

LI
301.2
C532

PN-AAG-955

Final Report of the Four-Week Workshop on

**Advanced Training in
Communication for Social Development
IN
LIBERIA**

Held in

MONROVIA, LIBERIA

January 15 to February 9, 1979

Organized by

Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Liberia

Family Planning Association of Liberia

and

The Community and Family Study Center

The University of Chicago

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Commendation by the Honorable Francis A. Dennis, Ambassador to the United States, Embassy of the Republic of Liberia, Washington, D.C.	Frontispiece
Acknowledgments.	i
I. Plan of the Workshop	1
II. List of Participants	7
III. Schedule of Class Sessions	11
IV. Evaluation of the Workshop	22
V. Liberia Communication Workshop Expenses.	55
VI. Summary and Recommendations.	57
Appendix A: Graduation Exercises	63
Appendix B: Participants' Evaluation Questionnaire	64



EMBASSY OF THE REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA

WASHINGTON, August 22, 1979

Dear Participants:

Having read the final report of the four-week workshop held in Monrovia on "Advanced Training in Communication for Social Development", from January 15 to February 9, 1979, I take this opportunity to sincerely congratulate each of you for your kind participation.

Whether in the developed or developing nations, the significance of gathering and disseminating unbiased and truthful information for effective communication in the process of national social development cannot be underestimated. That is why I am particularly happy to know that many of you ladies and gentlemen graciously helped to bring about the realization of the seminar. Your genuine participation in, and contribution to the workshop clearly attests to the importance which you attach to the role of communication in social development in Liberia.

I am confident that the information which you have received and/or provided at the conference will be quite useful to the Liberian people. For your efforts and the exemplary job you have done, I express, on behalf of President William R. Tolbert, Jr. and the Government and people of Liberia, sincere thanks and appreciation to you our American friends at USAID, the Ad Hoc Committee of Liberia, and to all those whose contributions and moral or material assistance made the seminar possible.

Yours sincerely,


Francis A. Dennis
AMBASSADOR

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A number of persons worked hard and conscientiously for the success of the Liberia Workshop on Communication for Social Development. The idea for holding the workshop was generated by Mrs. Dinah Barr and Mr. Peter Gboerreh-Boe, both of whom attended the Regional Workshop on Communication in Nairobi a year earlier. They stimulated interest in Liberia and worked industriously to launch the project. As chairwoman of the sponsoring committee, Mrs. Barr worked tirelessly for the many months it took to make preparations. Through her influence, the Ministry of Agriculture made the workshop a major project, and provided support that was essential.

Acknowledgements are due to all of the other members of the Committee for the important work they did in reviewing the plans, recruiting participants, nominating and selecting guest lecturers, and planning the program. Also, the Minister of Agriculture Chenoweth and former Assistant Minister Tubman provided many valuable services.

The University of Liberia was most generous in providing the use of the Farm Training Center as a site for the workshop. The staff, which was scheduled to take annual vacation, stayed to provide meals and other services to the participants. They were given only a modest budget with which to work and did amazingly well with it under the guidance of Mrs. Barr.

The many professional persons in Liberia who came to speak at the workshop were extremely generous with their time. This was particularly true of Prof. Thomas Ken, chairman of the Department of Sociology at the University of Liberia. He was a major source of wisdom, guidance, and help at every stage.

A great deal of preparation for the Workshop took place in the United States. The staff of the Community and Family Study Center prepared manu-

scripts, assembled and duplicated materials, and did its best to anticipate all needs.

The U.S. Agency for International Development was the financial sponsor of the workshop--providing the funds that paid all costs of training and administration. In addition, it did much more. Griffith Davis, Director of the Information-Education-Communication Division, took a deep personal interest in this project. His office mailed the fifty-plus cartons of materials needed by the participants. Mr. Davis personally attended the Workshop as an observer, and by his presence signalled the importance that the State Department placed on this event. The local office of AID was very helpful, especially Mrs. Cynthia Blake.

Finally, thanks are due the participants themselves. They worked extremely hard, and in a good-natured way overlooked or forgave the blunders that were occasionally made. Their keen expressions of enthusiasm for the training was a gift that every member of the Committee and the training staff acknowledges with thanks.

I
PLAN OF THE WORKSHOP

From January 15 to February 9, 1979, a Workshop on Communication for Social Development was held in Monrovia, Liberia. It was an in-country training program arranged for Liberian citizens working on educational and communication aspects of social development programs in the country. This workshop, the first in-country workshop of such scope and duration to be held in Africa, was organized and sponsored by the Ministry of Agriculture of the Republic of Liberia and the Family Planning Association of Liberia. It was a direct outgrowth of a nine-week all-Africa workshop (with the same title) held in Nairobi, Kenya, a year earlier. Planned and sponsored by UNICEF, UNESCO, International Planned Parenthood Federation, and the Community and Family Study Center of the University of Chicago, the earlier workshop uncovered the need for shorter, in-country training programs more directly focused on the specific programs and needs of individual countries. The workshop in Monrovia was, therefore, an experimental effort to meet this need.

A. Workshop committee

The workshop was planned by a committee of persons, drawn from a number of different agencies. It was comprised of:

Mrs. Dinah Barr, Director, Home Economics and Community Development
Extension Division, Ministry of Agriculture

Thomas B. Ken, Professor of Sociology (Chairman), Department of Sociology
University of Liberia

Henry Badio, Analysis Planner, Ministry of Local Government, Rural
Development and Urban Reconstruction, Monrovia

Princess S. Barlay, Head, Home and Community Development, College of
Agriculture and Forestry, University of Liberia, Monrovia

Frances R. Caulker, Information and Education Officer, Family Planning
Association of Liberia, P.O. Box 938, Monrovia

Adele A. Cobham, Assistant to the I-E-C Officer, Family Planning Association of Liberia, P.O. Box 938, Monrovia

Alaric Cox, Ministry of Education, M.C.S.S. Sinkur 12 Street, P.O. Box 1545, Monrovia

Maude Dennis, Home Economics Senior Field Supervisor, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of Liberia, Monrovia

Evelyn S. Dinkins, Instructor, Home and Community Development, University of Liberia, Monrovia

Adama B. Fahnbulleh, Training Coordinator, Ministry of Agriculture, Monrovia

Peter Gboerreh-Boe, Press Officer, Family Planning Association of Liberia, P.O. Box 938, Monrovia

E. Vanjai Gibson, Home Economics Field Supervisor, Ministry of Agriculture, P.O. Box 9010, Monrovia

J. Railey Gompah, Information Research Officer, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of Liberia, Monrovia

Edward Gouto, Assistant Director of Adult Education, Ministry of Education, Government of Liberia, Monrovia

Moore E. James, Program Officer, Liberia National Commission for UNESCO, Ministry of Education, Government of Liberia, Monrovia

Mae Bea Maximore Keller, President, Family Planning Association of Liberia, P.O. Box 938, Monrovia

J.G. Kogohndu, WHO Advisor, Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, Government of Liberia, Monrovia

Else Larsen, Home Economics Advisor, c/o FAO/UNDP, P.O. Box 274, Monrovia

Major J. Edwin Lloyd, P.O. Box 2931, Monrovia

Eric G. Paascure, Junior Demographer, Ministry of Planning, Population Division, Government of Liberia, Monrovia

Martha Poston, Education Specialist, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of Liberia, Monrovia

Reverend E. Toimu A. Reeves, Pastor, Providence Baptist Church

Meluina Takan, Instructor, Home and Community Development, College of Agriculture and Forestry, University of Liberia, Monrovia

T. Bai Sherman, Director of Adult Education, Ministry of Education, Government of Liberia, Monrovia

Carlos W. Smith, Senior Information Officer, Ministry of Information and Cultural Affairs and Tourism, Government of Liberia, Monrovia

Ruth Bryant Smith, Executive Secretary, Family Planning Association
of Liberia

Benjamin Temple, Director, Academic Coordination, College of Agriculture
and Forestry, University of Liberia, Monrovia

Alfred F. Tubman, Assistant Minister for Technical Services, Ministry of
Agriculture, Monrovia

Alex K. Wingba, Director, YMCA, 126 Broad Street, P.O. Box 147, Monrovia

B. Early planning

Two visits to Liberia were made by Donald J. Bogue, the director of the Community and Family Study Center, to plan for the workshop. The first visit, in March of 1978, was made en route to Chicago from the Nairobi workshop. At this time the Committee was formed, a decision to hold the workshop was made, and a division of labor for accomplishing it was established.

- (a) The University of Chicago agreed to draw up and submit to the committee a proposed curriculum and training plan, which would be reviewed and discussed at a later date.
- (b) The Committee agreed to find a suitable site for holding the workshop and to begin making arrangements for it, and recruiting potential participants.

A second visit was made in September, 1978. At that time the curriculum that had been drawn up by the University of Chicago was discussed in detail, changes made, and agreements reached on the courses, their content, and the teaching. Application forms for participation were designed and duplicated. A decision was made to hold the workshop at the University Farm, University of Liberia. Visits were made to the University to confirm these arrangements, and preliminary solutions to logistic problems of transportation, meals, and materials were reached. After this second meeting, the University of Chicago team began intensive preparation of training materials, lecture outlines, and teaching plans. Meanwhile, the Committee worked actively to:

- (a) complete the recruitment of participants, and select those who would undergo training;

- (b) recommend guest lecturers from available Liberian professionals to make presentations, and arrange for their participation;
- (c) complete arrangements for transporting, feeding, and housing the participants and for classroom and office space.

The Committee and the Community and Family Study Center each carried out the tasks for which it had assumed responsibility in such a way that everything was completed on schedule so the workshop could open without major problems.

C. Courses

The workshop consisted of eight courses, as follows:

- Communication 101. Principles and Theories of Communication
- Communication 102. Social, Demographic, Ecological and Psychological Aspects of the Development Process
- Communication 103. The Content of Social Development Programs in Liberia
- Communication 104. Person-to-Person Communication for Social Development
- Communication 105. Mass Media for Social Development
- Communication 106. Communication Research and Evaluation
- Communication 107. The Tabulation and Analysis of Social Research Data
- Communication 108. The Planning and Management of Communication Programs

The content of each of these courses is described in Part II.

D. Instructors

In order to give continuity and integration, each course was assigned an instructor/coordinator. This person was responsible for each day's session, for student assignments and laboratory work, and for assigning grades at the end of the course. The instructors/coordinators were assigned as follows:

- Course 101. Mike Hoff
- Course 102. Thomas Ken
- Course 103. Liberia Workshop Committee
- Course 104. Walter Allen and Donald Bogue
- Course 105. Robert Higgins and Mike Hoff
- Course 106. Walter Allen and Donald Bogue
- Course 107. Walter Allen and Donald Bogue
- Course 108. Robert Higgins

Because a certificate of completion was to be issued by the University of Chicago in cooperation with the Committee, the instructor/supervisor was a member of the Community and Family Study Center staff, or someone designated by the CFSC. However, each instructor/supervisor met frequently with the chairwoman of the Liberia Workshop Committee and incorporated her recommendations and suggestions for modifications of course content as the workshop proceeded. Additional Liberian specialists recommended by the Committee were invited to make presentations in those courses that could make effective use of their contributions.



LIBERIA WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS AND STAFF

II
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Zoe Scott Attoh 103, 104, 106, 107	Teaching Assistant College of Agriculture University of Liberia
Henry K. Ben 101, 102, 103, 104	Assistant Regional Coordinator Ministry of Agriculture
Roberta Omodele Bright 101, 102, 103, 106, 107, 108	Assistant Television Manager Liberian Broadcasting Corporation
Margaret Namisno Bropleh 101, 102, 103, 104, 105	Community Welfare Worker Ministry of Health and Social Welfare
Joseph S. Brownell 101, 102, 103, 105	
Miriam B. Chea 101, 102, 103, 105	Assistant Teacher Home Economics Extension Division
Alaric L. Cox 101, 102, 103, 108	Maintenance Engineer Monrovia Consolidated School System P.O. Box 15-45, 12 Street Sinkor
Helena T. Crusoe 101, 102, 103, 104	Trainer Home Economics Extension Division Ministry of Agriculture
Maude M. Dennis 101, 102, 103, 104	Field Supervisor Home Economics Extension Division Ministry of Agriculture
Beatrice Bgatu Dorliae 101, 102, 103, 104	Field Supervisor Home Economics Division Ministry of Agriculture
Robert W. Draper 102, 103, 106, 107	Executive Secretary YMCA, Monrovia
J. Rufus B. Folley 102, 103, 104	Social Worker, Social Welfare Ministry of Health
Esther Gibson 101, 102, 103, 104	Family Planning Association of Liberia
Bennora Gleplay 101, 102, 103, 104	Teacher Home Economics Division Ministry of Agriculture

Gladys M. Harris 101, 102, 103, 104	Training Officer Home Economics Division Ministry of Agriculture
Nancy T. Harris 101, 102, 103, 104	Supervisor Home Economics Division Ministry of Agriculture
Richelieu Batholomew Harris 101, 102, 103, 105	Information Officer Ministry of Labour, Youth and Sports
Theodosia N. Howard 101, 104, 105, 108	Field Work Supervisor Family Planning Association of Liberia
George Hutchful 101, 102, 103, 105	Teacher Home Economics Division Ministry of Agriculture
Maria Y. Johnson 101, 102, 103, 104, 108	Assistant Director of Nurses Continuing Education for Rural Health Workers, In-Service Division Ministry of Health
Sarah Johnson 101, 102, 103, 104, 105	Instructor Home Economics Division Ministry of Agriculture
Charles Fannah Jrateh 101, 102, 103, 105, 108	Director of Information Ministry of Local Government
Claudette Kaba 101, 102, 105, 108	Research Officer and Health Educator Ministry of Health
S.A. Morris Kainessie 102, 103, 105, 108	Project Coordinator Agriculture and Community Development Project YMCA, Monrovia
Charlotte Vani Kasor 101, 102, 103, 104	Community Welfare Worker/Social Worker Ministry of Health
Disi Klah 101, 102, 103, 105	Public Relations Officer Ministry of Agriculture
Martha Kou Kulati 101, 102, 103, 104	Instructor Home Economics Division Ministry of Agriculture
Rehana Lateef 101, 102, 103, 106, 107	Instructor Home Economics Division Ministry of Agriculture
Clarence Murray Momoh 101, 102, 103, 105, 108	Branch Secretary Registrar Family Planning Association of Liberia

Mary D. Obey 101, 102, 103, 104	Teacher Home Economics Division Ministry of Agriculture
Melvina Estella Okech 101, 102, 103, 104	Instructor, Coordinator Home and Community Development Program College of Agriculture University of Liberia
Arthur B. Paasewe 101, 102, 103, 104	Youth Club Organizer Ministry of Labour, Youth and Sports
Nathaniel Daba-Myene Payne 101, 103, 105, 108	Director Bureau of UPU Affairs Ministry of Posts and Telecommunication
Philip Boima QuaiQuai 101, 102, 103, 104	Field Work Supervisor Family Planning Association of Liberia
Elias I.K. Quist	Journalist/Translator Monrovia Consolidated School System
G. Bismarck Reeves 101, 102, 103, 104	Instructor Department of Wood Science University of Liberia
Victoria Teeter Reeves 101, 102, 103, 104	Field Work Supervisor Home Economics Extension Division Ministry of Agriculture
Marion King-Roberts 101, 102, 103, 104, 105	Information/Training Officer Health Education Division Ministry of Agriculture
Dennis Saa-Popei 101, 102, 103, 104	Social Worker and Program Coordinator Ministry of Local Government
Jusu Komah Sando	
David Kpaden Sums 101, 102, 103, 104	Project Leader Ministry of Agriculture
Carolyn Taylor 101, 103, 106, 108	Ministry of Agriculture
Patricia H. Wesley 102, 103, 106, 107	Research Officer Ministry of Labour, Youth and Sports
Paul Allen Wie 101, 102, 103, 106, 107, 108	Assistant Director of Public Affairs Liberian Broadcasting Corporation
Alex K. Wingba 101, 103, 104, 108	Physical Education Director YMCA, Monrovia

Christina Tiwro Wisseh
101, 102, 103, 104

Assistant Supervisor
Home Economics Division
Ministry of Agriculture

George K. Ziama
101, 103, 104, 105

Special Assistant
Ministry of Post and Telecommunication

Frances M. Yorwatei

National Coordinator
Home Economics Division
Ministry of Agriculture

III
SCHEDULE OF CLASS SESSIONS

Communication 101: Principles of Communication.

Coordinators: Michael Hoff and Donald J. Bogue.

Session number	Topic
1.	Opening ceremonies
2.	Nature of the communication process
3.	How people learn new ideas: reinforcement theories
4.	How people learn new ideas: cognition theories
5.	Attitudes and how they are formed
6.	The play theory of communication
7.	Selective exposure theory of communication
8.	Multi-step flow theory of communication
9.	The adoption process
10.	Effect of knowledge on adoption
11.	Effect of motivation on adoption
12.	Effect of legitimacy (social control) on adoption
13.	Effect of locus of control (efficacy) on adoption
14.	Effect of credibility of communicator on adoption
15.	Cognitive consistency and adoption
16.	Opinion leadership and informal communication networks in relation to persuasion and adoption
17.	Persuasion via changing beliefs vs. persuasion via changing attitudes
18.	Strategies for inducing behavior change
19.	Final examination
20.	Discussion of the final examination

Communication 102: Social, Demographic, Ecological, and Psychological
Aspects of the Social Development Process.

Coordinator and Principal Teacher: Prof. Thomas Ken, University of Liberia

<u>Session number</u>	<u>Topic</u>
	<u>I. THEORIES OF DEVELOPMENT</u>
1.	What is social development?
2.	Theories of how industrial/commercial development can be achieved
3.	Theories of how agricultural development can be achieved
4.	Psychological theories of modernization and social development
5.	Work force and development: income, employment, unemployment, and underemployment
6.	Dependence on developed nations in relation to development
7.	Theories of community development
	<u>II. DEMOGRAPHIC ASPECTS OF DEVELOPMENT</u>
8.	Population size and rate of growth in relation to development
9.	Population composition in relation to development
10.	Population distribution, urbanization and migration in relation to development
	<u>III. ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF DEVELOPMENT</u>
11.	The ecological approach to human affairs
12.	Nutrition and food in relation to development
13.	Natural resources in relation to development
14.	Technology in relation to development
15.	Environmental protection in relation to development
	<u>IV. SOCIAL ASPECTS OF DEVELOPMENT</u>
16.	Educational attainment in relation to development
17.	Health in relation to development
18.	Family welfare in relation to economic development
19.	Fertility and family size in relation to social development
20.	The status of women in development

Note: An examination was given at the end of session 10 and again after session 18.

Communication 103: The Content of Social Development Programs in Liberia

This course consisted of twelve sessions. Each session began with a one-hour presentation by a guest presenter who is a responsible professional person in the field being discussed. This presentation was followed by nearly an hour of questions and general discussion with the participants.

This course was planned and controlled entirely by the Liberia Workshop Committee. The Committee selected the persons to present the lectures and one of its members led the discussions following the presentation.

<u>Session number</u>	<u>Topic</u>
1.	Opening
2.	Community Development Facilities
3.	Community Development Programs
4.	Soil Conditions and Agriculture Development
5.	Small Scale Agricultural Development
6.	Formation of Cooperatives
7.	Family Planning Progress
8.	Family Life Education to the Young
9.	Women's Roles/Rights in Social Development
10.	Public Health Programs in Liberia
11.	Synthesis of Liberia's Social Development Progress
12.	Liberia's Nutritive Problem and Progress to Correct Them

Communication 104: Person-to-Person Communication.

Principal Coordinators: Walter Allen and Donald J. Bogue

This course met for eight two-hour sessions, with an all-morning laboratory on Saturdays. In addition, there were laboratory sessions scheduled on Tuesdays and Thursdays for persons who were not otherwise in class. These laboratory sessions gave each participant plenty of time for practice and planning for application of the course content to his particular work.

<u>Session number</u>	<u>Topic</u>
1.	The basic skills of interpersonal communication needed by all who do personal contact work for social development programs.
2.	Planning and conducting group discussions (theory). LABORATORY: Class members participate in group discussions, videotape playback and analysis.
3.	Problems encountered in holding group discussions with low-education rural people in developing countries.
4.	Planning and conducting information and belief-changing person-to-person counselling (theory). LABORATORY: Class members practice doing informational counselling, with videotape playback and analysis.
5.	Planning and conducting emotional and attitude-changing person-to-person counselling (theory).
6.	Problems encountered in house-to-house or other individual counselling of low-education rural people in developing countries. LABORATORY: Class members practice doing attitude-changing counselling, with videotape playback and analysis.
7.	Basic techniques of public speaking and the conduct of public meetings. LABORATORY: Class members practice extemporaneous public speaking, with videotape playback and analysis.
8.	Techniques of classroom instruction and the conduct of training sessions.

Communication 105: Mass Media Production for Social Development Communication

Principal Coordinator: Robert Higgins

This course was taught as 12 two-hour sessions each, followed by a two-hour lab, with an all-morning laboratory on Saturday mornings in the first, second, and third weeks. The emphasis was on practical experience at producing persuasive and educational communications for social development.

<u>Session number</u>	<u>Topic</u>
1.	Radio Interviews: Fundamentals of radio communication. How to prepare for a radio interview LABORATORY: Prepare, conduct, and record radio interviews.
2.	Radio Spots (Scripting): How to prepare a radio commercial. Use of music and sound effects. Scripting the radio commercial. LABORATORY: Write radio commercial.
3.	Radio Spots (Production): Revision and refinement of radio commercial scripts. LABORATORY: Record radio spots.
4.	Radio Drama: Introduction to preparation of the radio drama. How to script the radio drama. LABORATORY: Writing radio drama.
5.	Radio Drama (Scripting and Production): Revision of scripts and casting for production. LABORATORY: Record radio drama.
6.	Radio Drama: Production--no class session, rather a four-hour lab. Completion of all radio dramas.
7.	Television Spots: Introduction to television communication. Writing television scripts. LABORATORY: Introduction to television equipment. Write script.
8.	Television Spots Production--no class session, rather a four-hour lab. Revision of scripts. Production of television spots.
9.	Leaflets and Posters: Elements of effective design and writing. LABORATORY: Determination of effective theme and content.

cont.

<u>Session number</u>	<u>Topic</u>
10.	Leaflets and Posters: No class session, rather a four-hour lab. Making rough layouts of leaflet and poster.
11.	Leaflets and Posters: No class session, rather a four-hour lab. Completion of leaflets and posters.
12.	Using your communication skills: How to use your communication skills to support social development objectives.

Communication 106: Data Collection and Report Preparation for Communication Research and Evaluation.

Principal Coordinator: Walter Allen

This course consisted of sixteen units. It was assumed that the student was also taking Communication 107, dealing with the analysis of data once they are collected.

<u>Session number</u>	<u>Topic</u>
1.	<u>Preparation for data collection</u> (a) Selecting and wording questions (b) Developing the questionnaire, precoded for tabulation
2.	<u>Collecting data by interview</u> (a) Basic principles of interviewing (b) Recruiting, training and supervising interviews
3.	<u>Coding data for tabulation</u> (a) Coding forms and instructions (b) Coding open-ended questions
4.	<u>Audience research needed to plan a communication campaign</u> (a) Assembly of available data about the audience (b) Inventories of audience knowledge, beliefs, media habits, and media preferences
5.	<u>Pretesting communication materials</u> (a) Questionnaires for pretesting printed materials (b) Questionnaires for pretesting radio, movies, or TV
6.	<u>Follow-up evaluation of communication programs</u> (a) Monitoring on-going campaigns (b) Long-term evaluation of campaign impact
7.	<u>Organizing and writing the research report</u> (a) How to plan and organize good research reports (b) How to distill the findings as answers to the research questions
8.	<u>Presentation of data in the research report</u> (a) How to present statistical tables (b) How to present effective graphs

Communication 107: The Tabulation and Analysis of Social Research Data.

Principal Coordinators: Walter Allen and Donald J. Bogue

This course consisted of twenty-four units. It was taught as 12 two-hour sessions. It was assumed that the student was also taking course Communication 106, dealing with the collection of research data. This course taught how to analyze and interpret data after they are collected.

<u>Session number</u>	<u>Topic</u>
1.	<u>Overview of the research process</u> (a) Importance of research for program planning (b) Defining the research problem: variables and hypotheses
2.	<u>Planning the research project</u> (a) Identifying the questions worthy of research (b) Writing the research proposal: what, why, where, how, and how much
3.	<u>Tabulation of data</u> (a) Tabulation of one-way frequency distributions (b) Tabulation of simple (two-way) statistical tables
4.	<u>Analysis and interpretation of frequency distributions</u> (a) Interpretation of one-way frequency distributions: the percent distribution (b) Recoding categories for further analysis: advantage of dichotomies and trichotomies
5.	<u>Analysis of simple (two-way) statistical tables</u> (a) How to read a statistical table (b) How to interpret statistical tables by comparing percentages
6.	<u>How to test hypotheses with two-way statistical tables</u> (a) Measurement of independence and association (b) The Chi-square test for independence
7.	<u>Measures of central tendency</u> (a) How to compute mean, median, and mode (b) How to test hypotheses using means, medians, and modes
8.	<u>Introduction to correlation and linear regression</u> (a) The scattergram and linear regression (b) Correlation as a measure of relationship
9.	<u>Correlation and linear regression (continued)</u> (a) How to compute and interpret regression coefficients (b) How to compute and interpret correlation coefficients

cont.

<u>Session number</u>	<u>Topic</u>
10.	<u>How to test hypotheses using correlation and linear regression</u> (a) Introduction to analysis of variance (b) The F-test and the t-test for independence
11.	<u>Multiple correlation and regression</u> (a) Testing independent effect of several variables (b) How to interpret a multiple-regression tabulation
12.	<u>Three-variable cross-classification analysis</u> (a) The three-way cross-tabulation and its importance in research (b) How to interpret three-way cross-tabulations

Communication 108: The Planning and Management of Communication Programs.

Principal Coordinator: Robert Higgins

This course was taught as 8 two-hour sessions. Each participant was required to design the plan for a social development campaign, complete with all aspects discussed in the outline below. Where possible, this pertained to the work he does in his regular employment.

Session
number

Topic

A. THE COMMUNICATION PRODUCTION UNIT

1. The foundation: Long-range plans for communication support for SD programs
 - (a) Arriving at objectives and budget in consultation with directors
 - (b) Establishing working relationships with other departments of the organization and arranging for "feedback"
 - (c) Advantages of centralized vs. local production and how to reconcile them
2. Staffing and organizing the personnel of a SD communication unit (including plans for use of free-lance and part-time media specialists)
 - (a) Setting up the communication department and determining its personnel needs
 - (b) Locating and working with free-lancers, talent, artists, and printers as an alternative or supplement to in-house production
3. Physical facilities and equipment needed for the SD communication unit
 - (a) Space requirements for the SD unit
 - (b) Physical equipment needed for the SD unit
 - (c) Reducing needs for physical facilities and equipment through use of studios, production houses, printers, and free-lance specialists

B. PLANNING AND MANAGING SPECIFIC COMMUNICATION CAMPAIGNS

4. Planning and organizing for specific SD campaigns
 - (a) Defining objectives, audience and identifying messages
 - (b) Development of a campaign plan, theme, and strategy
5. Selecting media for a specific campaign
 - (a) Media in relation to target audience and costs
 - (b) Combining mass media with person-to-person contact
 - (c) Using the media to reinforce and amplify the messages

cont.

Session
number

Topic

6. Management of production for the campaign
 - (a) Establishing production schedules and monitoring them
 - (b) Establishing budgets and monitoring them
 - (c) Insistence upon pretesting and revision

7. Launching and monitoring the campaign
 - (a) Publicity releases, public relations work in behalf of the campaign
 - (b) Establishing schedules and internal support programs
 - (c) Monitoring and mid-course corrections of weaknesses

8. Post-campaign post-mortem
 - (a) Prompt conduct of evaluation research
 - (b) After-campaign critique
 - (c) Publicizing results of the campaign, internally and externally
 - (d) Implications for the total program and future campaigns

IV
EVALUATION OF THE WORKSHOP

On Wednesday of the workshop's final week, a questionnaire was distributed to each participant, soliciting his or her confidential evaluation of the workshop. Appendix B is a copy of this questionnaire. A total of 44 participants from the final graduating class of 48 filled out the questionnaire. Following is a summary and interpretation of those responses. The evaluation is divided into three parts. Part A deals with the overall evaluation given by the participants. Part B is a specific, detailed evaluation of each course by the participants. Part C lists the additional spontaneous comments contributed by the participants to improve future workshops.

PART A. GENERAL EVALUATION

1. Need for a Communication Workshop. The idea of holding a communication workshop was unanimously approved by the participants. They were asked, "How important do you think it was for Liberia to have short-term training in communication for social development?" They responded as follows:

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Very important.....	82
Moderately important.....	16
Not very important.....	0
A complete waste of time.....	0
Did not answer the question.....	<u>2</u>
Total.....	100

This unanimous approval of the idea of holding such a workshop could have been expected, because the participants were volunteers who had remained throughout the training period. Nevertheless, the fact that they felt as strongly as they

did at the end of the training period is strong reaffirmation that in-country training for communication is regarded as a much-needed program by large numbers of persons engaged in education and communication work.

2. Overall Evaluation of the Workshop Instruction. Each participant was asked to rate each course taken on a four-point scale ranging from "excellent" to "poor." Since each participant was enrolled for three or more courses, a total of 187 evaluations were made. The distribution of responses was as follows:

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Excellent.....	58
Good.....	34
Adequate.....	7
Poor.....	<u>1</u>
Total.....	100

Thus, the overall evaluation of the workshop instruction was overwhelmingly favorable. There were only 3 votes that a course taken was "poor." One could scarcely hope or expect a more favorable reaction to a training course. Nevertheless, as will be shown in Part B, the participants still had many suggestions for making the program even better.

3. Amount Learned. Question 3 asked, "Considering all courses you took, how much did you learn or how much did you improve your communication skills during the four weeks?" The ratings were a thorough endorsement of the courses as improving the participants' knowledge and skill levels significantly:

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
More than I thought possible.....	18
A lot.....	54
A moderate amount.....	21
Only a little bit.....	7
Almost nothing.....	<u>0</u>
Total.....	100

4. Usefulness of Training for Job. When asked, "Taking the courses together, how helpful do you think what you learned will be in your work next year?", the responses were also extremely favorable:

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
A tremendous amount of help.....	18
A lot of help.....	59
A moderate amount of help.....	16
Only a little help.....	2
No help at all.....	0
No response to the question.....	<u>5</u>
Total.....	100

5. Participation of Liberian Specialists. The instruction was provided by one Liberian specialist (Prof. Thomas Ken) and three University of Chicago instructors. In addition, one course was taught completely by guest speakers who were Liberian specialists. Thus, about one-fourth of the total instruction was provided by Liberian speakers and about three-fourths by the Chicago team. The students were asked to evaluate this mixture (Question 8), and responded as follows

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Not enough time was given to presentations by Liberian experts.....	27
There was about the right mixture to presentation by Liberians and foreigners.....	34
Not enough time was given to the foreign specialists to take full advantage of their skills.....	14
Gave ambiguous responses.....	16
Did not answer the question.....	<u>9</u>
Total.....	100

Although a majority of the participants approved the mixture of foreign and Liberian specialists, a very substantial minority would have favored a more equal mix of foreign and Liberian instruction. Some written-in comments sug-

gested that the Liberian instructors had not been given sufficient time to prepare, and that the search for Liberian speakers and teachers had not been extensive enough. Clearly, one possible way to improve the workshop would be to have Liberian specialists speak or make presentations in every single course, instead of in only two of the eight courses. It was perhaps the segregation of courses as all-Liberian or all-Chicago that led to this undercurrent of disappointment that the participation of Liberians was not greater. (This finding must be tempered with the realization that the course given the lowest marks by the participants was the one taught by Liberian guest speakers--see Part B, below.)

6. Performance by the University of Chicago Team. The participants were asked to rate frankly the quality of performance of the University of Chicago team (Question 9). The ratings given were as follows:

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Truly outstanding.....	25
Very good.....	55
Good.....	11
Adequate.....	5
Poor.....	0
Very poor.....	0
Did not answer the question.....	<u>4</u>
Total.....	100

Clearly, the persons selected to represent the University of Chicago (Allen, Higgins, Hoff and Bogue) turned in a performance which received no negative evaluation whatsoever and a substantial amount of praise.

7. Mixture of Theory and Practical Work by Chicago Team. From the outset, the University of Chicago team had informed the Committee that it favored a strong mixture of theory and practical work, and participants were warned of this academic orientation when they applied to the program. Courses 101 and 102 were designed primarily to be theory courses; Course 104 also contained a great deal of theory, as did Courses 106/107. Throughout, however, there were

classroom discussions that attempted to apply this theory. A question intended to get the frank evaluation of this approach was "The University of Chicago contribution was a mixture of theory and practical work. How would you evaluate this mixture?" The distribution of responses was as follows:

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Far too much theory, not enough practical work.....	14
Somewhat too much theory, not enough practical work.....	11
About the right mixture of theory and practical work.....	61
Somewhat too much practical work, not enough theory.....	5
Far too much practical work, not enough theory.....	0
Gave ambiguous answers.....	5
Did not answer the question.....	4
Total.....	100

About two-thirds of the class clearly approved of the theory and practical orientation, while nearly one-tenth believed too much theory was being offered by the University of Chicago. Much of the minor discontent was focused on Course 101, which bore the open title, "Theories of Communication." This course entailed a stiff dose of basic theory, taught as simply as possible and scaled down to the time available and the background of the participants. One means of further improvement would be to spend more time pointing out the practical applications of this body of knowledge or perhaps to omit some theoretical materials that are less essential for successful communication work.

8. Segregation into Subfields. The participants were required to specialize in one of three subfields of their choice: (a) Mass Communication, (b) Person-to-Person Communication, or (c) Research and Evaluation. It was reasoned that the time was short, the participants heterogeneous, and that efforts must be concentrated if high levels of skill were to be reached. The participants were asked to rate this policy (Question 11). Although they gave it a strong endorse-

ment, there was a substantial minority that criticized it because they wished to work in two or more of the three fields. They responded as follows:

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Good idea, it keeps the groups homogeneous and lets them go faster to higher levels.....	64
Poor idea, it keeps out people who want to get a little of two or more fields.....	14
Good idea, but needs to be changed.....	7
Gave ambiguous responses.....	4
Did not answer the question.....	<u>11</u>
Total.....	100

Although nearly two-thirds of the participants fully approved of the policy, one-fifth wanted change. This discontent took the form of wanting to have access to the administration course (which was a part of the mass media course) and to the research course, but on a limited basis. A few people wanted to have both mass media and person-to-person courses, but most realized that to have tried to cover both for all participants in two weeks would have greatly lowered the level of accomplishment in each course. Nevertheless, there was a significant amount of participants who wished to specialize either in mass media or person-to-person communication and to have had a brief overview or exposure to the other courses.

In view of the small enrollment in the research course (only six students completed it), this course must be greatly modified if it is to be taught in future workshops. (This is discussed in Part B of this section.) The fact that most of the participants are potential administrators suggests that the administration course should be made more widely available. The segregation between mass media and person-to-person communication was indeed perhaps too complete.

9. Overview of Liberia's Development Program. Because the participants

came from many ministries and organizations, it was anticipated that few of them would have a good overview of Liberia's development program. Therefore, Course 103 was designed to provide this overview, and was made compulsory (as was Course 102). The participants were asked to evaluate this policy (Question 12); they were asked the question, "If this course is offered again, should it be made required or voluntary?"

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Should be required, as this year.....	50
Should be made voluntary.....	41
Should not even be offered.....	0
Gave ambiguous responses.....	2
Question not answered.....	7
Total.....	100

As it turned out, the content of this course was quite familiar for many of the participants. They gave the lowest marks to this course, in terms of teaching, content, and reading. Although a majority favored a continuation of this year's practice, it is clear that if the course is to be made required, it must be upgraded in terms of teaching, reading materials, and course content.

10. Length of the Workshop. Question 13 asked the participants if they thought the workshop had lasted long enough or too long, taking everything into consideration.

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Too long.....	2
About the right time.....	27
Not long enough.....	69
Did not answer the question.....	2
Total.....	100

Regarding the length of the workshop, participants were asked the follow-up question, "How many weeks should it have been?" Twenty-six of the thirty

participants who said the workshop was not long enough suggested various periods. Eight weeks was, on average, the preferred time.

<u>Length of workshop in weeks</u>	<u>Number of participants reporting</u>
5.5.....	1
6.0.....	5
7.0.....	1
8.0.....	12
9.0.....	1
10.0.....	1
12.0.....	5
Duration not suggested.....	4

The single outstanding criticism by the participants was that the workshop was too short. In all of these evaluations except the length of training time, they approved by a strong majority the planning that had been done. Much of this criticism of duration is spelled out in the spontaneous comments, included below.

11. Location of the Workshop. The workshop was held at the University Farm, located 18 miles from Monrovia. The participants were asked to evaluate this arrangement (Question 14).

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Almost the best possible arrangement.....	23
A good arrangement.....	27
An adequate arrangement.....	23
A poor arrangement.....	23
Gave ambiguous answers.....	2
Did not answer the question.....	2
Total.....	100

The participants clearly did not agree on this point. That the arrangement was adequate or good was strongly upheld. However, nearly one-fourth clearly disliked it and a compensating one-fourth rated it as near-ideal. Most participants liked the quasi-isolation, the fellowship of eating lunch together

daily, and the absence of distractions. A few resented the time spent in travel and were upset by the occasional breakdown of buses or failure of buses to appear on time. Given the fact that the cost of the workshop would have nearly doubled had it been held at an in-town site, the use of the University Farm was clearly justified and should be given priority consideration if a similar workshop is held next year. This recommendation is particularly cogent when it is understood that dissatisfaction with the farm was concentrated among the participants who were University of Liberia staff members not associated with the farm. Also, some of the criticism was focused on the fact that the lunches were not Liberian, but Western (out of deference to the foreign staff). With a little improvement in transportation arrangements and slight changes in menu, the criticisms of the location could be largely eliminated.

12. Should the Program be Repeated Next Year? Toward the end of the evaluation, the participants were asked, "How important for social development in Liberia do you think it is that this course be repeated for a new class of participants next year?" The resounding affirmative accord is almost a command to hold it again:

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Very important.....	82
Moderately important.....	11
Not very important.....	5
Completely unimportant.....	0
Did not answer the question.....	2
Total.....	100

Whether the next workshop would be done as an all-Liberian project or as a joint project with the University of Chicago is still to be established. It is believed that the participants were assuming that essentially the same staff would return when they made this recommendation with the suggested im-

provements being incorporated into the program.

13. Follow-up Work with Trainees. Many programs of training are criticized for not following-up the trainees. Exactly how to do this in a constructive way has not yet been specified. An effort to explore one possibility was made in Question 16, which states: "There is a possibility that at least some members of the University of Chicago team can come back to Liberia to work with individual ministries and with the Family Planning Association of Liberia to help them plan and improve the production for their individual programs. How important do you think it is that such arrangements be made?" That such follow-up activities would be warmly welcomed by all but a small minority is indicated by the responses:

<u>Response</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Absolutely essential.....	46
Very important.....	32
Moderately important.....	7
Not very important.....	9
A complete waste of time.....	0
Gave ambiguous responses.....	2
Did not answer the question.....	4
Total.....	100

Whether follow-up work would be welcomed by the chiefs of the Ministries or even the trainees themselves after a few months back on the job could be raised as a hypothetical question. It is a concrete option that the Community and Family Study Center is prepared to carry through with if the Government of Liberia and AID/Washington both approve. Such collaboration could begin as early as June/July of this year.

14. Importance of Communication Workshops for Other African Countries.

In Question 17 the participants were asked to evaluate how important it is for other African countries to hold workshops of the type held in Liberia. The enthusiasm that they expressed throughout their evaluation of their experience in Monrovia carried over into a solid endorsement of the workshop

approach as a policy or program for all Africa.

Response

Useful for absolutely every country in Africa.....	68
Useful for about 3/4 of African countries.....	9
Useful for about 1/2 of African countries.....	9
Useful for about 1/4 of African countries.....	5
Absolutely unnecessary.....	2
Did not answer the question.....	<u>7</u>
Total.....	100

Conclusion. Assuming the above evaluation was sincere and frank (and the workshop staff members believe it was), the sponsors of the program believe that their highest hopes and aspirations for the training program were almost fully realized. The results achieved appear to justify fully the effort and funds expended. The importance of holding in-country workshops in communication for social development was reverified by the grass-roots response. A practical agenda that appears to meet this need has been produced. With modifications to meet local needs and with improvements resulting from the Liberia experience, it can be a prototype for a major effort to bring this type of training to every nation in Africa that requests it.

PART B. EVALUATION OF COURSES

The workshop participants were asked to rate each course they took in terms of content, reading materials, teaching, and laboratory experience (for those courses having lab sessions). Responses could range from "very good" to "very poor". In addition to answering this set evaluation, each participant was given the opportunity to respond in his or her own words about the courses taken. To obtain these spontaneous comments about the

strengths and limitations of the courses, the participants were asked two open-ended questions:

"In your own words, state what you found most useful or helpful about each of the courses you took. (Fill out for each course.)"

"In your own words, state what you found disappointing, unsatisfactory, or unnecessary about each course you took."

Participants' Evaluation of Course 101: Communication Theory

Instructor/Coordinator--Michael Hoff and Donald Bogue

Aspects of Course	Total Percent	Response by percent						
		very good	good	adequate	poor	very poor	no rating	ambiguous response
Content.....	100	26	41	13	5	2	8	5
Reading Material...	100	36	36	13	--	2	13	--
Teaching.....	100	30	28	18	10	3	8	3

Slightly more than two-thirds of the participants who took Course 101 rated its content as either very good or good. About one out of ten participants said it was adequate. When the "very good" and "good" ratings are considered together, this is the third best rated course in terms of content.

The reading material for the course had more than one-third rating it very good. The same number of participants considered it good.

Nearly six out of ten participants said the teaching for the course was either very good or good. Approximately one-fifth said it was adequate.

POSITIVE COMMENTS

There were twenty-eight positive comments concerning the useful dimen-

sions of the course. They fall into three general categories. Thirteen of the statements suggested that what the participants learned would improve their job performance. Ten responses indicated that the participants considered exposure to the process of communication to be worthwhile. Finally, the remaining five responses described the course as interesting.

1. Course's relevance to participants' jobs: "This course will improve my day-to-day job activities." "I have learned the steps and methods to use to become a better communicator. I have learned about the importance of communication." "This course was helpful in understanding why communication is very important for social development." "I learned about communication and how to apply it." "The course will enable me to get along better with my clients." "Even though the course was hard, it was most helpful to me in my current job." "This course has revealed to me how to be a good communicator, and it will enable me to do my work effectively."

2. Communication theory: "Information on the principles and flow of communication which specifies what to consider before attempting to communicate." "I found principles of communication useful." "The basic theory of communication taught was what I found most helpful." "The principles of communication laid a good foundation."

3. The course was interesting: "Every lecture was useful and was taught well." "The content of the course was excellent, but too much for four weeks." "I found the lectures most useful." "It was satisfactory."

NEGATIVE COMMENTS

There were seventeen negative comments. Following are a few examples.

1. Problems of comprehension: "Course 101 was very confusing to me." "I did not understand it well; they way of teaching was a bit hard to me." "It was not clear to me." "Some lectures were difficult to understand." "The course was not understood."

2. Time constraint: "There is nothing I found really unsatisfactory, but a lot more could have been taught in a longer period." "Time was too short." "We did not stay long enough on one topic in the principles of communication."

3. Other comments: "Exam was unnecessary in this course" was the view of two respondents. "Too much theory; no practical application." "The reading materials were too many." "I found that some of the examples or illustrations given in this course were unnecessary." "In this course, I found only the diagram in the text confusing."

Participants' Evaluation of Course 102: Social Aspects of Development

Instructor/Coordinator--Thomas Ken

Aspects of Course	Total Percent	Response by percent						
		very good	good	adequate	poor	very poor	no rating	ambiguous response
Content.....	100	33	33	22	7	--	5	--
Reading Material...	100	29	19	24	7	2	19	--
Teaching.....	100	36	36	19	--	--	9	--

Concerning the content for Course 102, one-third of the participants said that the content was very good and one-third said it was good. Slightly more than one-fifth rated it as adequate, and there were no responses rating it as very poor.

Approximately half the participants rated the reading materials as good or very good. For some unknown reason, almost one-fifth of the participants did not rate the materials at all.

Almost three-fourths of the participants considered the teaching in Course 102 to be good or very good. Less than one-fifth rated it as adequate.

POSITIVE COMMENTS

The thirty-two positive comments focused largely on the concept of social development and Liberia's development experience, the applicability of the course to job-related activities, and the useful aspects of the course.

1. Liberia's development effort: Twenty comments concerned the development issue in general and Liberia's development experience in particular. Some of the specific positive statements include: "The topics and definitions of development" were perceived as useful or helpful. "The way in which development is carried out in the rural setting in Liberia" was conceived by one respondent as having been most useful. "It really helped one to understand the role of communication in social development." "There is concern about development in the entire country. Therefore, the teaching of sound aspects of development was most useful." "I have come to know what some of the economic problems are." "The course helped me figure out problems and possible solutions to social development." "I learned more about Liberia than before." "This course demonstrated to me how development should take place through communication." "It gave me broad knowledge about development in my country." "I found development and population growth useful and helpful." "I learned more about the development of my country, the population phenomena, the problems facing my country, etc." "I learned in more detail about the development process in the country (Liberia) and the barriers towards development." "To understand the different aspects of development in Liberia was most useful to me."

2. The relevance of the course to participants' jobs: "This course was useful because I learned a new approach which I shall use in the field." "This course has given me a broad idea on how to be a good community worker." "I feel that this course will really help me in persuading the people I work

with. And I shall use the materials to guide me in improving my work."

"Information about development goals and means was intriguing. We looked at it in a general context and nationally. The course was thought provoking--why people migrate, fertility and mortality rates, etc. On the basis of these facts, we can make helpful, useful, functional development plans."

3. Useful aspects of the course: "The group discussions and the approach taught us new methods." "The presentations were clear; I understood virtually everything." "The method of teaching aimed at ensuring students' participation." "Both the lectures and reading materials were useful."

NEGATIVE COMMENTS

The thirteen negative comments made about the course relate to a wide range of issues: "Time was really too short to acquire much of the desired knowledge." "It was taught more like an undergraduate course of one to two semesters rather than a very short workshop course. It was assumed that most participants understood the concept and theories of development, etc. Many needed more fundamental explanations." "The lecturers generally did not come in time." "My disappointment is that the development of my country mostly focuses on the capital city and not in the rural sector." "There should have been more Liberian teachers involved in the teaching of this course." "Instead of concentrating on the topics in question, we digressed to other topics which resulted in confusion." "There was late starting of some lectures due to lack of transportation."

Participants' Evaluation of Course 103: Social Development in Liberia

Instructor/Coordinator--Workshop Committee, Walter Allen, and Thomas Ken

Aspects of Course	Total Percent	Response by percent						
		very good	good	ade-quate	poor	very poor	no rating	ambigu-ous re-sponse
Content.....	100	19	12	52	5	--	12	--
Reading Material...	100	9	23	31	7	2	26	2
Teaching.....	100	12	26	41	2	--	19	--

Whereas more than one-half of the participants in this course rated it as adequate, those who considered it very good or good comprise one-third of the participants.

As regards reading materials, about one-third and one-fourth considered them adequate and good, respectively. More than one-fourth did not rate the course materials.

Slightly more than four out of every ten participants perceived the teaching aspect of the course as adequate. More than one-quarter viewed it as good and about one-fifth did not rate the teaching.

POSITIVE COMMENTS

The participants gave twenty-seven comments about the course. Generally, the comments were about three issues. Nine statements were about the contributions of the various government agencies. Seven concerned Liberia's development. General development considerations comprised another category of the responses.

1. Contributions of various government ministries: "The lectures from

the various representatives of different ministries helped me to gain more ideas about some things I did not know before." "I learned about the activities of different ministries." "I got to know about other ministries of the government." "This course was useful in that it enabled us to know about different agencies, their goals and activities." "It was useful to have speakers come in to lecture on important topics about Liberia." "The selection of various speakers to lecture on various aspects of the Liberian society was commendable."

2. Liberia's economic development: "This course has helped to acquaint me with Liberia's problems and attempted solutions from the communication standpoint." "More information on Liberia's development was learned; the feedback I got was also helpful." "I learned more about Liberia's historical background." "The nature of our economy was of considerable interest." "I learned many things about development in Liberia."

3. General development concerns: "The discussion about the development attempts in the Third World countries was of great interest." "This course was helpful in providing the general knowledge concerning social development."

NEGATIVE COMMENTS

There were twenty-one criticisms of the course. Seven were about the organizational aspect of the course. Five concerned the speakers' performances. Another issue was the scheduling of speakers to participate in the workshop. Finally, the materials provided by the guest lecturers were limited in supply.

1. Course organization: "The course was not well organized and integrated into the workshop." "There was a poor arrangement for lectures." "The course was not adequately planned." "The lecturers from different government agencies talked about various subjects which were uncoordinated and hence confusing." "The course was not planned well."

2. The performance of the speakers: "I did not enjoy this course because there were too many lecturers coming in, most of whom did not do well in their lectures." "Some of the lecturers were caught unprepared." "I felt that some of the lectures did not know the subject matter." "Some of the speakers digressed from the issue under discussion and were also not good." "Some speakers were very poor." "Most of the speakers were boring."

3. Scheduling of speakers: "Liberian specialists were not contacted in advance. Some of the lecturers did not show up." "There was a failure on the part of some lecturers to show up." "Some topics were boring. Furthermore, some guest speakers were not able to answer some of the questions they were asked."

4. Limited reading materials: "There were not enough copies of the papers presented by the lecturers." "There were not enough reading materials."

5. Other comments: "Too much was talked about family planning." "The course was too political." "Some of the things taught I knew already."

Participants' Evaluation of Course 104: Person-to-Person Communication

Instructor/Coordinator--Walter Allen and Donald Bogue

Aspects of Course	Total Percent	Response by percent						
		very good	good	ade-quate	poor	very poor	no rating	ambigu-ous re-sponse
Content.....	100	36	28	20	4	--	12	--
Reading Material...	100	24	36	8	8	4	20	--
Teaching.....	100	32	24	16	--	--	24	4
Laboratory work....	100	44	20	8	8	--	20	--

So far as the content of Course 104 was concerned, slightly more than two-thirds of the participants felt that it was either very good or good. One-fifth said it was adequate.

On average, one-fourth of those who took the course considered its reading materials very good. Those who rated them as good were almost four out of ten. One-fifth, however, declined to rate the reading materials.

Concerning the teaching aspect, approximately six out of ten participants perceived the teaching as good or very good. A sizeable number, about one-fourth, once more did not rate this particular facet of the course.

Laboratory work was assessed as either very good or good by about two-thirds of the participants. One-fifth of them did not rate it.

POSITIVE COMMENTS

The total number of positive comments on this course were twenty-three. Twelve of these comments were about the group discussion aspect of the course. Nine concerned the relevance of the course to the participants' current jobs.

1. The strategy of group discussion: "The group discussion where we have a leader and everybody else taking part was one of the interesting aspects of the course." "I found group discussion most useful and helpful." "Group discussion is useful for me because it is better than the situation in which a group leader has to request the individual group members to contribute to the discussion." "Group discussion and person-to-person communication were useful." "The group discussion was very helpful because it is what I am confronted with most of the time in my field activities." "Conducting group discussions and presenting persuasive talks were helpful." "Now I am confident I can guide and lead group discussions easily." "I learned new ways of approaching problems and how to use group discussion to bring about social development." "I

learned how to handle a group discussion." "Good ideas about planning discussion." "This course suggested a new approach to group discussion."

2. Course relevance to participants' jobs: "I gained more experience about my job and this course helped me to improve." "It was most helpful, I learned how to communicate better with people, and how to improve myself in communicating with people." "I found very helpful the methods in which we convey our messages to our rural audience." "I learned more about person-to-person communication." "The course enabled me to acquire techniques of interviewing people well." "I was able to know how best I could motivate my clients to use family planning for child-spacing." "The course was most helpful because it is consistent with my job." "This course has taught me how to be a good group leader and also how to work along with the rural people."

3. Other comments: "The production of posters was very good." "The laboratory work was very useful."

NEGATIVE COMMENTS

It is interesting to note that most of the participants did not respond to this question. This suggests that the course did not have major shortcomings. However, there were six criticisms of the course: "We did not have enough lab work." "The class period was too long." "The lab work was disappointing because most of wanted to have our role-plays performed on TV." "The time was limited, and the tapes were insufficient." "This course would have been more useful had there been more time." "Issues were not discussed at length and there was a change in instruction."

Participants' Evaluation of Course 105: Mass Media Production

Instructor/Coordinator--Robert Higgins and Michael Hoff

Aspects of Course	Total Percent	Response by percent						
		very good	good	ade-quate	poor	very poor	no rating	ambigu-ous re-sponse
Content.....	100	71	24	--	--	--	5	--
Reading Materials...	100	67	10	4	--	--	19	--
Teaching.....	100	80	10	--	--	--	10	--
Laboratory Work.....	100	81	5	--	--	--	14	--

Considering all the courses taken by the workshop participants, Course 105 had the best ratings.

About three-fourths and one-fourth, respectively, considered the content for the course very good or good.

More than three-quarters of the participants thought that the reading materials were very good or good. It is, however, disturbing to note that nearly one-fifth did not rate the reading materials.

Eight out of ten participants said the teaching was very good. One-tenth considered it good. Another one-tenth did not rate it.

Laboratory work was also positively rated. Nearly nine out of ten of those who took the course felt that it was either very good or good.

POSITIVE COMMENTS

There were nineteen comments regarding the strengths of the course. The advertisement aspect of the course had six positive comments. There

were also six comments for the importance of mass communication. The rest of the comments were about other aspects of the course.

1. Advertising: "Getting actually to record radio commercials was helpful." "Writing and producing my own commercial and making posters and pamphlets." "The commercial production, studio scheduling and interview." "This course helped me to understand what goes on in radio and television programs, and it enabled me to deduce from various commercials which ones are good and not so good so that I am able to make some corrections." "I learned how to prepare a very good commercial."

2. The importance of mass communication: "This course has shown me the importance of mass communication." "It threw much light on mass communication." "I gained much on how to use the mass media." "Yes, this was the most useful course since I am interested in radio and television communication." "From this course I learned how to use the mass media to do my work." "I learned how to speak well while engaging in mass media communication."

3. Other comments: "This course was helpful in that we learned how to handle electronic equipment." "It was very interesting, but time was too short." "This course will improve my teaching activities in the ministry." "The posters and radio announcements" were viewed as useful. "The practical work was more useful than lectures."

NEGATIVE COMMENTS

"The allotted time was really inadequate." "The time was too short for practicals." "There was less time." "The unnecessary thing about Course 105 was that the text-book was mainly oriented to family planning instead of radio and TV."

Participants' Evaluation of Course 106/107: Research and Evaluation

Instructor/Coordinator--Walter Allen and Donald Bogue

Aspects of Course	Total Percent	Response by percent						
		very good	good	adequate	poor	very poor	no rating	ambiguous response
Content.....	100	50	17	33	--	--	--	--
Reading Materials...	100	33	67	--	--	--	--	--
Teaching.....	100	50	33	17	--	--	--	--
Laboratory Work.....	100	17	66	--	--	--	--	17

On the basis of the "very good" and "good" ratings combined, Course 106/107 is the second best rated of all the courses.

Half of the participants enrolled in the course rated the course content as "very good". One-third said it was adequate.

Reading materials were viewed as very good by one-third of the respondents. The rest thought they were good.

One-half and one-third, respectively, perceived the teaching aspect as very good and good. The rest felt it was adequate.

With regard to laboratory work, two-thirds of the respondents viewed it as adequate. About one-fifth considered it very good. Those who gave ambiguous responses were approximately one-fifth.

POSITIVE COMMENTS

The five positive comments for this course are: "The techniques on how to conduct research will be applied to enable us to prepare well development plans to meet the needs of Liberia." "This course was most

useful to us; we learned how to carry out research." "The mechanics and process of research were taught." "I acquired adequate knowledge of re- search." "The practical application of the theory was helpful."

NEGATIVE COMMENTS

The four criticisms provided by the participants who responded are:

"The duration of the course was too short." "Time was too short, the teach- er was too fast, and subsequently the basic aspects were not properly covered." "Time was too short." "There was too much materials and the time was very short."

Participants' Evaluation of Course 108: Administration of Programs

Instructor/Coordinator--Robert Higgins

Aspects of Course	Total Percent	Response by percent						
		very good	good	ade- quate	poor	very poor	no rating	ambigu- ous re- sponse
Content.....	100	67	25	--	--	--	8	--
Reading Materials...	100	17	25	--	8	--	50	--
Teaching.....	100	50	25	--	--	--	25	--
Laboratory Work.....	100	42	25	8	--	--	25	--

The content of this course was highly rated. About nine out of ten participants viewed the course content as very good or good.

There were no reading materials as such for this course. Thus, half of the participants did not rate this.

The teaching dimension of the course was considered very good by half of the respondents. One-fourth said it was good. Another one-fourth declined

to rate the teaching.

Two-thirds of the participants in this course maintained that laboratory work was either very good or good. However, one-quarter did not rate this aspect of the course.

POSITIVE COMMENTS

Twelve positive statements were made about this course. Seven of these statements suggest that the participants found the course relevant. The other five statements pertain to the skills the participants acquired.

1. Course's relevance to participants' jobs: "This course has reinforced my ability to organize, implement, and supervise sound programs concerning communication." "I acquired information which will improve the effectiveness of my project." "This course helped me a lot to do what people will expect me to do well. It was clearly presented." "Laboratory work was most rewarding and will be very useful in day-to-day work." "The course was very helpful for my program." "It refreshed my knowledge of supervision and administration." "Course 108 was very useful for planning and management of any program or plan."

2. Skills acquired: "Having the opportunity to put the proposal together and work on it according to what was done in Course 105." "What I found useful was the information on how to plan a communication campaign." "The marketing plan was most helpful." "It taught me creative writing, which is essential for successful communication; writing today is the most widely used medium of communication." "108 was very good; all the lectures were clear and well understood."

NEGATIVE COMMENTS

There were only three criticisms of the course: "Time was inadequate and so left one with a desire for more information." "Time was too short." "If the participants enrolled in courses 105 and 108 had worked together, I think they would have learned more in both courses."

PART C. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

A final question aimed at eliciting participants' spontaneous comments, criticisms, and suggestions. The participants were asked:

"Please use the rest of this page and any additional pages you may need to write, in your own words, any additional comments, criticisms, and suggestions you may have for holding a workshop of this type again in Liberia or for improving it if it is held in any other African countries."

Thirty-five participants gave seventy-nine responses in all. The answers comprised forty-three suggestions, twenty-three criticisms, and thirteen comments

SUGGESTIONS

Eleven of the suggestions advocated extending the duration of the workshop. Three concerned the food provided. The others were about diverse issues such as the optimal selection of guest speakers, the grading of participants' performance in the workshop activities, having the workshop repeated, and the educational background of the participants. These suggestions are listed below verbatim.

"A workshop of this type should be held again in Liberia for a longer time."

"I also feel that if this program should be repeated later in Liberia, or if it is carried out in any other African country, it should be a little over a month."

"If we should have this workshop again, it should be two months. The material covered within a short time is too much."

"I recommend that the time be extended to eight weeks."

"I shall suggest that since the time for the workshop is limited, there should be few required courses so that the participants spend more time on them."

"I would like the Government of Liberia, the University of Chicago, and

the Family Planning Association of Liberia to have another training program for three months."

"Because time was short, the participants did not learn much in order to contribute to the development process of Liberia and Africa. I suggest that the workshop should be held for eight weeks."

"I felt that time was very short and if it was possible that this course be repeated in Liberia, the time should be extended to maybe eight to twelve weeks. Since this was the first time we participated in this workshop, more time would have enabled us to gain more experience."

"This workshop should have more time, let us say eight or more weeks to give the participants an opportunity to learn more. What the instructors had to offer was very interesting and rewarding, but we needed more time for much more practical work and workshop participation."

"The only suggestion I would like to make is that the time for the courses was very short; it should be given a longer period of time like two or three months."

"I feel that the workshop should be longer next time it takes place. I also hope that this will not be the last workshop to be held here."

"I feel that Liberian dishes should be added to the meals next time and not having only European dishes."

"Serve more Liberian dishes."

"Even though rice was cooked every day and served with foreign food, next time have both local and foreign food."

"I suggest that a workshop of this type should be held again in Liberia and other African countries to improve the living conditions of the people in the continent; with such workshops in Africa, the whole continent may develop."

"I recommend that workshop participants should live on the campus to study and share ideas."

"The University of Chicago needs to ensure that tighter arrangements are made in advance by committee members in Liberia for the next workshop."

"A workshop such as this should be conducted once every year in Liberia for four years. This will increase development in Liberia."

"There should have been more time spent on Course 101 because it was one of the best subjects."

"Whatever the site of the conference may be, let it be at a place where more people can easily reach so as to have more participants than what we have had here in Liberia."

"I suggest that similar workshops should be held, but there should be one level of people having the same qualifications in the same field to attend."

"If possible, films about development projects in other African countries could be shown so that participants may also see what other African countries have done in the realm of development."

"If the workshop is held in other countries, participants from various countries should also attend the workshop to share ideas."

"My suggestion is that the schedule should be made in such a way that if possible people should take both Courses 104 and 105 including laboratory work."

"I recommend that participants should reside in one place throughout the period the workshop is in progress."

"This program should operate on an annual basis. We, the first participants, should continue this program on a yearly time schedule, but our courses should be more advanced than the previous ones. The new participants, on the other hand, should take the earlier courses."

"Specialists for the workshop should include also those in Home Economics."

"There should be a stipend given to the participants."

"Next time, let the participants be housed at a specific place just like the University Farm for about six weeks, where they can concentrate reading

the materials supplied."

"Guest speakers should be contacted, interviewed, and jointly chosen by both Liberian organizers and the University of Chicago."

"A balanced per diem system needs to be set for all participants regardless of ministry or agency. The imbalances in this contributed to the many absentees among participants."

"More than one Liberian teacher should work in collaboration with the foreign counterparts."

"This workshop should not have three categories of grades for participants, namely, honours, distinction, and pass. The grading should be based on attendance, attitude, and performance in the lectures."

"The workshop had too much theory instead of practical work. I suggest that the workshop should be built around the framework of more practical work than theory."

"This course should be held each year."

"I also believe that everyone who participates in the workshop should have the same award at graduation."

"I also hope that this will not be the last workshop to be held here."

"This program should be repeated in all African countries with more African professors taking part than foreign professors."

"I guess the experts of the countries concerned will be able to make pertinent decisions in their countries."

"There should have been three levels of examination: that for below high school graduates, one for high school graduates, and the third for college graduates."

"More administrators should be invited to attend the workshop so that they can support the implementation of new communication ideas. They should at the same time present papers on their different agencies as in 103."

"Have some other Africans invited to speak on development strategies in

their countries."

CRITICISMS

There were twenty-three criticisms in all. They are as follows:

"I know that many participants in this workshop were informed only a few days before the workshop began, and that many arrangements, e.g. for transportation, opening ceremony, etc., were haphazardly made. Better local arrangements would help to ensure that the quota of participants is obtained next year and that things flow smoothly."

"The food was always late."

"Liberian lecturers were not informed ahead of time."

"The food was poor."

"Food was served late."

"I suggest that in the workshop, it is not necessary to give participants an examination."

"The distance to the place the workshop was held is the main criticism."

"First of all, the time was too short and was not enough for this course. We were not able to learn and understand much in the limited time period."

"The research course was too advanced. I think it is better to add some basic aspects of it so that a person who takes the course for the first time can easily understand."

"The breaks and food schedules were not prompt."

"Travel allowances provided at the end of every workshop were not given to the workshop participants."

"The University Farm was inconvenient because of distance."

"Course 103 was not well elaborated. Much was not gained from this course."

"Some participants' attendance was very irregular."

"The time spent was too short for people who participated in this work-

shop for the first time."

"I do criticize the food provided. In the first week the food was well prepared, but later, it deteriorated."

"First, there was poor planning, viz. some participants could not get stipends, and the speakers were contacted in the last minute."

"The food was never on time. It was mostly Western instead of being indigenous."

"On several occasions the driver came very late and many times the instructors could not come to class because of lack of transport."

"Participants were informed too late. Some people who wanted to attend did not because of poor planning."

"It sometimes took a long time to wait for guest speakers."

"Lunch used to be served too late."

COMMENTS

The thirteen comments given by the participants include:

"I think the program is vital for most developing countries."

"This is very good for the African countries or the developing countries of the Third World, especially for Liberia."

"This is a very unique program and I feel that it should be extended throughout Africa and as a matter of fact in all developing countries. This program helps improve one's ability to communicate with others both in one's area of work and outside the job."

"I feel that with the lectures and handouts, I am going to do better in communicating with others."

"It is a good idea to hold the workshop in the home country because more people can benefit--these people can apply what is taught to their jobs on a daily basis."

"It will be very helpful to hold another workshop like this one again

in Liberia to help others that did not take part to learn more about communication."

"The entire workshop was of great benefit to the country."

"I believe that this workshop was a very successful one. Everything was just right. This workshop should be repeated for us again in the near future."

"This course is very rewarding. Courses 101 and 104 are in step with my work."

"This workshop has been a very nice one and I would appreciate it if another one could be held in Liberia."

"I believe that what was taught was very useful."

"I really gained a lot from this workshop. The instructors and everything about the workshop went well."

V
LIBERIA COMMUNICATION WORKSHOP EXPENSES

General

Meals.....	\$ 4,177.76	
Temporary Employees.....	2,462.50	
Books and Duplication.....	1,942.50	
Workmen's Compensation Insurance.....	783.74	
Trainers.....	1,150.00	
Excess Baggage.....	1,525.20	
Per Diems (Student).....	280.00	
Supplies.....	235.63	
Miscellaneous.....	<u>668.79</u>	
Subtotal.....	\$13,226.12\$13,226.12

Travel Expenses

Donald J. Bogue (13 days)		
Air Fare*.....	\$ 481.50	
Living Expenses.....	<u>419.50</u>	
Total.....	901.00	
Robert C. Higgins (29 days)		
Air Fare*.....	\$ 933.00	
Living Expenses.....	<u>1,308.45</u>	
Total.....	2,241.45	
Walter Allen (20 days)		
Air Fare*.....	\$ 487.70	
Living Expenses.....	<u>1,354.88</u>	
Total.....	1,842.58	
Michael Hoff (40 days)		
Air Fare*.....	\$ 664.58	
Living Expenses.....	<u>942.62</u>	
Total.....	1,607.20	
Subtotal.....	\$ 6,592.23\$ 6,592.23

Salaries

Donald J. Bogue.....	\$ 1,258.50
Robert Higgins.....	3,450.00
Walter Allen.....	2,125.00
Michael Hoff.....	<u>2,123.99</u>
Subtotal.....	\$ 8,957.49.....\$ 8,957.49

TOTAL.....\$28,775.84

*Air fare is roughly one-half the cost of round trip fare because part was allocated to The Gambia Workshop.

The total cost of the Liberian Workshop was about \$28,775. This total, divided by the number of participants (48) results in a cost of \$600 per participant, or \$150 per participant-week. This cost does not include, of course, the housing and morning and evening meals of the participants, or the cost of transportation for those participants who lived on the outskirts of Monrovia and drove or took buses to the training site.

The Chicago team believes this training is very nearly the most economical that is possible to accomplish anywhere under any arrangement. Where regional workshops are held and international travel is required of participants, with housing in a hotel and payment of per-diem stipends, the costs soar far above the level achieved in Liberia.

This low cost-per-student-week strongly argues that the strategy of holding in-country workshops is sound from a financial perspective.

VI
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Taken as a whole, this experiment in holding an in-country Workshop on Communication for Social Development in Africa was a solid success. The participants and their employers felt that they were participating in a program that was very worthwhile to them personally and to the nation's development programs.

2. Nevertheless, the program clearly could have been improved, and the participants helped to pinpoint its weaknesses.

- (a) The program tried to cram too much material into too short a time. Future workshops must reduce the scope of material covered or extend the duration of the workshops. The participants regarded the materials scheduled for teaching as important, and wished to extend the period of training. This request should be seriously considered.
- (b) The University of Chicago's policy of teaching basic theory while trying to make it practical and useful was not fully successful. Future workshops must either teach less theory, make a more convincing demonstration of its usefulness, or both.
- (c) The use of Liberian resources was not as good as it could have been. The teachers were not given sufficient guidance beforehand. (This was due in part to a policy of not wanting to appear to direct them in what to say or to over-supervise them.) In future workshops, more advance information and longer time for preparation should be given. A more critical effort should be made to evaluate the qualifications of local specialists and make use of them.

- (d) Some participants were definitely unhappy at having to fit themselves wholly into one track--a mass media, a person-to-person, or a research program. Some way of permitting more crossing over without losing the benefits of specialization needs to be found.
- (e) A few of the participants did not take the workshop as seriously as they should and were not faithful in their attendance. Recruitment and selection procedures need to be tightened.

3. However, the above shortcomings are all comparatively minor adjustments and can be corrected in the future. Some very important positive discoveries emerged from this workshop that should be cornerstones in planning future workshops.

- (a) The workshop demonstrated that it is possible for African countries to assume major responsibility for sponsoring, planning, and administering in-country training programs. The process of forming a committee, recruiting and selecting candidates, searching for guest speakers, and making arrangements for the program can be done with little guidance from outside.
- (b) Sponsoring and conducting such workshops does a great deal to generate interagency understanding and professional cooperation. At least temporarily (and hopefully permanently), the workshops tend to break down bureaucratic barriers that grow between Governments departments and private and public agencies.
- (c) It is possible for Western (American and European) specialists to work with African specialists in an intensive teaching situation with scarcely any problems over politics, race, culture, or international issues. Cooperation in-country is possibly easier than regional cooperation.
- (d) The University of Chicago found the quality and learning ability

of the trainees high. Any initial uneasiness about the Chicago team's capability or need to teach in a way that would stimulate learning in the African audience through special anecdotal or other teaching devices was unfounded. (The Chicago team had been warned that Western classroom techniques simply would not work in Africa. The team discovered that classroom techniques that are boring in the U.S. are also boring in Africa, but that the type of teaching that is effective in university classrooms in the U.S. goes over equally well in Africa.) In other words, the Chicago team found that the "uniqueness" of study and learning habits of African students can be exaggerated-- at least at the intermediate and upper levels of skill at which the workshop operated.

- (e) The content of the knowledge and skills that need to be taught in a course on social development communication has now been quite well identified. The curriculum plans of the Committee received a solidly positive evaluation from the participants. The list of items that needs to be taught and learned is now quite specific. It can be further refined and modified, but this workshop helped to define the content quite precisely.
- (f) Within each country, the communication and education specialists work in a highly compartmentalized way, each in his own agency, and they do not get an overall view of the economic development of their country. This program has helped to present such a view as a by-product of the training.

4. The University of Chicago, as an external agency, learned some very important lessons that should be passed on to any other international or external agency doing such work in the future.

- (a) The host country takes projects such as this as a very serious

undertaking, and it is possible to count on the sponsors to do hard, conscientious, and thoughtful work without having to be closely supervised in every minute detail.

- (b) Local educators (especially professors in local universities) can feel slighted or underappreciated if their advice and help is not sought in planning the course outline and content. On the other hand, external help is needed when the nation lacks fully developed resources in the communication area. Success depends upon being both understanding and critically realistic about what is essential for successful instruction.
- (c) The view of the economic development process as seen by the participants and local professionals can be very different from the viewpoint of developed countries, international agencies, or the United Nations. It is important that these diverse viewpoints be fully expressed and discussed.
- (d) Continuity in course work is important. Despite their high qualifications, most professional persons in developing countries are badly overworked and overcommitted. They can find time to make individual contributions, but are not prepared to spend the sustained investment that it takes to guide students through individual work. A major contribution of the University of Chicago team was simply in being available on the spot all day every day, available to the students.
- (e) Contrary to expectations, African students are not defensive about "Western ideas," but are quite interested in being exposed to them--but with great independence about deciding how useful they are.
- (f) Mature students of the type trained in Liberia possess a tremendous amount of information gained from their work, and the train-

ing should provide generous opportunities for group discussion so that this knowledge can be shared with the entire class.

(g) Most of the items of equipment and supplies for production are in very short supply in the country, and cannot be easily borrowed or obtained on short notice. They should be assembled beforehand (transported from abroad if necessary) as a part of the advance planning.

5. Some of the complaints and recommendations of the students (like students everywhere) about meals, lodging, transportation, etc., are based on only partial appreciation of the constraints under which a course like this must work. The food provided to the participants, for example, was well prepared and tasty to the Chicago team. (It was perhaps overly-Westernized in deference to the foreigners.) A tremendous amount of special sacrifice and effort had to be made to feed the group. With the very limited budget available, the organizers have only the highest praise for those who planned and prepared the meals. With no automobile assigned exclusively for workshop use, with every member of the Committee having to maintain the pace of his or her regular work, and with the many guest lecturers being some of the most influential and senior government or academic persons in the country, the delays, cancellations, and inconveniences were comparatively minor and completely understandable, and of secondary importance. A few of the complaints may have been based on some participants' misconception that they were to be treated as delegates to a conference instead of as students undergoing post-graduate training.

6. Social development communication reaches into every department of government, and into a great many private agencies and programs. Although the sponsoring committee for the Liberian program was quite large and representative of many agencies, some of the agencies (including some of the representatives of international organizations) did not appreciate until the course

was underway for a couple of weeks just how useful and unique the undertaking was. It is hoped that this training program can be repeated in Liberia in one or two years, and that the next workshop will have the full sponsorship and active involvement that the topics merit.

7. Beyond any doubt, the persons who learned the most and were most thrilled by the experience were the members of the University of Chicago team. For all of its members, the workshop in Liberia was a privilege they hope can happen again.

Appendix B

February, 1979
WORKSHOP ON COMMUNICATION FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
 MONROVIA, LIBERIA

PARTICIPANT'S EVALUATION

THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS CONFIDENTIAL. PLEASE DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME. YOUR EVALUATION IS TO BE USED TO MAKE DECISIONS ABOUT FUTURE WORKSHOPS OF THIS TYPE, BOTH IN LIBERIA AND OTHER COUNTRIES.

1. What courses did you take? (Circle in first column below)

A. FOR EACH COURSE TAKEN: Taking everything into consideration, how would you rate this course? (Circle ratings in right hand panel below)

Course	Did you take?	How would you rate?			
		Excel- lent	Good	Ade- quate	Poor
101 Communication Theory	yes/no	1	2	3	4
102 Social Aspects of Development	yes/no	1	2	3	4
103 Social Development in Liberia	yes/no	1	2	3	4
104 Person-to-person Communication	yes/no	1	2	3	4
105 Mass media Production	yes/no	1	2	3	4
106/107 Research and Evaluation	yes/no	1	2	3	4
108 Administration of Programs	yes/no	1	2	3	4

2. How important do you think it was for Liberia to have special short-term training in communication for Social Development?

- Very important.....1
- Moderately important.....2
- Not very important.....3
- A complete waste of time.....4

3. Considering all courses you took, how much did you learn or how much did you improve your communication skills during the four weeks?

- Almost nothing.....1
- Only a little bit.....2
- A moderate amount.....3
- A lot.....4
- More than I thought possible.....5

4. Taking the courses together, how helpful do you think what you learned will be in your work next year?

- No help at all.....1
- Only a little help.....2
- A moderate amount of help.....3
- A lot of help.....4
- A tremendous amount of help.....5

5. In the table below there are five columns. Put the course number of each course you took above one column. Then answer the four questions for each course.

COURSE NUMBER:

QUESTION

A. How would you rate the content of this course?

Very poor.....	1	1	1	1	1
Poor.....	2	2	2	2	2
Adequate.....	3	3	3	3	3
Good.....	4	4	4	4	4
Very good.....	5	5	5	5	5

B. How would you rate the reading material provided for this course?

Very poor.....	1	1	1	1	1
Poor.....	2	2	2	2	2
Adequate.....	3	3	3	3	3
Good.....	4	4	4	4	4
Very good.....	5	5	5	5	5

C. How would you rate the teaching of this course?

Very poor.....	1	1	1	1	1
Poor.....	2	2	2	2	2
Adequate.....	3	3	3	3	3
Good.....	4	4	4	4	4
Very good.....	5	5	5	5	5

D. How would you rate the laboratory work and practical application of the course?

Very poor.....	1	1	1	1	1
Poor.....	2	2	2	2	2
Adequate.....	3	3	3	3	3
Good.....	4	4	4	4	4
Very good.....	5	5	5	5	5

6. IN YOUR OWN WORDS, state what you found most useful or helpful about each of the courses you took. (Fill out for each course.)

- A. Course _____

- B. Course _____

- C. Course _____

- D. Course _____

- E. Course _____

7. IN YOUR OWN WORDS, state what you found disappointing, unsatisfactory, or unnecessary about each course you took.

- A. Course _____

- B. Course _____

- C. Course _____

- D. Course _____

- E. Course _____

8. What is your opinion about the use of Liberian specialists in this workshop?

Not enough time was given to presentations by Liberian experts... 1
There was about the right mixture of presentation by Liberians and foreigners.....2
Not enough time was given to the foreigner specialists to take full advantage of their skills.....3

9. Taking the whole workshop course together, how would you evaluate the performance of the complete University of Chicago team?

Very poor.....1
Poor.....2
Adequate.....3
Good.....4
Very good.....5
Truly outstanding.....6

10. The University of Chicago contribution was a mixture of theory and practical work. How would you evaluate this mixture?

Far too much theory, not enough
practical work.....1
Somewhat too much theory, not
enough practical work.....2
About the right mixture of theory
and practical work.....3
Somewhat too much practical work,
not enough theory.....4
Far too much practical work, not
enough theory.....5

11. How do you evaluate the idea of dividing the participants into three major groups, so that they must specialize in (a) Mass Communication, (b) Person-to-person Communication, or (c) Research/Evaluation?

Good idea, it keeps the groups
homogeneous and lets them go
faster to higher levels.....1
Poor idea, it keeps out people
who want to get a little of two
or more fields.....2
Good idea, but needs to be changed...3

WHAT CHANGES DO YOU RECOMMEND? EXPLAIN IN YOUR OWN WORDS.

12. How would you rate the idea of requiring all participants to take Course 103, the overview of Liberia's development program? If this course is offered again, should this course be made required or voluntary?

Should be required, as this year.....1
Should be made voluntary.....2
Should not even be offered.....3

13. Taking everything into consideration, do you think this workshop lasted:

Too long?.....1
(How many weeks should have been?)
About the right time?.....2
Not long enough?.....3
(How many weeks should have been?)

14. What is your evaluation of using the University Farm?
(Possible advantages--lunch together everyday, absence of distraction from outside influences.)
(Possible disadvantages--time spent in travel, inconvenience to guest speakers.)

Everything considered, I think the use of the University Farm was:

- a very poor arrangement.....1
- an adequate arrangement.....2
- a good arrangement.....3
- almost the best possible
arrangement.....4

PLEASE WRITE YOUR DETAILED COMMENTS HERE.

15. How important for Social Development in Liberia do you think it is that this course be repeated for a new class of participants next year?

- Very important.....1
- Moderately important.....2
- Not very important.....3
- Completely unimportant.....4

16. There is a possibility that at least some members (Higgins/Hoff) of the University of Chicago team can come back to Liberia to work with individual ministries and with the Family Planning Association of Liberia to help them plan and improve the production for their individual programs. How important do you think it is that such arrangements be made?

- A complete waste of time.....1
- Not very important.2
- Moderately important.....3
- Very important.....4
- Absolutely essential.....5

17. It is possible that USAID, UNESCO, UNICEF and IPPF could join resources to sponsor similar courses to this and use other universities in addition to the University of Chicago to bring a program like this to other countries in Africa. What do you think of this idea?

- Absolutely unnecessary.....1
- Useful for about 1/4 of African
countries.....2
- Useful for about 1/2 of African
countries.....3
- Useful for about 3/4 of African
countries.....4
- Useful for absolutely every
country in Africa.....5

SPONTANEOUS COMMENTS, CRITICISMS AND SUGGESTIONS.

18. Please use the rest of this page and any additional pages you may need to write, in your own words, any additional comments, criticisms and suggestions you may have for holding a workshop of this type again in Liberia or for improving it if it is held in other African countries.