

AMIC Workshop on Social Marketing and Public
Education Campaigns : Baguio, May 18-26, 1987 :
[a summary report]

1987

<https://hdl.handle.net/10356/91947>

A Summary Report

527

20

A Workshop to Develop Learning Modules
on Social Marketing/Public Education for Development:
A Summary Report

A workshop to develop learning modules on social marketing/public education for development was held in the Philippines on May 18-26, 1987 to answer the need for more effective marketing strategies to facilitate social development. The workshop was specifically designed to generate learning modules that would be useful not only to social development planners, practitioners, and educators, but also to students of development communication and marketing.

The opening ceremonies were held at the Manila Hilton Hotel by the workshop proper was conducted at the Baguio Country Club in Baguio City. The workshop was co-sponsored by the Asian Mass Communication Research and Information Centre, (AMIC), Philippines Information Agency (PIA), United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), U.P. Manila College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), World Association for Christian Communication (WACC), in cooperation with the Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP).

Twenty-four participants were invited to this workshop-- a congenial mixture of development planners and trainers, media specialists, communication researchers and educators, and marketing practitioners. (See Appendix A for profile of participants). Their multidisciplinary expertise and their actual experience in the field were expected to enhance the workshop outputs considerably.

They were asked to accomplish the following:

- 1) to examine the various elements and principles of social marketing as applied to socio-economic development programs in Asia; and
- 2) to develop and pre-test learning modules for possible inclusion in communications and marketing curricula and for adaptation in varying Asian contexts.

The Workshop programme consisted of the following:

- 1) a keynote lecture on the elements of social marketing and its contribution to national development;
- 2) country reports on social marketing efforts in Indonesia and Singapore;
- 3) case studies on the application of commercial marketing strategies to the development programs in nutrition and health, agriculture, family planning, forest conservation, and rural community cooperatives;

4) a paper on the integration of social marketing into the in-service and pre-service curricula, and another on marketing and communication issues in Expanded Program of Immunization (EPI) programs;

5) pre-testing of the UNESCO curriculum guidelines on nutrition and health education on two types of target audience : first, subject experts-- the workshop participants, and second, tertiary level clientele-- undergraduates at the University of the Philippines College Baguio (See Appendix B for report on Pre-test results);

6) writing of three learning modules: Introduction to Social Marketing: Module 2 - Elements of Social Marketing; and Module 3- The Process of Social Marketing (See Appendix C)

Originally labelled teaching modules, they were renamed at the workshop as learning modules in order to make them less focused on the teacher and more oriented towards the particular abilities and needs of the learner, whether he has had previous knowledge or experience in this field, or he is just being initiated into it.

Designed as a three-segment package for intensive training programs, each module makes general cross-reference to topics treated in greater detail in the other two modules. However, each module may also be used as a self-contained training material for individuals or groups whose main interest is a general orientation to social marketing.

The writing of these modules was shaped not only by the previous training or expertise of the various participants, but also by the lively discussion of issues raised during the presentations of papers and case studies.

The highlights of each workshop session are presented under Appendix D.*

APPENDIX A

DIRECTORY OF PARTICIPANTS

1. Professor Atilio Alicia
Assistant Professor
College of Arts and Sciences
University of the Philippines
Padre Faura, Manila
2. Mr. Ramiro Alvarez
Chief Information Officer
Publication and Information Division
Agricultural Training Institute
Diliman, Quezon City
3. Ms. Aura Anacan
Chief, Research and Production Division
Radyo ng Bayan
Bohol Avenue, Quezon City
4. Dr. Delia Barcelona
Associate Professor
Institute of Mass Communication
University of the Philippines
Diliman, Quezon City
5. Ms. Remy Camua
Sr. Training Officer
Bureau of Broadcasts
Bohol Avenue
Diliman, Quezon City
6. Ms. Zenaida Domingo
Head, Audio-visual Management Group
Department of Education, Culture and Sports
Palacio del Gobernador, Intramuros
Manila
7. Ms. Belina SB Capul
Chief, Motion Pictures Division
Information Department
Diliman, Quezon City
8. Mr. Excelsior Dangilan
Acting Regional Director
Region I-A
Philippine Information Agency
Baguio City

9. Professor Pacita Gavino
Assistant Professor
College of Arts and Sciences
University of the Philippines
Padre Faura, Manila
10. Ma. Socorro Ignacio
Ministry of Health
San Lazaro Compound
Manila
11. Atty. Evelyn Jiz
Acting Regional Director
Region 6
Philippine Information Agency
Iloilo City
12. Professor Ma. Milagros Laurel
Assistant Professor in Pilipino
College of Arts and Sciences
University of the Philippines
Padre Faura, Manila
13. Mr. Victorino Manalo
Instructor in Humanities
College of Arts and Sciences
University of the Philippines
Padre Faura, Manila
14. Mr. Prospero Madamba
AV Project Officer
IEC Section
Population Center Foundation
South Superhighway
Metro Manila
15. Ms. Minerva Matibag
Special Project Staff
People's Television 4
Bohol Avenue, Quezon City

16. Ms. Christine Matriano
Communication Officer
Philippine Business for Social Progress
Binondo, Manila
17. Ms. Faustina Miguel
Supervising Manpower Development Officer
Health Manpower Development & Training Services
Department of Health
San Lazaro Compound
Manila
18. Ms. Natividad Nuguid
Chief, Special Projects Staff
Philippine Information Agency
Visayas Avenue
Quezon City
19. Ms. Thelma Oliver
Head, Non-Government Sector
Program Development Office
Philippine Information Agency
Visayas Avenue, Quezon City
20. Unita Marie Otordos
Department of Health
San Lazaro Compound
Manila
21. Ms. Teresita Padua
Director, Public Affairs & Liaison Service
Department of Social Welfare and Development
Batasang Pambansa Complex
Constitution Hill
Quezon City
22. Ms. Elsie Santos
Project Officer, Program Division
Population Center Foundation
South Superhighway
Manila
23. Prof. Susanah Lily Silva
Assistant Professor
College of Arts and Sciences
University of the Philippines
Padre Faura, Manila
24. Dr. Teresa Stuart
Associate Professor
Department of Development Communication
University of the Philippines
Los Banos, Laguna

APPENDIX B

UNESCO's Curriculum Guidelines for Teaching a Social Approach to Nutrition and Health Education: A Report on the Pre-test Results

INTRODUCTION

The UNESCO handbook on Curriculum Guidelines for Nutrition Education Programmes was pretested in the Philippines as part of the workshop on social marketing/public education for development in Baguio City on May 18-26, 1987. The pretesting activity was jointly sponsored by the Asian Mass Communication Research and Information Centre (AMIC), the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of the Philippines (U.P.) Manila, and UNESCO, and administered by the Faculty of the Division of Humanities, College of Arts and Sciences.

The pretest aimed to examine the comprehensibility of the guidelines and their potential usefulness to training programs in social development and to academic curricula in communications and social marketing.

The handbook was pre-tested on two types of respondents: 1) University Students at the undergraduate level; and 2) professionals with expertise in education, communications, research, mass media, health, population, and development planning. The first pretest was held at the workshop site. Baguio Country Club, on May 20, 1987. A subgroup of twelve (12) participants was asked to read and assess the usefulness and effectiveness of the handbook for pre-service and in-service training programs in nutrition education. The participants were the following:

Dr. Delia Barcelona
Program Coordinator, Graduate Studies
Institute of Mass Communication
University of the Philippines

Atty. Evelyn Jiz
Acting Regional Director
Region 6
Philippine Information Agency

Ms. Remy Camua
Sr. Training Officer
Bureau of Broadcasts

Ms. Faustina Miguel
Supervising Manpower Development Officer
Health Manpower Development & Training Services
Department of Health

Professor Susanah Lily Silva
Assistant Professor
College of Arts and Sciences
University of the Philippines

Professor Ma. Milagros Laurel
Assistant Professor for Pilipino
College of Arts and Science
University of the Philippines

Ms. Elsie Santos
Project Officer, Program Division
Population Center Foundation

Ms. Minerva Matibag
Special Project Staff
People's Television 4

Ms. Belina SB Capul
Chief, Motion Pictures Division
Information Department
Philippine Information Agency

Ms. Christine Matriano
Communication Officer
Philippine Business for Social Progress

Ma. Socorro Ignacio
Department of Health

The second pre-test was held at the U.P. Baguio on Saturday morning, May 23, 1987. Twenty-eight students volunteered to be pre-test respondents, and received an honoraria of P100.00 each.

The profile of the respondents follows:

AGE: 17--4 students
18--5
19--11
20--6
21--1
22--1

SEX: Female--20
Male -- 8

STATUS: all single

EDUCATIONAL
ATTAINMENT:

Degree:

Biology--17	Freshman--5
Math-- 3	Sophomore--6
Psycho-Socio--1	Junior--4
Social Sciences--1	Senior--5
MassCom-Journ.--2	College Level--9
Speech Com-Theatre--1	
Fine Arts--2	
Business Administration --1 (cross-enrolee from the Diliman campus)	

The students were given three hours to read the UNESCO handbook and to answer a ten-item pre-test questionnaire. They were asked to identify the following:

- the main objectives and the main idea of each unit
- what was easy/difficult to understand in each unit
- what was useful/not useful in each unit
- the comprehensiveness of the structure of the
- of the guidelines
- the language of the guidelines
- the length of the guidelines
- their appropriateness to particular teaching/learning levels

ANALYSIS OF THE PRE-TEST RESULTS

A. Pretest at the Social Marketing Workshop

The workshop group reviewed the UNESCO handbook and found most of the material in the seven units of the handbook relevant and useful in planning social marketing programs in their respective fields. Specifically, the various aspects of the social marketing process-- from designing baseline studies to setting up criteria for project evaluation -- were found useful in formulating a general framework for planning a total social marketing strategy for their respective and prospective development projects.

The following is the draft outline of a possible social marketing project cycle drawn up by the workshop group. It shows which particular topics in the Handbook were found to be particularly relevant and applicable.

Steps in the Project Cycle

I. Pre-planning

- Needs Assessment/Consultative Meetings
- Target Audience Identification (both primary and secondary)
- Community Profile Description
- Identification of Communication Network

Research Activities

Phase I: Exploratory

- AKAP,
- ethnography,
- Rapid Appraisal System
- Resource Inventory Analysis
- Identification of resistance/Acceptance Points

II. Program/Project Plan

- Objective Setting (Identification of Success/Failure Indicators)
- Audience Segmentation
- Project Definition
- Project Campaign Design
- Message Formulation
- Media Mix
- Concept Design and Pre-test
- Distribution Scheme
- Training of Change Events
- Monitoring and Evaluation Scheme
- Schedule (Time Frame)
- Resource Requirements (5 Ms)
- Pre- and Post-Project Survey

Phase II: Formative
Monitoring
Process & Content
Schedule
Resistance/
Acceptance
points
Documentation

III. Implementation

- Social Preparation
- Training of Implementors
- Resource Mobilization
- Materials Development
- Dissemination/Media Placement
- Monitoring and Evaluation

IV. Project Evaluation (Summative)

- Implementation
- Outcome (in terms of attainment of objectives/resistance and acceptance points)
- Efficiency

It is significant to note from the group's evaluation that the principles of social marketing as discussed in the Handbook were actually validated by the participants' own experiences in the field. The guidelines therefore were found to have general applicability not only to nutrition and health education but to all other development programs as well. It may also be noted that out of this initial discussion on the Handbook, the group was able to contribute significantly to the writing of learning modules either on Social Marketing for integration into academic curricula or for pre- or in-service training. The three modules were: I. Introduction to Social Marketing; II. Elements of Social Marketing; and III. The Process of Social Marketing.

Since this was a pretest not on the level of learners but on the level of experts, no problem was encountered on the comprehensibility of the text.

B. Pre-test at U.P. Baguio

Discussion of the pre-test results will follow the order of responses to the questionnaire.

Question 1. What did you understand to be the main objective of each unit?

Question 2. What did you understand to be the main idea in each unit?

In order to determine the degree of the respondents' understanding of the objectives and main ideas of the units, it was necessary for the pre-test analysts to formulate guide answers which would be the basis for evaluating the respondents' answers. These guide answers, in turn, were based on the frame of reference and outline provided before each unit and necessarily, on the analysts' own perception of the material.

The respondents' answers were categorized according to the degree with which they adhered to coincided with the guide answers. These categories were: Very Close (to the Guide Answer), Acceptable, Unacceptable, and No Answer.

The responses were categorized as follows;

Question 1 (main objective of each unit)

<u>Units</u>	<u>Very Close</u>	<u>Acceptable</u>	<u>Unacceptable</u>	<u>No Answer</u>
1	(11) 39.43%	(8) 28.57%	(7) 25%	(2) 7.14%
2	(14) 50%	(6) 21.42%	(7) 25%	(1) 3.57%
3	(23) 82.14%	(2) 7.14%	(3) 10.71%	-
4	(17) 60.71%	(8) 28.57%	(3) 10.71%	-
5	(17) 60.71%	(10) 35.71%	(1) 3.57%	-
6	(15) 53.57%	(8) 28.57%	(5) 17.85%	-
7	(16) 57.14%	(5) 17.85%	(7) 25%	-

Question 2 (main idea in each unit)

1	(9) 32.14%	(11) 39.28%	(7) 25%	(1) 3.57%
2	(12) 42.85%	(13) 46.42%	(1) 3.57%	(2) 7.14%
3	(11) 39.28%	(12) 42.85%	(3) 10.71%	(2) 7.14%
4	(8) 28.57%	(13) 46.42%	(2) 7.14%	(5) 17.85%
5	(11) 39.28%	(7) 25%	(4) 14.28%	(6) 21.42%
6	(14) 50%	(4) 14.28%	(6) 21.42%	(4) 14.28%
7	(6) 4.42%	(13) 46.42%	(2) 7.14%	(7) 25%

The figures from the Very Close Category and those from the Acceptable Category indicate that all the units of the handbook elicited responses which range within the original intentions of the handbook. However, the respondents were able to produce more answers in the Very Close Category in Question 1 (6 of the 7 units had 50% or better answers in the Very Close category) than in Question 2 (only 1 out of 7 units has 50% answers in the Very Close Category). This might be because the objectives which Question 1 addressed were very clearly marked out and explained in the Introduction of each unit.

Therefore, the results of Question 2 seem to be a better gauge of the effectiveness of the units since the answers relied more heavily on the respondents' own abilities of inference. Of the seven units, Units 2 and 6 obtained the highest percentage of answers in the Very Close Category (42.85% and 50% respectively) whereas Units 1 and 4 had the lowest (32.14% and 28.57% respectively). A review of Units 1 and 4 would show that these units tended to be more general and more discursive than the other units, and therefore less effective. Units 1 and 4 also gave fewer concrete examples, especially in the form of actual case studies. On the other hand, the advantages of unit 6 may stem from the fact that its information is presented through the use of diagrams and of guide questions. Unit 6 also contains more specific examples of the issues being discussed.

Question 3 : What did you find easy to understand in each unit?
Question 4 : What did you find difficult to understand in each unit?

Answers to these two questions cover a wide range of specific topics listed as subtitles in the handbook, e.g., "problem and audience identification", "work plan development," "health education as planner," etc. There were also a few vague answers such as "the early parts" and "the last parts." The entire unit, 7 was singled out as "easy to understand" by 11 respondents whereas 8 respondents found Unit 6 "easy to understand." No other parts were significantly identified as being either "easy" or "difficult" by more than one respondent. On the other hand, the number of respondents finding nothing difficult to understand in the Units (ranging from 3--12 respondents for the various units) appears significant relative to the lower frequency of occurrence of other answers.

Question 5: What part(s) did you find to be useful in each unit?

Several portions of the handbook were labelled "useful" by the respondents. Among the more useful portions noted by these respondents are the following:

- Unit 1. problem and audience identification
developing a plan or investigative design
- 2. ethnographic research
need for cultural understanding
- 3. community participation
- 4. message design and media choice
- 5. pricing and prize-product relationship
packaging and use of advertising
- 6. resource allocation
health education project framework

Question 6: What part(s) did you find not useful in each unit?

Less than 50% identified portions of the handbook as "not useful". Majority did not answer Question 6. This could mean that (a) the respondents may not have found anything not useful or (b) the respondents were pressed for time and thus left the question unanswered. Even the few who identified very specific parts which were "not useful" vary greatly in opinion such that rarely do two respondents point to common portions as not being useful. A rare sample may be found in Unit 2, where 3 respondents concurred that they did not find the example of the Tunisian health system useful;.

Question 7: What do you think of the ~~sa~~structure of the guidelines?

A significant 57.14% (16 respondents) and 42.86% (12 respondents) found the handbook "comprehensive" and "very comprehensive" respectively. None of the respondents indicated that they found the structure "not comprehensive".

Question 8: What do you think of the language of the guidelines?

82.14% (25 respondents) found the language "technical and academic but not difficult to understand" whereas 17.86% (5 respondents) found the language "too technical and academic and difficult to understand."

Question 9: What do you think of the length of the guidelines?

71% (17 respondents) found the handbook "too long" whereas 39.29% (11 respondents) found it "just right". No one found it "short enough".

Question 10: For what teaching/learning level would these guidelines be most appropriate?

Teaching/learning level--Number of responses

"In-service training of professional health workers"-- 19
"College/university level course"--8
"Workshop training of graduate rural health workers"--7
"Graduate level course"--7
"Workshop training of undergraduate barangay or community level health worker"--3

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the foregoing analysis of the pre-test results (U.P. Baguio), the UNESCO handbook is generally clear, comprehensible both on the level of subject matter experts and on the level of university undergraduates. The handbook is also acknowledged to be useful for various levels of training programs. Its wide-ranging applicability is significantly validated by the experts (workshop group) pre-tested.

The following recommendations can be made:

1. The practice of beginning each unit of the handbook with a brief statement of purpose seems effective in aiding comprehension, and should be retained. The use of subtitles appears to be just as useful.
2. Units may be improved by shortening them and by providing more guide questions which the social marketer can use in approaching the specific problems discussed in each unit.
3. The use of more diagrams may also be helpful. Illustrations help clarify important points in the guidelines, as evident in the responses to Unit 6. These visual aids may help in explaining technical terms and abstract concepts.
4. More examples and relevant case studies may also aid the learner in comprehending the guidelines. These case studies should also be more thoroughly discussed with regard to their implications and ramifications.
5. The handbook can still be compressed but without necessarily sacrificing its scope. It must be pointed out, however, that the data on "length", in the case of the pre-test, may very well be a function of the artificial setting of the pre-test or the time constraint of three hours rather than an actual excess of the handbook.

6. If the handbook is to be used by non-professional groups, its language should probably be adapted to suit the level of such groups. But the response of majority of the college students pretested that the language is "technical and academic but not difficult to understand" can also be a safe gauge of its comprehensibility as far as its language is concerned.
7. From the pre-test results alone, it appears that the respondents consider the handbook most suited to the training of professional health workers, perhaps mainly because of its basic orientation to health and nutrition. A considerable number, however, also foresee its usefulness as a course in college/university, both on the undergraduate and graduate level, and as an input into the training of graduate rural health workers. This would seem to indicate a relatively wide range of applicability even in its present form; however, it must be remembered that this assessment is only from the point of view of the college students who were the subjects pretested. Hence, it is recommended that the handbook still be pretested among as many prospective users as possible.

Prepared by:

The Faculty of the Division
of Humanities, College of
Arts and Sciences