditions, opinions, issues, challenges and strengths via videos and arts through an interactive website; c) create interactive school curricula to help students worldwide understand and meaningfully engage and support their peers.

**Intended outcomes**

- **Main outcomes from the three projects 2005-2007:** Changes in youth perspective on what they are able to do and confidence that they can do a video and they have abilities. At the same time, improvement in their relationships with other members of the communities and, in some cases, creation of space to discover groups that they were not involve with before.

- **Intended outcomes for 2008-2010:** 112 youth and 56 partner staff trained in youth media, 400 community members and 16 partner staff trained in arts based expression, participating youth are seen and heard by their local and national societies, students in Africa are engaging with one another around common issues via school curriculum, students globally are engaging with African youth issues via a school curriculum, youth worldwide are using the website to learn about African issues and comment on them, African youth are updating their web pages to respond to comments and questions from youth worldwide, youth worldwide are raising awareness and advocating issues impacting African youth, participating youth, organizations and/or Plan staff are recognized for the project by the media or similar organizations.

**Planning**

In PLAN words (PLAN, 2008, p. 4): “what started off as a fundraising ‘virtual visit’ project turned into a youth-youth exchange where U.S. and Ugandan youth created a video project together” in Uganda in 2005. The lessons learned from that experience (related to unnecessary expenses and youth preparation for participation and creation of media) lead to change the planning and training processes for the Dominican Republic and the Togo
projects\textsuperscript{15}. At the same time, those experiences lead to adjust the final proposal for 2008-2010 in the eight African countries.

Both empowerment and dialogue were defined by PLAN in the planning process before each project, conceptualizing them as:

- **Empowerment definition**: to give the youth we work with the possibility to talk more with other members of the community and give them tools to be more involved in decision making in the community in relation to what they want. At the same time, to give a space to critical understanding of the issues happening in their communities. “We don’t set an agenda related to development but the issues that are important for that community are those that the youth choose to discuss about”. This implies power with, power to and power within.

- **Dialogue definition**: the opportunity to speak about whatever they want and at the same time gain skills.

The activities planned for each project include:

- **Project Preparation**: hiring of overall project director and core project artist; selection and briefing of point people in participating countries, initial partnership identification; identification and selection of web design partner, agreement on design and maintenance; quick assessment of internet capacities in the countries (Plan office, country-wide); establishing calendar of activities for the overall project.

- **Project cycle per country**: selecting community, local partners, staff to involve in the project; re-vamping of the training pack to fit the local situation in each participating country; including translation; meeting with selected communities to inform them more in depth about the project; selection of youth and securing their corresponding paperwork (permission slips and volunteer agreements); equipment purchase and set up; local agreements w/partners; youth media training in each country (includes: introduction to the project, community meeting, creation of the community map, identification and discussion of themes and issues to cover, child protection and journalistic ethics, interview training, video training, sound/light training,
photography, logging and notes/organization, going to the community to interview and film, editing training and first edits of the videos by youth, critique and re-editing, plan for follow up, final evaluation of the training; translation of videos from local language to French/English (by Plan staff or hired translator upon finalization of each one); training/work with arts in each country (includes: introduction to the project, using paints and canvas, using light and shadows, different types/styles of painting, interpreting meaning in painting, discussion of the meanings, possible solutions to these issues); local celebration at national level and show videos and artwork made.

Follow up per country by Project Director and Core Artist: video clean up and editing for form/style, child protection (font, titles, etc.); photo organization and captioning; finalization of the community map and making it web-ready; editing the community profile (original created by the youth) and any other text; upload of video translations via dotsub.com; creation of downloadable curriculum (focuses on country’s particular theme/s); creation of website for the country within overall frame of the whole website (includes: map of community, placement of videos/icons on map; placement of art work, background information, projects that could be funded, interactive portions, curriculum, surveys to capture learning); marketing the project and website (schools and youth groups/organizations in and outside of Africa; newsletters, magazines, etc.; sharing the site amongst other youth oriented global websites such as Taking IT Global; linking to the site from Child Rights organizations; looking at theme-related sites and generating traffic in general; presenting at conferences; managing updates and new video submissions by each country on a regular basis; liaising with web partner for web tracking, evaluating, updating information; project reporting, tracking and public relations support.

Follow up in country by Plan staff or partners after initial training: meet once a month with local partner to revise any communications/comments to their website; creation of new arts/media content every 3 months that responds to questions asked by youth website visitors; build partnerships with Ministries of Education for use of curriculum in local schools in Africa.
Training

PLAN’s programme was built from each previous experience in the three pilot projects done since 2005. To be able to appreciate this learning process here is a brief description of the three training processes:

- **Uganda**: Five North American youth travelled in August 2005 with four adults (including a videographer) and paired up with four Ugandan youth, one Rwandan youth and a media consultant from Uganda to create the virtual visit. “The selection of the Ugandan youth was hindered by Uganda’s lack of an existing child media program and school exam time. The youth that were selected therefore had no prior experience with any type of media. That coupled with insufficient time and lack of depth of media training for the youth during the actual visit to Uganda meant that some of the interviews were not engaging. The editing was not done by the youth themselves. Working with an outside consultant who was overstretched meant that the product was not up to par in some cases, and timeliness was an issue. Costs were high due to the additional travel costs of bringing US students.” (PLAN, 2008, p. 15)

- **The Dominican Republic**: 9-days workshop in April 2007. “In an effort to reduce costs, build sustainability and rely on local resources, a local media technician was hired to support and a staff member from Plan El Salvador was invited to participate to conduct the video training based on his prior experience with similar trainings together with a Plan USA staff member who was involved in the Uganda virtual visit” (ibid, p.16). The youth group was integrated by 18 Dominican youth from Arts and Media clubs. The first days were dedicated to know each other and establish the environment with games. After that, the youth group watched the videos done in the Ugandan project and generated a discussion of similarities and differences with youth people in the other country. From that point, they started the discussion of their own community. The facilitator (local partner) had freedom to choose how to guide the discussion. Generally, the young people started asking questions that created the space to discuss the issues that were interesting for them. Once they discussed the issues they would like to work on, they presented the project to the community in a meeting and started the research process about the topics. The next step was a group discussion to work on the ideas they had and the information they found, as well as prioritize the ideas together. They placed the information on a map they have already
done about the community so everyone could see what they were working on. The next steps are the filming and editing, what they did with minimal adult support.

- **Togo**: 2 weeks workshop in June 2007. The training was designed in relation to the experiences in The Dominican Republic in conjunction with Plan Togo’s Multi Media Centre project. Two staff and 1 video consultant participated from Plan USA, 5 staff from Plan Togo and the Togolese television station sent 3 staff to support the training and follow up. The youth group was formed by 13 participants who were trained in mapping, prioritizing, interviewing, photography, filming and editing. The youth had prior experience in computer training, print media and radio due to Multimedia Centre projects in the past.

The group discussion was established as a key component of the training, particularly important at the beginning of the process to give the space to the participant to decide on the topics they want to work on in relation to their communities.

**Evaluation and continuity**

During the training, each project had the space for daily evaluation at the end of the day, where the participants had the space to say something about their learning process and their feelings. During the filming process, this space included daily screening to evaluate the material and give their opinions. According to Linda Raftree\(^\text{16}\), from PLAN USA, this gave the facilitators and the staff the flexibility to change the agenda for the following day, according to the comments of the participants. In one case, for example, some participants felt frustrated with the editing process, so they all decided to change the activities to do something they were comfortable with. The staff participating were evaluated too.

The results were different in each context. In The Dominican Republic, for example, “They were an organised group and we wanted to help them to strengthen what they were already doing. In Togo they were already a group too, and they wanted to train other groups they belong to, to be able to use the equipment. At the same time, they started thinking what other

---

\(^{16}\) See interview in annexes.
things they can use video for as income generation for them, education and advocacy purposes.”

The video and computer equipment is available for the youth groups through the local partners to continue creating videos. “Once the initial training, website and curriculum are created, costs are quite low for continued video production and uploading.” (PLAN, 2008, p. 14) In the second stage (2008-2010) the virtual visit website will give the possibility to continue the project locally with updated material created by the groups and globally engaging youth to network and support each other.

The internal mechanism for monitoring and evaluation include: a) a baseline pre-survey for youth and community members before arts/media training takes place; b) project/country level evaluations at the end of project training by all involved; c) interactive and fun pre- and post- surveys for youth who visit the website; d) web tracking; e) a teacher survey for feedback on the curricula; and f) feedback from Plan’s Child Rights Technical Network, Media Advisors.

Sources:
Phone interview with Linda Raftree, Director Youth Engagement and Action, PLAN USA.
PLAN International: [http://www.plan-international.org/about](http://www.plan-international.org/about)

### 6.3.8 Centre for Communicator Mayan Women NUTZIJ– Participatory video in Guatemala

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>&lt;&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;</th>
<th>&lt;&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>&gt;&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of participation</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Short-term</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>Top-down</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Bottom-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment definition</td>
<td>Manifest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Latent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NUTZIJ

NUTZIJ (My Word, in Maya Kaqchikel) is known as the Centre for Communicator Mayan Women whose mission is to promote development and technological access to indigenous women through participation.

Introduction

After a research process done by university students that are part of the community and a training process done by Padma Guidi\(^1\), in 1997 NUTZIJ was created as a result of the response by local women and the first workshop took place. After 12 years of work, approximately 500 Mayan women have been trained in participatory video to become community workers and participate in the economic, social and cultural development of their communities.

These community workers are called “Popular indigenous communicator”, and have training in PV and the use of computers and internet. With those skills they facilitate local dialogue and have an opportunity to create their own livelihood.

---

\(^{1}\) A US practitioner with experience in US, India and Czechoslovakia.
Goals

- **Overall objectives**: to educate, train and support indigenous women in the use of ICTs and video to exchange and diffuse information relevant to sustainable community development; to develop creative and practical ways of using technology at a community level; to create a space for dialogue and diffusion; to create a space for indigenous women’s participation.

- **Specific objectives**: to contribute to the incremental communication in civil society; to improve self-esteem and analysis capacity; to create employment opportunities for women; to educate indigenous women in ICTs; to create capacity-building in the civil society to participate and formulate research related to video and ICTs; to promote educational, cultural, social and environmental programmes; to promote the use of the internet in the Mayan communities.

Outcomes

- **Outcomes**: increase of leadership and analytical capacities of communicator Mayan women; capacity of advocacy through video at community, national and international level; self-confidence and pride in the community after the process of discussion and sharing of problems and possible solutions through the production of videos; dialogue space for Mayan communities about community development.

Planning

Each year Mayan women from different departments in Guatemala participate in workshops to be trained in PV and different topics. The issues discussed are chosen by the participants (gender, indigenous rights, HIV/AIDS, etc.) and the production of the videos is guided by their communities, according to their interests. For example, one community decided to produce a video related to the Peace Treaty to advocate to the national government concern about actions that were taking place.

After the workshop, the participants become community workers with access to equipment in Telecentres and NUTZIJ and produce a wide variety and amount of videos for community
dialogue, advocacy and networking. “Management of the existing telecentre is in the hands of local people, who receive support from Nutzij” (Gumucio Dagron, 2001, p.203).

The constraints with which NUTZIJ is working today include practical obstacles such as: technical equipment, access to electricity in some areas and telephone lines. The creation of groups to share equipment and the creation of community telephones are some of the solutions they implemented; although funding is the major constraint of the association.

Both empowerment and dialogue were defined by NUTZIJ who conceptualised them as:

- **Empowerment definition:** participants’ decision making and guidance of the planning and training process to then generate community dialogue and become community leaders.
- **Dialogue definition:** Space for discussion and consensus in the community during and after the filming process (production, screenings and festivals).

**Training**

Once the participants set the topics to be discussed, they are first trained in PV and ICTs (use of computer and internet) and then in the topic they have chosen (gender, rights, etc.). The workshops are generally done twice a year, with approx. 40 participants in each one. Depending on available funds, some are 12 and others 18 months in length.

One of the main parts of the PV training is community discussion to extract the ideas for the production of videos and the community screening process after the video was filmed.

**Evaluation and continuity**

The main evaluation methodology is done by video, to film experiences and feelings of the participants and their communities. At the same time, in some cases, written documentation is kept for some experiences.
Approximately 500 women became communicator Mayan women and local facilitators. As a pre-requisite to participate in the workshops, they have to present several letters from the community approving their participation to become local facilitators and they sign an agreement that they commit themselves to serve their communities and multiply knowledge training amongst other community members. Through this process, “women open up a space in their communities to discuss any issues the community wants to” (Juliana Julajuj Hom, phone interview\(^\text{18}\))

Those 500 women are part of NUTZIJ creating a network and using their skills as a livelihood too. Today NUTZIJ is trying to implement a virtual network through internet and achieve a community TV channel for permanent space of Mayan content with the videos that each member is creating today for their communities.

Sources:
NUTZIJ website: [http://www.interconnection.org/cmcm/](http://www.interconnection.org/cmcm/)
Phone interview with Juliana Julajuj Hom, coordinator of NUTZIJ.
NUTZIJ strategic plan and background information. Internal document.

\(^{18}\) See interview in annexes.
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