

Presented

9310153 (7) /
FD-442-830

PROJECT SUMMARY

3p

Title: Center for Mass Communication in Development

New or Extension: New

Contractor and Address: Stanford, University
Stanford, California 94305

Principal Investigator (pro tem): Wilbur Schramm
Director, Institute for Communication
Research
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Duration: Five years, beginning July 1, 1973

Total Estimated Cost: \$997,192

Project Manager: Dr. Clifford H. Block, TA/EHR

Narrative Summary:

This grant to Stanford University's Institute for Communications Research is designed to make available to LDC's a resource for research, training, and technical assistance - centering on the use of communications and instructional methodologies for achieving (principally) out-of-school human resource development objectives. The proposal is responsive to a growing conviction that breakthroughs in LDC education will require a better designed and more vigorous use of communications media for reaching the majority of people in developing countries with information they need.

Specifically, Stanford is proposing that the grant be used:

- a. to contribute to the availability of highly trained people for this kind of activity by increasing its output of Ph.D's in the field and by establishing a new two-year M.A. research degree especially for promising researchers and planners from developing countries;

- b. to translate the growing knowledge in this field into policy guidance, by workshop in other countries, by consultation, and by publications;
- c. to maintain its vigorous research program, with increasing emphasis on non-formal applications and on low-cost systems of communications technology. (Most research would be supported by other funding);
- d. to strengthen relationships with similar groups in the LDC's and elsewhere;
- e. to broaden the disciplinary competencies and perspectives relating to these problems, through short-term appointments of people with other approaches and from a variety of LDC's;
- f. to maintain their core group of young specialists concerned with these LDC problems, while accomplishing a transition from the leadership of Prof. Wilbur Schramm, who by the fourth year of the grant will phase into retirement.

The Institute at Stanford is a pioneer in research on communications and development. In recent years, much of its support for this work has come through AID projects, currently a research project on television and its lower-cost alternatives and a GTS project evaluating the El Salvador educational reform. Both projects will be completed this year. Stanford has also been working, with other funding, on family planning, on the role of the agricultural charge agent, on health care in remote areas, and other AID relevant problems.

In addition, Stanford is a focal point for LDC scholars and planners in this field, with a remarkable array of relationships in every region.

The continuation of this effort is now largely dependent on receipt of the 211(d) grant. Without it, several of the younger scholars at the Institute who have concentrated on LDC problems will likely go elsewhere at the end of this academic year. Given Prof. Schramm's proximity to retirement, it is likely that the Institute's work on LDC problems would become only a secondary focus. Stanford's main reason for requesting the grant, therefore, is to put its work in this area on a long-term institutional base.

In the view of TA/EHR, Stanford's continued and expanded work is of critical importance. Their expertise is instrumental to achieving key Agency objectives in educational technology, in non-formal education and cost-reduction. Stanford comes closer than any other institution in the country to integrating the three key problem areas of EHR. Perhaps most importantly it can contribute to the integration of educational components into the broad range of development activities, in such areas as nutrition, health care, and rural development.

The grant will thus permit: the retention of an extraordinary nucleus of professionals with intimate LDC experience and second language capability who collectively represent one of the premier training institutions in the world; the possibility of building directly upon its accumulated knowledge of field evaluation, cross-national research, and measurement; the addition of the kinds of disciplines needed for a more comprehensive approach to the study of LDC communications - anthropology and economics, for example; a significant expansion in the number of LDC specialists with high quality training; and, a fresh attack on cost-effective methods at providing majority population in LDC's with the developmentally relevant information, data, and knowledge they need.

Stanford's studies during this period will fall into four main categories: factors influencing the learning of rural people through media; ways to maximize the impact of inexpensive technologies and of natural communications channels; better measurement of behavioral and other effects of media programs; and improvement of the feedback and evaluation systems available to the operators of field programs.

Finally, the grant will go far toward firming up the network of institutions concerned with these problems. The Stanford group has itself been instrumental in stimulating the creation of several LDC research and development institutions and their continued leadership in this cooperative endeavor will greatly strengthen LDC capability in this area.

Its work will be complementary to the FSU 211(d) center in Ed. Technology, which has its means focus on instructional systems in the reform of formal education. By concentrating on communications as an instrument for providing

non-formal education, Stanford may also have a catalytic effect on the more organizational and theoretical work in non-formal education of such institutions as MSU and UCLA. In fact we would expect these institutions to establish a more formal working relationship.

Finally, we would note that all of the grant's objectives would strongly support Section 220 of the FAA.

FILE

MEMORANDUM

TO : AA/TA, Mr. Curtis Farrar DATE: August 17, 1977

FROM : NE/TECH, David I. Steinberg; LA/DR/EST, Ardwin Dolio; TA/EHR, Willis C. Schaefer; International and Development Education Program, University of Pittsburgh, Dr. Seth Spaulding.

SUBJECT: Fourth year Review of 211 (d) Grant to Stanford University

Executive Summary:

This is a fourth year report based on a field review of the Section 211 (d) institutional grant to Stanford University awarded September 13, 1973 for 5 years to "Strengthen Competence in Communication as Related to Education and Human Resources Development in Less Developed Countries." The team under the chairmanship of David I. Steinberg, NE/TECH, and including Seth Spaulding, University of Pittsburgh, Ardwin Dolio, LA/DR, and Willis C. Schaefer, TA/EHR, visited Stanford University's Institute for Communication Research on April 25-26, 1977.

The review team was favorably impressed by the scope and vigour of activities supported by the 211 (d) grant, by the participation and enthusiasm of the students, by the specially developed 2-year Master's Degree program involving support for research in the student's country, and by the high quality of staff support for field projects and mission consultant requests. Clearly, this grant program represents a high level of success in building and strengthening competence in areas of the grant objectives. However, issues were recognized with reference to institutional limitations on the number of tenured positions which pressure skilled staff members to seek career positions elsewhere; on the lack of evidence for continued support for the program at presently operating levels after termination of the grant; and on the desirability for greater emphasis on wider functional involvement of the program with applied interdisciplinary programs, with LDC colleagues; and with contemporary programs in the U.S. university community.

Recommendations: (1) That support be provided to ICR for the M.A. and Ph.D. programs for a limited period to clear the student pipeline in an orderly and constructive manner and to insure continuity of the field research element of the training program for these students. Such support would be strictly for the training program. (2) A.I.D. should take action to place under personal service contracts those ICR staff members who may be planning to leave the ICR in order that the continuity of their services may be assured in meeting Agency needs. (3) That the Agency endorse early preparation by the ICR during the last year of the grant of useful syntheses of all experience in communication research and field consultation and implementation for wide distribution.

I. Objectives of the Grant:

The overall goal of the grant was to strengthen the capacity of Stanford University in communication research, training, and technical assistance with respect to the education and human resources development needs of the less developed countries.

To achieve this goal, seven major areas of activity were designated by Stanford:

1. To develop new knowledge and insights with respect to the use of communications and instructional technology to extend learning opportunities beyond the classroom and the campus, with special emphasis on the use of the smaller, less complex, less expensive media. The major focus of this research and development would be toward devising strategies that would be both effective and economically feasible for rural audiences in LDCs.
2. To synthesize information on instructional television for the purpose of disseminating relevant conclusions from past work and with the hope of extending existing knowledge, through field research, when such investigations are likely to help solve priority problems of LDCs.
3. To develop appropriate methodologies for the evaluation of communication technology, including the improvement of the generalizability of findings of pilot projects, the application of cost-effectiveness analysis to different communication technologies, the measurement of non-cognitive outcomes of technological innovation, and better formative evaluation.
4. To provide interdisciplinary training for U.S. and LDC personnel through graduate degree programs and other shorter term opportunities for enhancement of skills in this area.
5. To establish and strengthen collaborative relationships with institutions both in LDCs and more developed countries concerned with research, planning, and implementation of communication technology projects for the solution of development problems.
6. To contribute to the dissemination of knowledge and innovations in this field through various other means in addition to the usual written reports and summaries; this might include such things as consultation to specific LDC institutions, regional or national conferences, and use of technological means such as films, video cassettes, etc.

7. To provide short-term basis interdisciplinary teams of problem solvers who can assist LDC development planners on communication strategies, especially for reaching the rural, out-of-school population. These teams may include specialists from other U.S. institutions. Such assistance activities would be related to Stanford's areas of competency in communications and would be undertaken only insofar as they would support the basic competence building objectives of the grant.

II. Grant Amount and Time Period:

The grant was approved by the AID Administrator September 13, 1973 in the amount of \$1,000,000 and was to extend for a period of five years.

III. Fourth Year Review Participants:

Review Team:

David I. Steinberg, NE/TECH Director, Chairman

Seth Spaulding, International and Development Education Program,
The University of Pittsburgh

Ardwin Dolio, LA/DR/EST

Willis C. Schaefer, TA/EHR, Secretary

Stanley D. Handleman, TA/EHR, Project Manager, Observer

Robert W. Schmeding, TA/EHR, Observer

Clifford H. Block, TA/EHR, Observer

Stanford University:

Lyle Nelson, Chairman, Department of Communication and Director of the
211 (d) program from 1973 to 1975

Nathan Maccoby, Director, Institute for Communication Research

Everett M. Rogers, Director of the 211 (d) Program, 1976 to date

Edwin Parker

Emile McAnany

John Mayo

Robert Hornik

Peter L. Spain

IV. Arrangements for the Review:

The review was conducted in the Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University on April 25-26, 1977. All AID and the University of Pittsburgh's representatives were present throughout the review as were the principal representatives from Stanford.

In preparation for the review, the four members of the review team were provided with the following materials: Annual Reports for the first three years of the grant through August 31, 1976; the AID Manual Order 1010.1 "AID Institutional Grants Program" which was in force at the initiation of this grant; AID Policy Determination (PD-62) "Institutional Grants Program" which is currently in force; an Issues Paper prepared by the Grant Project Director which was sent to Stanford prior to the review; a Proposal from the Institute for Communication Research dated January 31, 1977 for a 3 year program of follow-on activities; and a copy of the official grant award agreement. A reply Issues Paper from Stanford dated April 20, 1977 was received for review by the team prior to the formal review. A preliminary meeting of the Washington based members of the team was held 4/19/77, and a full team discussion was held 4/24/77 in Palo Alto.

The schedule for the two day review was as follows:

4/25 Monday am - Welcome by Stanford officials,
Brief statement of AID objectives and policy
Historical background of the Institute,
Discussion of issues.

Noon - Luncheon discussion with Dr. Jerry Lieberman,
Associate Dean of the College of Humanities and
Sciences and Vice Provost for Research.

pm - Discussion of issues,
Panel presentation by graduate students.

4/26 Tuesday am - Meeting with William Miller, Provost and Vice
President for Academic Affairs,
Discussion of issues dealing with commitment
to future activities.

pm - Review Team meeting to discuss committee report.

V. Substantive Review:

The Institute for Communication Research (ICR) was founded by Dr. Wilbur Schramm in 1956 in the Department of Communications of Stanford University. Its purpose was functionally defined as being the research interests of its staff, constituting an applied social science research group. Funding prior to the 211 (d) institutional grant included some hard funds but mostly soft funds from a variety of sources. ICR is considered to be the graduate degree arm on the Department of Communications. Four university fellowships provide support for 1st year Ph.D. candidates, after which ICR picks up the support depending on the research interests. The Master's program was started under the 211 (d) grant and represents a significant training program.

Grant Management Influence on Activities:

Most staff members have worked on most of the program over the three and a half years of the grant. There is consensus or majority agreement on crucial matters of management such as the selection of students, thesis areas, and courses or advisors; work assignments; core course; and course assignments. Consulting assignments depend on appropriateness and time availability. This has resulted in shifting pairs and subgroups toward a coalescence of interests and activities within ICR. Reference is generally made to the "group" rather than to individuals. From the ICR point of view, contacts with AID management have been very appropriate. Because of the increasing ICR staff coalescence of interests, it doesn't particularly matter who is approached, since the needs and the capabilities are cooperatively worked out within the total staff. From the AID point of view, contacts were viewed as minimal and usually at AID insistence.

Emphasis is placed on the integration of the experience of consulting and field work with class room teaching, and this is slowly evolving with spurts of activity. In fact, ICR is not interested in projects without an educational component which will involve graduate students and lead to potential work opportunities. Ethically this is a requirement. It is also a university policy to require opportunities for research assistants. ICR has responded to all cases of AID requests with the exception of Korea. The Korean project involvement by ICR was rejected because it involved formal schooling, Asia language and experience which was not available, and involved television as a repeat of the work in El Salvador and Mexico. AID interests and policy guidance are viewed as having supported the building of a strong program at ICR.

Involvements of other University departments, such as the Latin American and African Area Studies Programs, have not been close since these centers are more interested in art, history, politics, and other academic aspects than in field work. Area Development Centers have been less participatory than special centers such as SIDEC (Education), the Food Research Institute, and the College of Engineering, and selected individuals. All such activities may send students to the ICR courses for applied orientation.

Grant Management and Systematic Interchange: Special consideration is given to foreign students who will be returning to staff positions in important institutions in their home countries. LDC institutional assistance from ICR is also considered to be important. Many are staffed by former Stanford students. Collaborative style at the faculty level with LDC institutions poses some difficulties in that there is an direct relationship between LDC capability to be collaborative and the degree of development of the country. Dr. Clifford Block stated that Stanford had been responsive in this area. With reference to a planned collaborative development of a conference on radio schools in Latin America as a regional seminar for educators, the basic planning finally had to be done by the ICR staff. Practically, options tend to be either to build good programs or to withdraw. However, the role of the "flying experts" cannot go on forever.

The problem of the documentation and dissemination of the cumulative, intangible field experience is well recognized. Dr. Everett Rogers pointed out that the organizing of the group experience and its synthesis should be accomplished during the fifth year of the grant. Stress was placed on the need for the accumulation of wisdom both as to content and as to procedures.

Discussion with a panel of six graduate students indicated general agreement on the following points. The Stanford program is a good program with positive attitudes. There is a continuous and productive exchange among faculty and students. By contrast to the somewhat paternalistic relationship between faculty and students in LDCs, the constructive informality at Stanford is valued. Students would like more knowledge about the budget with concerns for the potential levels for support of student field work, and support for student attendance at professional meetings. Why had students come to Stanford? Because the Stanford program offers the most international resources with an emphasis on students from developing countries. Also, the program is associated with production of answers for field applications. By contrast, other programs tend to be more journalism based. Feedback from field experience is useful and essential. Students are prepared to do evaluation studies. There is good grounding in the types of media, and they are pleased with the flexibility allowed. In contrast, there was some student indication that they felt somewhat isolated in the program, and that there was little attempt to alert students as to what is happening at other universities or centers in the U.S. or to help students establish contact with other groups. There was more than a lack of funds to attend professional meetings. It seemed to represent a kind of intellectual arrogance not appropriate in preparing young professionals who must know what a variety of people are doing in a field.

Responsiveness to AID: A Guatemala Project referenced in the 3rd Annual Report has not panned-out. The project request was generated by a former student in the Guatemala Planning Commission some two years ago. TAB was not brought into the activity. The project was one of generating interministerial collaboration across 60 programs, primarily in planning, to create a new integrating agency. Lack of clear identity was its prime weakness. The plan is now at a crisis point. Dr. Block indicated that this is a common problem; more AID involvement might have been valuable.

The continuing issue is the extent of joint learning about improved project coordination between AID and ICR. A solution is not clear. Possibly more direct reports or briefing from ICR to AID would be helpful. The ICR staff suggested the value of informal rather than written reports. It was suggested that in this project the basic problem was lack of adequate communication among AED as the contractor, the Regional Bureau, and TAB. ICR indicated that they had received conflicting signals from different offices in AID. Better synthesis was and is desired. Discussion of the future planning for the AIDSAT follow-on program and related technologies suggested that AID policy guidance was still not clear.

ICR staff members hold one school-quarter free from classes in order to provide potential but limited assistance for mission requests. Reference was also made to a separate proposal by ICR to AID for support services in communication policy studies. ICR regards this not as a question of one type of service in contract to grant activities, but would like both to be integrated.

Research Productivity: A bibliography of work accomplished by ICR with 211 (d) support contains 7 pages of references to books, monographs, articles, reports, and dissertations. Some were not done under the grant; a number would not have been possible without the grant support. Discussion of improved distribution indicated that the ICR utilized the facilities of the Academy for Educational Development's Clearinghouse for Development Communications for this purpose. Attention was invited to the need for improved dissemination, improved publishing in the local language and society of the students.

Training Effectiveness: There was no MA program before the 211 (d) grant. In the event that the grant terminates, as now scheduled September 30, 1978, it is expected that the ICR program will continue although at a lower rate with only four core courses. The university will receive tuition fees. However, for the students to afford the high tuition, most must receive support. Half of the MA program students are now receiving support from the 211 (d) grant; another 4-5 now receiving 211 (d) funds would be paid as research assistants from other contracts. More students would be U.S. students or elite students from developing countries. The excellence of the M.A. program which was specially designed is enhanced by the two year program including the home country experience in application and data collection. This program costs more, and the university cannot continue it as it now stands without additional support. Results of grant termination would be a shorter program, fewer courses, larger classes, and a shift to U.S. and elite self-supporting students.

Future Work: At issue is the fact that there will be only one tenured position in international communications in the ICR, and that other staff members will be seeking career positions elsewhere. The University does not require that untenured staff leave after five years, and they can be reappointed for a second 5 year period. This permits continuation of grant funding in some model such as a consortium or institute to further continuing work. There is also an excellent chance of finding new staff members coming up from the training program as did the original staff. It was pointed out by Dr. Block that institutional growth under the original 211 (d) concept means growth of capability not just replacement. Discussion of the 211 (d) concept supported the value of the goal of creating capacity, but it was accepted that continued support is not possible and a new institution must eventually be self-supporting. Dr. Everett Rogers indicated that ICR has planned both for alternative contract support and has alerted all M.A. students of the possibility of no second year of support. He made a strong appeal for continuation of the 211 (d) grant for an additional 2 years to (1) provide for greater planning of staff changes, (2) continue the M.A. program as it is now operating, and (3) develop the health communications area with emphasis on nutrition and family planning.

Discussion of the future activities under the last year of the grant and the proposed new contract for support of new communication technologies concerned adequacy of staffing and possible duplication of activities. Dr. Rogers saw no necessary conflict with careful scheduling of staff. Grant activities would focus on development of the synthesis papers, an emphasis on local participation in project planning, and extensive overseas travel to integrate the experience of the staff.

Discussion with Dr. William Miller, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, concerned the future planning by Stanford for the Institute for Communications Research. He indicated that the criteria for starting or stopping programs include (1) peer opinion, (2) student appeal, (3) outstanding capability or excellence, and (4) funding requirements. The ICR is considered to be a strong program and Stanford is committed to some support for strong programs. He stated that he felt Stanford had lived up to the spirit of the agreement of the 211 (d) grant. Alternative support would be sought, and they usually found money for strong programs.

VI. Conclusions:

The 211 (d) Institutional Grant mechanism contains several inherent problems which complicate an evaluation of any institutional grant performance. First, the 5-year self-financing goal as a concept requires an expanding economy for realization. This is not currently the situation. Second, the static nature of universities, particularly private universities in a period of retrenchment, does not support the establishment of tenured positions outside standard academic fields. Third, the non-quantifiable nature of indicators of institutional excellence makes objective evaluation difficult.

B. Accomplishments:

1. Research : We cannot judge the research results. There is no broad research strategy, and the seminar approach has not been productive of a common framework for interdisciplinary research. There have been significant integrative efforts, such as, books on radio alternatives, cost/effectiveness papers, a strong evaluation emphasis; but there is no large scale empirical research under the grant, and the Guatemala effort needs analysis. There is need for more work on the synthesis papers and for refinements of guidelines as referenced in the second annual report. This type of work would be more helpful to missions at this stage than would stronger work on evaluation. Dr. Block stated that the missions would give high marks to Stanford and to staff members for responsiveness in consulting and support activities. Dr. Handleman stated that the work in Nepal and Pakistan is understood and appreciated, although synthesizing is needed for broader applicability. Thesis titles have a relatively high level of relevance to the development communications process.
2. Training: The training program is impressive. The total program recognizes substantial non-211 (d) - grant funding. Estimated numbers of students for the total program during the five years of the grant include: (a) Students enrolled in courses taught-696, (b) students enrolled in M.A. program-73, (c) students enrolled in Ph. D. program-50, and (d) Post-Doctoral fellows-13. The field component of student training conducted in the student's own country is unique among programs of this sort. Inasmuch as the grant does not specify limitations to AID countries, some of the work is not directly relevant to AID's interests.

Our review of the home country of students supported on 211 (d) funds includes those who completed the M.A. program (9); completed MAs transferred to the Ph. D. program (6) 2nd year M.As to graduate in 6/77 (6), 1st year M.As to graduate in 6/78 (7), M.A students delayed (4), and M.A. students admitted 9/77 (9)--a total of 41. Of this number 24 (59%) appear to be from AID recipient countries; the others (41%) come from Hong Kong, Mexico, France, Iran, Eire, South Africa, and India. When the analysis includes Ph.D. students (7), Ph.D.s awarded (4), and Ph.D. candidates admitted 9/77 (4) these 15 cases added to the 41 M.A. cases make a total of 56 students of which 27 (48%) come from AID recipient countries. The others come from the Netherlands, Argentina, U.S., and Canada.

We encourage limitation of grant support to include only AID graduate and current recipient country students. The broad mix of geographical origins of students, especially those funded under the 211 (d) grant, suggests that either the program is of no interest to most countries of AID concern, or the program has made no attempt to recruit students from these countries. We recognize that the two-year M.A. program is probably not viable elsewhere without support. The Ph.D. program is extremely important to AID particularly in view of the need for Ph.D.s in the proposed software centers. However, to the developing countries

2. Training: con'd

M.A.s are more important than Ph.D.s; short term training should be encouraged. Interdisciplinary concern is clear in development communications planning, but there is little evidence to show the involvement of intersector substance in practice.

In contrast, the number of courses developed is limited, and these courses cover a very limited range of interests within the broad area of educational communications and technology. Part of this may be due to the location of the program in a journalism-oriented department in contrast to a school of education. This contextual isolation of the program may well be a limitation as suggested by the curriculum and the experiences of the students.

3. Collaborative Relationships: There is no evidence of ongoing working relationships with Developing Country institutions beyond specific projects. Nor is there such evidence of working relationships with other 211 (d) institutions. Further, there appeared to be a serious lack of awareness of interest in anything that any other university or institute in the United States is doing in the area. This, in turn, has affected the dissemination of Stanford's material. There has been little exchange of information with centers elsewhere in the U.S., except through the Academy for Educational Development(AED) clearinghouse in Washington. Relationships with AID Regional Bureau offices are less than they might have been, except for project contacts.
4. Dissemination: Publication in normal professional channels is adequate. Dissemination for special circles of other users is an area of greater need and greater currency.
5. Consultation: The Institute for Communication Research receives high marks, beyond what is normally considered reasonable, for responsiveness and quality.

C. Issues:

1. Institutional Commitments: There has been adherence to the grant document and agreement. The University regards itself as having lived up to the spirit of the grant agreement. However, in terms of the principle of "additionality" by which accomplishment under the grant should be indicated by some additional capability or resource, the fact remains that there was one tenured position before the grant, and there remains only one tenured position at the time of this review. We recognize that it is University policy: (a) for tenured positions to revert to the University pool upon position vacancy and to be rewarded only on the basis of justification under competition; (b) not to provide funding for research activities from general funds; and (c) to provide reimbursement for partial teaching support from general funds. The Provost

C. Issues- con'd

has indicated his support for strong programs and is understandably reluctant to commit advance funding to the Institute for Communication Research. We recognize that private universities like Stanford when they give their good name to institutes do thereby provide some support for fund raising activities. This is accepted as a degree of commitment. However, the University's inability to make specific commitments makes for difficulties in any justification for an extension of the institutional grant.

2. Staffing: The quality of the staff of the Institute for Communication Research is given high marks. We are especially pleased with their performance in the field. Unfortunately, academic situations cause many of the outstanding staff members to seek professional careers elsewhere; plus normal loss by retirement and sabbatic leave. Despite the introduction of other Stanford faculty members and new professional replacements, this causes the concept of "critical mass" of expert knowledge to be tenuous requiring continuous rebuilding. This discontinuity is disconcerting and makes difficult any justification for extension of the institutional grant.
3. Financing: The 5-year limit of the initial 211-(d) grant has been well known. We see no evidence of significant effort to realize alternate sources of funding for the continuity of the Institute.
- D. Alternative Courses of Recommendation: In view of the above evidence, consideration has been given to the following alternatives:
 1. No additional 211 (d) funding, leading to significant cutback of ICR activities.
 2. Extension of the 211 (d) grant at the same level for an additional one or two years which provides some time for strengthening activities but essentially postpones the current type of decision.
 3. Support for the M.A. Program in recognition of its importance and a sense of responsibility for the students involved.
 4. Contractual support for additional communication technology policy and support studies which would utilize the existing capabilities of the ICR in meeting current field needs of Agency programs. This would require careful spelling out of the implications for staffing of the overlapping program during the 5th year of the grant and the new contract and other program changes.
 5. Contractual support as outlined under alternative No. 4 above, and extension of the 211 (d) grant for an additional two years; both would then terminate simultaneously at the end of two years with problems comparable to or greater than the present considerations.
 6. Consortium development to provide the institutional mechanism for coordinated activities by the ICR, former ICR staff members subsequently affiliating with other universities or institutions, and other professional resources available under any arrangement.

7. Separate contracts between Stanford and the Agency for specific services for training, research, evaluation, and consultation.

Consideration was given by the review panel to the Agency needs for support in communications for development including concern for the following: the Technical Assistance Bureau's forward looking programs for research and development; A.I.D. Regional Bureau needs for consultancies and continuing long-term relationships; growing requirements for intersectoral communication resources in such areas as health, nutrition, agriculture, education, and family planning; significant coordination with the newly developing mechanisms of the Title XII approach; and the specific mandates of the Agency legislation.

VII. Recommendations

1. That support be provided to ICR for the M.A. and Ph. D. programs for a limited period to clear the student pipeline in an orderly and constructive manner and to insure continuity of the field research element of the training program. The support would be strictly for the training program.
2. A.I.D. should take action to place under personal service contracts those ICR staff members who may be planning to leave the ICR in order that the continuity of their services may be assured in meeting Agency needs.
3. That the Agency endorses early preparation by the ICR during the last year of the grant of useful syntheses of all experience in communication research and field consultation and implementation for wide dissemination.

Dec. 4/1972
 Submitted to R I A ²¹¹⁴ priorities mtg. of Dec. 1, 1972.

Block (3)

TA/ENR/EI

Center for Mass Communication in Development
 Stanford University
 \$997,192

project summary?

like 3p
 Stamp 2/18

This grant to Stanford University's Institute for Communications Research is designed to make available to LDC's a resource for research, training, and technical assistance - centering on the use of communications and instructional methodologies for achieving (principally) out-of-school human resource development objectives. The proposal is responsive to a growing conviction that breakthroughs in LDC education will require a better designed and more vigorous use of communications media for reaching the majority of people in developing countries with information they need.

Specifically, Stanford is proposing that the grant be used:

- a. to contribute to the availability of highly trained people for this kind of activity by increasing its output of Ph.D's in the field and by establishing a new two-year M.A. research degree especially for promising researchers and planners from developing countries;
- b. to translate the growing knowledge in this field into policy guidance, by workshop in other countries, by consultation, and by publications;
- c. to maintain its vigorous research program, with increasing emphasis on non-formal applications and on low-cost systems of communication technology. (Most research would be supported by other funding);
- d. to strengthen relationships with similar groups in the LDC's and elsewhere;
- e. to broaden the disciplinary competencies and perspectives relating to these problems, through short-term appointments of people with other approaches and from a variety of LDC's;
- f. to maintain their core group of young specialists concerned with these LDC problems, while accomplishing a transition from the leadership of Prof. Wilbur Schramm, who by the fourth year of the grant will phase into retirement.

The Institute at Stanford is a pioneer in research on communications and development. In recent years, much of its support for this work has come through AID projects, currently a research project on television and its lower-cost alternatives and a GTS project evaluating the El Salvador educational reform. Both projects will be completed this year. Stanford has also been working, with other funding, on family planning, on the role of the agricultural charge agent, on health care in remote areas, and other AID relevant problems.

In addition, Stanford is a focal point for LDC scholars and planners in this field, with a remarkable array of relationships in every region.

The continuation of this effort is now largely dependent on receipt of the 211(d) grant. Without it, several of the younger scholars at the Institute who have concentrated on LDC problems will likely go elsewhere at the end of this academic year. Given Prof. Schramm's proximity to retirement, it is likely that the Institute's work on LDC problems would become only a secondary focus. Stanford's main reason for requesting the grant, therefore, is to put its work in this area on a long-term institutional base.

In the view of TA/EHR, Stanford's continued and expanded work is of critical importance. Their expertise is instrumental to achieving key Agency objectives in educational technology, in non-formal education and cost-reduction. Stanford comes closer than any other institution in the country to integrating the three key problem areas of EHR. Perhaps most importantly it can contribute to the integration of educational components into the broad range of development activities, in such areas as nutrition, health care, and rural development.

The grant will thus permit: the retention of an extraordinary nucleus of professionals with intimate LDC experience and second language capability who collectively represent one of the premier training institutions in the world; the possibility of building directly upon its accumulated knowledge of field evaluation, cross-national research, and measurement; the addition of the kinds of disciplines needed for a more comprehensive approach to the study of LDC communications - anthropology and economics, for example; a significant expansion in the number of LDC specialists with high quality training; and, a fresh attack on cost-effective methods at providing majority population in LDC's with the developmentally relevant information, data, and knowledge they need.

Stanford's studies during this period will fall into four main categories: factors influencing the learning of rural people through media; ways to maximize the impact of inexpensive technologies and of natural communications channels; better measurement of behavioral and other effects of media programs; and improvement of the feedback and evaluation systems available to the operators of field programs.

Finally, the grant will go far toward firming up the network of institutions concerned with these problems. The Stanford group has itself been instrumental in stimulating the creation of several LDC research and development institutions and their continued leadership in this cooperative endeavor will greatly strengthen LDC capability in this area.

Its work will be complementary to the FSU 211(d) center in Ed. Technology, which has its means focus on instructional systems in the reform of formal education. By concentrating on communications as an instrument for providing

non-formal education, Stanford may also have a catalytic effect on the more organizational and theoretical work in non-formal education of such institutions as MSU and UCLA. In fact we would expect these institutions to establish a more formal working relationship.

Finally, we would note that all of the grant's objectives would strongly support Section 220 of the FAA.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305

93101F3 (14) (10)
PD-AA6-830
8p

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

REDWOOD HALL
Telephone:
415/321-2300
Ext. 4903

May 11, 1973

Dr. Clifford H. Block
Office of Research Analysis
Agency for International Development
21st Street and Virginia Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20523

Dear Cliff:

Per your request, here are three additional items of information which you wanted. The first is a statement of objectives for our proposed 211(d) grant. These are taken from the grant proposal, but are set down here in outline form for easy review.

With respect to the five year budget summary, I think it's important to emphasize the tentative nature of these estimates. Naturally it's almost impossible to determine with accuracy the shape of expenditures two to three years ahead, much less five, because they will change to reflect new directions and new opportunities developed in previous years. Thus we would expect to make a good many changes as we go along. However, the breakdowns given may be helpful at this point in time.

The first year budget, of course, is a good deal more specific and does reflect the approximate way we expect to allocate resources during the 1973-74 fiscal year.

I hope this information will be helpful as a basis for our discussion May 16.

Sincerely,



Lyle M. Nelson
Chairman

cc: Wilbur Schramm

Stanford University

Proposed AID 211(d) Grant

Statement of Objectives

5/10/73

Principal objectives of activities under the grant.

- (1) Maintain and strengthen Stanford's capability in the study of instructional and informational technology.
- (2) Contribute to the capabilities of organizations and institutions in developing countries to study their own needs, develop their own programs, and evaluate their own activities in this field.
- (3) Add to the store of usable knowledge in this field by
 - (a) sharing knowledge with appropriate agencies, research organizations, and individual researchers in developing countries;
 - (b) joining with them, where possible, in cooperative studies;
 - (c) summarizing and interpreting knowledge derived from these and other sources in terms of generalization to applications;
 - (d) conducting new field research, to the extent that it can be separately financed;
 - (e) contributing to the improvement of research methodology in the field.

Substantive focus

For economy of effort, we propose to focus on:

- (1) the use of communication and instructional technology in extending learning opportunities beyond the formal classroom and the campus;
- (2) the use of the smaller, less complex, less expensive media (e.g., radio rather than television, filmstrips rather than films, etc.).

Geographical focus

To make maximum use of our strengths, and those of the cooperating East-West Center, we propose to focus on Asia and Latin America, adding material from other continents as it becomes possible and appropriate.

To maintain and strengthen Stanford's capability

(Objective 1)

We intend to:

- (1) keep the strong young Stanford team together for a while and give them a chance to develop while the established leadership gradually moves from direction to cooperation to advisory status;
- (2) seek out from all possible sources, not excluding the possibility of members of the present team, a new director of senior status;
- (3) until this appointment is made, retain the advantage of senior personnel in the program by bringing in a person or persons for less than permanent appointment (possibly using such an appointment as a tryout);
- (4) train a limited number of highly selected students in this field at the doctoral level and, as appropriate, add highly promising post-doctoral members to the staff;
- (5) establish interdisciplinary ties within the University which will bring other expertise to bear on some of the problems facing developing nations in the use of instructional in the use of instructional technology.
- (6) cooperate in an exchange of staff with the East-West Center and other organizations, trying always (a) to represent disciplines and experiences not presently available, and (b) to put Stanford staff members in situations where they broaden their experience.

To contribute to the capability of organizations and institutions in developing countries

(Objective 2)

We intend to:

- (1) establish close relationships with the organizations in Asia and Latin America (perhaps later Africa) conducting or beginning to conduct research in this field;

- (2) conduct planning workshops (in cooperation with the East-West Center) with, first, representatives of such institutions in Asia, secondly in Latin America, and thirdly, at the appropriate time, to bring some of these scholars from the two continents together and include, if possible, some scholars from Africa also;
- (3) through such meetings and resulting relationships
 - (a) to identify ways (consultation, materials, cooperation) in which we can be of help to these organizations, (b) to identify sources of experience and data in these organizations or their regions which can be of help to scholars or planners in other regions, developing or industrialized,
 - (c) to identify students who would, by virtue of advanced training at Stanford or elsewhere in the United States, be able to contribute in an important way to research in this field in their own countries, and
 - (d) to identify research topics and sites of first importance.
- (4) to develop a program of cooperation, exchange, and sharing with these institutions, including cooperative research to the extent that it can be financed.

To add to the store of usable knowledge

(Objective 3)

We plan to:

- (1) stimulate the flow and exchange of information between and among centers of study in the developing regions, as suggested in the preceding section;
- (2) make a major activity of the next five years the interpretation of data in this field in terms of its generalizability and implications for policy and planning. Thus, for example, even at the present time, several important bodies of information remain to be put together in a definitive way: (a) the experience of El Salvador, Niger, American Samoa, and the Ivory Coast, in using television in a massive way for swift educational development; (b) the experience of about 30 countries in using combinations of instructional media for extending learning opportunities beyond the school; (c) the experience of a number of developing countries with radio; (d) the experience of a number of countries with trying to devise a "local" use of the broadcast media, and thus combine the

abilities of these media to serve large numbers from a central point and under certain conditions to meet local needs; and (e) study in some developing cultures the comparative effectiveness of special efforts at media education such as Sesame Street -- e.g., application and utilization of such programs in Latin America.

- (3) drawing upon the materials and resources of the East-West Center, to try to bring as many as possible of the "fugitive" materials from developing countries into the open where they can be utilized by scholars and policy makers.
- (4) realizing that the proposed grant is not intended to pay for extensive field research, to try to build around the grant at least a small program of research (financed largely from other sources), making use of Stanford's rather uncommon experience with research in this field in the developing countries; and training advanced students in these skills. For such activities, the proposed grant would be "seed money."
- (5) to continue to work in whatever ways (meetings, bringing in of visiting staff with special disciplinary skills, consultations, evaluation of other experience, field trials) prove most promising, on advancing the research methodology of this field. In particular, it seems desirable to try to throw some light on the inadequately researched areas of learning effect that deserve to be measured (what kinds of classroom behavior, what non-intellective results, etc.) and on the foggy area of cost-effectiveness;
- (6) to organize a series of summer meetings of top scholars for advanced study of topics of essential importance to this field. These sessions might last eight weeks and would result in some written product by each participant, perhaps a general publication, and some outlines of needed research. The kind of topics we have in mind are:
 - (a) relation of attitudes to action in social change
 - (b) cognitive results of instruction that need to be measured
 - (c) desirable and undesirable effects of instructional technology
 - (d) local vs. central control in instructional systems
 - (e) linear vs. simultaneous symbol systems in learning
 - (f) extending the school: methods and media
 - (g) the role of the media in rural development
 - (h) implications of satellite communications for development policy
 - (i) strategies for improving the utilization of media at the local level
 - (j) the developing pattern of international cooperation and assistance

SummaryFive Year Budget EstimatesProposed AID 211(d) Grant - Stanford University

<u>Category</u>	<u>1st Year</u>	<u>2nd Year</u>	<u>3rd Year</u>	<u>4th Year</u>	<u>5th Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
Professional and Staff Salaries	\$134,718	\$138,000	\$108,950	\$120,272	\$ 98,172	\$600,112	
Graduate Student Expenses	7,560	24,000	24,000	28,000	24,000	107,560	This is less than original proposed budget, reflecting subsequent discussions with AID officials
Consultants	4,000	5,000	6,000	5,000	4,000	24,000	Primarily from related disciplines
Travel, Per Diem and Relocation	12,000	16,000	12,000	15,000	14,000	69,000	Staff and participants; slightly less than original budget
Library Acquisitions and Reproductions	2,000	2,800	3,200	3,200	2,600	13,800	
Computer Services	4,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	6,000	25,000	
Cooperation with East-West Center	4,800	7,800	8,400	8,400	3,200	32,600	Materials acquisition, Asia; program planning, planning Summer Center; Joint conference/publications and related activities
Conferences and Publications Costs	12,940	18,000	12,000	18,000	14,000	74,940	Includes Summer Center for Advanced Study in Media Development
Supplies, Materials and Other Expenses	<u>7,731</u>	<u>9,149</u>	<u>10,200</u>	<u>11,100</u>	<u>12,000</u>	<u>50,180</u>	Office supplies, telephone and telegraph, postage and freight, Xeroxing, plant and interdepartmental services
TOTAL	\$189,749	\$225,749	\$189,750	\$213,972	\$177,972	\$997,192	

Detailed Budget
First Year of Operation
1973-74

I. Salaries

Co-Program Director (Wilbur Schramm), 40% time at annual 12-months salary base of \$36,000	\$14,400	
Co-Program Director (Lyle Nelson), 10% time at annual 9-months salary base of \$28,000	2,800	
Senior Program Associate (Emile McAnany), 100% time at annual 9-months salary of \$15,000	15,000	
Senior Program Associate (John Mayo), 100% time at annual 9-months salary of \$15,000	15,000	
Visiting Senior Scholar - one-man year (one or more persons for 1 to 3 quarters)	25,500	
Visiting Junior Scholar - one-man year (one or more persons for 1 to 3 quarters)	18,000	
Research Associate (Robert Hornik), 100% time at annual 12-months salary base of \$11,000	11,000	
Secretarial (vacant), 100% time at annual 12-months base of \$8,182	8,182	
Part-time student help	4,680	
Consultants (Stanford and outside in related disciplines primarily)	4,000	
Total Salaries	\$118,562	
Fringe Benefits at 17%	<u>20,156</u>	
Total Salaries and Fringe Benefits		\$138,718

II. Graduate Stipends

Two Research Assistants at established
Stanford rates (\$3,780 for 1/2 time, 12 months) \$ 7,560

III. Travel and Per Diem

Travel \$7,000
Per diem 160 days at \$25 per day 5,000
Total 12,000

IV. Library Acquisitions and Reproductions

Collections of materials on uses of
instructional/informational technology 2,000

V. Cooperation with East-West Center

(Materials acquisition, Asia; program planning,
Joint conference/publication planning, and
related activities) 4,800

VI. Conferences and Publications

(Includes dissemination of results) 12,940

VII. Supplies and Expenses

Office supplies, telephone and telegraph,
postage, Xeroxing, plant services, freight,
minor equipment (under \$100), interdepartmental
services 7,731

VIII. Computer Services

4,000

Total Budget \$189,749