

EVALUATION OF

DEVELOPMENT MOTIVATION AND LEADERSHIP TRAINING
PROGRAMME

OF

INDO-GERMAN SOCIAL SERVICE SOCIETY, DELHI

(? 1988.)

EVALUATION OF DEVELOPMENT MOTIVATION & LEADERSHIP TRAINING
PROGRAMME OF INDO-GERMAN SOCIAL SERVICE SOCIETY, DELHI.

CHAPTER - I

BACKGROUND

I.1 The Catholic Church and Development in India -

Within the historical perspective of India, the Catholic Church has played a leading part in the organisation and motivation of people from the weakest segments of society, as far back as the early 1970s. The participation of Catholic priests in the organisation of the fisherfolk in Kerala, and the motivational training programmes set up by the Indian Social Inst. also date back to this period.

The Indo German Social Service Society itself has sponsored motivation training courses even as far back as 1979 e.g. the motivation course of community development of the Kumbakonam Multi-Purpose Social Service Society from 22nd to 27th January 1979. Sanction for Rs.20,000/- was given to the Kumbakonam Multi-Purpose Social Service Society under grant Sp(Tn-242) 78-104 of 9th January 1979. Again under their letter 343 dt. 30th August, 1979 the Indo-German Social Service Society circulated a note on 'Development, Motivation and Community Development Leadership Training Programme'. In this note the Indo German Social Service Society proposed as an interim and immediate measure to assist a selected small number of project holders in the field of development, motivation and community development leadership training with small amount so that, atleast, a few and most deserving of such of those project holders, who have already made some preparation for the N.A.E.P., and who are still awaiting approval of the Government, may be able to initiate the implementation of this important programme in a modified way.

I.2 The DMLTP as introduced by I.G.S.S.S. -

While this original programme was linked to the National Adult Education programme of the Government of India, at a later stage I.G.S.S.S. approached Misereor for funding for coverage of 100 programmes of development, motivation, leadership training throughout India and set up a budget amounting to Rs.85,000/- for each of the projects.

The suggested mix was 2 church : 1 secular projects. Misereor cut down the number from 100 to 60 at the same ratio of 2:1 for church / secular organisations, and reduced the budget from Rs. 85,000/- to Rs.75,000/- each. Misereor also cut back a request for provision for a socio-economic survey. As no provision existed for training programmes, consultations etc., the DMLTP Advisory Committee of I.G.S.S.S. suggested that Rs.2,500/- be held back from each of these organisations to cover such costs.

According to I.G.S.S.S. note: 311 of 18.6.1985 Misereor e.V. and Zentralstelle through I.G.S.S.S. would financially assist 40 Dioceses and 20 non-church related organisations to implement the DMLTP for two years only. According to this note once the sanctioned fund is exhausted, the local financial resources may be used for conducting future DMLTP, if needed. While some groups had requested it for DMLTP type programmes, even prior to the Misereor sanction, these were comparatively few, and in order to open the field to others who were not aware of the possibilities of such support from I.G.S.S.S. I.G.S.S.S. held two workshops for introducing and/or training groups in the development, motivation, leadership training programmes. The first was in Bhopal in 1984 and the second in Shillong in 1985.

The Bhopal workshop was set up for providing orientation to DMLTP project holders in the Northern Region. The Shillong workshop, besides providing orientation, included other Dioceses from the North-Eastern Region, as the members of DMLTP project holders in the region was rather low, in the hope of promoting greater interest in DMLTP.

I.3 The status of DMLTP, as on 11th April 1986.

As of 11th April, 1986 the position of DMLTP was as follows:-

REGIONS	NO OF STATES COVERED	DMLTPs UPROOT		
		Diocease	Secular	Total.
Southern	5 (on going)	13	4	17
	(yet to start)	1	2	3
Northern	7 (on going)	13	1	14
	(yet to start)	2	3	5
North-Eastern	5 (on going)	9	4	13
	(yet to start)	1	2	3
		30	16	55
Total on going		: 44		
Total yet to start		: 11		

It is against this background that the evaluation of DMLTP programme of the I.G.S.S.S. was set up.

CHAPTER - II

FOLLOW - UP

II.1 DMLTP documentation -

The note 'An effective development, motivation and leadership training programme' (DMLTP)' Number 311 of 18.6.1985' lays down on pages 8 and 9 the point - "What should be the type of follow-up and documentation required for an effective DMLTP?"

The points laid down are :

"1. Follow-up of DMLTP is very important as the utility of the critical awareness created among the people, groups etc. cannot be otherwise ensured. The follow-up steps to be taken will depend on the type, hopes and aspirations aroused among the people/participants, needs expressed by the participants, which could be considered as need of the areas from where the participants are drawn etc. The project holder is, therefore, expected to keep I.G.S.S.S. informed about the programme, particularly about its impact, by means of periodical reports.

2. During the implementation of DMLTP, continuous monitoring of DMLTP should be done through progress reports of project holders using standardised programme.

3. The members of the DMLTPs Advisory Committee would also be involved in monitoring the DMLTP Projects, and the DMLTP project holders would also be assisted and guided for self-evaluation of their DMLTP.

4. An impact evaluation of DMLTP should be undertaken at the end of 18 months of operation of DMLTP in India. To facilitate this impact of evaluation, the project holders of DMLTP should be encouraged to undertake base-line survey in their areas before the implementation of projects. The members of DMLTP Advisory Committee would play greater role in the impact-evaluation of DMLTP.

....5.

A. A 'pre test' and 'post test' design can be used to evaluate the DMLTP programme in India. For this a base-line survey be undertaken, using an appropriate interview-schedule before the beginning of the programme, by each project holders.

After implementing the programme for say, one year or two years, another survey be undertaken using the same or similar interview schedule. The difference between 'pre-test' and 'post-test' responses are suggested to reflect the changes brought in by DMLTPs.

B. To canvas the interview-schedule, a target group of the potential Learners/Trainees should be used, either as to cover all of them, or some of them using a sampling technique. It is recommended to cover all the potential Learners/Trainees at the time of entering of this programme. The interview schedule is to be administered, both before the programme and after the programme. Thus, the subjects of the 'pre-test' and 'post-test' design would also act as control-group.

Despite the methodological limitations of this design, it is suggested to adopt this design because of the ease and low costs involved.

C. The key concept of evaluation of the DMLTP programme at each of the project sites are :

- * analysis of social reality in terms of social, political, ^{and} cultural, institutional structure.
- * awareness of oppression and exploitation perpetuated by one caste/class against others.
- * problems solving through self-help / mutual help.

- * practise of values such as equality, sharing and co-operation in the implementation of economic programmes which generate as a result of DMLTP.

5. An evaluation workshop should be held with all the project holders of DMLTP at the end of the two year programme. The recommendation of the evaluation workshop should help to decide about the continuation of the programme beyond two years."

The same paper answers the question 'what would be an effective DMLTP' that could be adopted at the Diocesean / regional / local level as under :

"An effective DMLTP that would be adopted at the Diocesan / regional / local level would include the following :

1. It is envisaged that the Church related and other development project holders, through DMLTP would provide in-puts for development education, development motivation and leadership training to ensure peoples responsible participation & involvement in their development project. DMLTP is a must since there is a strong feeling that while a large number of institutional and non-institutional socio-economic development projects are under taken, by church-related and other project holders, not much is being done for developmental education motivation and organisation of the people concerned.

2. The training programme should generate social awareness, organisation of the people, and concrete action, with a continuous reflection. To achieve this, all those concerned in the field of development would be exposed to a process of reflection and study in a training programme. The people at the grass-roots, need to go through a critical awareness building programme in order to become deeply aware of their attitudes. For this those who catalyse this reflection and study process, namely, core group of village leaders has to be trained.

3. These village leaders, men and women, should be selected from among the community, in which the process of development will be initiated. This should be done only by prolonged contacts with the community and enabling the community to identify the apt persons from amongst them. These core groups of village leaders should be then given an intensive training and responsibility for a community growth. Thus, not only should people be sensitized, and their leaders be trained, but the Animators also should be given training.

4. Similarly, training should be given to Priests and immediate personnel who also work as Animators.

5. Other support groups such as Directors and members of the social action cell in the Diocese, Parish Priests, religious congregations, and Parish and other Priests, would also be given such exposure. The training will vary according to the role and the level of the different groups.

6. The programme should start at the level of the people. First would come the process of living with them and identifying the community leaders, working with them in a democratic non-heirarchical manner. Then would follow the training of these leaders. Obviously, a preparatory training is needed so that all those involved at the Diosesan / regional / local level are attuned to this approach to community development. Hence, training programmes are necessary for Parish Priests and other support groups like Directors and members of the Social Action, religious congregations, Parish and other groups, as well as for the Animators of community development workers.

7. An indegenous orientation is also aimed at so that the community leaders & the community itself become responsible for their own development."

The same document, i.e. 311 of 18/6/1985 also puts down the vision and values connected to DMLTP.

- "a) The first ingredient of any training course is a study of and understanding of the social reality in which the people live. This will necessitate an analysis of the social, political, economic and cultural structures prevalent in the areas. If this is done with seriousness and in depth, it will necessarily lead to a searching for and clarifying of a vision of what society should be, the goal towards which all should be striving in their efforts for development. Consequent on this will be a reflection on the various approaches and methods needed to achieve this goal.
- b) In this search for a vision of total human development there will necessarily be some philosophical and moral inputs through the giving of the good news of justice and equality and the denouncing of injustice and exploitation.
- c) A very important requirement of the training for development is that it must internalise in the participants the values which differ totally from those underpinning the present prevalent social system, namely profit motive, competition and individualism. Values cannot be taught, they are acquired through practice. Hence the training will incorporate all the values we expect to find in the real community development workers, the community leaders and the people. These are values of sharing, justice, equality, team-spirit, honesty, cooperation and open-mindedness to learn from others even though they are socially and economically weaker. The flowering of such values is essential for the people, so that they may bring about a real change in the society in which they exist. These values are not only preached about, but exercised and acquired during the training programme, thus creating new energies in the trainees as well as in the trainers, to act with conviction and courage in their various struggles at different levels.

If the training programme is patterned on democratic, participatory and non-hierarchical lines, it will already set the foundation for the acquisition and internalisation of many of these values.

d) Another requirement of training will be for inter-personal relationships and communications. These are important for the village leaders, the Animators and those in the support groups in order to ensure acceptability by the people and solidarity with them.

e) An important point to be borne in mind is that the training programmes envisaged will carefully avoid the imposition of any rigid methodology. While it is necessary for those involved in development to have more or less clear understanding of why they are working in this field, and what they want to do, it is not right to force a particular methodology on others, nor to blindly accept any one prevalent methodology as perfect and fully satisfactory for all times and situations. But it is necessary that the trainees hold to some essential common elements of all values committed to justice. To start with, all should be committed to up-hold equality, justice and freedom, and to make a clear judgement of the present socio-economic system as unjust, oppressive and unequal. They must acquire the conviction that the evils of injustice, poverty and oppression, can only be removed by a basic restructuring of the whole society and false values on which it is built. They must realise that the restructuring of society can only come through the grass root people working in a coordinated manner as a united force.

f) If training skills for economic programmes is to be included in the training, as might be felt necessary according to the local situation, the right orientation to these economic programmes must also be given in the training. The trainees must be led to see that first of all, any economic programme must not

be an end in itself, but a stage in the whole process of liberation of the community in the socio-economic, political and cultural fields.

Second, they must realise that unless the values of sharing, cooperation, collaboration, solidarity are integrated and exercised in these programmes economic projects will have the opposite effect of creating more inequalities than justice.

g) To combat effectively mass poverty and to establish a human and egalitarian society the collaboration of all individuals and organisations committed to such an ideal is essential. Self understanding is one of being a servant to society striving for social justice. Any seeking of self interest or isolation from the movement of the people at large would be counter productive to the cause of liberation as well as to its own mission for setting free the downtrodden and of serving the growth of kingdom of justice, love and brotherhood."

Against this definition of the DMLTP the objectives, content and methodology of evaluation have been laid down in document '2' dated 11.4.1986.

"OBJECTIVE :

- a) To assess the impact of the DMLTP, .
- b) To identify the problems faced during implementation of DMLTP and the related solutions.
- c) To make recommendations for financing continuation of the existing DMLTPs, and starting new DMLTPs.

CONTENT :

The specific aspects to be looked into while making on the spot evaluation are :

- a) what were the specific short term and long term goals of the DMLTP, and to what extent have these been achieved.
- b) how clearly the information imparted on the DMLTP has been retained by the participants in the training.
- c) how well the participants in the DMLTP have understood the information imparted.
- d) to what extent the DMLTP has been applied and practised, and what are the results achieved, not only in setting up groups , but also in terms of positive and negative changes in the areas where programmes have been conducted.
- e) the various action programmes undertaken / planned / to be planned, and the extent to which the local resources have been / will be tapped to meet the costs of such programmes.
- f) problems faced during the implementation of the DMLTP and how they have been solved.
- g.1) whether financial assistance will be required for the continuation of the programme.
- g.2) if financial assistance is required for the continuation of the programme, what modification is /are required in the cost and finance plans of the programme.
- g.3) requirement of assistance - for what period (one, two, three years).

g.4) whether the project holder and beneficiaries could contribute towards the cost of continuing the programme - if yes, to what extent and what items.

METHODOLOGY :

a) assessing the information already with I.G.S.S.S. FROM THE BASE LINE SURVEY AND progress reports received from programme implementers.

b) gathering information from programme implementers through another questionnaire to be designed by Mr. Patel.

c) conduct $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 2 days pre-evaluation consultation in each of the three regions. With programme implementers of the respective region - to explain the need, objective and methodology of the evaluation - together with as much information as possible on the points listed under 1.a to 1.c above - to make the process of evaluation a participatory one.

d) visit to selected DMLTPs and interviewing :

- those who are in charge of the DMLTPs.
- those who are covered under the DMLTPs.
- those who are not covered under the DMLTPs. (outsiders)."

II.2 Analysis of the structure to be changed through DMLTP :

At this point it would be important to attempt an analysis of this kind of societal structure which the DMLTP proposes to change, keeping a historical perspective on developmental efforts. In the 1950s and 1960s development efforts changed from

the perspective of charity to the perspective of goal and target orientation. The groups working in development moved in the directions of economic perspectives, eg. the setting up of training programmes, and the provision of basic equipments for improved agricultural practices or the setting up of technical training to provide employment, programmes which, while looking at the economic problems did not really look at the social problems which prevented the upward mobility of the weaker segments of Indian society.

In the early 70s, two kinds of development groups came into existence, the first were youth groups with leftist orientation, and the second were the liberation theologians. However, in retrospect, one can see the failings of both these groups and these must form part of such an analysis.

The left - wing groups following Marxist dogma, failed to see that the class definitions of Marx were enormously complicated in a country like India by the facts of caste, ethnicity and religion.

Similarly, they failed to recognise that the legislation turned out by the Government of India was largely socialistic, the flaw being not in the legislation itself as much as in the implementation. Ofcourse, there were examples of faulty legislations, as in the case of the agricultural policy where, in attempts to grow more food, technologies were used which were actually counter-productive for the small and marginal farmers, while they increased the profitability of the medium and large farmers.

Again Government programmes were normally status quoist in the sense that they focussed more on subsistence than long term assets creation for the poor. The few programmes that did have an inbuilt structure for asset - creation at village level did not

provide an effective machinery to supply these assets to the neediest & consequently, there were creamed off by the already existing power groups at village level.

The Government and its representatives were laid down as class enemies. This frequently prevented the groups from getting social justice for the weakest segments of society by enlisting the aid of the more or less neutral Government officials such as the Collector. On the contrary, by starting off with confrontations with the Collectors as representatives of the class enemy (Government), they frequently lost somebody who could intervene for the people they represented in cases of social injustice.

While it is true that the Collector who tries to totally stamp out corruption normally ends up behind a desk with no real responsibilities, the good Collector recognises corruption as a fact of life & uses it in negotiating for a fairer deal for the neediest. It is all the more necessary to keep in contact with the Collectors to ensure that the maximum benefits reach the neediest.

The liberation theologians also failed to make distinctions between the Governments of Latin America and parts of South-East-Asia, where the policies of the Government are controlled by and aimed in favour of a very small group at the expense of the masses & that of India. Again, the liberation theologians failed to recognise the problems in India caused by the fact that unlike in Latin-America etc., there is no unifying factor of Christianity in India. This often exposed them to charges that their primary motives were proselytisation and this was what led to the diffusion of confrontations which they were trying to bring about by organising people.

Over the last few years, however, a lot of these groups have matured to a point where they are making a distinction between

the classic anti-poor Government, and the policies of the Government of India. This means that more and more grass roots projects are trying to use the system and its plus points in the cause of social justice through legal means. Here again, the social reality of India has to be looked at. While a certain amount of freedom exists to pursue legal methodologies to obtain social justice in large parts of India, particularly in the South and parts of the Central Indian area of Maharashtra and Gujarat, the feudal belt from Orissa through Bihar, U.P., parts of M.P. and Rajasthan, still do not provide small grass root groups, the freedom to fight for social justice without repression from the feudal lords and the Govt. Machinery.

The question then arises as to what the ultimate objectives of DMLTP would be. Pragmatically, this should mean that programmes meant for the weakest segments of society should be accessible to them. However, in practical terms, one must realise that the programmes drawn up for the weakest segments of society are frequently drawn up without consulting them at all, and this is one of the reasons why such programmes go astray, and infact, help the stronger segments of society to grow stronger still. As an example the country-wide programme for cross-breed cows as supplementary income source for the rural economy is particularly ill-conceived. It presupposes a certain resource availability to the small and marginal farmers, which they do not have i.e. adequate fodder and feed. Without these resources, the cow, by virtue of having to repay a loan, becomes more of a liability than an asset. If before such a scheme was drawn up, an adequate knowledge base was created amongst those who were supposed to benefit from it, they would surely modify it adequately to make it work. Similarly, without the necessary knowledge, a lot of the rural poor are involved in programmes drawn up by the Khadi and Village Industries Commission, whose costings are invariably out of date, and whose programmes, therefore do not provide the support they are drawn up to do.

Considering these deficiencies in these systems it becomes almost inevitable that at some point or the other, in the quest for social justice, groups of the weakest segments of society will run into situations of confrontation, either with the authorities or with the socially stronger elements of their society. This background is necessary to understand the lines of thinking of the evaluation.

CHAPTER - III.

The Evaluation, questions raised and findings

III.1 Basis :

The first objective of the evaluation has been put down as; to assess the impact of the DMLTP. As a pre-requisite to assessing the impact, it was felt necessary to find out whether the DMLTP was understood in the same way at all levels from I.G.S.S.S. down through the participants in the field. The primary DMLTP document, 311 of 18/6/85 recognises the need for differentiating between economic development programmes and socio-economic development programmes. This is primary to the concept of DMLTP and unless participants can recognise the difference between providing economic resources to a few and providing a system whereby economic resources are available to many, the DMLTP programme could be considered a non-starter. Primary to this, again, is the need for people who are participating in the DMLTP at all levels, to be able to analyse the situation of poverty not only in our country but also especially in their local structures. Such an analysis would serve the purpose, both, of determining the understanding of DMLTP by various levels of people and gauging the impact of the DMLTP. Besides, making such an analysis, the evaluation also needed to see whether, if an analysis was made, the participants were putting it into practise.

As an example while in many instances it could be noted that a village head-man was part of the group which was oppressing the weakest people of the village, the project personnel had close and friendly contacts with such head-men, without bringing up the problems created by the head-men's alignments. Before the commencement of the evaluation, it was felt that with two years of active DMLTP, there would be some impact at the general level of the villagers, which could also be elicited by group discussions. It was also felt that possibly interviews with

non-officials of DMLTP, i.e. people who had not participated in the DMLTP programmes, would also result in some feed back on the effect of DMLTP.

During the course of the evaluation, it was found that it was too high an expectation, and therefore this third group was dropped. In the original thinking on the evaluation it was felt that the impact and understanding could be checked at three levels; the heads of the organisation such as the Bishops, Diocesan Directors or Boards of secular organisations; secondly, the DMLTP participants and workers, meaning the extension level workers as well as the people who had participated in DMLTP training programmes; and thirdly the general public such as panwallas, low level Government officials etc.etc. who were living in areas where DMLTP training had been conducted but were not directly involved in the training process. As mentioned earlier, this third group was dropped on the basis of early experiences.

The pragmatic part of the evaluation as laid down in document 311 of 18/6/1985 on page 9. i.e. 'pre-test and post-test' base line survey information, was found a defective one and was therefore not usable. The base-line survey report format was found unusable for three reasons. Firstly, most of the project-partners were unclear on when and how it should be used. Although a number of them had filled it up the information conveyed therein was of little significance. Where more than one base-line survey format was filled up, it was not possible to co-relate the information given. Secondly, the problems of finding this kind of information were not apparently clear through out. In a group situation responses would probably be coloured by the responses given by group leaders. In individual situations it would take a tremendous amount of man power to find out answers to the various questions asked in the base-line format from individuals, and collating them. It would be even more difficult repeating this.

Thirdly, with the sending out of the base line survey format routinely every six months, there was even greater lack of clarity on when and how it should be filled.

III.2 The Regional Consultations :

Prior to the visits to the field projects in the course of the evaluation, regional consultations were held in each of the three regions, starting with the South, going to the North and finally to North-East as under :

Southern Region	Kerala, Tamilnadu, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh.
Northern Region	Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Himachal Pradesh, Punjab and Delhi.
North - Eastern Region	Bihar, Orissa, West Bengal and North Eastern States.

In each of the consultations, apart from explaining the evaluation, its outlook and methodology and the participants nature of the evaluation itself, the attendees were broken into groups and were involved in group discussions on four different topics. The first was the impact of DMLTP, the second, the problems in implementating DMLTP and related solutions, the third on continuity of DMLTP, discussing the questions as to whether outside financial assistance would be required and what modifications would be required in the programme, cost and financing plan etc. and in the fourth, the question of continuity of DMLTP to discuss questions on requirement of assistance, for what period, contribution by project holder and beneficiaries etc. While the reports of consultations are attached as annexures to

this report, a few points which came out in the discussions are shown below :

III.2.i In the group discussion on the impact of DMLTP in the social field, the South and the North both made specific mention of caste problems and problems of women, while the North-East did not.

In terms of impact in economic fields, the North specifically mentioned reduction of malpractises and corruption, which the other two regions did not.

In the field of political impact, the North-Eastern region for some reason included womens development. The North-Eastern region also included women taking an initiative to play an important role through role-play, dramas, social gatherings etc. in the cultural fields as part of the positive impact, what was rather significant was that both in the North and the South, social confrontation was put down as one of the negative impacts of DMLTP. Again the North and the South felt opposition group political leaders and confrontation with the politicians were negative factors in so far as the political impact of DMLTP was concerned. The significance of this must be noted in so far as the understanding of DMLTP is concerned.

III.2.ii In the "Problems faced and related solutions" section of the discussions - one of the significant common factors was the fear of transfer of trained staff, particularly in the Diocesan structure.

III.2.iii In group discussion three, while the agreement was general that DMLTP should continue, what was significant was that while the South stated that the DMLTP target groups would be according to the documentation on the DMLTP, the North felt that the target groups of people should be lay-leaders from rural

2408

COMH310



areas, children, most vulnerable section of the society, and DMLTP groups, and the North-East group felt that women, local leaders like Sarpanch and Mukhias, and Government officials like Block development officers should also be included. The questions of structure were tackled in three different ways by the three different regional groups. The South felt the existing structure should be retained with an addition of local advisory committees, at central level for coordination between groups working for similar objectives. The North felt that the socio-economic structure of the community should be identified and the existing structure should be simplified. And the North-East felt that detailed information of the various Government schemes for assistance should be included.

III.2.iv In the group discussions continuity of DMLTP finance etc. (discussion 4) there seems to be uniform thinking that ca. 3 years extension is necessary for the DMLTPs.

Comments & suggestions based on the Regional Consultations are included in the Chapters on Analysis & Recommendations (Chapters IV & V).

III.3 Field visits :

The field visits were made by the Chief Evaluator as under :

Accompanied by : Mr. M.O. Peter, Mr. Vincent George, Mr. Inna Reddy of I.G.S.S.S.

In Alleppy Diocese from 13th to 16th June 1986 covering the Diocese of Chellanam South, Khandakhadav, Manacadem (East), Manassery, Velapally, Omanapuzha (incl. Thanpoly, Pollathic, Vallor), Arthuntal (incl. Azheekal & Ottamassery), Punapra North, Punnapra South, Vadaikaul, Vattal.

Accompanied by Mr. P.Gasper of I.G.S.S.S.

i) From 17th to 20th June 1986 covering the Malarchi Trust - Vahaikkulam (also on 18.6.86), Vappankulam, Meenakshipuram, Kurullikulam, Chinna Vahiakkulam, discussions with Prabhakaran, Murli and Mujib Nettur, Rural Diocesan centre, Palayyankottai staff, and discussion with Fr. Kalandai Raj.

ii) From 21st to 2nd June 1986 - Vellore Diocese covering M.C.H. Group, Fr. Arockiaswamy, Vaddakamedu (leprosy patients), Christianpet women group and Kondakuppam Sri Lanka refugees. From 23rd to 24th June 1986 - Vellore Diocese covering - DMLTP contact person meeting, Allikadepatti, Fr. Arockiaswamy.

iii) From 25th June to 27th June covering the Bangalore Archdiocese - Swantatra nagar, REDS, Ozur Pandai.

Covering the Northern area visits -

Accompanied by Mr. M.B.Fernandez of I.G.S.S.S. :

From 11th July 1986 to 12th July at the Agra Archdiocese - Fr. Jose Malakkal, Fr. Thomas, Fr. Ignatius, St. Peters College.

Accompanied by Mr. M.B.Fernandez & Ms. Amita Chakravorthy (15 th only) of I.G.S.S.S. :

From 15th July to 16th July - Gram Niyojan Kendra covering the Sweeper colony, Jatwara and discussions with women motivators.

Accompanied by Ms. Annie Jayaraj and Ms. Succowrine Albuquerque of I.G.S.S.S. :

On 17th July - Delhi Archdiocese - covering Nandnagar, Trilokpuri, Pratiksha office and Jehangirpura.

Covering the North-Eastern areas visited -

Accompanied by Mr. L.D. Rozareo :

i) Bhagalpur Diocese from 25th to 28th July - covering Giridih Parish, Chakai Parish, Harimora Parish, Mt. Carmel School, Holy Family Convent, Avila Bhawan, Clarist Convent, St. Joseph's Convent Parish, Periyat - Mercy Hospital, Godda, Dakoita, Mangare, Dakoita (Santhals), Bishop Urban Mc Garry.

ii) From the 29th of July to 31st July - Sewa, Bhagalpur - covering Rajaun, Patwa, Dhoraiya, Habipur, Manoharpur, Sharjapur - Bhawanipur, Raghapur Tikai and discussions with Sewa staff.

iii) From 1st to 3rd August - Tura area covered - Tura, Mendal Shillong - Bosco Reachout and Nangpoh.

During the Alleppy Diocesan visits a project visit report format was worked out covering the questions raised in the original questionnaire which is also attached as an annexure.

III.4 Questions arising from the field visits :

Besides giving primary information these project visit reports have the following questions about the poor; How do the group understand the causes of poverty? What do they see the possible approaches are to overcome these? What do the group think DMLTP stands for? What do they see as the ultimate objective/ target group of DMLTP? What do they see as the approach of DMLTP? What do they see as the short comings and what ways do they see for improving DMLTP? Besides this, achievements and information regarding support from I.G.S.S.S. and the comments and analysis of the evaluating person form a part of this report. Using the same format the Evaluator was assisted with evaluations made by the staff members of I.G.S.S.S. and the coverage by these is given below :

Mr. M.O.Peter and Mr. Vincent George :

Project : Bathery Diocese from 21st to 25th June 86 covering :
Kolagappara, Chingeri (5 wards), Cheeral Parish (5 wards),
Kallonikernnal Mahila Samajam & Kammana (5 wards).

Mr. M.O.Peter :

Project : Chanda Diocese - covering Kopralli and Ambala

Mr. P Gasper

Project - Madkere Parish from 8th August to 11th Aug 86. covering
- Mercara, Kaushalnagar & Sonwarpet, Yediyur parish, Mangala
Parish, Chamrajnagar Parish, Thomayarpallayam parish, Cowdalla
parish and meeting with Fr. Becket D'Souza.

Mr. B.Inna Reddy

Project Grama Siri from 19th June to 21st June 86 covering -
Community organisers - 15 villages Pedda Polugavaripalam (5
villages & 11 villages).

Project : Sambalpur Diocese from 3rd Aug to 4th Aug covering -
Ruglinnal Tholakotta DMLTP functionaries
Ruglinnal Tholakotta Non DMLTP group

Badamal - DMLTP functionaries
Badamal - non DMLTP group.

Dr. L. D'Rozario

Project - Dibrugarh Diocese - 8th Aug - Disc. with Fr. Sebastian

: 25 :

Project - Bangiya Unnayan Parishad - 12th Aug -Disc. Mr. Mukherjee.

MR.M.B.Fernandes -

Project Goa Archdiocese - 25th Aug 86 - Pernem

Project - Rajkot Diocese - 16th Aug 86 - Bavda, Raithanpur & Bhuj.

Project : Jabalpur Diocese - 26th Aug 86 - Motinala, Kurela and Balpur.

III.5 Compilation of field visit reports :

The findings reported in the field visits are compiled below :

The poor :

A. How does the group understand the causes of poverty?

1. Politics cause and sustain poverty.
2. Industrialists and businessmen cause and sustain poverty.
3. Not enough work for all.
4. Only seasonal work availability.
5. Laziness
6. Lack of leadership to guide poor.
7. Lack of awareness of rights and facilities.
8. Lack of equipment needed for employment.
9. Lack of education.
10. Alcoholism.
11. Superstition.
12. All Government and bank resources go to the rich.

13. Surplus labour.
14. Small holdings without irrigation/drought prone areas / poor soil.
15. Overpopulation.
16. Large-scale corruption.
17. Fate.
18. Exploitation by rich (including contractors, Government officials, bank officials, middlemen) and other religious groups.
19. Illness.
20. Non-remunerative price of agricultural products.
21. Frequent crop failure.
22. Indebtedness & concurrent exploitation by money lenders.
23. Extravagance in social functions.
24. Non-implementation of Govt. programmes e.g. minimum wages.
25. Caste discrimination.
26. Lack of self confidence.
27. Rising costs of living.

B. What do they see as the possible approach to overcome these?

1. Organisation of the poor.
2. Setting up of work opportunities.
3. Using Government programmes for the poor.
4. Good water availability for farming.
5. Facilities for (higher) education.
6. Drought relief programmes.
7. Adult and non-formal education.
8. Population control.
9. Supplementary income sources.
10. Setting up adequate health facilities.
11. Setting up (centralised) collective marketing of agricultural produce.

12. Storage facilities for produce (e.g. agril produce, fish etc.) for optimising prices.
13. Small savings programmes.
14. Acquiring & developing land for the poor.
15. The teaching of improved agricultural practices.
16. Self-employment schemes.
17. Adequate legislation (against hoarders, etc.) and its enforcement.

D.M.L.T.P.

C. What do the group think DMLTP stands for?

1. Awareness creation in the masses with a view to organisation.
2. Getting people together to learn about employment programmes.
3. Imparting knowledge aimed at improving economic situation of the poor.
4. Leadership training.
5. Adult education.
6. Improving the situation of the poor.
7. A programme to help people to help themselves.
8. Total integrated development of the people.
9. A programme for forming labour unions.

D. What do they see as the ultimate objective/target group of DMLTP.

1. To give the poor equal opportunities for development in the future.

2. To help the poor to find work/funds.
3. To improve the survival situation of the poor and needy.
4. To continue adult education particularly for women.
5. To organise village Sangams.
6. To build a just and peaceful society.
7. To provide all round development of the individual and society.
8. To redeem the situation of poverty.
9. To form labour unions & consumer co-operation.
10. To bring about a situation of self-sufficiency.

E. What do they see as the approach of DMLTP.

1. To teach people to understand situations before tackling them.
2. To provide information on Government employment schemes.
3. To put up finance for employment schemes.
4. To motivate people to realise and link up with others having similar problems.
5. To train people to form groups which can then gain access to resources and become responsible.
6. To bring the poor together for discussion leading to action.
7. To build awareness among the poor.
8. To reach the poorest of the poor.
9. To organise cultural activities.

F. What do they see as the shortcomings?

1. It is a slow process and some immediate relief is necessary.
2. Non provision of finance for employment creation.
3. Women animators are not provided.

4. It is of too short a duration.
5. Animator training is inadequate.
6. Lack of time for the trained local leaders to extend DMLTP.
7. Lecture methods are inadequate to motivate the semi literate.
8. There are no concrete programmes built in.

G. What ways do they see for improving DMLTP?

1. To provide some immediate relief for which the organisation is being formed and strengthened.
2. To provide finance for creating employment opportunities.
3. To have more training/exposure.
4. To consciously include women.
5. To include adult education inputs.
6. To provide lady animators.
7. To provide technical expertise and materials such as audio-visual aids.
8. To provide periodic refresher training.
9. To appoint more paid animators.
10. To provide support for action programmes.
11. To set up demonstrations/demonstration plots.

H. Achievements :

1. Building of wells.
2. Obtaining Government and bank loans and subsidies for the poor.
3. Setting up information centres.
4. Setting up credit unions.
5. Housing for poor.
6. Building of latrines.

7. Vocational training for girls as well as boys.
8. Career guidance centres.
9. Rehabilitation programmes for natural calamity victims.
10. Provision of work centres/production units for natural calamity victims.
11. Formation of labour unions.
12. Formation of co-operatives.
13. Legal aid.
14. Taught administrative skills to poor (quarry workers).
15. Obtaining community resources from Government and other resource organisations.
16. Increased wages (quarry workers).
17. Formation of village groups (Sangams).
18. Village administration in hands of DMLTP trained youths.
19. Starting co-operative grain stores.
20. Helping landless get land.
21. Women demanding and receiving equal wages as men.
22. Formed all caste village advisory committees/ reduced caste differences.
23. Running adult and non formal education centres.
24. Reduction of social evils (alcoholism, gambling etc.).
25. Reduction of corruption.
26. Organised group action.
27. Setting up of grain banks.
28. Gaining access to Government schemes (TRYSEM, IRDP etc.).

I. Support from I.G.S.S.S.(current and suggested) for the future.

1. I.G.S.S.S. should provide more finance for employment related schemes.
2. I.G.S.S.S. should provide more training inputs and infrastructural supports.
3. I.G.S.S.S. should provide solidarity and support to strengthen women's groups.
4. I.G.S.S.S. should extend the terms of the DMLTP.

....31.

125-125
2408

5. I.G.S.S.S. should provide more inputs and guidance through field staff visits.
6. I.G.S.S.S. should make more provision for payments of T.A., D.A. and honorarium to volunteers.

CHAPTER IV

IV.1 The Regional Consultation:

In the Regional Consultations, a few points come forth quite clearly.

Firstly, there was substantial disparity between the various participants on their understanding of DMLTP. The 'Role Model' exercise in the Southern Regional Consultation brought this out clearly, and the idea was substantial in the Group Discussion presentations (commented upon earlier). These included questions on target groups, stipends to be given to participants coming to DMLTP training sessions, what constitute positive and negative impact of DMLTP etc.

Secondly, and to some extent as a corollary to the first point, the need for I.G.S.S.S. inputs to clarify these problems was quite clearly expressed. This also gives rise to questions of what groups should be supported for DMLTP, and, to look at it in a positive light which groups need support, largely by information, dialogue and analysis at a pre-DMLTP stage.

Thirdly, while there was total unanimity on the need for continuation of support for DMLTP, the question of duration needs to be considered. It is questionable whether the two to three year extension suggested was an honest expression of self-sufficiency, probability, or was coloured by what the groups felt would be a probable time expectation of the funding group. This evaluator is inclined to feel that it was the latter because, at local level, getting support for continuation from local "haves", (improbable though this might be, considering the objectives of DMLTP) , would be self-defeating; and creating enough local economic growth amongst the poorest of the poor to support the programme is also improbable.

IV.2 Field visits

In the course of the evaluation two common factors came to light. The first was that in the course of evaluating the particular project area, a certain pattern emerged and it could be discerned within the first two three days of work. The second was that there was a great commonality in the information coming in from the various field visits. What came through very strongly right from the onset was the fact that the analysis of the situation of poverty, and particularly consideration of the social factors involved in the socio-economic situation of certain groups was very shallowly made. Since this was a common factor in most of the visits made, the exceptions being in the case of a few individuals (but not in the case of groups). It became necessary to take a closer look at the expectations in the original DMLTP programme. The first point that deserves to be looked at, is the question of whether the time frames in which the DMLTP was supposed to perform was a realistic one. This becomes a very pertinent question because one is trying to bring about attitudinal changes as demanded by DMLTP in a two year period, and this is very unrealistic considering that there are at least 5000 years of recorded history to show how the attitudes had been built and maintained. Secondly, one must consider the question of inputs available through all persons involved in the DMLTP. "We All" include the staff of I.G.S.S.S. at all levels, members of the Governing body of I.G.S.S.S., Members of the DMLTP Advisory Committee and other staff of I.G.S.S.S. who are not directly related to DMLTP. Some attention does need to be paid to the seeming contradictions in the programme policies within I.G.S.S.S. In specific terms, it is feasible to promote a programme in which people are being involved in trying to find their own futures by optimising the use of resources available and at the same time, making resources available, which are in many cases duplications of resources which should be provided to people by existing organisations like the Government, Banks, etc.

To delve a bit deeper into this, one must consider whether additional project support is concurrent with the aims and objectives of DMLTP. A change in the socio-economic conditions of the downtrodden, using mass organisation and mass movements can be approached in three ways: One approach would be to try and change the system from within; for example, getting the Sarpanch or Gram Savak to perform his or her task in favour of the weakest segment of their village. Second is to approach the core problem on an issue basis; for example, getting people freed from bond or getting them minimum wages. A third approach would be to use a service for people as an entry point and ultimately development; as an example Mahila Mandals formed and encouraged to start a kindergarten whose financing would be taken over by the Government after successfully running it for a year, would require, apart from the organisational costs, a small input for the service of kindergarten to be run for a year or two till the women's group can induce the Government to take over its running. The first approach has its obvious limitations, and has not yet, to this Evaluator's knowledge been effective anywhere in the country. The second case, while the issues can be tackled by mass organisation, organised on the theme of the issue, the failure rate has been high because the causes from which the issues arise have not been tackled. As an example of this, freeing people from bond has sometimes had a very negative effect because without creating a structure which will help the people meet their needs, the next time they have a financial crisis, the people would then have to go back to a money lender, and this would be putting them in a position even worse than the one, they were originally in. Experience has shown that the third approach has usually been the most effective because it has allowed the organisation to grow strong on simple victories, to a point where it can tackle more difficult ones, with confidence. The other approach, which is non organisational and by which people's needs are met by an organisation other than the one, whose job it is to meet those needs, prevents people from gathering strength and bring about change by themselves, and this is the issue which will have to be thought through, at length in policy making.

IV.3 Roles of I.G.S.S.S and DMLTP projects :

The next question in this analysis would be the question of who would be providing the kind of inputs necessary to the DMLTPs reaching a point where local leaders can make their own analysis effectively and act on them. Obviously, this would have to be the three tier system; the I.G.S.S.S.'s with adequately trained, motivated and supported staff, who would then go to the second level which is the groups which are being supported under DMLTPs., and pass on the benefits of information, knowledge, training, etc. to them; and they would, in turn, pass this on to the identified local leaders, which is the primary objective of the DMLTP in any case.

Within the frame work of the observations and analysis, too, one should see the very positive factors which have emerged from the first two years of the DMLTP. In a number of the organisations involved in the DMLTP, two very positive first steps have been taken: that of getting people to come together, especially the neediest, and discuss and find solutions to their own problems; and that of helping them to fulfill their actual immediate needs even though the perspective may be short term. Considering this, and considering that within the problems of time frames mentioned earlier, a fair bit of good has emerged from the programme, the first two years of DMLTP support should be seen in the nature of a starting point, and not in the nature of 'the end'. Influx of motivation and changes in attitude have many variables. These should be realised and care should be taken that the DMLTP programme does not in fact become a 'formulae' programme, but has built within itself, enough flexibility to permit variations on the primary theme of leadership creation and attitudinal change creation of analysis and action.

Attached to this report are two annexures, the list of analysis in the case of one non-church programme and one Diocesan

programme - annexures 2 and 3. The case studies should not be seen in a negative light, but should provide the grounds for future directions of the DMLTP programme.

IV.4 General:

While the earlier sections of this chapter largely point out problems of DMLTP planning and execution, there is a need to examine the past, present and future scenarios. Had there been no DMLTP programme of I.G.S.S.S., a few of the current projects would have run a DMLTP programme with funds from other sources. Indeed, a number of projects are already doing so, and have been done earlier to the I.G.S.S.S. programme, without having been part of the I.G.S.S.S. - DMLTP. Some of the current DMLTP projects actually started their work before the formal programme, and the formal programme has helped them to continue. The introduction of the DMLTP by I.G.S.S.S. has, however, brought in a number of groups who were not yet committed to this approach and this needs to be seen as a very positive contribution.

The present position is one in which a number of DMLTP programmes are being watched and discussed by groups who are not yet committed one way or the other, who are open to the idea.

It is the future, however, which shows the greatest potential by virtue of its coverage of the country through the various Church groups, and by extending its work to cover the secular, and more particularly grass-root groups. I.G.S.S.S. is in a position to evoke a nation wide movement not only by direct support but also by facilitating a networking of DMLTP type programmes, throughout the country. The poor can have access to their rights, only if they are organised in sufficient number to have a voice in receiving these. With rights go responsibilities, and these need to form a very necessary part of DMLTP and networking efforts to avoid replacing one oppressive group by another new group of oppressors.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

V.1 Conclusions :

The objectives and the content of evaluation have been laid down in document '2' dated 11.4.1986. The first objective was to assess the impact of DMLTP. In many ways the impact of DMLTP in terms of material change has been very good. The short comings, however, have been in terms of attitudinal change. Part of the problem arises from the fact that the various participants in DMLTP had very different ideas of what the objectives of DMLTP, both, short and long term were. This Evaluator feels that within the time frame and within the scope of change from normal methods of work to the methods of work and directions shown by DMLTP, there is more than enough justification for extending the work of DMLTP programme and strengthening it. As mentioned earlier in this report, the time frame is something which really requires looking at. When one is working with the poorest people in society, both in economic and social terms, one would be having totally unrealistic expectations if one were to feel that in two years time :-

a. The attitudes of the down trodden be changed to an attitude of coming together and gaining what is theirs by right;

b. That within this process enough of an economic change would be brought to allow them a better economic standing within their own community group.

c. That this combination of social and economic change, or attitudinal and economic change would be adequate to provide finance for the support of the continuation of the programme like DMLTP.

Some of the recommendations being made below are specific, and some are general.

It would be upto the Board and Management and Staff of I.G.S.S.S. to assess them and implement them.

V.2 General Recommendations :

1. As mentioned earlier I.G.S.S.S at the policy making level would really need to make hard decisions on how committed it is to DMLTP, and in relations to this, what kind of other programmes supports are compatible with the concept of DMLTP.

2. If the stance is one of support to the DMLTP, it would be necessary to provide the inputs needed for an improvement in the understanding and putting across of the project to the Staff members of I.G.S.S.S. at all levels. From experience one knows that such a process is not a very fast one, but it can be accelerated by certain tools. For example, from time to time certain cases of social injustice very openly manifest themselves within the country. It would be worthwhile for the Staff to get together and discuss the issues involved. As an example, the recent Muslim Women's Divorce Bill should have been and still should be debated for its rightness and wrongness, and the stance of the Staff judged, as well as their attitudes in a situation of this nature. Direct inputs in terms of training for analysis of situations of oppression and poverty, as well as supplementary inputs to discussion groups as mentioned earlier could be some of the tools in use.

3. DMLTP in the field would then require to receive the inputs, which the trained staff can provide. This would mean, to a very large extent, decentralisation of staff to provide field support. Such staff would also need to be able to make the distinction between project support which is valid in the context of DMLTP and that which is not.

4. Both the Church groups and non-Church groups have their own strength and weaknesses. The Church groups have as a strength an

encompassing organisation covering almost all of India fairly thoroughly. Their shortcoming is that they are largely aimed at the Catholic population of the country and therefore, are frequently thin on the ground in areas with a low Catholic population, but where a great deal of work is necessary. On the other hand the non-Church organisations as a strong point usually cover all the needy. Their short coming arises from the fact that they have poor organisation, limited geographical areas and frequently, not enough in terms of men and material to cover the needs of DMLTP. Ideally, the Church groups should be encouraged to include non-Church groups within their fold in DMLTP support programmes. This would not mean depriving the non-Church groups of their independence and integrity, but rather providing them the net-working which the Diocese can afford to do and to a certain extent access to their resources. On the other hand the Church can also use the inputs which they provide. Within the Church structure also there would be two recommendations :

(i) That the Church not see DMLTP as a programme which must encompass the entire Church covered area, but limit it to those areas where the Church staff have the necessary commitment, understanding and desire to work on the programme. DMLTP is not repeat not a programme which can be run like a factory. Its success or failure depends entirely on the motivation and commitments of the persons who carry it out.

(ii) Once such persons are found within the Church structure, they be allowed to stay on and carry out this work without fear of transfer for atleast a three year period.

5. The heads of Church or non-Church groups should be clearly faced with the possible consequences of DMLTP before their inclusion in the DMLTP programme is finalised, although on more than one occassion the field level people felt that even without the support from the top they could mobilise enough people's

support at this point, to face any problems which might crop up, support from the top is always better.

6. I.G.S.S.S should also include as one of its objectives the net-working of groups who are involved in the DMLTP programme, so that a smaller group can be the core of a larger mass movement. Facing the social realities of the country real development and real change can only come about if there is enough of a mass in support of such change. Political will can only be created by the masses.

7. While the document 311 of 18.6.1985 is very clear on both the objectives and methodologies of DMLTP, it is apparent from field work experience that this document has not been properly handled, analysed and absorbed, by the groups involved in DMLTP.

This clarification should be taken up on a priority basis.

8. On going through various material, the lack of co-ordination between the project one division, project two division, administration and accounts, frequently show themselves. An analysis of the correspondence between I.G.S.S.S. & DMLTP participants provide a number of such examples. Key personnel and project also show a certain amount of confusion when persons from project group one visited project group two programme just, after say, a visit by a project group two staff member. This should be minimised and co-ordination increased.

9. There seems a tendency to reduce everything to a format. While formats have their advantages, in the case of programmes like DMLTP, they really greatly reduce the information inflow. A lot of the very interesting information available from field visits could equally have been conveyed in the form of reports if formats would not be observed. Similarly, in the case of the base-line survey lack of clarity on the contents of the format

and its uses came in the way of its being included in the group of the current evaluation.

10. Finally, when the financial implications of DMLTP extensions are being drawn up, enough financial inputs should be made available to cover all the points mentioned earlier. The evaluator feels that it is not within the scope of evaluation to actually draw a Budget.

V.3 Specific Recommendations :

i) The DMLTP programme should be continued as a primary programme of I.G.S.S.S. and accorded the highest priority within the organisations.

ii) The members of the Board of the I.G.S.S.S. and the DMLTP advisory committee should go into all the implications, analyse and assess these. The overall implications in terms of the possibilities of repercussions from an outside the organisation as DMLTP begins to succeed should be clearly understood. Unless I.G.S.S.S. stands behind the programme totally, the programme cannot succeed.

The implications within the organisation are manifold :

a) The programme support policy should be directly linked to the concept of the DMLTP. Any programme support should first be tested to see whether it diffuses the concept of the people's access to the existing resources to which they have a right, and whether it increases the existing disparity in assets and power of the 'haves and have-nots'.

- b) If I.G.S.S.S believes in the need for DMLTP to break down the existing oppressive structures, it needs to analyse its own internal structures and policies. As an example, in a non-heirarchical structure, daily allowances should be standardised, modes of transport flexible enough to suit needs, the right to be heard universalised. This may sound rather theoratical but the recommendation is to initiate a process of attitudinal change as a pre-requisite to actual changes.
- c) Decentralisation should mean a growth in field staff, with enough in-built flexibility but also adequate in-built controls, to optimise a nationwide coverage of DMLTP. While this evaluator feels that the field staff at present are of excellent quality, their number needs to be strengthened. Selection of the field staff should be pased more on their identification with the masses of our country, their analytical capacity, their capacity for learning and communication, rather than paper qualifications. The selection process should be designed to evaluate the above factors rather than exclusively book knowledge.
- d) Concurrent with this, there should be a programme of continuous in-service training both within and without the organisation. Such training could involve resource persons or institutions such as I.S.I. (for social analysis) CENDIT(for communications), participation in workshops/seminars and movements etc. It is also necessary to involve all levels of I.G.S.S.S. staff in the process and one means could be to have periodic meetings of all staff to discuss questions like ' the Muslim Women's Divorce Bill', ' The Code of Conduct for the Voluntary Agencies Bill', 'The implications of the large outlay for voluntary agencies in the Seventh Five Year plan' etc.
- e) I.G.S.S.S. if seriously considers decentralisation in terms of a larger field force, should also seriously consider the merging of all the field tasks at field level. This becomes necessary to avoid conflict of interest.

f) At field level as well as at Central level, the need for training needs to be supplemented by the need for networking. This would mean regional as well as central level workshops/ seminars / training programmes. At the early stages they would be more in terms of understanding DMLTP (as, even during the evaluation, a number of groups were not aware that DMLTP training could be considered for follow up to earlier training programmes, for the same groups or smaller groups selected from earlier participants).

A small but vital point in training programmes would be the role of Government organisations in social justice. This would include not only questions as to what segments of the Government should be contacted, but also what programmes of the Government, i.e. IRDP, ICDP, Public interest legislation etc. are conducive to DMLTP growth and how.

iii) Considering the above, the funding pattern for DMLTP in future should consider :

- a) Training cost for I.G.S.S.S. staff.
- b) Support costs for Central and field staff.
- c) Support for one national level, ~~two~~ regional level meetings including input components per year.
- d) Longer term support of DMLTP programmes. The need to promote atleast a modicum of security (five years atleast) for animators, project staff to ensure quality of local DMLTP workers should be obvious. Numbers of local staff will also need to be considered.
- e) Costs for inputs of documentations and communicative aids at all levels.
- f) Support costs for small service entry points for people's organisation.

: 44 :

This evaluator would like to put on record his sincere thanks to I.G.S.S.S. for affording him the opportunity to participate in this very interesting and educative evaluation. Particular thanks are also given to the various individuals. Mr. M.O.Peter, Mr.P.Gasper, Mr.Vincent George, Mr.Inna Reddy, Mr.M.Fernandez, Mr. L.D.Rozario, Ms.Annie Jayaraj, Ms. Succowrine Albuquerque, Ms.Amita Chakravorthy who accompanied me on the various field trips. Lastly, my thanks to the President and the Board of I.G.S.S.S., the DMLTP advisory committee members, the Misereor Resident Representative, the Executive Director of I.G.S.S.S., other I.G.S.S.S. staff and of course the managements and staff of the projects who made the regional consultations and field visits so instructive and interesting.

(A.D.PATEL)

PUNE

30.9.1986.

DMLTP EVALUATION

PROJECT VISIT REPORT FORMAT

Visit of :

Village :

Parish Priest :

Treasurer :

Area Information :

Population of Catholics :

Work Area (percentage) :

Agriculture :

Industry :

Co-ordinator :

Secretary :

Members No.:

Women :

Others :

Fishing :

Other :

THE POOR :

How does the group understand the causes of poverty?

What do they see as the possible approach to overcome these?

DMLTP

What do the group think DMLTP stands for?

What do they see as the ultimate objective/target of DMLTP?

What do they see as the approach of DMLTP?

What do they see as the shortcomings?

What ways do they see for improving DMLTP?

ACHIEVEMENT : (Please see list)

SUPPORT FOR I.G.S.S.S. : (Current and suggested for future)

COMMENTS/ANALYSIS OF EVALUATING PERSON :

Signed :

DATE :

A CASE STUDY - a voluntary organisation working in South India with Child Labour in the match industry.

The organisation covers five villages with a population of 725 families, an average family size of 7. 35% are Christians, ca. 2% Naidus, and the remaining 63% Harijans.

The organisation has two kinds of programmes, a programme of education at village level and a programme of DMLTP which primarily aims at the child labour involved in the match industry. Their interest is in fighting the exploitation of child labour by the match factory owners who are largely from Madras and Northern India and who have a mix of Hindus, Christians and Muslims amongst them. However, the staff member who is responsible primarily for the DMLTP programme is of the opinion that no child labour should be allowed at all. The Director of the trust who works with the workers in the field feels that within the economic situation of this part of India atleast, child labour is a necessity. The objective they quoted was to form 'sangams' in order to bring pressure on the match industry owners to provide higher wages to the children working in the industry.

On being questioned as to what the objective was, they said the objective was to provide the children with a childhood. After some hesitation it was interpreted to me - children should have an opportunity for recreation, education and health care, besides the work which they are doing. The children at the moment are being picked up by buses sent around by the match factory at ca. 4.30 to 5.30 in the morning and dropped back between 6 & 7 p.m. When asked how high wages would solve the problem of the children not getting their childhood, there was a bit of rethinking, and after some prompting they came up with the idea of forcing the factory owners to provide them the same wage for much less work time, so that this time could be used for education, recreation

and health. Currently, according to them, the children who earn 30 to 40 rupees per week, support the parents who get work in stone-quarries, earning about 10 Rs. per day for 10 to 15 days in a month. Although almost all the Harijans in the area also hold land it is dry and unproductive. When the workers of the agency were asked what they would be asking for as the increment from the match factory owners, they said they were not sure. They were asked if they had made an analysis of profits at various stages of the work, but found that they had not. So, they listed the places at which the expenditure occurred, which result in the final price of paise 25 per box any where in India.

These include :

1. Cost of the empty boxes, including transport.
2. The cost of the match stick, including transport and breakage.
3. The cost of the labourers, including transport.
4. The cost of the chemicals involved in making the matches.
5. The labour component for sticking labels on the match boxes, for putting the match heads, for wax dipping and for sticking of the excise labels.
6. The cost of transportation all over India.
7. The margins to the wholesalers and retailers.
8. Including the 10 paise as excise to the Government.
9. The profits to the owners of the factories.

While trying to work out the costings, they came to an item which surprised them - the greatest exploiter was the Government, who took 10 paise for excise, without doing any work what-so-ever. They therefore said that when they presented their demands, these should go to both, the factory owners and the Government itself.

When further questioned they found that the area had had a proposal for coverage under an irrigation programme mooted under the British Raj in 1936. Before the plans were completed second world war started and they were shelved. This Kriyan dam scheme was put up again in 1952 and squashed by the match industry.

This analysis showed them that probably the best way to stop Child labour all together would be to pursue the dam, and once having got irrigation for the working force of the area, come to a position where the family could support itself without child labour from the earnings from their farms in the farming season, horticulture with coconut palm etc., and supplementation by quarry work in the dry season.

This basic absence of analysis and working without very clear cut thinking is not necessarily an indictment of the project itself. This seems to be the norm, and the project does have strength in the way it has brought the village population together. However, it underlines the need for a proper perspective and this is where the DMLTP and I.G.S.S.S. can provide a lot of help.

area and they destroy plantation, making areas they have fished, barren for sometime to come. Service boats were earlier owned by the richer people, and the crews were hired with a catch division of 50% for the crew members and the major percentage for the owner. By helping a few people to buy their own boats, they are converting the exploited into the exploiters, because they too give only the same low percentage of the catch to their crew. Again, the imported outboards can only be overhauled and repaired by only a few 'agents', and the economics of even the ring service boats become untenable at some points. Support programmes for the families of the fisher-folk include kora grass mats and similar traditional crafts. However, no real analysis is made of the reasons for the decline of these crafts, replacement of traditional by synthetic raw materials etc., and the fear is a very real one that the traditional industry will be rejuvenated only to fall flat on its face due to lack of market. Even the obvious programme possibilities to regulate fish prices, i.e. cold storage and ice factories and have not been analysed for reasons of earlier failures and long term possibilities.

Both in the case of more efficient fishing crafts and equipments and in the case of revival of traditional craft, long-term perspectives remain unanalysed. For instance, what will be the future of the fishing yields when the number of ring service boats increases ten fold? Will the sea be able to provide adequate harvest? Similarly, who will buy the traditional crafts and to what extent?

Leaving these apart, one also needs to look at the effects of the policy of total coverage of the Dioceses Parishes under DMLTP. DMLTP being by nature a motivational programme is totally dependant on the motivation and skills of those who organise it. Improperly used, such programmes can do incalculable harm, and set back development by years. Is it then, consistent with the

Case study - of a Diocesan, DMLTP efforts in South India under the I.G.S.S.S. programme :

One of the Dioceses in South India which was covered in the course of the evaluation offers a good case study.

The Diocesan head felt that the DMLTP Programmes, should cover the entire Diocese - all the Parishes inclusive. Accordingly, the programme was organised to cover all the Parishes under three Co-ordinators.

The Objectives were:

- i) to form societies at Parish level.
- ii) to set up credit unions.
- iii) to have information centres to disseminate information on programmes and resources available through Government, Banks, etc.
- iv) to help the people to actually have access to such programmes. While the organisational end of the programme is very well set up, the work does not come from a proper analysis of the social and economic causes of poverty in the area. The majority of Catholics are in the coastal area, and involved in fishing. The fishing Industry at this point works at four levels; the deep sea trawlers; the power boats working with purse service; the power boats working inshore using ring nets, and non power craft doing inshore fishing.

The deep sea trawlers have the obvious advantage of reach to outlying fishing areas and have the power endurance to locate and follow the schools of fish. The purse-service fishing boats have two major disadvantages. They usually cover all the fish in an

DMLTP ideology to entrust the programme to those who have not the slightest motivation, far less, the skills to make the programme work, in the interest of 'coverage' ?

This case is certainly not an indictment of the efforts of the Dioceses concerned. On the contrary, the organisational work seen was excellent. What needs to be emphasised is the need for definite and on-going monitoring and inputs for proper analysis and therefore proper working and effectivity of the DMLTP.

