odi

SOCIAL FORESTRY NETWORK

SEEING THE PEOPLE FOR THE TREES: IMPLICATIONS OF SOCIAL FORESTRY FOR THE TRAINING OF FORESTRY EXTENSION STAFF IN KARNATAKA—SOUTH INDIA

Chris Garforth

Network Paper 12f Summer/Winter 1991

Dr C J Garforth is Head of Department — AERDD, University of Reading, London Road, Reading RG1 5AQ, UK.

This paper is based on information gained while the author was working with the Karnataka Forest Department (KFD) under assignment from the Overseas Development Administration (ODA—UK). The views expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily coincide with those of the KFD or ODA.

Social Forestry Network Paper 12f (**ODI**, Regent's College, Regent's Park, London) Summer/Winter 1991.

SEEING THE PEOPLE FOR THE TREES: IMPLICATIONS OF SOCIAL FORESTRY FOR THE TRAINING OF FORESTRY EXTENSION STAFF IN KARNATAKA—SOUTH INDIA

by
Chris Garforth

INTRODUCTION

Social Forestry brings people, rather than trees, to the forefront of forest policy and programmes. It is people's needs which, in theory, determine tree planting and harvesting priorities. People are seen as partners in the planning and management of forest resources, rather than as a harmful influence to be controlled or excluded. Most States in India now have social forestry projects, and in those that do not, elements of social forestry exist within such initiatives as the National Wastelands Development Programme and the National Rural Employment Programme. Nepal's new Master Plan for the Forest Sector envisages much of the existing forest in inhabited areas being turned over to those who use it.

This shift in policy from looking after trees to working with and through the users of tree products implies considerable changes in the jobs which forestry staff are expected to do. This in turn suggests that changes may be needed in the training which forestry staff receive, in terms both of content and of method, and in both pre-service and in-service training. Some would go further and argue that the hidden curriculum of the internal procedures of their employing organisation acts as a powerful constraint on the way they interact with their 'clients': foresters will only learn to work with rural people in a participatory manner, in a way which stresses listening and consensus and compromise, if the same processes are adopted in the internal workings of their own departments (Gronow and Shreshta, 1990).

Both within central government in India and within State Forest Departments, there is intensive debate on the future direction of forestry education and training at all levels, to which an important impetus was given by a conference on the subject in 1988 organized by the Society of Indian Foresters. This paper contributes to one part of that debate: the implications of the shift towards social forestry for the training of field level forestry staff in the State of Karnataka.

SOCIAL FORESTRY IN KARNATAKA

In Karnataka, forest cover varies tremendously from the dense natural forest which survives in parts of the Western Ghats to very sparse cover in the drier, lower lying areas in the east of the State. Concern over continued degradation of tree cover led the Karnataka Forest Department to launch a Social Forestry Project (SFP) in selected districts in 1983, although initiatives to encourage people to plant trees, and the afforestation of public land to meet the needs of local residents, had been going on for some time. Indeed, one of the administrative complexities facing forestry staff is that 'Social Forestry' activities are funded under a variety of government programmes, which in turn have very varied funding and reporting arrangements vis-à-vis central government and external donors or lenders.

With the inception of the SFP, a separate cadre of social forestry personnel was established, within a new Social Forestry Wing headed at headquarters level by a Chief Conservator of Forests. In the field, the structure of the Wing parallels that of the Territorial function of the Department. Within a Division, a Deputy Conservator of Forests (DCF) is responsible for social forestry while the territorial DCF continues to be responsible for the management and protection of the natural and plantation forest belonging to the State government. They each have their separate complement of Assistant Conservators, Range Forest Officers and Foresters (Fig 1). In the Social Forestry Wing, a new designation of Forest Extension Workers (FEWs) has been created which is exactly parallel to that of territorial Forest Guards. FEWs receive the same initial training as Forest Guards and are still referred to as 'Guards' by many people both within and outside the Department.

The main innovation in terms of staffing has been the recruitment of 'motivators'. These were originally intended to be locally recruited men and women who would work in their home community as a link between KFD and rural people, a link to inform KFD of local needs, interests and requirements, and to make KFD services, inputs and advice available within the community. In practice, because of the minimum qualifications laid down and the general preference for competitive applications, most motivators are working outside their home communities. They come from a wide range of backgrounds. Few have any forestry or agricultural training before they are recruited. They are employed on a part time basis and do not hold regular KFD posts.

Figure 1 Parallel Structure of Social Forestry and Territorial Wings in Karnataka Forest Department

PCCF		
CCF (SF)		CCF (General)
Conservator (Circle)		
DCF (SF)		DCF (Territorial) (Division)
ACF (SF)		ACF
RFO (SF)		RFO (Range)
Forester (SF)		Forester (Section)
FEW		Forest Guard (Beat)
Motivator		

Social Forestry in Karnataka is seen as comprising two rather separate strands: • **Farm Forestry**, under which individuals are encouraged to plant trees on their own land, and • **Community Forestry**, where trees are planted on public land to meet specific local needs for fuel, timber, artisanal inputs (such as bamboo), fodder and green manure. Farm forestry ranges from the planting of a few fruit or fuelwood trees by a landless family in the yard of their home, through the use of field bunds for raising timber or fodder species, to monocropping commercial species on farmland. Tree planting on private land has a long history in some parts of the state and the SFP has given added impetus. In other areas, particularly where natural forest cover remains quite high, farm forestry still fails to catch the imagination of most landholders. In the early years of the SFP, farmers could have 1500 free seedlings from KFD for planting on their own land: this has been reduced progressively to 150 in order to achieve greater equity.

Community forestry makes use of roadsides, canal banks, wastelands which have traditionally been used for grazing and for collection of firewood, the foreshores of irrigation tanks and several other categories of **'public access'** land. Although the land is owned by the state or central

government, a complex network of rights of access and use usually exists over it. In practice, community forestry involves the KFD in planting trees, with varying degrees of consultation with local people over the species mix, and in looking after the plantation for up to five years, after which the trees are handed over to the community for management, harvesting and distribution. In keeping with KFD's use of the Working Plan as the basic tool for forest management, a management plan is prepared for each community plantation before the community takes full responsibility for it. After the handover, KFD staff continue to provide technical advice and support as and when it is needed.

A key feature of both facets of the SFP is the decentralisation of nurseries. Farmers are recruited to establish **'kissan'** nurseries in which they raise seedlings for distribution to farmers in the vicinity, and to stock community plantations. KFD supplies the inputs and pays the nursery owner for each seedling he or she distributes. One of the tasks of the field staff is to identify suitable people to operate these nurseries and then to give them technical and administrative support. In some cases, nurseries have been established by schools and local voluntary organisations.

A complicating factor, from KFD's point of view, is that development planning and funding in the State is increasingly being decentralized to representative bodies at **'zilla parishad'** and **'mandal panchayat'** level. The zilla parishad, an elected body for an administrative District, now has the power to decide how development funds will be spent. This includes the allocation of money under some of the schemes and projects which involve social forestry activities. Often schools, clinics and water supplies have a higher political profile than tree planting. Social forestry staff have to work hard to make sure that forestry receives what they would regard as a fair share of the available resources. Decentralisation is proceeding further, with mandal panchayats (a mandal typically consisting of around 9 villages) also having funds allocated to them for spending on locally determined projects.

Although the designation **'extension worker'** is given to one particular category of staff within SFW, all social forestry staff within the District can properly be thought of as engaged in extension, or as change agents. This is especially true of the three categories of staff with which this paper is concerned — Foresters, FEWs and motivators — at least in terms of their duties as set out in job descriptions. In practice, however, many staff have a more restricted view of what their job entails.

Figure 2 Structure of Local Administration and Social Forestry Wing, at District and Sub-District Level

LOCAL ADMINISTRATION		SOCIAL FORESTRY WING	
Level (Number)	Representative body	Staff	(Number)
District (19)	Zilla Parishad	Deputy Conservator of Forests	(12)
		Ass. Conservator of Forests	(14)
Taluka (172)		Range Forest Officer	(112)
		Forester	(248)
		Forest Extension Worker	(340)
Mandal (2469)		Motivator	(1305)
Village (26306)	Grama Sabha		

Motivators' duties as set out in the Project Implementation Manual (PIM) include preliminary consultations with the community about the local potential for community forestry, gathering feedback about local demand for tree products as an input into community plantation planning, assistance with micro-planning and transfer of technology before, during and after planting. However they tend to see their job as the identification of potential kissan nurserymen and women, visiting households to tell them about the schemes under which they can get free or subsidized seedlings, collecting information on seedling requirements each year and technical support of kissan nurseries and of households who take seedlings.

Forest Extension Workers, in addition to the technical support and supervision of motivators, are expected to assist in publicity campaigns, and in micro-planning, hold preliminary consultations with the community about the local potential for community plantations and collect monitoring and evaluation data. In practice, much of their time is taken up with the technical aspects of community plantations, supervising the labourers hired by the Department for site preparation, trenching and planting work and the maintenance of plantations. The working relationship between FEW and motivators varies from District to District. In Hassan, FEWs said they spend the 8 months of the year which are relatively slack as far as work in community plantations is concerned accompanying motivators on their visits to households, while motivators say that they report to their RFOs through the FEWs. In some other Districts, FEWs are seen as responsible for community plantation activities while motivators concentrate on kissan nurseries and private (farm forestry) planting and see themselves as reporting directly to the RFO.

Foresters are to help RFOs identify suitable sites for plantations and nurseries, give technical advice to farmers, prepare maps of chosen sites and supervise FEWs and motivators in their area. They are generally responsible for the technical quality of social forestry work as well as being involved in general publicity and extension. Given the small size of this cadre, they cannot visit a high proportion of farm forestry clients on an individual basis. They can, however, influence the technical competence of FEWs and motivators through training, whether this is done through pre-arranged in-service sessions or ad hoc skills training during supervisory visits in the field.

TRAINING FOR SOCIAL FORESTRY IN KARNATAKA

Training for Foresters and FEWs is conducted by the KFD at three institutions: the Guards Training Schools at Kushalnagar and Bidar, and the Foresters and Guards Training Schools at Tattihalla. More senior staff receive initial training outside the State: RFOs at one of the Ranger Training Colleges in other States, ACFs at one of the State Forest Colleges and DCFs at the premier forest education institution — Indira Gandhi National Forest Academy (IGNFA) at Dehra Dun — after undergoing a rigorous selection procedure for recruitment into the Indian Forest Service (IFS).

Foresters and FEWs enter the SFW through one of two routes. The first is by transfer from territorial or wildlife or other duties (as Foresters or Forest Guards); the second is by being posted to the SFW on completion of initial training. However, as the posting of trainees is not decided until their training ends, there is little difference in terms of training between the two routes. In both cases, their main preparation will have been the regular 12 month or 6 month course received by Foresters and Guards respectively.

Five features of training at the three KFD institutions are significant for their ability to prepare staff for people-centred forestry. First, the syllabuses are enshrined in legal instruments, which limit the freedom of individual trainers to modify them. Second, there is no cadre of trainers: regular forest officers are posted to the institutions as instructors as just one stage in their career within the forest service. Average length of service as instructor at Tattihalla is between two and three years. Third, newly posted instructors receive no induction training either in the subject matter which they are to teach, or in training skills. This means that their own theoretical background may be out of date, and that they tend to rely on training methods they experienced during their own initial training. Fourth, the status of the trainees is that of 'men under discipline', their daily timetable leaves little time for self-directed learning, they are in uniform, drill is a regular feature and compulsory sport a daily activity. Fifth, there is no one on the staff of the institutions with any background in social sciences or extension.

The essence of social forestry, then, is that foresters' success in getting trees planted depends much more on their ability to work with, encourage, teach, persuade and support people than on their technical expertise. The tasks facing the three categories of field staff are similar to those of other rural 'change agents', whose work involves motivating and enabling individuals, households and communities to make changes in the way they use land and other natural resources. These include:

Education, for example in helping people develop a fuller understanding of the interactions between trees and annual arable crops.

Training, when they are instructing someone in a specific skill such as pruning or planting out a seedling.

Interactive process skills using them in their work, such as listening, questioning, negotiating, reviewing, discussing.

Recruiting individuals into the KFD's programme, whether as nursery owners, as recipients of seedlings or as supporters of the idea of community plantations;

Solving problems, which may be technical (plant protection, silvicultural), or concerned with administrative, marketing or distribution aspects of the programme;

Participatory planning, which includes situation analysis, identifying needs, selecting appropriate objectives, sifting through alternative courses of action, monitoring the implementation of the selected course of action and evaluation to complete the cycle. The emphasis here is not so much on the elements of the planning cycle themselves as on the participatory nature of the activity. Particularly in community forestry, the process by which the plan evolves is more important to the future of the forestry endeavour than the technical or economic soundness of the plan;

Publicity, which some see as 'selling' the idea of social forestry as well as providing clear information to the public on KFD's programmes;

Advice & Information given to those who may be considering the possibility of planting trees as well as to those who have already done so.

Given the traditional role of forestry staff in Karnataka, the above tasks represent a fundamental change. They do not in any way devalue the technical expertise of foresters and Guards. Indeed, personnel may require a larger (or at least different) repertoire of technical knowledge and skills in moving from territorial to social forestry because of the wide range of site and social parameters they will encounter. But in addition to their technical expertise, they require a different set of **attitudes** towards rural people and their use of forest products, additional areas of **knowledge**, particularly in the social dimensions of forestry, and new **skills** in working with people.

KFD staff recognise these training needs. At a workshop on training methods held at Tattihalla in September 1990, participants were asked to suggest training objectives for the extension component of initial training for FEWs and foresters. Their list included trainees' ability to:

COMMUNICATE with people in simple, effective language

MOTIVATE people to take up farm and community forestry activities

LIAISE between rural people and the Forest Department

GUIDE people in planting and maintenance activities

BEHAVE acceptably among rural people

Current initial training for field staff does not match these objectives, either in content or in methods. Social forestry has been added to the Foresters' and Guard/FEWs' courses, as a separate subject. For the Foresters, it occupies 25 hours out of a total of 750 hours — a mere 3% — which they complete in two one hour sessions per week during their first term. The remaining 28 sessions each week are taken up with scientific and technical subjects ranging from civil engineering and surveying to silviculture and nursery techniques. Extension is treated as one topic within the social forestry syllabus. Much of the social forestry component is taken up with technical issues, such as the selection of species for various 'models' of planting (roadside, tank foreshore, artisanal, etc.) and very little time is devoted to social and procedural issues. There are no practical sessions on extension or communication skills, even though considerable emphasis is given to practical work in the more technical areas of the curriculum; nor are there any learning activities designed for the development of problem solving or team work skills.

These points can be illustrated by considering the list of subjects to be taught to FEW/Guards (Fig 3) and Foresters (Fig 4), and the syllabus for the social forestry component of the Foresters course (Fig 5), as laid down by KFD in 1987. These are compiled from information supplied by DCF Social Forestry Training, Tattihalla, in September 1989.

Figure 3 Components of FEW / Guards' Initial Training

1.	Forest Protection	10.	Forest Utilisation
2.	Soil Science	11.	General Silviculture
3.	Forest Mensuration	12.	Social Forestry
4.	Silviculture of Species	13.	First Aid
5.	Wildlife Management	14.	Study tour: tour journey and tour examination
6.	Forest Engineering	15.	Field Botany: identification
7.	Forest Survey	16.	Field practical works
8.	Forest Law	17.	Quiz
9.	Accounts & Office Procedure		

Figure 4 Components of Foresters' Initial Training

1.	Forest Engineering	12.	Wildlife Management
2.	Silvicultural Systems	13.	Forest Management
3.	Elementary Mathematics	14.	Forest Law
4.	General Silviculture	15.	Social Forestry
5.	Botany	16.	First Aid
6.	Forest Utilisation	17.	Statistics
7.	Surveying and Drawing	18.	Silvicultural Species
8.	Soil Chemistry, Soil and Water Conservation	19.	Survey and Engineering Practicals
9.	Mensuration	20.	Botany practicals
10.	Accounts & Office Procedure	21.	Tour, examinations & journal
11.	Forest Protection	22.	Quiz test

Figure 5 Syllabus for Social Forestry Component of Foresters' Course (from 1987)

1.	Introduction, terminology
2.	Need for social forestry, objectives and scope of social forestry
3.	Different components of social forestry: farm forestry, extension forestry, recreation forestry, afforestation of degraded forest
4.	Agro-silviculture, agroforestry, social security plantations, school forestry, urban forestry
5.	Afforestation of railway lines, high tension lines, canal banks, roadsides of different types of roads, major and minor irrigation tanks and ponds, degraded hillocks, C&D lands, saline and alkaline soils, sand dune stabilisation, Gomal lands; community planting — locality factors, method of soil preparation, choice of species and nursery and planting technique
6.	Raising of woodlots, windbreaks and shelter belts; tree crop husbandry
7.	Development of fodder blocks, and important fodder species (grasses and trees)
8.	Impact of social forestry on rural economy, employment and health
9.	Organisation and planning in implementation of social forestry
10.	Benefits of social forestry
11.	Methods of motivation, extension servicing to social forestry
12.	Concept of Pavitravana, Devarkadu, Nakshatravana, Rashivana, Navagrahavana
13.	Kissan nurseries
14.	Wood energy saving devices
15.	Re-using wood
16.	Non-consumable energies

The situation for motivators is different in a number of respects. They receive no formal pre-service training. At some time after appointment, they take part in a one week orientation course on social forestry held either at Tattihalla or at a new Social Forestry Training Centre at Kadugodi, on the outskirts of Bangalore. The content of this course covers a range of technical subjects (see Fig 6), with extension presented as a discrete topic in a one and a half hour session. The course is taught largely by visiting lecturers from various government departments and from the Universities of Agricultural Science at Dharwad and Bangalore. While this brings the motivators into direct contact with highly qualified experts, it makes it more difficult to integrate the subject matter in a way which would assist the participants in their future work. There is also a tendency for subject matter to be presented in an academic style: the session on extension is more likely to present motivators with a standard annotated list of extension methods and a standard model of the adoption and diffusion of innovations rather than a discussion of how one might establish an extension programme in a mandal. Some recognition is given to the fact that motivators already have some experience before coming to the course, by having sessions where participants talk about situations and problems they have faced in their work. At present, however, these are conducted as formal reporting sessions, rather than as an opportunity for sharing ideas on possible strategies for enhancing their work. This reflects the trainers' own lack of experience in social forestry work and their lack of exposure to learner centred and interactive modes of teaching and learning.

THE WAY AHEAD

The relevance of training to the new demands of social forestry can be improved in at least five areas:

Clarifying the Aims and Objectives of Training

The first step is to establish that the aims and objectives of initial training have changed. No longer is it sufficient for a new entrant into the Forester or Guard/FEW cadre to be technically competent and to have developed a prescribed set of attitudes towards the protection of trees and the pre-eminence of the Department's interest. The overriding aim is that trainees should be able to perform the tasks expected of them, whether they are posted to territorial or wildlife or social forestry duties. With both regular KFD staff and the motivators, a balance has to be struck between technical competence and knowledge, and human relations, communication and process skills. Motivators are called on to advise on species selection for farm forestry, and to give support to those who run local nurseries. To that

Figure 6 Social Forestry Orientation Course for Motivators, Forest Extension Workers, Progressive Farmers, etc. Tattihalla

Day 1	11.30	Introduction to and need for Social Forestry
	14.30	Nursery techniques, raising and maintaining different types of nurseries
	16.15	Vegetation pattern in Karnataka as a basis for tree planting raising different types of plantations, their techniques and maintenance
Day 2	9.30	Agroforestry, importance of windbreaks, shelterbelts, recommended species
	11.30	Watershed management and its relevance to social forestry
	14.30	Species for different soils and their economic benefits
	16.15	Wood saving devices
Day 3	9.30	How to organise extension works in the villages for rural development and motivation
	11.30	Micro-planning
	14.30-17.30	Practical knowledge about nurseries and plantations
Day 4	9.30-18.00	Field visits
Day 5	9.30	Silvipasture and its utility in social forestry
	10.45	Role of banks and voluntary organisations in the promotion of social forestry
	11.30	Discussions
	14.30	Feedback and valediction

Fig 7 Additional Areas of Content for Forester & Guard/FEW Training

A.	**RURAL SOCIETY AND SOCIAL FORESTRY**
•	Structure of rural society (economic and social differentiation, leadership, gender, family types, landholding pattern)
•	Problems facing rural communities, and alternative approaches to tackling them
•	Processes of social, technological & economic change at village level
•	Trees and tree products in the local economy, including a historical perspective—eg how the present situation has evolved, tree planting & management practices in the past and now
•	Gender issues in the use of trees and tree products
•	Rationale and objectives of social forestry - meeting local needs - reducing pressure on diminishing forest resources - boosting rural income earning possibilities
•	Planning and administrative structures and procedures at village, mandal and zilla parishad level
B.	**EXTENSION AND COMMUNICATION**
•	Nature and objectives of extension work
•	Planning extension programmes at village or mandal level
•	Directive and non-directive extension; the need for participation at all stages
•	Principles of communication (ie what it is, and how to do it effectively—basic principles)
•	Non-verbal communication
•	Listening and questioning skills
•	One-to-one communication, including: - training in a technical skill or operation - problem diagnosis/situation analysis on a client's farm - giving advice
•	Communication with and within groups, including: - situation analysis, problem census techniques - discussions (leading, guiding, summarising), within formal (Village Forest Committees) and informal settings - negotiation - micro-planning procedures - method and result demonstrations
•	Use of visual and audio-visual aids

extent at least they need some basic technical training. However, much of that can be provided by a period of attachment to KFD nurseries and plantations. The week long induction or introductory course could then concentrate on the other set of objectives. Given a clear statement of the duties each cadre is expected to perform, one could use the common classification of training outcomes — knowledge, attitudes and skills — as a basis for building up an agreed set of training objectives (see page 7, above). Clear objectives will, in turn, help in the selection of content and of methods.

Adjusting the Content of Training Curricula to give more Emphasis to Social and Extension Issues

An initial review of training objectives in KFD identified two main areas of content on the human and social aspects of forestry, the first of which is more concerned with knowledge and understanding, while there is a strong element of skills within the second. These are set out, together with a list of possible topics within each, in Fig 7.

The administrative separation of social forestry within the KFD is mirrored in the treatment of social forestry as a separate curriculum area. In future projects and programmes, such as the Western Ghats Forest and Environment Project, social forestry principles are likely to permeate the work of the whole Department. But even without this development, there is a strong case for integrating social forestry across the whole training curriculum. If it continues to be treated as a separate subject, within a curriculum based on the management of large scale natural forest and plantations, social forestry will continue to be seen as a departure from the norm rather than a fundamentally new way of approaching the development and utilisation of trees.

Using Social Forestry as a Cross-Curricular Theme rather than Treating it as a Discrete Topic

Accepting social forestry as an organising principle, as a major theme which should permeate the whole curriculum, would lead to a review of all course components within the initial training of Foresters and FEW/Forest Guards. All the subject areas listed in Fig 3 and Fig 4, for example, could be adjusted to give due emphasis to farm and community forestry. Forest engineering examples and practicals could be based on the requirements

within community plantations. The list of species discussed in the silvicultural systems component would need to include species which have not been at all significant in the management of either natural forest or KFD plantations. The notion of silvicultural requirements of a species would have to be adjusted to take account of social and economic demands for tree products. Similarly, the topic of forest protection takes on new dimensions in small plantations in populated areas, or in roadside planting, which are absent in traditional approaches to protection of large tracts of mature forest: the threats and the pressures are different both in nature and degree, and solutions must be sought through consensus and participation rather than policing.

Broadening the Repertoire of Training Methods

A fourth step is to review the teaching and learning methods used. The lecture mode dominates all classroom sessions at present. Information is delivered through the spoken word and via the blackboard (rarely through handouts); trainees are expected to record it and learn it. The reliance on lectures is understandable: it is how the trainers themselves were taught, and it seems efficient in terms of the amount of information presented to a relatively large group of trainees by a single trainer. Lectures have their place: they can be an effective means for achieving certain aims, such as exposing trainees to the relevant corpus of forest law, or offering a conceptual framework within which trainees can structure their understanding of new subject matter. Even here, however, learning would be enhanced by an element of interactive and self-directed learning activity: review exercises, for example, and case studies in which trainees are required to apply legal provisions to real situations.

There are two strands to the argument that a wider range of methods is needed. The first is that the lecture method is not appropriate to all the objectives of extension worker training. Trainees will not develop communication skills, or problem solving methodologies, or negotiation skills, by being told about them in a lecture. They will not learn how to draw up a plan for tree planting in an area from a formal presentation of the planning cycle. The second strand lies in the notion of the hidden curriculum: extension workers will tend to use training and communication approaches in their work that they experienced in their own training. If all their classroom experience has been of formal lectures, they will internalise a model of teaching and learning in which an expert delivers information to a set of recipients; they will tend to see themselves in relation to their

rural clients in a similar way to how they see their teachers in relation to themselves. The hidden message behind current training methods in KFD is that teacher-centred approaches are the most appropriate. This is diametrically opposed to the principles and rhetoric of social forestry, which begins with the local situation and local needs, of which the forestry extension workers will be much less informed than the rural people they work among. For both sets of reasons, then, trainees need to experience learner-centred, participatory training methods, in which the trainer is essentially a guide or a change agent rather than a dispenser of facts and knowledge.

A shift in training methods requires a change in the way in which resources are used, and suggests additions to the current range of resources and materials. This does not necessarily mean an investment in new technology, although a video would certainly be useful as a means of allowing trainees to see and learn from their performance in carrying out extension tasks, and provision of OHPs would enable trainers to prepare visual material beforehand and build up a stock of transparencies which could be left at the institution when the present incumbents are posted elsewhere. Even the humble blackboard can be used in a more interactive, participatory manner: trainees' contributions to a discussion can be written up, for evaluation and comment by others; or an analysis of a topic can be built up from trainees' responses to the trainers' questions.

In short, teaching and learning materials are needed which—

- draw participants into active collaboration
- exercise and stretch their problem solving and analytical skills
- acknowledge that participants have relevant knowledge and experience to bring to their training
- encourage them to apply the knowledge gained in training to real situations
- allow them to evaluate their own learning.

One type of material that meets these requirement is the case study, of the kind that has been developed for use within extension training at Reading (Wilson-Jones and Smithells, 1985). These are open-ended, short case

studies which present trainees with a situation and then pose a set of questions or problems for them to resolve. In doing so, the trainees will be using the information contained within the study and their own knowledge derived from previous training and from their field experience. At two workshops for trainers held in Karnataka in September 1990, it was shown that the use of case studies can—

- stimulate exchange of experience among participants
- encourage application of theoretical knowledge and procedures to the solution of problems based on real situations
- develop skills in social interaction, group discussion and cooperation
- acknowledge and use participants' own experience and knowledge as an important learning resource
- show that there is often no single 'correct' solution to problems in the field
- encourage participants to integrate different areas of knowledge in analyzing a complex situation.

In the same workshops, participants wrote case study material based on information gathered from short field visits (Garforth and Clarke, 1990, 9: 15ff); these case studies have been used in subsequent training activities.

There are already opportunities for a greater focus on social forestry in training and for more trainee-centred, interactive methods. Forester and FEW/Guard trainees have an extended field visit on their pre-service courses, of up to four weeks. They visit a wide range of forestry sites and activities, including community plantations, kissan nurseries and farm forestry. A requirement of the course is that they keep a detailed journal of their visit. This encourages them to analyze what they see and to relate it to what they have learnt, and the generally high quality of the journals testifies to the ability of the trainees. However, even when reporting on visits to social forestry sites, the journals are completely silent on social and extension issues. They analyze the technical aspects of these sites — species selected, layout in relation to topography, soil conservation — in considerable detail but have failed to ask questions about the process by

which the social forestry activity came to be undertaken. Who initiated the activity? What groups or categories of people in the community were involved? Through what stages did the discussions or negotiations go? What was the role of KFD in the whole process? Have there been any conflicts or differences of view over whether trees should be planted or how the produce should be distributed? What are people's attitudes towards the trees? In what ways has the management or husbandry of a community plantation been different from what would have been done in a commercial plantation?

Another opportunity exists with the induction courses for motivators. Here the participants have already been in post for some time — up to four years in some cases. They have a wealth of experience of field level extension. They have encountered difficulties and achieved successes. They have developed strategies for dealing with a variety of situations. The course could be an opportunity for them to analyze their experience, to compare it with others', to try out new approaches, to increase their confidence in dealing with the situations they face. The many years of combined experience which the participants bring could be regarded as the most valuable learning resource available to them. A course that gave due recognition to that resource would proceed through a series of student-centred activities, with tutors acting as resource persons, providing specific inputs of information as appropriate, but essentially playing the role of facilitators as participants pool their skills and insights in the completion of the task in hand.

The Training of Trainers

The challenge of adjusting content and developing new training methods and materials highlights the fifth requirement: training of the trainers. Although some of this training should be devoted to updating and enhancing knowledge in those subjects for which they will be responsible, the main need is for them to develop their own abilities and confidence as trainers. Developing a cadre of trainers or instructors is not really possible under the present arrangements for transfers and promotions within KFD; the relevance of postgraduate courses in teacher training is therefore limited. However a short induction course for staff who are posted to the KFD training institutions could be provided.

This need has been recognized by KFD. In the later years of the SFP, staff from the Social Forestry Wing have followed courses at UK institutions

with a strong emphasis on extension and training methodology — at Edinburgh and Reading Universities and at Wolverhampton Polytechnic. The benefit of this training, however, is spread throughout the Department rather than being concentrated in the training institutions. In the longer term, establishing a link with a teacher education institution within Karnataka would enable induction courses to be held on a regular basis for newly posted trainers.

CONCLUSION

Reviewing objectives, adjusting content, integrating social forestry and extension issues across the curriculum, developing more interactive and collaborative learning methods and the materials that go with them — these represent a fundamental change in the way KFD staff at all levels are prepared for their responsibilities. The recognition by KFD senior management that such a change is needed is an important step. Implementing the change will become easier as more senior officers are exposed to content and methods that are relevant to KFD's training objectives. As people-centred forestry increasingly permeates the work of the Department, so too must forestry training seek to develop skills in working with people as much as competence in dealing with trees.

Credits

Network Coordinator: Dr Gill Shepherd

Editors: Dr. Gill Shepherd, Social Forestry Research Fellow
Dr. Mary Hobley, Social Forestry Research Fellow
Edwin Shanks, Social Forestry Research Associate

Design, typing and layout:
Ingrid Norton, Social Forestry Network Secretary

Social Forestry Network
Overseas Development Institute
Regent's College
Regent's Park
Inner Circle
London NW1 4NS
England
Telephone: +44(71)-487 7413
Fax: +44(71)-487 7590
Telex: 94082191 ODIUK

This issue of the Social Forestry Network is funded by the INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE — IDRC, CANADA