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Seminar Report

By

Victor Valbuena
SEMINAR REPORT

This report covers the implementation of the Seminar on Development and Communication in the 1990's: What Needs to be Done? organised by the Asian Mass Communication Research and Information Centre (AMIC), Singapore with support from the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), Canada. The seminar was held at the AMIC Conference Room on 2-6 April 1990.

Background

Along with similar other writings, the classic work on communication and development, Daniel Lerner's The Passing of Traditional Society (1958) set the tone for succeeding efforts at conceptualising the relationship between communication and development, particularly in the Third World. It influenced many developing countries in the 60's to adopt the economic strategy of modernisation and its corresponding communication paradigm called development communication.

The basic thesis of this paradigm was that information and communication - in terms of hardware and programmes - would make possible the acceleration of development processes by modifying the attitudes and behaviour of peoples of the Third World. The mass media, particularly radio, seemed to have a considerable potential for helping developing nations to meet development
goals. Thus, radio and television stations, printing presses, training institutions and scholarships for training abroad drew the largest proportion of investments in communication. It was expected that, as a matter of course, these investments would accelerate development and distribute its benefits equitably.

But such expectation did not fully materialise. In many instances, economic differentials were widened rather than reduced. The relationship between communication and development was more complex than originally thought.

The concept of development, the concept of communication, and our understanding of the relationship between the two, underwent fundamental changes. Development came to be seen as including more than merely quantitative growth. Communication came to be seen as being more than just mass media.

Third World countries would adopt other economic strategies that would bring about "new" communication paradigms. One of these strategies would be self-reliance, resulting in the communication paradigm of participatory communication. Another would be leap-frogging into post-industrial informatics and the communication revolution.

In many cases, whichever strategy and paradigm was adopted did not result in the expected development of majority of the people. In many cases, the strategies could not even be carried out for various political and socio-economic reasons. Many countries failed to look closely at the basic defect in their socio-economic and political structures as well as the geopolitics of the region in which they are located.
There was need, therefore, to reconceptualize the meanings of development and communication and their relationship with each other. Communication thinking, communication investment policies, and training programmes needed to be aligned with each other and with the changes which have occurred in the area of development.

In an effort to address this need, the Asian Mass Communication Research and Information Centre, with support from the World Association of Christian Communication and Worldview International Foundation, held a consultation on the topic Beyond Development Communication in November 1986. The meeting brought together a cross-section of sectoral groups involved in policy-making, planning and implementation of communication and development work. They were requested to re-examine and reconceptualize the models and concepts of the 60's and 70's, and to conceive of, if possible, a new framework for relating communication and development in the 80's.

Among other conclusions and suggestions, the consultation:

1. Accepted that paradigms are essentially post-hoc superimpositions and constructions to produce order from chaos, and as such may be inadequate as models of social development or for explaining the peculiar workings of a particular country undergoing development processes; however, the participants granted that some of the researches carried out within the framework of these paradigms have been useful in understanding the dynamics of the relationship between development and communication, and that paradigms, whether old or new, could
exist side by side.

2. Suggested that new information and communication technologies will continue to be essential for a better understanding of development communication. Those technologies that bear on development must be based on certain premises of social justice than the usual economic indicators of growth rates, GNP, per capita income, etc.

3. Suggested that it is a paradigm where full, actual involvement of the people from all walks of life would be sought for. Toward this end, technologies are not to be rejected en toto. The application of high technology must not take place without a careful consideration of their consequences upon the environment and an evaluation of social costs to the society.

4. Suggested that the paradigm would have indicators more in terms of social justice than the usual economic indicators of growth rates, GNP, per capita income, etc.

5. Called for a restructuring of communication policies and structures so that the role of communication is an integral part of the development process.

6. Called for a revitalized development communication curriculum in formal, university-based communication education programmes to produce manpower with the skills to use and apply the various communication approaches and media in development-oriented work, as well as with the knowledge and skills to conduct research for policy-making and programme planning and management in development areas.
While the consultation has proved useful and enlightening, certain issues and problems remain to be discussed and dissected further. These include the following:

1. The need for a more sociological and wholistic approach to research on development and communication; the need to draw from the experience of other social science disciplines in evaluating the factors and the dynamics that interplay in development; the need for a development communication research agenda that take into account the historical, economic, political, organizational, professional and personal factors which impinge on the research process in so many ways.

2. The issue of control and use of information and technologies critical to the development of Third World countries; the need to address the inherent contradictions in the process of technological advancement; the problem of managing the exploitative campaigns of TNCs to introduce information-communication technologies to developing countries.

3. The problem of addressing the questions: How can information-communication technologies be utilized to improve the position of Third World countries in the international system such that they get access to information and other data necessary for national development? And how can Third World countries cope with the instability introduced into so many aspects of society by information-communication technologies and their potential for further exacerbating power differentials between Third World countries and the developed countries?
4. In view of the above, how can the conflicts generated or triggered by development programmes be managed such that conflicts remain at constructive rather destructive forms?

5. Is a thorough understanding of power in all its forms, political, social, economic and communication power and how it is exercised by the various key actors of the development process essential in understanding the growth and decline of nations? Why have communicators shied away from studying the variables related to power and conflict? Can such an understanding be translated into concrete policies and programmes that could lead to a more efficient and effective use of communication for nation-building?

6. The problem of dissemination and utilization of research findings on communication and development among government policy-makers and programme planners and implementators; the need to link researchers and research-users to facilitate interface on development-oriented programmes and projects; the need to influence policy-makers with the idea that information is a vital resource for decision-making on matters concerning developments.

7. The need to integrate analysis of the state and policy-making at the national level with the response to international information-communication technology developments.

To address these problems and issues, the Asian Mass Communication Research and Information Centre proposed to hold a seminar on the topic of Development and Communication in the 1990's: What Needs to be Done?, the focus of this present report.
Participants

Thirty participants attended the seminar. They included researchers and academics, communication policy-makers and planners, programme implementors, and representatives of development institutions.

The seminar was envisioned to bring together the above participants from various social science disciplines, for them to dissect the issues enumerated earlier, as experts and specialists.

The seminar was to attempt looking at communication and development not just from the perspective of communication alone but also from a total systems point of view and thus bring into focus variables hardly given any attention in communication studies such as political, social and economic power, conflict-management, the dynamics of decision-making in allocation of scarce resources, etc.

The expectation was that the interface with social science researchers, particularly those with extensive field practice, would generate an interest among policy-makers, programme planners and implementors to use research findings and other information usually sourced by practicing researchers. On the other hand, the researchers were expected to benefit from the interaction with policy-makers and programme administrators in terms of generating a more realistic, practical, and sociologically based research agenda addressing communication technology development and national development.
The participants were expected to discuss, debate and make recommendations on the issues earlier listed.

Annex A lists down the names and addresses of the seminar participants.

Summary of Proceedings

Following is a summary of the proceedings of the seminar. Annex B contains a copy of the programme.

2 April 1990

Opening Session. Dr. Victor T. Valbuena, AMIC Senior Programme Specialist and Coordinator of the Centre's Seminars and Institutional Development Programme, welcomed the participants on behalf of the Secretary General, Mr. Vijay Menon. Dr. Jingjai Hanchanlash, Regional Director of the International Development Research Centre also welcomed the participants and reiterated the interest of IDRC in development efforts in the Third World. He wished the participants a fruitful exchange of ideas and experiences during the seminar.

As Seminar Director, Dr. Valbuena also introduced the participants and gave a brief orientation on the seminar procedures.

Keynote Address. Dr. Juan F. Jamias, Professor of Development Communication, Institute of Development Communication, University of Philippines at Los Banos, gave the keynote address on the theme of "Towards a Holistic Approach to the Study of Development and Communication in the 1990s". Dr. Jamias, of the Asian pioneers in development communication
thinking, looked at some of the theories of the holistic method of analysis. He said that the holistic approach required one to identify the various elements or components of the developmental issue, and then to act on each one. All components were interdependent. As such, communication could be seen as only one part of a larger system composed of multiple interacting factors.

Dr. Jamias illustrated this with some of his own experiences in development communication in Philippines. Using Kenneth Boulding's model of hierarchical levels of a 'systems of systems', Dr Jamias explained that at the different levels of the social structure, attributes like cultural beliefs and values, general innovativeness and modern outlook could no longer be the only matters of concern - but social structure like land tenure, the exercise of social power, infrastructure and government policies were some of the other interacting factors to be considered. However, he also observed that there is a difference between the theory and practice of the holistic approach.

Dr. Jamias concluded by saying that the future of development communication lies in -

1. the integration of the various disciplines like social science, communication and political science;
2. educational approaches to the problem of literacy of both the leaders and the masses; and
3. empirical-positivist researches to be complemented by more qualitative researches to probe normative issues.
Paper Presentations. After tea, Dr. Anura Goonasekera, AMIC Senior Programmes Specialist and Head of the Centre’s Research Programme, started the series of paper presentations with his paper on "Socio-anthropological Approaches in the Study of Development and Communication". Dr. Goonasekera emphasized the importance of culture in the study of communication and development. He said that communication could be seen as mediated through culture. Early studies of communication and development assumed that mass media could bring about changes in values, aspirations and economy. Such was not the experience of many societies. What the early studies lacked was incorporation of cultural practices and other institutional factors in the studies.

Dr. Goonasekera also pointed out that communication should be seen as part of the social system. To see the role of communication in society was to see its relationship with other institutions and practices in society. The study of development and communication could benefit from the use of the methodology of the anthropologist. This included the use of conceptual tools developed in social anthropology - namely, the concept of social institution, socialization, artefacts and functional analysis.

The next paper focused on the topic "The Strategic Importance of Organisation and Leadership in National Development Communication Programmes". It was presented by Dr. Jesucita L. Sodusta, a social anthropologist at the Department of Sociology, University of Hong Kong.

In her paper, Dr. Sodusta advocated the new approach to development communication which involved organisation. She said,
however, that today's development communication needs more than integrating an organisation component into its programmes. The environments of these programmes had changed dramatically in the last decade. Demand for service quality, a broad-based participation, new information technology, and so on required an organisational strategy that can keep up with all these changes.

Dr. Sodusta discussed the structural dimension of communication, particularly the structure of organisation. She said that the structure of development communication programmes must move away from the classic linear, one-way flow of bureaucratic communication to participatory and feedback communication. In addition, on one hand, programmes must also be sensitive to a diversity of features such as personality, cultural and corporate ones within the bureaucratic structure. On the other hand, the bureaucratic organisations could team up with non-bureaucratic ones since the former had the flexibility to organise transactions rapidly. To meet the increased demand for resource-based linkages, development programmes must build networks.

She emphasized that these strategies required a strong leadership that could effectively organise staff participation and implement the corporate vision. Unless the leadership component was integrated, the search for sound policies for programmes will be inadequate.

After lunch, Dr. Majid Tehranian, Professor and former Chairman of the Department of Communication, University of Hawaii, spoke on the topic of "The Political Economy of
Development Communication: A Comparative Perspective.

Dr. Tehranian outlined four political ideologies - the Blues (Capitalist democracy), the Reds (Communist democracy), the Blacks (Totalitarian dictatorship) and the Greens (Communitarian democracy). He advocated the Communitarian system as a viable communication and development policy option.

Compared to the others, Communitarianism focused on high integration and a balance between capital accumulation and sociopolitical mobilization. Its principles were rooted in community, ecology, peace and participatory democracy. Dr. Tehranian said, however, that Communitarian philosophy development also faced an uphill battle against forces beyond its control.

After Professor Tehranian's presentation, Dr. Benjamin V. Lozare, former AMIC Joint Deputy Secretary General, presented two related papers on power and conflict management. The first paper was on "The Need for a Technology on Conflict Management".

Dr. Lozare started off by saying that conflict when properly managed could be a positive factor in national development. He identified the causes of conflict in many development countries to be:

1. Lack of a clear, shared vision
2. Low level of skills of development workers
3. Lack of teamwork
4. Social and political obstacles
5. Limited resources and its adherent problem of allocation
6. Lack of participatory activities and poor sequencing of development messages

7. Use of the law with force to resolve conflicts.

In his second paper, "Power and Conflict: Hidden Dimension of Communication, Participative Planning and Action", Dr. Lozare examined the definitions of power and conflict and stressed on the two as essential elements in communication.

Looking at participative planning and action, he said that conflicts would arise because if everyone were to be allowed to have his say, not everyone would agree on the same thing. Therefore, a conflict model was needed in participative planning and action. The conflict model required that conflict management and the exercise of power be given due attention. He called for a better appreciation of conflict and how to manage it.

Dr. Lozare also brought up the concept of transformational leadership where the leaders address followers' wants, needs and other motivations as well as those of their own. Eventually, the goals and purposes of the two groups which might have started out as separate but related, become fused. He explained how a transformational leadership style was needed if a meaningful participation of people in the development programme was desired.

3 April 1990

During the first half of the morning session, four speakers gave their perspectives on the topic, "The Concept of Power in the Context of Development and Communication in Third World Societies".
Dr. Boonlert Suphadiloke, Director of the Office of the National Communication Policy Board, Thailand, was the first speaker. He represented the policy-maker's views. He said that in formulating development communication policies and programmes, it was not only necessary to take into account the needs of the people. It was also necessary to be aware of and understand the interests of the political powers-that-be who will eventually approve and support the policies. He candidly admitted that one has to consider the seemingly personal priorities and interests of the government's and specific ministries' leadership, and integrate them in development policies.

Mr. P. Subramaniyam, Director of the Centre for Development Research and Training in Madras, India, represented the programme administrator's views. Mr. Subramaniyam said that to make development programmes work, the administrator needed executive power. However, there must be a matching sensitivity to the perceptions of the masses who come from varied socio-cultural backgrounds.

First, there must be multi-disciplinary studies at the micro-level of the people so as to understand and appreciate how they perceived and responded to development concepts. Second, a plan has to be worked out to incorporate a communication strategy suitable to bring the development message across effectively and the training needed to implement the communication strategy.

In the Indian context, Mr. Subramaniyam said that the role and potential of traditional media was very important in communicating development messages to target groups. He said that
there was also a need to train development functionaries in the techniques of communication as they had to interact with people in the process of implementing development programmes.

Giving the social scientist's perspective, Dr. Joseph Man Chan, lecturer in the Department of Journalism and Communication, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, said that power was ignored in the study of development and communication in the past; now, power, in particular equitable distribution of power, is gradually being recognised as a precondition to any development. A challenge for the Third World was to periodically review and reform its power structure such that development could be enhanced.

In this respect, Dr. Chan advocated developing new communication technologies which required social and political restructuring on the national as well as international levels to ensure people's access to information and their ability to act on the information.

Mr. Mohammad Zakaria, Executive Director of Gonno Gobeshona O Unnayan Foundation, an NGO headquartered in Dhaka, Bangladesh, presented the community leader's perspective.

In his analysis of power, Mr. Zakaria saw that the inequitable power distribution in the rural structure in Bangladesh did not permit the poor who were the majority to better themselves. Because the poor were caught in a deprivation trap, they were isolated from resources, information and other people. He said that the mass media (TV, radio and newspapers) played a significant role in providing the much needed
information to the masses. There was a need for change in the social structure to ensure an equitable distribution of power and resources.

After tea break, Dr. H. K. Ranganath, Director of Programmes, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan Bangalore, India and an expert on traditional/folk media presented his paper on "Recent Trends and Development in Using Traditional/Folk Media for Development and Communication".

Dr. Ranganath traced the shift in the role of folk media from entertainment to communication and observed that they were also setting a change in the lifestyle and value system of the rural masses in the Third World.

He noted that although the status of folk media had been enhanced with the help of researches and even integration with mass media, the lot of the folk artist remains deplorable with limited economic viability and training to support him.

In the afternoon session, a panel of four spoke on the topic, "Communication Needs of Development Practitioners in the Field".

Representing the sector of the government extension worker, Dr. Teresa H. Stuart, Director of the Applied Communication Division, Philippine Council for Agriculture, Forestry and Natural Resources Research and Development (PCARRD), advocated technology transfer or effective research dissemination and utilization among extension workers as a tool of development.

Mr. Wirasak Salayakanond, Executive Director of Press Development Institute of Thailand who spoke from a mass media
practitioner's point of view, said the media people need information and training on development programmes in order for them to effectively communicate development to their various target audiences.

Dr. Hernando V. Gonzalez from the International Institute for Rural Reconstruction, Philippines, represented the view of private development agencies (PDAs). He identified interactivity and unequal social relations as two critical factors that bear on the communication effectiveness of PDAs.

He explained that the interactive model of communication and the participatory model of development seemed to assume equality, participation and symmetry among the members of a social system. In practice, however, inequality always exists in society and treating unequal members as if they were equal could lead to greater social and economic inequity. Differential power in a social system led to asymmetrical flows of information such that some groups found it easier to communicate than others and some groups were more likely to take part in project activities than others.

Some kind of mechanisms may have to be adopted to ensure accountability and representation in the development process – namely, monitoring and evaluation research. As many PDAs considered evaluation research as a poor cousin to field operations, funding agencies could help direct PDAs towards institutionalizing research as part of their project management.

Representing consumers and pressure groups, Mr. Mohd Hamdan Adnan, Secretary General of the Federation of Malaysia Consumers
Association described the role and function of a consumer group. Mr Adnan brought out the need for consumer groups as pressure groups to improve their communication skills and to widen their communication channels. Not only the mass media could be used, he said; the consumer associations could also print publications and organise talks, public forums and seminars to inform, educate and update the public as well as the policy makers on consumer issues.
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Case Studies. The morning session focused on presentations of case studies on participatory communication and development. Dr. Emma Porio, Research Associate from the Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University, presented a paper on "Participatory Approaches to Communication and Development: The Philippine Experience". She cited three case studies which tended to show that the participatory approach in communication and development in the Philippines had been hindered by the fundamental structures of power, poverty and inequity.

The first case study was the Barangay Agrarian Reform Program which was hindered by domination and interference by political personalities. The second case study was the Community Information and Planning System that saw powerful entities in the community disrupt the progress of community development.

The third case study was the Local Resource Management Project. There were three main observations in this case study:

1. The poorer groups could not afford the time to attend training sessions and seminars which were designed to
help them manage and sustain the development projects on their own.

2. The poorer groups also could not change certain practices like going against the middlemen whom they had always depended on for emergencies.

3. The government bureaucrats were not prepared for the change in the role and status of the poorer groups who would be the beneficiaries of the development projects.

In summary, Dr. Porio said that the implications for the 1990s were first, that the community-based groups and the non-government groups must take greater initiatives as the bureaucratic and institutional entities were not taking the catalyst role badly needed in the development process. She added that there was a need to widen the masses' accessibility and control of information systems.

Dr. Anchalee Leesavan, Coordinator of the Graduate Programme in Development Communication, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand, presented a paper on "Policy and Action Oriented Research: Two Cases".

In her presentation, Dr. Leesavan focused on the skill and resource management problems in Thailand, illustrating with two case studies - "Food and Nutrition" and the "Promotion of Cattle and Buffalo Raising and Integrated Cropping System".

In the former case study, training activities and nutrition educational materials were provided for some villages. However, problems like unqualified trainers, delayed training and loopholes in the distribution of educational materials hindered
the project.

For the latter case study, the people in twelve villages were trained and equipped with new technology of raising cattle and buffaloes and of the integrated cropping system so that they could be self-sufficient. The project was undertaken by the villagers themselves with close collaboration with the government. By and large, however, it was one person—a monk—who provided the strong leadership.

From the case studies, Dr. Leesavan also cited the problem of the gap between policy makers, researchers and practitioners due to differences in knowledge and attitudes about development inputs, outputs and their processes.

In conclusion, she said that development communication should be integrated into the country's planning process. She expressed the hope to see policy-makers and administrators get multi-disciplinary researchers and practitioners involved in the early stages of development projects.

The papers presented by the participants are in Annex C.

Supplementing the case studies was a video programme entitled "Participatory Approaches to Development: The Grameen Bank Project in Bangladesh". The video described the various integrated communication-training-income generation development projects undertaken by Grameen Bank in the rural areas of Bangladesh.

Open Forums/Discussions. Each presentation of seminar papers and case studies was followed by highly-spirited question and answer cum experience-sharing sessions to clarify statements,
argue a point, or to supplement examples made. A common thread running through the open discussions, however, was the concept of power and the need to understand it in the context of its various ramifications. The participants were one in suggesting that in any attempt to implement and evaluate development programmes, there must be a deep awareness of the influence of the power structure, be it in the international, regional, national or local levels, and be it in the specific area of political, economic, or social power.

Workshop Discussions. The seminar programme called for structured workshop group discussions to further dissect the issues as well as to produce an agenda for action in the area of information-communication technology development vis-a-vis national development, the exercise and distribution of power, conflict management, communication research dissemination and utilization for national development programmes, and collaborative activities between researchers and development programme policy-makers and administrators.

The first workshop group discussion session was held in the afternoon.

Discussion Papers. To provide additional background and context to the workshop sessions, discussion papers were presented before the participants were divided into groups.

Dr. Amri Jahi, Chairman of the Department of Agricultural Communication, Institute Pertanian Bogor, Indonesia, presented two papers echoing the sentiments earlier articulated by Dr. Leesawan. One was on "Collaborative Research and Development
Activities for Social Science Researchers Development Policy-makers and Programme Planners"; the other was on "Strengthening Participation of Field Practitioners in the Communication Research and Development Process".

Dr. Jahi said that collaborative research and development activities would be beneficial to researchers, field practitioners, policy-makers and programme planners if they could establish a pattern of interaction and cooperation.

As field practitioners have close contacts with the users and thus, know them better than the researchers, they could contribute significantly to the communication research. However, in practice, there were still questions about what types of research and at what stage of the research should the field practitioners be involved.

Dr. Mohd Fadzilah Kamsah, Chairman of the Department of Development Communication, Universiti Pertanian Malaysia, also discussed some strategies for strengthening the participation of field practitioners in the communication research and development process. He noted that increased participation will only be realized through deliberate, systematic and concentrated efforts of those responsible for project formulation, design and operation.

Mr. Abdul Waheed Rana, Assistant Director in charge of the Mass Media Section, Planning and Development Division, Pakistan, presented a paper on "Crisis of Mass Communication in Asia: Some Issues". Mr Rana said that most Asian government budgets showed little provision for research in mass media and that the
Governments also failed to provide effective policy guidelines in the development of mass media. He said that the new regional communication and information order of the day is to link communication facilities with other national objectives and integrate communication development with other national and international development plans.

**Discussion Groups, Session I**

The participants were divided into three discussion groups:

**Group I - "Towards a Multi-Disciplinary Development Communication Research Agenda"**

The group was led by Dr. Eddie C. Y. Kuo, Associate Professor and Head, Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore and Dr. Anura Goonasekera of AMIC. The group identified four areas of research activities:

1) **Background information compilation**
   
   There was a need to synthesize existing knowledge, experiences, failures and successes of development programmes and projects. This could be done on a country-to-country basis and compiled in a handbook or manual. In addition, compilation of development communication indicators would be helpful.

2) **Applied communication**
   
   Strategies in organisational communication like establishing communication networks should be formulated. Attention should also be made on applying communication and development strategies in urban areas.
3) **Basic research**

There was a need to identify communication models in the Asian context.

4) **Action-oriented communication research**

Research should be made on the socio-political and economic impact of new information and new communication technology.

**Group II - "Action Responses to Research and Information Needs of Policy and Decision Makers"**

The group was co-chaired by Dr. J. S. Yadava, Director of the Indian Institute of Mass Communication, New Delhi and Dr. Anchalee Leesavan of Chulalongkorn University. The group felt that in general, policy makers were not aware of the importance and relevance of research-based information. Therefore, they should find out what research and information were available prior to their decision-making.

The group also made the following suggestions:

1) Make research reports easy for policy makers to read.

2) Institutionalize the interaction between researchers, policy makers and field practitioners.

3) Researchers should find out the concerns of the policy makers and focus research on policy issues.

4) Make researches more action-oriented.

5) Synthesize social science research studies and bring out the communication policy implications of these studies.
Group III - "Strengthening Participation of Field Practitioners in the Communication Development Process"

The group was co-chaired by Dr. Mohd Fadzillah Kamsah of the Universiti Pertanian Malaysia and Mr. Kangsadarn Devahastin, Director of the Department of Agricultural Extension, Thailand.

The group agreed that the field practitioner was an important link between the researchers and development programmes' target beneficiaries. The field practitioner's input would be to provide feedback and to help translate research results into understandable and usable forms for the beneficiaries.

To increase the effectiveness of the field practitioners, the group suggested the following:

1) Give monetary / material incentives.
2) Give recognition/rewards for their participation in the communication and development process.
   (One step towards this is to persuade the management to see the participation of the field practitioner as a benefit rather than a cost factor.)
3) Maintain a well defined management structure to which the field practitioners can relate.
4) Provide knowledge and skills training.
5) Ensure that the infrastructure and other support systems are available.
6) Ensure sharing or pooling of resources where resources are scarce.
7) Ensure proper monitoring, supervision and control of the field practitioners.

The reports of the three groups can be found in Annex D.
The first half of the morning session was allocated for a presentation and discussion of the workshop group reports. Following the group reports were two presentations on India. The first was a slide/video presentation on "Development and Communication: Cases from India" made by Mr. P. Subramaniyam of the Centre for Development Research and Training, Madras. The cases focused on health and nutrition projects assisted by a Scandinavian development agency.

The second was a paper on "Communication for Social Development: Indian Experience" presented by Dr. J. S. Yadava of the Indian Institute of Mass Communication, New Delhi. In his paper, Dr. Yadava noted the strong coherence and close relationship between social structure, communication and the development process. He concluded by saying that communication plays a significant role in individual adaptation and the creation of a new and better environment.

Discussion Groups, Session II

After lunch, the participants were again divided into three discussion groups; the groups were:

Group I - "Policy Research Issues in National Communication Development Planning"

The group was led by Mr. Abdul Waheed Rana of Pakistan and Dr. Boonlert Suphadiloke of Thailand.
The group came up with the following policy research issues:

1) Information needs of the people
2) Review of existing communication researches done in different countries and their impact, especially on beneficiaries
3) Comparative study on distribution of resources used for communication and development activities
4) Comparative research on the accessibility of the media and its impact on the people
5) Transfer of communication technology
6) Improvement of the participation of field practitioners in the development and communication process
7) Improvement of the communication between the policy makers and academicians/researchers.

Group II - "Issues in Power and Conflict Management in Technology Transfer in the Asian Context: Some Areas for Research"

This group was led by Dr. Majid Tehranian of the University of Hawaii and Dr. Joseph Man Chan of The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

The group discussed three critical areas in considering technology transfer -

1) the cultural climate or preconditions for technology transfer (The preconditions implied asking questions like 'what indigenous technologies were there before adoption of new technologies?', 'what facilities were there for science and information research?', 'were there any any linkages between the education system and the technology transfer?', 'did the media provoke or...
encourage technology transfer? etc.)

2) strategies

3) impact of technology transfer (The implications for conflict arise from the impact of military technology transfer and the impact of other types of technology on special groups like women and children.)

Group III - "Collaborative Research and Development Activities for Social Science Researchers and Development Policy-makers and Programme Planners"

The group was co-chaired by Dr. Emma Porio of the Philippines and Dr. Amri Jahi of Indonesia.

The group identified the following study areas:

1) Collaborative research process - to do a retrospective process analysis on past and on-going collaborative research projects to find out the mechanism for effective collaboration

2) Conditions of conflicting objectives of different organisations

3) Assessment of failed collaborative projects to find out what were the loopholes

4) Perception of the actors in the collaborative research and its consequences on problem-solving, design and implementation on future collaborative research

5) Power and legitimation in collaborative research (the concern was for broadening the base of participation in collaborative research)
6) Participation of research users, support agencies and beneficiaries in research, implementation of programmes and evaluation.

The group also expressed concern that the strategy for collaboration be sensitive to the different stages of the development process and to address the issues of environmental protection and improving the quality of life in the 1990s.

The three discussion groups' reports are also in Annex D.
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Closing. The workshop reports were presented for discussion during the first half of the morning schedule. Following this, Dr. Victor T. Valbuena, the Seminar Director, gave a brief summary and recapped the proceedings of the meeting.

Mr. Vijay Menon, AMIC Secretary General, closed the seminar and expressed appreciation for the support provided by IDRC to the seminar, as well as the hope that the meeting was most useful to the work of the participants.

Evaluation. On the whole, the seminar was able to meet its objectives of articulating and probing issues on development and communication in the 1990's. It was particularly successful in discussing the concept of power and how it impinges on the development and communication processes in Asia, and in raising awareness of the need to consciously acknowledge power at all levels when planning and implementing development programmes.

The seminar had originally wanted a thorough discussion of the concerns relating to information and communication
technologies and the attendant issues like the political economy and multinational control of technology transfer. Unfortunately, the subject experts invited to discuss these subjects were unable to come to the meeting. However, aspects of the issues were raised in the workshop group discussions.

The papers and case studies presented showed an uneven quality. This, in part, is due to time constraints. Some of the paper presentors were busy with other commitments prior to the seminar; others could not be contacted or could not confirm their participation early. Several, in fact, presented drafts which they promised to revise after the seminar was over.

Participant Feedback. Feedback was sought from the participants on their appraisal of the seminar. Majority of them felt that the seminar was useful and relevant to their work. They said that the papers were, in the main, thought-provoking and provided insights useful to planning programmes as well as evaluation researches. Many said that they found the discussions spirited and motivating.

They also commented favourably on the flexibility adopted by the seminar to enable modifications in the programme to accommodate participant needs, particularly in providing opportunities for extended presentation and discussion of the papers.