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AMIC's Vice-Chairman Dol Ramli, chaired the opening session of the meeting. Welcoming the participants, he said the planning for the Consultation on Beyond Development Communication had taken almost a year.

The Consultation was envisaged as a meeting of minds of theorists, both drawn from communication as well as development, journalists, media practitioners, heads of media institutions and selected devcom practitioners. He said the task before the participants was to reconceptualise the meaning of development and communication and their relationship with each other. In the five-day path-breaking meeting, the task would be how devcom should be chartered for future action.

Mr Carlos Valle, General Secretary, WACC, said in his address that the concern of his organisation was that communication -- a powerful tool -- could be used to promote all-round development resulting in a more just, liberated and peaceful world.

Ms Roberta Borg, speaking on behalf of WIF, said that the organisation was keen to promote development communication and looked forward to the recommendations to be
framed by the working groups so as to be able to assist with follow-up activity.

AMIC Secretary-General Vijay Menon, in his welcome address, said that development communication had been a topic of concern for AMIC almost from its founding. Devcom could claim to be a Third World phenomenon. In the past two and a half decades and more, practically all developing countries had come to accept it as an instrument of policy and as an integral part of development planning. Nevertheless, experience of the past 25 years had prompted serious questions about the reality of the concept.

Dr Nora Quebral presided over the first business session.

Mr Neville Jayaweera, Director, Planning and Research of the WAQC, who had been the moving spirit behind the holding of the meeting, made a presentation on "25 years of the devcom debate - the shifting paradigm" which served to provide a backdrop to the five-day meeting.

Mr Jayaweera said it was important to remember that we were talking about development communication and not development support communication, the latter being project-oriented. He said in the last 25 years, there had been four paradigms. There were four economic paradigms and the four communication paradigms could be identified as corresponding to the periods of the economic paradigms. The first economic
paradigm of the period 1950-1965 he labelled as modernisation with the communication paradigm corresponding to its being called devcom. Structuralism are listed broadly from 1965-70s, resulted in the NWICO and what Mr Jayaweera called "underground communication". The third economic paradigm - self-reliance - led to the communication paradigm of participatory communication. The fourth economic paradigm which he labelled post-industrial-informatics at a corresponding communication paradigm labelled as communication revolution or leap-frogging.

Mr Jayaweera said the experts of institutions like MIT in 1950 onwards propagated economic progress development from which developed the concept of communication for development.

Structuralism in communication gave rise to the demand for a new communication order and this led to concepts like news pool, etc.

In stage three, the period of self-reliance, PQLI - physical quality of life index - has become more important than GNP and communication is now seen as a process.

Mr Jayaweera said we have come almost a full circle in the fourth paradigm where the individual is important. The emphasis was an output through automation; not only were man and paper being replaced, but also mind labour through the use of computers.
During the discussion, Mr Jayaweera referred to the maitland report called "The Missing Link" report, which said that the need was to have a telephone in every household which in turn would promote all-round development. This in essence is the maitland report in a nutshell, he added. Mr Jayaweera said that essentially, what had been argued in the report was to provide information and it will become a catalyst to development.

Dr Prodipto Roy, Chairman of the Council for Social Development, India, in his illuminating paper "Research Findings - do they bear out the assumption of devcom?", said in most developing countries, it was the elite who want to control the masses through structures by withholding research findings from the people.

He said any science had to be built on primary research and data. Science has its imperialism of imposing models to developing countries and since these models were usually developed in the West, they need to be countered by primary data to show why they are not applicable to developing countries.
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In the afternoon session, Dr James Halloran presented a paper on "Devcom - the international research experience".

The Past

Dr Halloran agreed that optimism of devcom is not justified. He spoke from his experience of 20 years.

Young researchers re-invented the same wheel. We have no clear intellectual devcom over the years. No significant researches have been made. There are some reasons why we have not moved.

1. We are not allowed to ask the right sort of questions. We are also not allowed to obtain right information.

2. We do not get the money to do the critical research. We are not allowed to ask questions or do research at all for this concern. The research was built in status quo or value free. We do not understand reasons for this concern. However, we did have a very short period of critical approach while there is development of M.C. (Halloran cited some of the western researchers.)
3. Those who frankly do not accept value of all this do not worry much about the output. There is implicit complexity. Research became politicised and we have not been allowed to do. This results in a lack of progress.

The future

We cannot administer cure without diagnose correctly the illness.

Some aspects of diagnosis:

1. Much of the work has dominated the field of mass communication research. Devcom research is characterised by the inadequate models of societies, images of men and women. Those inadequacy is still with us today.

2. The work has not been sociological, essentially the critical sociology. More is a need for holistic and contextual approaches. We should get away from communication at centre as communication process is related to other social context, not in isolation, eg. media influence in relation to other aspect of the society. We cannot look at media influence alone. Therefore, there is a demand to look at total process or look at social process of communication.
The researchers should give attention to collective aspect - social - political relevance rather than individualistic aspect and verbal response.

3. Communication is a field of interest. There is no theory but models. People spent too much time centering around the theory which is micro level and not social level.

4. Communication researchers concern with doing not thinking. We look at what they say they do than what they really do. All this is not correct.

5. It is not appropriate to make distinction between devcom and development support communication but distinction should be made between effect and effectiveness of communication programmes. Also, distinction should be made between policy research and policy-oriented research. We should not tie to ivory tower, and not take problems as given.

So, research should be: how we can get communication effectiveness across. It should not be the research like who did the communication, what effect were in the past.
6. Internal factor rather than external is important.
   There is slowness to recognise the power of national elites.
   Finally, Halloran admitted that we still work with small minorities. There is difficulty in addressing research as an exercise which look at media as a system.

Dr Prodipto Roy commented on invention of communication technologies that he is not sure whether people who invented technologies really know what those technologies are for. We should not look for high technology which may not be used in the Third World countries.

Dr Harald von Gottberg commented on the quality of research in devcom that researchers learned a lot but may not understand and may not know how to apply. It is the question of applicability.

A participant added that some of these people do not want other people to ask about the nature of what they are doing. Some tried to answer questions that have been given to them.
Dr Nora Quebral clarified the situation of devcom in developing countries that the government will say what kind of research has to be done, therefore, researchers do not get money to do research they wanted to. There are few researchers in developing countries, rather, there are practitioners who follow the instruction or who were told to do.

It is difficult to address research as an exercise. There is also reluctancy of people to absorb the benefit of research.

Dr Halloran added that most researchers do not have a sense of history which is very important to do critical research of communication.

We do not want further such research and look for the change.

Case Study I: Case Study on Sarvodaya - Sri Lanka by

Mr A T Ariyaratne
Case Study II: Philippine - Devcom in Community Organising Process by Dr Mina Ramirez

Dr Ramirez started her presentation with a description of Asian Social Institute as a graduate school of the Social Sciences (offering Masteral degree courses in Sociology, Economics and Social Work) as well as a research and social action centre. There are three dimensions - academic, research and action are integrated within each of the different programmes of ASI. She added that the Institute is for supporting grassroots development one of its departments. The Communication Centre is engaged in production, training and research in the field of group media.

The case study presented dealt with how the ASI staff assisted small fishermen in the two-fold community organizing and development communication process - twin aspects directed to the objective of total human development. Training the fishermen in the production and use of group media such as posters, newsletter, photography, drama, and especially in a soundslide production preceded by a participatory action research, the fishermen were enabled to articulate their problems to those involved in TV, broadcast and print media. Thus, empowered through the participatory research, community organizing and communication processes, the fishermen's level
of consciousness regarding their own realities, was enhanced, their communication capability improved; and they grew in self-confidence to express their problems and aspirations to mass media people.

Concurrently, they continue to gain the support of other sectoral groups - farmers, professionals, students and some influentials in government.

One important principle from the collective experience of ASI as an institute in partnership with the movement of small fishermen is that it is not so much a particular medium that is important in the process of social change but it is how the medium is used. In other words, the process is the message itself.
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Dr Harald von Gottberg, AMIC Deputy Secretary-General, presided at the second day's morning session. After welcoming the late-arriving participants from some countries, he proceeded to introduce the first speaker for the morning, Dr Anura Goonesekera, Director-General of the Sri Lanka Rupavahini Corporation.

Dr Goonesekera said that "development communication, the interest of Third World countries and the debate on the demand for a New International Information Order all relate to a broader sociological issue of the relationship between communication and modernization of Third World countries". He said that there are value premises underlying these three concepts that should be identified and analyzed for their both normative and ethical implications for the socio-economic development of Third World countries. He said that communication is not neutral; communication strategies have to operate within the socio-political realities of Third World countries and the realities of the geopolitical relations among these countries.
Dr Goonsekera then analyzed the three concepts against two sociological paradigms of under-development advanced by sociologists and social psychologists: the paradigm of modernization as enunciated by Lerner, Rogers, Schramm, Inkeles and Smith and the world systems paradigm or depending paradigm advanced by Wallerstein, Portes, Delacroix and Ragain. He said that such an analysis was necessary "to help to place these three concepts within a wider framework of sociological knowledge on the subject of development and stagnation of Third World societies".

Dr Gooneseureka's paper invited much comment and discussion and raised issues on various aspects of the three concepts he analyzed. Some agreed with his analysis that communication is not a neutral thing but a practical, sociological and economic issue. Others pointed out that paradigms have a lifespan and are only therefore useful for certain periods of development. In a related question, one pointed out that in the process of tearing down an existing paradigm, one may be creating new paradigms which are just as invalid; he instead suggested approaching the issue of development communication, not from the starting point of communication, but of development. Other comments focused on the NIIIO: the impossibility of reversing the order; the need for reversing the communication orders within countries; the need for mechanism to provide national population with the
relevant information necessary to make them grow and "jump ahead"; the ignorance of both Westerners and Easterners about each other and the global socio-political issues affecting them. Comments were also articulated on the problem of technology that "lurks like a monster, consuming tremendous capital inputs", and that transmits non-development programme materials like advertising and entertainment.

The second speaker was Dr Usha Vyasulu Reddi, Coordinator of the Audio Visual Research Centre at Osmania University in Hyderabad, India. In her paper, Dr Reddi talked on the issue of the kind of development brought about by new communication technologies. She reviewed the new communication technologies of the 20th Century: the revolution in the print media that has altered the role of newspapers, radio, television, video/cassette recorders, computers and satellites. Then, she gave a historical background on the use of new communication technologies for developing, illustrating this with "the most ambitious experiment in the use of technology for development communication - the Satellite Instructional Television Experiment (SITE) in 1975-76".
Dr Reddi pointed out, however, that "technology is not only the satellite and the computer". She then proceeded to examine the other dimensions of technology - the economics of technologies, the politics of technology and the socio-cultural impact of technology. She raised many questions and issues on technology and development and concluded by providing a 10-point summary of "the kind of development that has resulted from the introduction of new technologies in developing countries". In fine, she said that "until such time that the focus of the use of the communication technologies shifts from the hardware to the human being and the society it is meant to improve, we shall not be able to deal with the basic issues. We must not be so enamoured of the new technologies that we fail to understand the choices before us human beings; that we fail to understand the choices before us human beings; that we substitute the satellites and computers for the human brain".

The comments that were elicited by Dr Reddi's paper focused on the functions of satellites in particular societies; the differential values in technology; the political uses of technology; decision-making procession relating to the introduction of communication technology in countries; the measurement of cultural identity; and the need for media education.
The third speaker, Mrs Subhadra Belbase of the Worldview International Foundation - Nepal, presented a case study on the use of the video cassette recorder in the development of women and women's organisations at village-level. It was also on video.

In the discussion that followed, Mrs Belbase elaborated on the process of planning and development of the video materials by the village women themselves, the criticisms against the poor technical quality of the video productions, the technical and cultural problems involved in production; and the lessons learned on the process of bringing the video materials to their intended audiences - both in the government-administrative bureaucracy as well as in the community.

The other participants asked questions about the development of the project, its planning process - the selection of the project sites and the communication strategies used to reach women. They also commented on the innovative approach to the use of video in grassroots women's development and organization. As one participant put it, video technology was able to bring the people to the government.
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SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS: November 19/Afternoon session

Prof James Halloran presided over the afternoon session which began with Prof Leela Rao presenting a case study on the community television system in Karnataka state in India.

Prof Rao's presentation dealt with the management of devoom - the use of television in the rural area. The analysis found there were problems in the management of television at the practitioners' level. At a micro level of implementation of policies/plans. The management of devoom requires greater coordination of communication/information provided with the development services promised. Often when coordination is lacking, communication loses credibility.

As an illustration of the function of television as a medium of devoom, at the micro level, effective management requires that television should be integrated into development programmes and also into other media packages. No medium can function in isolation.

The presentation is long, which left no time for discussion. However, Mr Jayaweera pointed out that the value of the paper that hint about the relationship between the technology and the cultural, bureaucratic nature of the
society. Mr Judo asked how the programmes were produced, who produced the programmes and whether there is any survey of programme preferences. The answer was that there was no linkage between the programme producers and the programme policy-makers. There was no survey on programme preferences. Prof Halloran left the question to be answered that should we expect communication to be handled by other institutions and why?

Dr John Lent: Devcom - a view from North America

Dr John Lent analyzed the status and growth of development and communication. He classified the growth and approaches of development and communication into three, namely - old paradigm, new paradigm and old in new garb. Next this, it is a survey of periodicals, 1978-85. He found that the topic - development and communication - was not of much importance to the editors of the main journals. Discussion of development and communication theories had been minimal. The conclusion supports the notion that the field academically lacks an adequate theoretical base, as well as empirical evidence.

The discussion then centred around the following:

1. The status and future of devcom in Northern and the Third World societies.

   The status - not important, uninteresting.
   The future - really dead in the northern societies but it is not sure in the Third World societies. It is just an illusion.
2. The relationship between high technology and the Third World; the technology determinism;

3. The use of communication technologies brings imbalance of power.

4. Whether technology is valued neutral? Not sure, evidence of misuse technologies show that technology is not valued neutral.

5. Levels of technology used - multi-national, neutral, regional and village.

6. Communication is a social process, cannot be viewed in isolation.

7. What are the right questions we should ask?

8. A shift of interest in devcom from academic to practitioners.
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Mr Sarath Amunugama of the Worldview International Foundation presided at the third day's morning session. He remarked that there should have been a case study included in the programme on agriculture as a success story in Asia in contrast to Africa. In the next two or three years, all of South East and South Asia would have agricultural surplus.

The first speaker of the day was Dr Nora Quebral who made a presentation "Communication training values - have they kept pace with the changing paradigm?".

In the lively discussion that followed the presentation, Dr Alwi Dahlan remarked that in Indonesia, the curricula was submitted to train government officials in development support communication.

Dr Alwi said that his country did not have enough people to teach; many of them lack of theoretical grounding for instance, often they talk of a two-step flow approach as (a) media gets the information to opinion leaders, who in turn (b) will take it to the population.
Dr Quebral said at under-graduate level, the students had to be trained in skills so that they can get jobs as also fill the need for development support communication staff.

Prof James Halloran remarked that in many Asian countries, academicians were "paralysed" by the inheritance from American theory.

Dr Godwin Chu wanted to know whose responsibility graduate students' research was. "Where is the Asian theory that we are looking around for," he asked. What had we done to correct the situation, he added.

Prof Eapen remarked that we cannot talk about courses of curricula in isolation from other studies. As Prof James Halloran had been saying, communication had to be totally society-oriented.

Prof Kunczik was of the view that the task of government was how to keep the people quiet, whereas the people want governments to constantly keep their point of view in mind. It is here that development journalists would play the role to motivate people and to evaluate the roles set by government as even public projects have a distributed aspect.
Mr Augy Loorthusamy wanted to know if we believe what we were doing and what we were teaching. Perhaps that is why NGOs are more successful compared to government officials in whom often the spirit is snuffed out.

Dr Usha Reddi said the experience of her department was that their students mostly end up in advertising irrespective of what and academic background they came from.

Dr Prodipto Roy said that organisations like AMIC and ICIMOD should identify closely the fleeting reports of rural development practitioners that one comes across occasionally and raise them to academic and scientific levels.

Mrs Subhadra Belbase said that teaching alone was not all, and self-learning on the part of students was important.

Dr Anura Goonesekera wanted to know that when designing the courses, the needs of government officials and departments which were ultimately going to employ the products of the journalism skills, were kept in mind.

Responding to the questions and needs, Dr Nora Quebral said that communication had gained the reputation of being an easy course as a result of which communication schools get
poor quality students. She said in designing courses, the needs of employers were kept in mind. "In communication schools, we have to consider what we teach so that students are prepared for the industry," she added.

She felt that communicators and journalists act as mediators between the various actors who perform in the field of development and communication.

After the break, Dr Victor Valbuena presented a case study on the "AMIC-Adhikarya Case Study and the PACE Study 1985, Philippines".

Dr Valbuena said much of the policies were drafted by technocrats and even those who draft communication policies were technocrats who did not understand communication policies.

The Chairman, Mr Sarath Amunugama wanted to know what was the competence of communication teachers to larger development problems, to which Dr Valbuena reacted that the communication policies were not determined by communication technocrats alone.
Dr Valbuena informed that the physical closeness of communication schools, for instance in the Manila area, was a boom. For instance, the schools have a common catalogue of books and materials which can be borrowed freely from each other's libraries. Similarly, the faculty resources can be shared between different schools.

Prof James Halloran said that the above was very encouraging.

Prof Halloran said we want to be looking for social theories and not communication theories because communication and development are not disciplines. Let us borrow from all other fields and disciplines to build up a communication theory.