Isang Bagsak!

Report of a training workshop on Participatory Development Communication for Community-Based Natural Resources Management

Hosted by
Hue University of Agriculture and Forestry
The People of Hong Ha Commune
Hue, Vietnam. March 11-23 2002

Rapporteurs:
Guy Bessette
Moses Buregyeya
John Graham
Lun Kimhy
Le Thi Thuy Hang
Touch Lakhena
Enoch Lwabulanga
Nhem Sovanna
Chhum Sovanny
Wilberforce Kateera Tushemereirwe
Chin Saik Yoon

Report on Week 2:
Manon Hogue

Evaluation report:
Wilberforce Kateera Tushemereirwe

IDRC CRDI
Canada
Executive summary

How do we involve women and children in development projects?

How do we involve the poorest?

How can we be sure that our project really responds to the priority needs of the people?

How do we translate research results into development impact?

How do we facilitate sustainable development processes?

How do can we be sure people come first in R&D?

These were some of the questions posed and addressed during the two week workshop on Participatory Development Communication (PDC) held in Hue, Vietnam in March, 2002.

Participants’ evaluation

This is what the participants felt about the workshop, as expressed through the evaluation (See Appendix “C” page 37 for the full report) designed and conducted by the participants themselves:

Strengths:

Generally the workshop was evaluated as “very good” (48 percent) and “good” (52 percent) by participants who attended. No body ranked it below these levels.

Seventy-six percent of the participants rated the workshop as “extremely useful” to their work and the remaining 14% as “useful”.

All participants rated the workshop objectives fully achieved.

Participants felt the following were strengths of the workshop:

Interpersonal relationships and good rapport:

“Small number of participants allowed easy learning.”
“Full participation of all members.”
“Ideas sharing.”
“Inter-team interaction high.”
“Confidence building among teams.”
“Rich experiences on how to use different tools in PDC and to apply it in our respective team projects.”

Workshop content:

“Topics were related to the workshop objectives.”
“Diversity of content learnt.”
“Hands-on work (practicals).”
“Quality of communication tools and activities.”
“Use of camera and other audio-visual tools.”
“Capacity building of the participants.”

Workshop set-up/organization:

“Good organization (activities, facilities, venue, agenda, face-to-face contact).”
“Silent [quiet] venue was selected.”
“[Warm] hospitality.”
Weaknesses:

Interpersonal relationships/rapport:
“Language problem.” (12%)
“Some people kept silent during the workshop.” (8%).
“Most of the inter-personal skills, games, role-play could not be shared among groups.” (4%).

Workshop content:
“Lack of enough equipment for practicing.” (32%).
“Few hand-outs were given to participants.” (20%).
“Workshop did not discuss in detail about facilitation skills in CBRM research.” (8%).
“Less time for practicing communication tools.” (8%).
“Much time spent on theory and less on practical.” (8%).
“Sometimes teams tended to be behind the schedule (not cover the assignment given on time).” (4%).
“Less discussion on participation skills.” (4%).

Organization and set-up:
“Field trip was allocated a short time.” (8%)
“Limited time for a discussion.” (12%)
“Workshop duration was too long.” (20%)

Participants contributed following suggestions to overcome the above weaknesses:

“More equipment to be provided for each team.”
“Preparation of hand-outs to cover all presentations.”
“More time for practicing communication skills.”
“Training time should be allocated such that 80% covers practical and 20% theory.”
“Reduce on the content.”
“Allow the participants to use local language for easy understanding.”
“More time for clarifying a discussion.”

Workshop purpose:
This workshop provided the first opportunity for the three teams from Cambodia, Vietnam and Uganda, and the resource persons to meet, network and exchange experiences on PDC and community-based nature resources management (CBNRM). The team members and resource persons had been interacting via an e-line forum for the four months prior to the workshop. The e-line forum is hosted at the website http://www.isangbagsak.org.

The workshop was also an opportunity for the teams to discuss as a group Part 3 of the e-forum which deals with: “Communication during the implementation and monitoring of participatory research”. The first two themes of Part 3 were the focus of the first week of the workshop: “Developing communication strategies” and “Using communication tools”.

Workshop objectives:

* Enable members of the three participating teams of Isang Bagsak to share experiences and ideas face-to-face.
* Practise the application of a systematic methodology in developing communication strategies.
* Learn to make effective use of audiovisual communication tools (photography, audio and video recording) in the context of participatory development communication.
* Consider and practise the use of interpersonal communication techniques as PDC tools
* Evaluate the progress of the Isang Bagsak programme.
Workshop format:
The workshop was planned in two parts. The first week focused on the following:
* Discussion and evaluation of Isang Bagsak activities.
* Training and practise in a systematic methodology in developing communication strategies.
* Introduction to games and other interpersonal communication tools.

The second week concentrated on the use of audiovisual communication tools. It focused specifically on video and photographic cameras as tools for facilitating community participation in CBNRM initiatives.

Workshop processes:
A variety of participatory workshop methods were adopted to maintain congruence with the overall objectives of the workshop. The sessions were facilitated and rapporteured by representatives from all the teams and the resource persons. In addition to this there were:
* Team work involving project teams.
* Team work involving mixed teams.
* Plenary sessions and games involving all the participants.
* Buzz groups

Group work was facilitated by a mix of PDC techniques:
* Card collection.
* Collective flip-chart preparation.
* Group presentation.
* Participatory video.
* Photo-novella/album.

Monday
March 11
Week 1, Day 1

Opening of workshop
The day began with words of welcome from at the formal opening of the workshop presided by the Rector, Hue University of Agriculture and Forestry and Guy Bessette.

Evaluation of workshop
Esther Lwanga Semakula and Drake Mubiru Nagulumbya of the Uganda Team presented their proposal for how the workshop will be evaluated at the end of two weeks using a questionnaire they had designed. Copies of the questionnaire were later circulated for the comments of all the participants. The completed questionnaire was to be processed in a participatory fashion via an innovative group tabulation exercise where questionnaires were to be randomly exchanged, and each participant of the workshop were to act as the proxy of the anonymous writer of the questionnaire in an open session to tabulate the results. This innovative method was appreciated by the group. It had unfortunately to be dropped from the last day of the workshop due to a shortage of time.

The questionnaire focused evaluation on the following areas:
* Realization of workshop objectives.
* Strengths and weaknesses of the workshop.
* Organization and management of the workshop.
* Quality of presentations and training activities.
* Suggestions for follow-up to the workshop.

The participants agreed to the appointment of three members to act as the Evaluation Committee to oversee the finalization, distribution, collection and processing of the completed questionnaire at the end of the two weeks. The committee comprised:
The results of the workshop evaluation is attached as Appendix “C” on page 37.

This session was aimed at just flagging the issues related to the project and its e-forum which was to be discussed in-depth on Friday March 15, Week 1, Day 5. Participants were invited by Chin Saik Yoon, who is also the moderator for the e-forum, to consider the following in preparation for the in-depth discussions:

* What do you like the most about the e-forum?
* What can we do to improve the e-forum?
* What should be evaluated for the overall Isang Bagsak Project?
* How should the work of each project team be evaluated?

The participants were divided into four teams (using the simple method of calling out the numbers 1 to 4 consecutively by every participant) for this exercise. Each team focused their discussions on one of the above questions. The teams each carried out a card collection on the topic they were discussing, before sorting and clustering the cards on flip charts for presentation to the workshop when it met in plenary. The results of the session were displayed on one wall of the venue to serve as “food for thought” on the issues over the next three days leading-up to the in-depth discussions.

Presentation of research projects by the teams.

The afternoon was devoted to the presentation of each team’s project. The Powerpoint presentations used by the three teams are available for reference, please contact Guy Bessette. The following are salient points which were raised during the discussions which followed each presentation:

**About the Vietnam Team:**

The team did not have prior knowledge about the PDC methodology. The team adopted the method to promote an even greater bottom-up approach after learning about PDC. The main challenge faced so far in implementing PDC is trying to convince the agencies which the team collaborates with to use the same methodology. The other challenge is trying to reach the poorest in the community. They lack all types of resources: land, people to work on the land, etc.

**About the Cambodia Team:**

The project was broadened in scope after joining the Isang Bagsak programme. It now includes a communication approach. The team tries to strike a balance between policy-advocacy and promotion of bottom-up communication. The PDC methodology has been very useful to the team in launching new initiatives in Ratanakiri province. The Cambodian Team reported that the team itself has benefited from the programme in the following ways: Team-building, confidence building, new knowledge on communication, and improving their fluency in the English language. All of this was achieved through the active participation of team members in weekly meetings to discuss postings from the e-forum and to prepare their postings to the forum. When asked to provide an example of a PDC method they have used they gave the example of their current efforts to train villagers to do the annual review for their project, this review was done by staff of government departments in the past.

---

**Review of the Isang Bagsak**

This session was aimed at just flagging the issues related to the project and its e-forum which was to be discussed in-depth on Friday March 15, Week 1, Day 5. Participants were invited by Chin Saik Yoon, who is also the moderator for the e-forum, to consider the following in preparation for the in-depth discussions:

* What do you like the most about the e-forum?
* What can we do to improve the e-forum?
* What should be evaluated for the overall Isang Bagsak Project?
* How should the work of each project team be evaluated?

The participants were divided into four teams (using the simple method of calling out the numbers 1 to 4 consecutively by every participant) for this exercise. Each team focused their discussions on one of the above questions. The teams each carried out a card collection on the topic they were discussing, before sorting and clustering the cards on flip charts for presentation to the workshop when it met in plenary. The results of the session were displayed on one wall of the venue to serve as “food for thought” on the issues over the next three days leading-up to the in-depth discussions.

Presentation of research projects by the teams.

The afternoon was devoted to the presentation of each team’s project. The Powerpoint presentations used by the three teams are available for reference, please contact Guy Bessette. The following are salient points which were raised during the discussions which followed each presentation:

**About the Vietnam Team:**

The team did not have prior knowledge about the PDC methodology. The team adopted the method to promote an even greater bottom-up approach after learning about PDC. The main challenge faced so far in implementing PDC is trying to convince the agencies which the team collaborates with to use the same methodology. The other challenge is trying to reach the poorest in the community. They lack all types of resources: land, people to work on the land, etc.

**About the Cambodia Team:**

The project was broadened in scope after joining the Isang Bagsak programme. It now includes a communication approach. The team tries to strike a balance between policy-advocacy and promotion of bottom-up communication. The PDC methodology has been very useful to the team in launching new initiatives in Ratanakiri province. The Cambodian Team reported that the team itself has benefited from the programme in the following ways: Team-building, confidence building, new knowledge on communication, and improving their fluency in the English language. All of this was achieved through the active participation of team members in weekly meetings to discuss postings from the e-forum and to prepare their postings to the forum. When asked to provide an example of a PDC method they have used they gave the example of their current efforts to train villagers to do the annual review for their project, this review was done by staff of government departments in the past.
**About the Uganda Team:**

The team in Uganda is multi-disciplinary in composition. It aims to promote not only communication among the farmers and people, but also between the people and policy-makers. The team hopes to use PDC to build mutual understanding and collaboration among the people they work with.

---

**Tuesday**

**March 12**

**Week 1, Day 2**

**Continuation of the discussions on the review of the Isang Bagsak Project**

The day began with a short discussion of some of the points which were raised the previous day about the project review. The following were some points of agreement which emerged:

**Improving the e-forum:**

* Teams should schedule quality time for discussions and posting to the e-forum.
* Information exchange among the teams should be maximized.
* Intervals before postings made to the various themes should be spaced out, and the process of interaction slowed down.
* The Cambodia team faced frequent problems with their e-mail connections. It was a problem without ready solutions.

**What participants like the most about the e-forum:**

* Sharing of experiences among the teams.
* Learning from each other.
* Sharing of a new methodology.

**What should be evaluated at the project level?**

* Knowledge acquired by members of each team.
* Level of participation by team members.

**What should be evaluated at the national level?**

* The amount of information is exchanged within the group.
* The effect of the information exchanged on local capacities.
Introduction to the methodology of communication planning

This was the main theme for the days work. The theme was addressed in two smaller components:

**From approaching community to identifying communication objectives:**

The Uganda and Vietnam Teams were invited to present their projects’ experiences in making approaches to the communities they work with, and identifying their communication objectives.

**The Vietnam Team presentation**
was made by Hoang Thi Sen.

The following are the main points shared by Sen:

- **How to approach community**
  * Study before hand existing data on the community.
  * Identify the people you want to work with.
  * Meet with the local authorities.

- **The way to approach the community**
  * Meet with community leaders.
  * Call-on the local authorities.
  * Meet with key members of the community during discussions with various interest groups.
  * “Eating, drinking and sleeping with the farmers.”

- **Kind of information to be gathered**
  * Local political system and “power” distribution.
  * Local regulations

**Challenges faced**

- * It is difficult to reach out to the poor people.
- * Negotiations and reaching agreements with people (For example: Finding out from farmers how they do certain activities, and their ideas on issues affecting them).
- * Language barrier, the people at the project site speak a different language.

**Involving community in CBNRM**

- * It is important to pay attention to all the different groups in a community.

**Decision-making**

- * It empowers people in the community.
- * It also helps to build the people’s confidence.

**The Uganda Team presentation**
was made by Esther Lwanga Semakula.

**Approaching the community**

- * The team focuses on banana cultivators and aims to identify different groups of farmers with concerns about soil infertility and soil erosion.
- * Many of the farmers shifted their farms on to higher slopes which are prone to soil erosion, information acquisition.
- * A good way to obtain information about the communities prior to visiting them is by asking staff of NGOs who know the farmers, or during market days when the farmers are gathered at one spot, and sometimes from agricultural extension staff working in the area.

- **Constraints faced by the team**
  * Most of the young people have moved away from the farms to the cities, leaving only old people to tend the farms.

- **Information interests of the community**
  * Knowledge on modern farming practices and availability of credit facilities.
  * Market conditions and opportunities.
  * Information sharing on common problems.

**Planning, monitoring and evaluating PDC activities**

This session covered the following three topics:

**Discussing specific communication channels and strategies for different community groups and stakeholders/Identifying communication activities:**

This topic was addressed in the form of a presentation of ideas by Guy Bessette with discussions afterwards.

Three very main types of channels were identified: interpersonal channels, institutional
channels and mass media channels.

Guy noted that communication theory has changed in recent years but many practitioners have not updated their ideas. Some people still follow the sender-receiver model of communication. With this model there is some feedback from the receiver to the sender. A message is sent via a channel from the sender to the receiver. Many agricultural extensionists still belong to the old school. It is a very top-down approach which seldom works well.

The PDC method stresses the use of interpersonal and institutional channels to facilitate bottom-up communication in order to promote sustainable development.

Selecting communication tools and preparing communication materials:

Each of the three teams presented their ideas on “tools” and approaches they had begun to use in their work with communities. All presentations were made in Powerpoint (contact Guy Bessette for soft copies of the presentation).

The Vietnam team noted in their work that they “ate together, lived together and worked together” with their farming communities and this has allowed them to begin to understand the development needs of their partners. They used communication tools to help them build this understanding.

The Uganda team was a little more formal in their approach. Different “criteria” for selecting tools had been identified, then different types of audience were considered and then depending on the needs of the audience, different communication options were considered for use.

The Ratanakiri team spoke more about their overall strategy and how this related to the development objectives they needed to meet. Taking forests as an example, they started with a visioning strategy with the community. People stated that forests are essential to their livelihoods and hence the formal recognition of community forests for them is important. They then brainstormed with communities about how to achieve this objective and following that brainstorming a communication strategy is developed that would help them achieve this goal. They recognized that they would need to communicate with different groups of people in different settings and hence, different communication strategies are needed depending on the situation and need.

In discussions on the presentations, Chin noted the processes being used is most important. We need to support people in their development objectives. The communication process is therefore more important than the media product. People need to be in control of the process and the tools used. On the other hand in the top-down mass media approach, the product is always most important, and the people’s role in the communication process is often reduced to that of passive consumers of these media products.

Planning, monitoring, evaluation and documentation:

Again, each of the three teams were asked to make a presentation on this topic.

The Vietnam team, based their presentation on experiences gained in the Philippines, presented a framework that is often used: Why PM&E, For whom, Who to Involve, How to ensure full participation, and then What to monitor. Methods and tools to be used follow and then documentation of the processes and results follows that.
The Uganda team noted top-down approaches bring poor results and PM&E is used to empower people. It allows for a faster adoption or adaptation rate for any technologies that they may be testing with farmers, thus enhancing the effectiveness of one’s work.

The Cambodian team returned to the ideas introduced in the previous session regarding how to ensure people do not lose their forests to outsiders. They prefer to work with people to “protect” their forests. Part of their strategy is to form a community forestry network. They also aim to work with local policy makers on forestry issues. Basically, for all, it is an Interest, Attitude, Practice Framework. How to create interest and awareness, how to change attitudes and then how to change management practices for forests (which stop all illegal activities). The team will be developing a communication strategy, testing that with groups of people, evaluating if they are making progress and then documenting the processes.

Guy, as a discussant suggested evaluation plans need to be simple. One can pick two or three communication activities and evaluate them. In the documentation of the processes being studied one can also consider using such simple methods.

Wednesday
March 13
Week 1, Day 3

Inter-team work on PDC strategies

The day was devoted to group work on the PDC plans of the three teams. In order to facilitate the sharing of ideas between members of the three teams, each group comprised members drawn from all the three project teams. The task for each group was to work on the PDC plan of a particular team.

The PDC plans produced by the three inter-team groups are available for reference over the next three pages. It should be noted that these plans are work-in-progress. The limited time available at the workshop did not allow for full plans to be prepared. The draft plans which follow are incomplete and require further development and refinement.
## Who?

- Community groups
  - Firewood collector
  - Non-formal education group
  - Farmers
  - Women groups
  - Traditional leaders
  - Village volunteers
  - Agriculture/village vet
  - Policy maker
    - Departments
    - CDC/CC/VDC
    - Local authorities
    - Elders
    - CNEM committee
    - PEDC
- Other stakeholders
  - Other villages
  - Timber companies
  - NGOs

## With whom?

- Community as a whole
- Firewood collector
- Farmers
- Lloggers
- Women groups
- Commune councils
- NRM committee
- PRDC/departments
- Elders
- NGOs
- Other villages

## Communication need

- Sensitization in sustainable use of timber and NTFPs
- Capacity building inappropriate forest management.

## Communication objectives

- Awareness raising on consequences if forest is not managed properly.
- Motivate CTY to facilitate CTY to share knowledge, experiences, success stories.
- Empower women through their participation in decision-making in NRM.
- Encourage CTY to experiment with different management options.

## Communication activities

- Conduct meeting with CTY to discuss impact and resources available to forest dwellers.
- Conduct CTY exchange visit.
- Establish networking with other villages.
- Produce awareness raising materials.
- Discussion with CTY to identify appropriate local knowledge.
- Sharing success stories.

## Communication tools

- Brain-storming
- Mapping
- Visits
- Posters/brochure
- Photographs
- Videos
- Audio-cassettes
## PDC Plan for the Uganda Team

**Development action: To improve banana production through improved soil management technologies.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>With whom?</th>
<th>Communication needs</th>
<th>Communication objectives</th>
<th>Communication activities</th>
<th>Communication tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* Community groups: Small-scale banana growers in Ddwaniro sub-county, Rakai district.</td>
<td>* Soil fertility management groups.</td>
<td>* Information on soil management</td>
<td>* Developing learning materials to facilitate participatory learning of improved soil management practices.</td>
<td>* Involve the farmers in the production of learning materials.</td>
<td>* Meetings, discussions, games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Other stakeholders: NGOs working in the area, traders, credit institutions, extension department.</td>
<td>* Soil erosion management group.</td>
<td>* Awareness raising that they are responsible for carrying out soil management practices.</td>
<td>* Build capacities in soil management practices.</td>
<td>* Pre-testing learning materials developed.</td>
<td>* Meetings, discussions, field-visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Sub-county chairman.</td>
<td>* Behaviour change to develop a team strategies for implementing the technologies.</td>
<td>* Continue participatory action research.</td>
<td>* Facilitating farming contests to encourage farmers to obtain and apply skills in soil management.</td>
<td>* Farmer day celebration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Sub-county chief</td>
<td>* Understanding the CBNRM problems facing the local community.</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Demonstration, discussion, evaluation.</td>
<td>* Observation, experimentation, evaluation, documentation, workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Credit institutions.</td>
<td>* Awareness about possible solutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Demonstration, discussion, evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Agro-based NGOs.</td>
<td>* Information on how to access, use and repay credit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Agriculture extension staff.</td>
<td>* Soil management techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Understand the work of NGOs to avoid conflicting approaches in the field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Who?</strong></td>
<td><strong>With whom?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Communication needs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Communication objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>Communication activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Communication tools</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Community groups  
* Women association  
* Poor farmer group  
* Animal production group  
* Crop production group  
* Credit group  
* Forest planting group  
* Community leader group  
* New settler group | **Poor women**  
**Farmers with less opportunities (Capital, land, labour, knowledge)**  
**Fish production group**  
**Pig production group**  
**Cassava cultivation group**  
**Hamlet leaders**  
**People committee**  
**Land less**  
**Rice production** | * Where to buy good breed?  
* How & where to market?  
* How to control the diseases?  
* How to use manure?  
* How to better local feed sources?  
* How to keep pigs effectively?  
* Can you improve pig management system?  
* Sharing workload between men and women  
* Persuading men to share workload with women. | * To motivate the farmers to improve pig production | * Farmer-to-farmer visit  
* Study-tour  
* On-farm experiments  
* Periodical meetings for sharing information  
* Developing training materials | * Meetings of farmers  
* Use of local languages  
* Pictures  
* On-farm workshop  
* Brain-storming sessions  
* Video  
* Documentation |
Thursday  
March 14  
Week 1, Day 4  

Field trip to  
Hong Ha Commune

The entire day was set aside for a visit to Hong Ha Commune, the project site of the Vietnam Team. The commune is located in the mountains east of Hue. It is reached after crossing the Fragrant River and driving continuously after hill for about two hours. The access to Hong Ha is now vastly improved with the building of a new road, compared to a couple of years ago when the Vietnam Team first started working in the commune.

Objective of the field trip:
A discussion the previous day identified the following objectives for the visit:
* To know the Vietnam team CBNRM experience in Hong Ha.
* For the villagers to meet with foreigners from Cambodia, Uganda, Canada and Malaysia.
* To request the villagers their own views on how to reach the poorest.
* To share aspects of the Vietnam team communication plan with the villagers.

Formal community meeting:
In the first part of the visit, after the introductory and welcome comments, the visitors and the villagers participating in the meeting introduced themselves. Some 20 villagers were present at the beginning of the meeting. The participants from Hong Ha were mostly leaders of their community: Chairman of the village, head of the party, representatives of various associations, representatives from the women association, leaders of ethnic group, medical resource person, etc. Some villagers were also present.

Participants were then presented with folk music and dance. After the presentation, the chairman made a presentation to the meeting about the history of the commune and the CBNRM project in which they have worked with the Vietnam Team since 1998.

Discussions followed the presentation, the members of the commune and participants from the of the workshop were invited to ask questions and share their experiences.

The village chairman asked first question of the workshop participants. He wanted to obtain experiences from the countries of the workshop participants on ways of reaching poor farmers and some experiences were shared.

Questions were also posed in relation with facilitating the learning of technologies particularly related to rice and cassava production, gardening, pig raising, fish farms).

A question was then asked to understand the main difficulties faced by the villagers in the realization of this project. Some participants offered that the understanding of technologies by villagers is limited and that the results of applying the technologies was not fully satisfactory. Usually people perform well the first year, with the support of the project but in the second year, results are less encouraging.

Someone else explained that the problem was a problem of money as the people did not have the means to invest in their new production. As discussion was slow and difficult, one farmer said that most villagers were to shy to express their views in a big meeting. A decision was then taken to break the group in two and to pursue such discussions more informally.
It was explained to this group that one problem faced by some villagers is that they don’t know how to use their money productively. Some of them who borrow from the development bank, at a very good rate (0.5%), use all the money from their loans without making any improvement to their farm production. They then face difficulties in repaying their loans. The net result of the loan being a loss rather than a gain.

In answer to a question asking why there were so few women in the discussion, it was offered that if workshop participants would probably meet more women when they visited the villages.

The second group spent most of the time discussing the question: “Why did the training workshops on the new farming methods not produce satisfactory results?” A villager, who is also a member of the local veterans groups, said that the farmers could not remember all that was taught to them (most of the trainees are illiterate and therefore cannot make their own notes). He suggested that the solution was to conduct refresher training on the farms. The on-farm approach suggested seems to relate to the difficulties in calculating inputs, such as fertilizer, to the farms. By doing on-farm training the farmer hopes the trainer can work out the inputs for him. The farmers also suggested that the training be conducted in smaller groups, and that the content of the training be simplified. It was also suggested that demonstration plots be established after the training.

The farmers also identified some of their other needs. They include: An interest-free credit scheme, more land for the cultivation of wetland rice, the conduct of more study-tours for the farmers to visit with other farmers to learn new agricultural methods, and the poor quality of soil in parts of the commune.

Discussion was then stopped for lunch. The discussions had to be translated in full from Vietnamese and the local language to English, and back. This limited the scope of the discussions.
Visit to the farms:
After sharing lunch with the villagers, participants went in two groups to visit the commune and some households.

Some reflections on the visit:
Participants were impressed with the good working relationship which the Vietnam Team has built-up with the village leadership during the short time they had been working there.

Participants were also impressed with the cultural and social dynamism of the village as demonstrated in the cultural and musical presentations made during the field-visit.

It was also evident from the farm visits that the work of the Vietnam Team has succeeded in facilitating improvements in the livelihood of many members of the community in Hong Ha.

With regards to the meeting with the commune leadership, it was noted that formal community meetings may not be the best way of conducting in-depth discussions with villagers. The setting must be comfortable for the people to speak. A formal meeting should terminate after the introductory discourses and presentations to give way to informal discussion with small groups.

The formula of a community meeting may be all right for meeting with association leaders and commune leaders, but not very suitable for villagers. It would be better to visit villagers on their farms or at their homes than to ask them to come to the commune office to attend a meeting.

The timing of a visit is also an important consideration. Evenings, for example, are more suitable for meeting with farmers as they would have finished their work on their farms by then and can spare the time for discussions.

It would also be useful to prepare discussion guides when conducting small group discussions and forming specific groups with homogeneous participants (groups of women, leaders, farmers, etc.).

With regards to content, certain reflections from the discussion should be taken in consideration, like including a course on how to use money soundly, giving longer term support to the villagers, choosing specific meeting places to include specific groups, etc.

The following day, the discussions on the evaluation raised most of these comments. One participant also suggested that there should also be a better preparation for introducing the workshop participants when visiting households.
Friday
March 15
Week 1, Day 5

The day began with a discussion about the field trip the previous day. The participants thanked the Vietnam Team for their hospitality and kindness in arranging the very interesting and fruitful visit. Most of the points discussed are recorded in the notes above about the field trip.

Evaluation of Isang Bagsak:
The main thrust of the day was group work on the evaluation of Isang Bagsak, and generating suggestions on how to improve the on-going programme, of which the e-forum is a part.

The workshop participants were randomly assigned to four working groups. Each of the groups focused their discussions on one of the following topics: Team organization, E-forum, Reference materials, Follow-up work for Isang Bagsak.

The groups worked using a combination of group discussion and card collection. The teams then presented their work and recommendations at a plenary session. The main points of the working groups are summarised briefly below:

Reference materials:

Weaknesses:
* Inadequate time for reading.
* Language problem for most of the Cambodian and Vietnamese participants who are not fluent in English.
* Reference materials exchanged is sometimes not comprehensive.

Recommendations:
* Distribute the reference materials in smaller installments or packages.
* Information exchanged should be related directly to the topics being discussed.

Follow up work for Isang Bagsak:

Strengths of the programme:
* Two training workshops were held (one in each country, and an international workshop in Hue).
  * On-going group discussions.
  * Reference material and documentation.
  * Exchange of information using the e-forum.
  * Face-to-face meeting in Hue.

Recommendations:
* PDC approaches and methodology could be applied to other research projects.
  * The e-forum should be continued.
  * All team members should be involved in posting so as to acquire the experience and skill of doing it.

Organisation of project teams:

Weaknesses:
* Only core-team members benefit from the project.
  * The e-forum schedule often conflicts with regular work plans.

Recommendations:
* Extend benefits to all Isang Bagsak members.
  * Revised e-forum posting and discussion schedule for sharing with all the three teams.
  * Convene meetings regularly.
  * Isang Bagsak teams should be multi-disciplinary in composition and limited to a maximum of 10 to 15 members per team.

E-forum

Weaknesses:
* Internet connection is usually slow and difficult, particularly for the Cambodia Team.
  * Limited time is allocated to the reading of contributions posted on the forum.
  * Some project team members are not familiar with using the project website.
**Recommendations:**

* Make sure several members of each team know how to post messages to the website.
* Try and improve local Internet connections.
* Increase time allocated for reading the postings, especially the introduction to each theme of discussion.
* Conduct training on how to use the Internet.

**Decisions taken at the conclusion of the workshop**

The results and recommendations of the four working groups reported above, formed the basis of the concluding discussions for the workshop which was held on Saturday May 23. The three teams agreed to the following:

**E-forum:**

* The pace of e-forum should be slowed down. It will now iterate at the rate of two weeks for the introductory posting to each theme, one week for the second posting, and one week for the wrap-up by facilitators. The revised schedule is available for reference at Appendix “A”, page 36.
* To increase the participation of the three teams in the facilitation of the e-forum, each team will take turns in being the time-keeper for one theme. The line-up of time-keepers is also available at Appendix “A”, page 36.
* A description of the role and responsibilities of the time-keeper is available at Appendix “B”, page 36.

**Follow-up and future of Isang Bagsak:**

* Guy Bessette shared with the participants his plans to identify a regional organization to take over the coordination of the programme. He is in the process of making contact with such potential organizations and would like to involve one representative from each of the teams to eventually join him in meeting such an organization and planning for the hand-over of coordination responsibilities to the selected organization.

* Guy Bessette also echoed the concerns of participants on the importance of communication in the national languages. With regard to this concern, the Vietnam Team will be piloting a national version of the Isang Bagsak initiative within Vietnam, involving interested national organizations, and using the Vietnamese language for communication.

The participants passed a vote of thanks to Mr. C.V. Rajasunderam for his much appreciated help in conducting the literature review on PDC, and gathering all the references for the project.

**Cultural exchange**

An energetic evening of traditional song and dance was held on March 15 to permit all the participants to appreciate each others cultural forms, which are also powerful PDC tools. The team from Hong Ha Commune made a special visit to Hue to take part in the exchange. They presented the best performances for the evening ranging from moving romantic duets to stirring hunting songs and dances. The Cambodian Team had everyone’s feet tapping to their ram-vong music and dance. Our Vietnamese friends did their country proud with stirring renditions of a couple of national hymns. And the Uganda Team borrowed the Hong Ha drums to roll out the beautiful rhythms of Africa. It was a wonderful evening to mark the completion of Week 1.
The workshop report on Week 2 which follows is contributed by Manon Hogue

A stirring song about Uncle Ho from the Vietnam Team.

A charming demonstration of the Cambodian *ram-vong*.

Esther teaching participants to move elegantly in a Ugandan dance.
This part of the report focuses on the second week of the Isang Bagsak workshop.

The stated objective of the workshop’s second week was to learn how to use effectively audio-visual communication tools (photography, audio and video recording) in the context of participatory development communication.

Part 1: Introduction

Presentation of facilitator:

The facilitator briefly introduced herself and explained that she doesn’t pretend to be an “expert”, but rather a practitioner in PDC who has had the opportunity to experiment and witness how PDC is used in different parts of the world. The facilitator also mentioned that she believes people in developing countries can greatly learn from one another’s experiences, that Isang Bagsak is a vivid example of it, and that throughout the workshop, she would make a point of illustrating concepts with concrete examples drawn from experiences in other developing countries.

Finally, the facilitator mentioned that participants were not asked to introduce themselves at this particular moment, because they would be asked to do so a little later, as part of a practical exercise.

Presentation of methodology:

The methodology to be used was described as a three-step combination of theory, techniques and hands-on exercises/assignments. More specifically, each time a new technique or skill is introduced, participants will have the opportunity to practice through hands-on exercises. Finally, through group discussions and assignments, an effort will be made to relate the newly acquired skills and techniques to the reality that participants work in.

It was mentioned at this point that the technical aspects of the workshop would focus on the aspects that are needed in order for communication to be efficient, as opposed to an in-depth knowledge and mastering of the tools.

“Communication without knowing what’s it’s about” (Game)

The second step in this first day was a game entitled “Communication without knowing what it’s about”. The idea underlying the use of this game at this particular moment was to first “break the ice” by having people play and laugh together, while triggering a reflection on the importance of two-way communication. The game unfolds as follows:

Two participants are asked to volunteer and required to leave the room. On the flip chart, the facilitator draws a picture at the bottom of the sheet. The drawing is then hidden with large pieces of paper, with just its upper part remaining visible.

The first volunteer is asked to come in and complete the drawing, starting with the few remaining lines of the previous drawing that remain visible. This second drawing is also hidden with pieces of paper leaving a few remaining lines at the top.

The second volunteer is asked to come in and to complete the drawing as s/he sees fit. The paper hiding the first two drawings is then removed, revealing a very awkward picture with three drawings on top of each other without any real connection between them.

The game produced a lot of laughing, and a short discussion followed, as to “what it tells us about communication”. Participants rapidly
identified how the lack of communication when performing a common task can lead to the outcome being completely different from what was expected at the onset. They also discussed how communication can be incomplete, and how trying to make sense out of partial communication can lead to a wrong interpretation of what’s meant.

Participants’ self-introduction:
Thirdly, participants were requested to introduce themselves using a very special technique: among an array of objects lying on the table, they were to pick one that symbolically represent them. The objects ranged from a can opener to a bottle of liquid paper, paper clips, etc. Participants were also requested to take turns filming one another with their video camera as they were explaining why they picked that particular object to introduce themselves. Each presentation was not to last more than 30 seconds.

This exercise pursued various objectives simultaneously, such as:
- improving the cohesion of the group;
- helping people lose fear of using their video camera;
- helping people lose fear of talking «on camera» and of seeing themselves on screen;
- starting to “de-monopolise” the use of the camera (most teams had one person considered the “camera expert”)
- having people experiment the use of symbols in communication, i.e. how symbols can be a powerful way to express oneself and how symbols can be interpreted differently by different people.

The presentations were then played back on the TV screen. Each person therefore had the opportunity to introduce themselves in a way that was more insightful and more personal than traditional ways, while also having the opportunity to see themselves on screen.

On a technical level, the exercise was also used for participants to learn how to connect the digital camera to the TV screen by using the RCA cable provided with the camera. The exercise also revealed the limitations of the cameras’ built-in microphones, since an important part was inaudible. This led the group to reflect on the need to purchase an external microphone for their cameras, while revealing the importance of sound, on how it is often overlooked and considered second to the image. Also, participants noticed that the image was most of the time very unstable and asked how they could resolve this problem. The facilitator shared some tips on how to hold and handle the camera for more stability. The exercise also helped participants acknowledge the need to develop better technical skills in order for communication to be efficient. One participant pointed at the fact that “even if we ultimately would like people at the grass-roots level to have the communication tools in their own hands, this cannot happen unless we first acquire the technical skills ourselves”.

Harmonising expectations:
Even if the workshop planning process had allowed for all three teams to have a major input in the workshop design, the facilitator still felt it necessary to conduct an activity to make sure that the content of the workshop was in tune with participants’ expectations and needs. Furthermore, the need to harmonise expectations had become clearer in the course of the previous exercise, as the difference between the two technical aspects of communication (how to use the tool itself and how to use it in a process) did not seem very clear in people’s mind.

Participants were therefore asked to break down in “country teams” for a 20-minute discussion, during which they were to agree on a set of expectations to be presented to the group thereafter.

Following their group discussion, the three teams came up with the following expectations:

1. How to produce audio-visual materials for PDC
2. How to use the audio-visual materials effectively
3. How to reflect for evaluation and improvement
4. The technical instructions in audio-visual tools
5. How to get information effectively and meaningfully by using audio-visual tools
6. Systematising and presenting information collected
7. To know which tools are appropriate for specific communication activities and how to prepare them
8. To acquire skills of using different communication tools
9. To learn techniques of doing on-the-spot interviews

The next step was for participants themselves to try to figure out if, among the expectations expressed by each team, some were similar in meaning while different in wording. Underlying this exercise was also the objective that people realise, through experience, that the same idea can be expressed differently. In other words, the process was an exercise in consensus-building.

Once the expectations similar in meaning were grouped together, the result was as follows:

- Learn technical aspects of communication tools (#1, 4, 8);
- Learn how to use our tools in a communication process (#2, 5, part of 7);
- Learn how to systematise and present information collected
- Learn techniques for “on-the-spot” interviews
- Learn how to evaluate and improve our work (technical skills and what we do with them)

The facilitator drew participants’ attention to the fact that the first set of expectations could be summed up in the question “how does it work?”, relating to the tool itself, while the second set of expectations could be summed up by the question “what can we do with it?”, relating to the processes that can be initiated or reinforced through the use of the tools. One expectation, “how to conduct on-the-spot interviews”, was not considered as part of any of the above categories. Nevertheless, all three teams agreed on the need to include this topic in the workshop.

Part 2: The use of the video camera

The language, rules and codes of video:

After making sure that everyone could insert a cassette in their camera and perform basic operations such as play, fast forward and rewind, the facilitator made a short presentation on the language, rules and codes of video.

Each medium uses different symbols or “codes”. The use of those codes is governed by a set of rules, just as in the case of spoken language. To illustrate further, the facilitator described how “letters” are the basic unit of spoken language, how they combine to produce a “word”, how the words combine to create a sentence and finally, how a set of sentences becomes a conversation, a speech, a chapter, etc. Furthermore, the use of those “codes” are governed by a set of rules called grammar. It is the combination of those units in a way that respects the rules that allows for the language to make sense.

The same is true with audio-visual language. The basic unit is called a “shot”. Shots can be combined to make a scene, scenes can be combined to make a sequence, and sequences put together become a film or a video. In order to use the camera tool properly, one has to learn how its language is structured, just as when one learns a new language, with new words and new ways of combining the words into sentences.

- Shots can be classified in different ways:
  - according to their scale;
  - according to the camera movement;
  - according to the angle;
  - according to what they are going to be used for;

- A demonstration of shot scales and camera movements followed this explanation. To that effect, a video camera was connected to the TV screen. As the facilitator described the shots, two people came in the middle and demonstrated it, so that participants could immediately see the result on the screen.

**Shot scales:**

The following scales of shots were explained and demonstrated:

- Long shot (LS, entire subject);
- Medium shot (MS, waist up);
- Close-up (C-U, shoulders up);
- Medium long shot (MLS, knee upward);
- Extreme close-up or big close-up (chin to forehead);
Camera movements:
The following camera movements were explained and demonstrated:
· Zoom-in, zoom-out (getting closer/further);
· Panoramic (camera moves horizontally, cameraman remains in the same spot);
· Travelling (camera moving horizontally, cameraman also moves);
· Tilt (camera moving vertically)

Photo composition:
The next step was to introduce the issue of photo composition. The following aspects were addressed:
· Rule of thirds and dynamic points of an image
· Diagonals and other sources of movement
· Focus/off-focus, foreground/background
· Head room;
· Eye level;
· Eye direction;
It was mentioned that the same basic visual rules apply to still photography, and that we would have an opportunity to re-discuss it later.

Hands-on exercise/Assignment:
Following this series of explanations and demonstrations, participants were asked to break down in country teams and to go outside the classroom to experiment each shot scale and camera movement. It was specifically asked that each team member has an opportunity to handle the camera. The teams were to share their footage with the other teams on the next day.

Tuesday
March 19
Week 2, Day 2

Part 2: The use of the video camera (continued)

At the beginning of Day 2, some more technical information on the use of the video camera was presented by the facilitator. The issues addressed were:

Position of camera:
· Angles
· Rule of 180°
As was the case previously, a demonstration was performed and simultaneously shown on screen. In this case, participants were able to see for themselves how the choice of an angle (upward or downward) can create a sense of domination and how the violation of the rule of 180° can create great confusion in the viewer’s mind.

Use of camera movements
- Tilt: can be used to build anticipation and expectation;
- Zoom in: can be used to create interest by making the subject closer or the impression that the subject is moving towards the camera;
- Zoom out: can be used to create surprise
- Pan: to show subjects, such as landscapes and long buildings, or many people, which are not possible to show in a single shot because of their size;
- Pan: indicating a connection or a relationship between two separate objects or subjects
  - Ex.: shot of a woman’s face as she strains to see something in the distance and then panning to the object of her attention, her child.

Categorising shots according to what they are used for:
- Establishing shots (LS or Pan)
- Introductory shots (LS or MS or C-U)
- Cutaways
- Inserts

Continuity:
- Visual
- Audio
- Space
- Time

Part 3: Conducting an interview

Following participants’ request on the first day of the workshop, a section on «conducting an interview» was added to the initial program. In
order to put participants in the mood of «asking questions», a game was introduced.

**The “Lost Person” (game):**

The idea underlying this game is that people realise the importance of asking precise questions and to get them to reflect on the questions they need to ask to obtain a particular type of answer. The game unfolds as follows:

A volunteer is asked to leave the room. One s/he’s left participants select one individual, who is to be the “Lost Person”. The game consists in the volunteer trying to guess who is the “Lost Person” by asking questions that other participants can only answer by “yes” or “no”.

In this case, the volunteer was finally able to detect the lost person after asking 8 to 10 questions, and a lot of laughter.

**Interview techniques:**

**Establishing trust**

The theory part of “the art of asking questions” started with the importance of developing a good relationship between the interviewer and the interviewee prior to the interview. The key is for the interviewee to feel at ease and to trust the interviewer. Such a relationship can be established through informal conversation prior to the interview, although it is recommended not to discuss the topic of the interview before the camera is rolling, as the interviewee might later get a false sense of repetition and unconsciously omit important information. Other team members should try not to interfere with the interviewer, who should preferably be the only one discussing directly with the interviewee as a first step.

**Demystifying technology**

In cases where people have never or seldom seen a video camera, technology can be intimidating and even inhibiting. Its is always a good idea to allow people to become more familiar with the equipment before actually starting to record. Letting them view themselves on the side screen, looking into the viewer and even film the interviewer are good ways of demystifying technical tools.

**What to ask**

During the interview, the interviewer should always keep in mind that there might be a need for information relating to the following aspects, called the “5 Ws”.

- Who?
- What?
- Where?
- When?
- Why?

Depending on the situation, the emphasis might need to be put on one or the other of these aspects. Nevertheless, it should be kept in mind that to get a complete picture of a situation, all five of them are relevant.

**Types of questions and types of interviews**

There are basically two types of questions: closed and open-ended. A closed question invariably calls for a “yes” or “no” answer. An open-ended question is one that triggers the release of information and knowledge on the interviewee’s part, in a non-directive manner.

The two main types of interviews are “on-screen” and “shadow”. In an on-screen interview, both the interviewer and the interviewee appear on the screen. The interviewer is usually in a dominant position, and can make use of both closed and open-ended questions. The control remains in the interviewer’s hands.

In a “shadow” interview, the interviewer is not seen on screen. This type of interview requires open-ended questions that can be edited subsequently. Questions have to be formulated in a way that leads the interviewee to provide complete answers as opposed to partial sentences.

In interviewing, listening is of primary importance, as the interviewee’s answer might lead to sub-questions or re-direct the interview in an unexpected but relevant direction.

**Photo composition**

The basic rules of photo composition that were discussed earlier also apply to an interview situation. The location of the interviewer and of the interviewee should respect the rule of thirds, the framing should allow for sufficient head room and appropriate eye level. This will help keep the interest of viewers, as will alternating shot scales during the interview.
**Hands-on exercise/Assignment:**

The exercise assigned to participants aimed at having them both their camera skills and experiment interview techniques. To that end, they were requested to break down in country teams and to interview each other, based on the following questions:

1. How is PDC useful to your work?
2. What is Esther telling us with her photos? (referring to the photographs taken by the Ugandan team as part of an exercise the previous week).

**Part 4: Organising information and footage**

After completing the previous exercise, all three teams had in their hands enough footage to start feeling the need to organise it. As a first step, they were shown how to organise their footage on a log sheet, in view of future selection. To that effect, their attention was drawn to the existence of “time codes” on each image recorded. They were then given a model of log sheet, while being reminded that the headings on that log sheet are basic ones and that each person/team might want to log in other relevant information. The idea is that the log sheet helps organise, store and retrieve filmed material easily. The log sheet model was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cassette no</th>
<th>Time code in</th>
<th>Time code out</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>00:02:00</td>
<td>00:02:15</td>
<td>Pan</td>
<td>Outside campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>00:02:20</td>
<td>00:05:10</td>
<td>C-U</td>
<td>Interview with Chin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title of project**

Theme: _______________
Date of shoot ______________
Location of shoot_____________

1. Create a log sheet
2. Select segments of the interviews that you would like to share with the group; indicate on the log sheet t.c. in, t.c. out;
3. Select the best sample of each camera movement and discuss why; indicate on log sheet;
4. Select a sample of each camera movement that didn’t go well and discuss why; indicate on log sheet;
5. Select one person that will present the results to the group.

Following the log-in of their footage, each team was asked to present to the rest of the group the shots they had selected, while explaining the reasons for their choice. Once again, the cameras were connected to the TV screen but this time participants did it themselves.

This exercise allowed participants to view first hand their own shots and to critically discuss them in a team. Most of the camera movements that were identified as being the worst were either too fast or unstable. Upon participants’ request, the facilitator shared the following tips to improve image stability:

- Take a big breath and count to five before starting your movement and to five after.
- Keep your elbows close to your body and your legs apart for more stability
- Rest your elbows on something stable such as a table, a large rock, etc.

In some cases, digital video cameras have a built-in image stabiliser. Participants were invited to explore their cameras and the accompanying instruction booklet to find out if their camera is equipped with such a device.
Wednesday
March 20
Week 2, Day 3

Part 5: Using video in a participatory process

Day 3 marked the beginning of a new aspect of the learning process, aiming to help participants develop ways to use communication tools in participatory processes. In order to draw participants’ attention to the fact that individual perception is an important component of communication, and on the factors that can influence perception, a game was introduced.

The “Mysterious Object” (game):

The game unfolds as follows:

Three volunteers are asked to leave the room. Outside the classroom, the facilitator explains what was expected of them: the aim of the game is for them to describe part of a mysterious object to other participants, who have to guess what object is being described without actually seeing it. (In this case, the object was a book. One volunteer described the cover page, another described the side, and the third one described the back of the book). Each volunteer starts their description with: “the way I see it” and proceeds with the description, providing information such as colour, length, width, thickness, etc. After the each volunteer has given his own description of the mysterious object, participants are asked to say what they thought the object is; they are allowed to discuss aloud.

It took participants roughly 10 minutes to figure out what the mystery object was, without guessing completely. Before they agreed that the mystery object was a book, a number of other potential objects had been named, such as a video cassette, a cigarette pack, etc.

With this game, participants were able to experiment for themselves that the same object can be seen and perceived differently by different people depending on the viewpoint, thus influencing how each person describes it and what s/he communicates about it.

The Lok Jumbish story:

For the following activity, participants were handed a magazine article entitled “Dust, veils and videotapes: A true story on how video was used to create dialogues in a desert”.

The article describes a participatory video experiment that took place in a small village in Western Rajasthan, North India. In this case, an organisation called Lok Jumbish, whose work focuses on primary education using an integrated participatory approach, used video to create a dialogue between men and women, and between adults and children. After acquiring basic skills in the use of video equipment, people were asked how they could apply their newly gained skills in ways which would improve their work towards education for all. The field workers and the film-makers decided to try out two video experiments in order to answer these questions. One group wanted to create a debate between parents and children in one village. The other group wanted, through the use of video, to raise a debate in another village on why so few women were actively involved in the Lok Jumbish programme.

The first dialogue took place between children, parents and Lok Jumbish workers on the question of why children, particularly girls, were not going to school, even though a school a teacher, books and material were available. The plan was to interview some children on the first day, edit the interviews during the evening and the following day, and then screen the interviews the following evening, filming parents’ responses and discussion.

The second experiment was to create a dialogue between men and women in the village, as to why so few women take part in Lok Jumbish activities, such as village education committees. To do so, they filmed women’s discussion and showed it to the men, then filmed their response and showed it to women.

Assignment:

Participants were asked to break down in country teams and discuss the Lok Jumbish story, starting with the following questions:

1. What strikes you the most about this story?
2. Can you find a situation in your project where there is a need for dialogue? How can
Question 1 yielded the following answers:

**Vietnamese Team:**
- Video attracts community: new, modern equipment; using simply, easily, demonstrating real images;
- It’s useful in involving villages in participating in dialogue;
- Creating familiar, realistic dialogues by the field worker;
- Video could break out the old-age ways of thinking, out-of-date thoughts.

**Ugandan Team:**
- Video helped remove the communication barrier that existed between couples;
- The power of the video broke a tradition of men not mixing with women at public meetings when men sneaked in to watch with women;
- The power of video helped in making people open up to discuss frankly;

**Cambodian Team:**
- Simple process to organise video workshop;
- Sensitive topics or issues can be raised;
- Usefulness equipment/tool to encourage participatory dialogue
  - The lessons learnt from the workshop;

As for question 2, the following answers were provided:

**Vietnamese Team:**
Situation in Hông Ha: Poor women were rarely involved in NRM projects’ activities.
- Creating dialogues with poor women on their participation: select a group of field workers and guiding them how to use the camera recording the villagers’ daily lives;
- together with field workers, organise a debate between men and women on the topic of… / recording;
- play the video(s) recorder to the whole community.
- Policy-makers vs the minority villagers
  - recording the dialogue between policymakers and villagers
- convincing to live a settlement life.

**Ugandan Team:**
Need for dialogue:
- Between credit institutions and local farmers;
  - There is a distance between credit institutions management and the farmers; the institutions are using a top-down approach;
  - Between husband and wife, for equitable control of family income; use peer pressure to cause a change in attitude.

**Video could be used in the following ways:**
- Dialogue on credit:
  - Record a discussion by farmers of the credit problems, the present this to the credit institutions management to view and discuss;
  - Record the reaction of management to present to farmers as feedback;
- Dialogue on family income distribution:
  - Record a discussion by women about the income management problem in their homes;
  - Present the recording to men and record their reaction as feedback to women;

**Cambodian Team:**
- Indigenous women left school before men;
- Traditional forest management;
- Express the real and sensitive issues;
- Interest and pay attention from participants;
- Encourage/motivate dialogue;
- Documentation;

**Video could be used in:**
- Recording discussions on above issues with elders and women;
- Display the issues during meetings and workshops.

**Part 6: The use of still photography**

The initial plan was for this part of the workshop to focus first on technical aspects such as shutter speed and exposure. After a brief
inquiry, it appeared that none of the participants had cameras that allowed for manual settings. With all-automatic cameras, it is not possible to modify the shutter speed or the exposure without going first into the menu to reprogram the camera. Despite its limited usefulness, participants still felt they wanted to find out more about manual settings.

**Shutter speed, aperture and light:**

The key element in photography is the amount of light that is allowed onto the unexposed film, which is defined by the shutter speed and the aperture. The connection between these two functions was explained. Optimal shutter speed for a human hand is 1/60th of a second. Average aperture is 5.6.

Secondly, the notion of field depth was explained, as well as the inverse relationship between the digits on the aperture ring, the size of the aperture, and its impact on the image foreground and background. For example, a 1.2 aperture, the largest possible aperture on a 35 mm camera, while 22 usually is the smallest. Accordingly, the smaller the aperture, the greater the field depth, and the larger the aperture, the shallower the field depth.

**Film sensitivity:**

One participant raised the issue of ASA, which refers to film sensitivity. A higher ASA indicates higher sensitivity, with 100 and 200 ASA considered normal sensitivity for the outdoors. Even though 400 ASA and above can still be used outdoors, the side effect will be much larger «image grain» (pixel in digital cameras). Upon enlarging a photograph, too large a grain can cause the picture to appear blurred, with many details disappearing. Nevertheless, high sensitivity films such as 1200 or 1600 can prove very useful in special circumstances, at night or in poorly lit conditions. In the case of an emergency where a higher ASA film would be needed and is not available, it is always possible to use a lower ASA film and «boosting» it by setting the ASA at the desired sensitivity. In such a case, special procedures will have to be followed at the film development stage.

**Photo composition:**

The same rules of photo composition as in video apply to still photography. The rule of thirds, eye level, head room, etc. are all important factors to take into consideration, for an optimal use of photography. The only exception that is worth mentioning is that in still photography, positioning the subject in the middle of the frame is appropriate in the case of portrait. To avoid the image to be too static, the use of diagonals and other conducting lines aiming towards the subject can be helpful.

**Taking care of cameras:**

Both photographic and video camera
- Develop the habit of keeping the lens cap on when camera is not in use;
- Keep finger prints and dirt off the lens. If fingerprints or dirt on it, use lens cleansing paper. Start in centre of the lens, going towards the outside. Use an air pear if necessary.
- If stained, use cleans cleansing fluid, not water;
- Check batteries, keep a spare battery charged.

**Video camera:**

- Do not have the lens or the viewer directly pointing to the sun
- Do not hold it vertically
- Use cleaning cassette once in a while to clean heads
- Keep away from devices that produce magnetic fields (transmitting radio or television, antennas, top of VCR or TV, etc.)
- Try to avoid using in extreme heat. If you really need to, put in shade or cool in between shots

**Enemies of your cameras:**

- Heat
- Water
- Dust
- Grease
- Magnetic fields

**Enemies of cassettes and film:**

- Magnetic fields are also a problem for cassettes.
- Heat! Avoid leaving cassettes in extreme heat. Ideal storage temperature is between 12-24 degrees. If tape has been in heat, let it rest 24 hours before using it.

- Humidity! Tips: keep film and cassettes in their box, store in a plastic bag with rice. The rice will absorb humidity. Ideal is 40-80 degrees of relative humidity.

- Film for still photography are to be stored at a lower temperature, ideally in the fridge.

**Tips for better storage of film and cassettes:**
- Never touch the film nor the inside of a cassette directly
- Always rewind cassettes
- Always store upright, in their cases.

**Hands-on exercise / Assignment:**

The assignment consisted in going to the Hue market, in the late afternoon. This time, participants didn’t break down into country teams, since for the exercise to be effective, it was preferable to have people from different cultural backgrounds mingle within each group. The assignment was two-fold, one based on collective photographs, the other one based on individual photographs. (Initially, a third part relating to audio was also planned, but it was not possible to pursue it because of limited time).

1. **Collective photographs**

   This part of the assignment aimed for participants to experiment the use of photography for reconstructing a process, and as a tool for consensus-building.

   As a group, people were requested to tell the story of their trip to market in no more than 8 photographs. A larger number of photos could be taken, but only eight of them could appear in the final display.

2. **Individual photographs**

   These individual photographs aimed at people to experiment using an image as a symbol, while experimenting how differences in perception can be expressed through an image.

   Participants were requested to take two pictures on an individual basis. The first photograph was to depict what they see as most similar to a market place in their home country, while the second photograph was to show what they consider most dissimilar. In the case of Vietnamese participants, they were asked to take a photograph of what they consider most and least representative of a Vietnamese market.

**Thursday**

**March 21**

**Week 2, Day 4**

**Part 6: The use of still photography (continued)**

The use of still photography continued into Day 4, which was organised around three main exercises:

**Exercise 1: Organising pictures and displaying them:**

The first part of the morning was used for people to select and organise their photographs on large pieces of cardboard. As per the assignment, the first set of photographs was to depict in a sequence of no more than 8 pictures the story of «going to the Hue market». As the groups were working on the selection of images that best described their field trip, a consensus started to emerge within each group. After an hour of animated discussion, all three teams had reached a consensus and were ready to present their work to the larger group. It appeared that, while each team had respected the guidelines, one team had focused on team members as subjects of the story, while another team had focused on what they saw. While both interpretations were considered appropriate, it was a perfect opportunity to start addressing the issue of perspective and perception, and the role they play in communication.

The discussion around these issues was further made possible in view of the results of the second part of the assignment, which focused on the use of images as symbols. As expected due to the different cultural backgrounds of participants, the
Photographs varied greatly in content, and even more so in meaning. Furthermore, what was considered most representative of a market place in someone’s home country occurred to be the least representative for someone else. Acknowledging this difference led to a short discussion on how still photography can be useful in conflict resolution, which each party presenting their viewpoint through a photograph.

How could you use photography in your work?

The following exercise aimed at triggering people’s creativity as to how still photography can be useful in their projects. They were asked to find one way in which photographs can be used in a descriptive manner, and one way in which they can be used symbolically.

All three teams came up with ideas on how to use photography as a way to reconstruct a process, i.e. in a descriptive manner. One team explained how they would use photography to document the implementation the various phases of a project, another team talked about how rural women could be given small cameras to document the many domestic tasks they perform in a day, as a way to raise men’s awareness of women’s workload, trigger discussions on that topic and find solutions to alleviate women’s burden. Another team mentioned that photography would be very useful to contrast a «before» situation with an “after” situation.

Photography vs video: advantages and disadvantages

The final exercise of this section aimed at sharpening participants’ capacity to choose an appropriate tool for a specific situation, by listing the advantages and disadvantages of each one. The idea underlying this exercise also was for people to develop their capacity of abstraction by applying their newly acquired skills to concrete working conditions. The summary of all three teams’ appraisal of each tool is listed in the following table. Following the display of the teams’ conclusions, a discussion took place.

Photo advantages:
- Un-movement
- Cheap
- More available
- Easy to operate
- Easy to transport
- Delivering to others easily
- Using easily
- Cheap
- Easy to use (anywhere, anytime)
- Keep and maintain easily

Photo disadvantages:
- Difficult to keep continuity
- No sound
- Static images
- No real action
- No sound
- No continuity
- No sound
- Needs more explanation
- Takes time for developing
- Few activities could be taken

Video advantages:
- Attracts more attention
- Attractive
- Animated action
- Continuity
- Sound
- Continuity
- Drawing more attention
- Sound
- Describes real action
- Lively image
- Seeing images immediately
- Usefulness for workshop
- Take all activities
- Recording sound - easy to understand

**Video disadvantages:**
- Difficult to carry
- Expensive
- Storage
- Less available
- Difficult to transport
- Requires tools to play; power
- Requires skills
- Having three conditions: electricity (power), time, place
- Needs more equipment to show
- Needs skills to use video
- Expensive
- High cost
- Takes much time for performing

**Part 7: The design and use of posters**

The afternoon was dedicated to addressing remaining issues that the tight schedule did not allow to review in-depth. Among them, the design and production of a poster. It was first explained that the same basic rules of photo composition apply to poster design. Besides the rule of thirds, the use of diagonals, and the notions of head room and eye direction, the need to limit the number of elements in the picture was also discussed. An overcrowded picture can easily get the eye confused as to what the main message is and means. The same applies to the choice of colours. Ideally, a poster should not have more than three colours, with a clearly dominant one. If the poster includes a written message, it should be brief and clear. The lettering should be the right size and well-positioned, as to not overshadow the picture while still attracting attention. The importance of an appropriate choice of locations was briefly discussed. The choice of location depends on the characteristics of the target group. All agreed that as in all aspects of PDC, consulting with people is the best way to ensure an appropriate choice. The example of a campaign on children’s rights performed in Central America was discussed. In this case, posters had been selected as a way to sensitise fathers, who had been described by children as being the prime violators of their rights, mostly through domestic violence when coming home drunk. When consulted, children hinted that the entrance of bars would be the most appropriate location for posters to be hung. An impact assessment conducted after the project indicated that indeed, a great number of men had noticed the posters while on the bar’s doorstep, and that in many cases, it had had a deterring effect.

Subsequently, through the example of a group of women who, at the end of a workshop cycle on women’s self-esteem and organising, gathered to design a poster depicting their achievements, the use of poster designing as a collective process was discussed. After long hours of discussion, the women had agreed that the illustration on the poster should depict their multi-task reality and their overwhelming domestic work burden, but that the woman illustrated should also hold a book in one hand, to show their commitment and desire to learn and progress. In this particular case, the poster designing process was used as an evaluation tool to measure the degree to which women had improved their self-esteem, through self-representation.

**Part 8: Pre-Testing**

The second issue addressed was the importance of pre-testing material. In continuity with the previous discussion, the pre-testing of posters was used as a first example. Issues such as the meaning of colours in a particular culture were discussed: for example, while the colour black is related to death and mourning in Western cultures, it symbolises strength in other cultures. Pre-testing allows to figure out how the message conveyed by an image, a colour or a sentence is interpreted according to people’s cultural, social or economic background. Other features such as the size of lettering or the length of the message...
can also be important according to other characteristics such as the level of literacy and fluency in reading.

The main parameters of pre-testing were stated and briefly explained:

- Content
- Format
- Material
- Usefulness for feedback

The existence of listeners’ clubs in some parts of Africa was also discussed. The experience of Zambia and Malawi, where listeners’ clubs have become in recent years a space where people can voice and channel their opinion back to the broadcaster, was considered innovative in establishing two-way communication. This experience shows that even in countries where telephone lines are not accessible to all, micro-channels can be created to provide feedback and establish dialogue.

Part 9: The use of audio material and community radio

As time limitations didn’t allow for exercises in using audio material, the issue was addressed taking as a starting point the Ugandan team’s experience in that regard as well as their ideas for further use of audio cassettes. The idea was to record songs addressing the issues at stake, in a way that is both entertaining and culturally relevant to the banana growers participating in the project. From that point on, a discussion on possible collaboration with local and community radios ensued. After briefly discussing the differences in access to the airwaves in Africa and in Asia (where most radios are still State-operated), the facilitator explained the basic conditions that need to be considered for a radio to be interested in collaborating with a project or a group. One such condition is that the format of the material to be broadcast fits into a particular time slot. The topics to be covered should also fit into the radio’s priorities. For those reasons, it is very important to monitor local radios before proposing some kind of collaboration. The proposed material should be as close as possible to the existing programming structure, so that the broadcaster does not have to re-organise his schedule to fit the proposed material. As an example, if a call-in program already exists, it might be better to propose a topic to be discussed as part of that program rather than proposing a completely new program, which would require the broadcaster to make too many changes to its programming.

The last day of the workshop was dedicated to integrating and synthesising the new skills and knowledge acquired in the course of the week, through two main exercises/assignments.

Exercise 1:

The first exercise aimed at identifying the various uses of each tool. For that purpose, the group broke down in country teams. Each team was handed a pile of labels. Possible communication needs that PDC can help fulfil and/or objectives that can be pursued through PDC had been written on each label. The exercise consisted in each team discussing which medium of still photography, video and audio could be most useful in answering the need or attaining the stated objective.

The list of communication needs and/or objectives handed to participants was made out of three different sources: expectations expressed by participants at the beginning of the workshop; uses of PDC that were discovered and experimented during the workshop; and uses that the facilitator had witnessed in other parts of the world. Combining these three elements, the list of labels resulted as follows:
· Improve a group’s dynamics/cohesion
· Improve people’s self-esteem
· Consensus-building
· Conflict resolution
· Improve capacity of synthesis
· PRA
· Improve people’s ability to understand complex/abstract concepts
· Document/reconstruct a process
· Evaluation
· Collective problem solving
· Gender analysis
· Improve mutual understanding between research team and communities
· Advocacy

After discussing each label, all three teams were requested to post the labels under the column corresponding to the tool they deemed most appropriate.

**Exercise 2:**

The second exercise of the day, which was to close the workshop, aimed to integrate both the technical skills and the conceptual notions learnt throughout the week. For that purpose, people were asked to produce a short video which was to depict two major things they had learnt during the workshop. The video had to be filmed in a way that integrated the different camera movements, shot scales and audio-visual rules they had learned. Any medium could be used to explain the lessons learnt. In other words, people could decide to use drawings, photographs, interviews, sounds, songs, etc., as long as they were filmed on video in a way that integrated the technical skills and conceptual notions.

As a first step, before the group split into country teams, the facilitator explained the nature and the use of a storyboard, as each team was to produce a storyboard of their video before actually filming it. An example of a storyboard including the drawings and the shot annotations was handed to participants, together with a number of blank storyboard sheets.

Each team came up with different ideas both in terms of content and of how to plan their storyboard.

**Vietnamese Team:**

The Vietnamese team divided their first topic in two:
1a. Video recording of an interview
1b. Transferring planting techniques to other farmers

Their second topic was also divided in two:
2a. How to improve pig production
2b. Deforestation and solutions

According to the storyboard, in both topics, different means of communication were used to establish two-way communication channels between the researchers and the farmers. The storyboard, which can be found in the following pages, showed a very good understanding of audio-visual language, with an appropriate combination of shot scales and camera movements.

**Cambodian Team:**

The Cambodian team, on its part, chose to produce a storyboard describing their reflection process on what they had learnt about PDC during the week rather than a specific application in a project. In their case, the characters depicted in the storyboard were themselves, as opposed to the Vietnamese team who depicted the farmers they work with.

As was the case of the Vietnamese team, the storyboard showed a very good understanding of both the technical aspects of the tools and their use within communication processes. The use of audio-visual language, the combination of shot scales, the indicated camera movements, and the respect of photo composition rules are just about perfect.

**Ugandan Team:**

Unfortunately, the Ugandan team did not hand in its storyboard. Nevertheless, earlier observation during the work session revealed that they chose to depict a communication strategy using audio cassettes as a main tool. As far as can be remembered, their of audiovisual language was also in line with the notions learnt throughout the week.
Saturday March 23
Week 2, Day 6
Plenary session

All three teams presented their final work in a plenary session on Saturday morning. Despite some technical limitations affecting the sound level, it was a moment of great pride for all participants, who seemed to be ending the workshop with a fairly large set of newly-acquired skills to be experimented and exercised back home, as well as with a huge dose of optimism as to the potential contribution of PDC towards achieving their development objectives.

Conclusions and suggestions

Based on empirical observation, it appears that the methodology was appropriate and effective, in view of the objectives of the workshop. The combination of hands-on exercises and assignments with theoretical and technical explanations, added to the reflection process on field applications, seems to have allowed for participants to have acquired the know-how and gained the confidence needed for an effective use of PDC tools.

Nevertheless, due to the experimental nature of the workshop that was implemented for the first time, a number of improvements could be made to enhance the learning process:

1. There could be a more direct connection to other aspects of the learning process (i.e. the first week of the workshop and the e-forum). This connection could be made through the use of «case studies» drawn from participants’ experiences as a starting point. As a first step, participants would review the situation, identifying the development problem and the communication objectives. The workshop on the choice and use of communication tools would directly relate to the case studies, allowing for more concrete application possibilities from the onset, and for a common thread to be followed throughout the workshop. For this process to be feasible and efficient, the case studies would have to be chosen very carefully, as to allow for a large variety of tools to be explored and experimented.

2. The contribution of a second facilitator is an extremely valuable asset in this type of workshop, given the level of difficulty of the learning process, which simultaneously takes place in different levels: cognitive, manual, technical, creative, etc. A reflection process on how to «tighten» the links between those different levels is nevertheless needed. In that regard, the role of the second facilitator could be greatly enhanced and could prove even more valuable to facilitate those connections to take place. Besides a strong reflection process, this requires, of course, better planning of the results sought through the use of certain exercises, more abstract in nature. This improved planning, in return, should lead to greater sharing between the two facilitators, prior to the workshop.

3. Participants mentioned that the use of print materials (hand-outs) could have improved their understanding and their retention capacity, particularly in view of the need for simultaneously translation. In our opinion, this suggestion could even be taken one step further through the use of audio-visual aids. In effect, even though the use of simultaneous on-screen demonstrations proved very useful for learning technical skills such as camera movements and shot scales, the use of audio-visual material to show concrete experiences using the techniques...
being experimented could greatly help transfer the know-how to real-life situations. As an example, participants’ exposure to the Lok Jumbish story from India was by all means a turning point in the workshop, where participants started making the transition from technical skills (how does this tool work?) to practical applications (what can we do with this tool?). Similarly, examples drawn from other developing countries that were provided by the facilitators in a verbal way seem to have awakened great interest. Therefore, it would be very interesting to compile images taken from those experiences on a video cassette. Many of these images are indeed readily available or would require minimal research.

4. In view to the limited time devoted to the workshop as a whole, the use of audio material (cassettes and/or community radio) was only superficially touched. Nevertheless, audio tools still remain the most prevailing medium in many developing countries, given the strength of oral tradition, and the low cost and accessibility of audio tools, even though this reality has been tempered in recent years by the development of low-cost, small-format digital video cameras.

For methodological reasons, this workshop started from the most complex tool (video) and moved towards the least complex (audio cassettes). This led to the importance and usefulness of sound to be somewhat overshadowed by the attractiveness of images. One has to wonder if the reverse process (starting with least complex tool) would have allowed for more attention to be paid to the potential of audio. Although there is no set answer to this question, it still deserves to be reflected upon.

5. From a strictly technical viewpoint, it would be very useful for participants to have access to more equipment for the duration of the workshop, so as to give all participants equal opportunities to handle the tools directly. Furthermore, numerous exercises throughout the workshop were hindered by the low quality of sound provided by the video cameras’ built-in microphones. If the program can afford it, the purchase of a unidirectional hand microphone for each team could greatly improve the quality of their work. Similarly, the use of a small tripod could greatly improve image stability.
**Workshop participants**

**Cambodia Team**
Nhem Sovanna
Lun Kimhy
Chhum Sovanny
Nut Saman
Touch Lakhena
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**Uganda Team**
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Moses Buregyeya
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Wilberforce Kateera Tshemereirwe

**Vietnam Team**
Le Van An
Le Duc Ngoan.
Nguyen Xuan Hong
Nguyen Minh Hieu
Nguyen Thi Thanh
Ngo Huu Toan
Le Quang Minh
Hoang Thi Sen
Hoang Huu Hoa
Tran Minh Tri
Le Thi Thuy Hang
Nguyen Phi Nam
Ton Nu Tien Sa
Tran Ngoc Liem
Tran Duy An

**Resource people**
The People of Hong Ha Commune
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John Graham
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*Kimhy explaining the “Police and thief” game from Ratanakiri.*
Appendix “A”

Revised schedule for the Isang Bagsak e-forum

PART 3: “COMMUNICATION DURING IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING OF PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH”

THEME 1: “Developing communication strategies”
(Time-keeper: Chin)
• Second Posting by all teams: 22-28 April

THEME 2: “Using communication tools”
(Time-keeper: VIETNAM TEAM)
• Introduction and First Posting by all teams: 29 April-12 May
• Second Posting by all teams: 13-19 May
• Closing comments by Guy and summary by Chin: 20-26 May

THEME 3. “Evaluating communication activities”
(Time-keeper: CAMBODIA TEAM)
• Introduction and First Posting by all teams: 27 May-09 June
• Second Posting by all teams: 10-16 June
• Closing comments by Guy and summary by Chin: 17-23 June

PART 4: COMMUNICATION AND THE SHARING OF KNOWLEDGE

THEME 1. “Facilitating the identification and sharing of local knowledge”
(Time-keeper: UGANDA TEAM)
• Introduction and First Posting by all teams: 24 June-07 July
• Second Posting by all teams: 08-14 July
• Closing comments by Guy and summary by Chin: 15-21 July

THEME 2. “Planning dissemination of research results to different stakeholders”
(Time-keeper: VIETNAM TEAM)
• Introduction and First Posting by all teams: 22 July-04 August
• Second Posting by all teams: 05-11 August
• Closing comments by Guy and summary by Chin: 12-18 August

THEME 3. “Facilitating extension to other communities”
(Time-keeper: CAMBODIA TEAM)
• Introduction and First Posting by all teams: 19 August-01 September
• Second Posting by all teams: 02-08 September
• Closing comments by Guy and summary by Chin: 09-15 September

CONCLUSION: EVALUATION OF THE PILOT PROGRAM AND RECOMMENDATIONS

• Arrangements to be finalised.

Appendix “B”

Role of the time-keeper

1. A week before the start of the Theme that you are responsible for leading, send an e-mail to Guy and myself to confirm that the e-forum is ready to start the new Theme, and invite Guy to post his Introduction to the Theme.

2. On the Monday when the new Theme begins, send a posting or e-mail to all the three teams announcing that the Theme is now open and remind everyone to post their contributions by the date stated in the e-forum schedule.

3. On the day when all the First Postings are supposed to be made, check that all the teams have made their postings. The time-keeper will e-mail those teams who have not made their postings to remind them to do so.

4. Once all the postings have been made, request everyone to make their Second Posting by the date stated on the schedule.

5. On the day when all the Second Postings are supposed to be made, check that all the teams have made their postings. The time-keeper will e-mail those teams who have not made their postings to remind them to do so.

6. Guy and Chin will then take over after all the Second Postings have been made with concluding remarks and a summary of the discussions for the Theme.
Appendix “C”

Evaluation Report for the PDC Workshop, Hue, Vietnam.
March 11-23, 2002

By Wilberforce Kateera Tushemereirwe

Other members of the Evaluation Committee:
Ngo Huu Toan
Touch Lakhena

The purpose of this evaluation was to find out whether the objectives of the workshop were achieved at the end of the workshop. Also the information gathered will help in planning future workshops/similar events.

1. General Assessment

1.1 Generally the workshop was evaluated as good (52 percent) and very good (48 percent) by participants who attended. No body ranked it below these levels.

1.2 The highest percentage (76%) of the participants rated the workshop as extremely useful to their work and the remaining 14% as useful.

1.3 All participants rated the workshop objectives fully achieved.

2. Workshop Objectives

The individual objectives were rated as follows:

2.1 “To enable the three participating teams of Isang Bagsak to share experiences and ideas in face to face context”. Seventy six percent (76%) rated it very well achieved, 20% well achieved and none below these levels.

2.2 “To apply a systematic methodology in developing communication strategies”. Forty percent (40%) rated it very well achieved, 56% well achieved, 4% rated as averagely achieved and non ranked it below this level.

2.3 “To use effectively light audio visual communication tools (photography, audio, and video recording). Forty four percent (44%) of the participants rated the objective as very well achieved, the remaining 56% rated it as well achieved and nobody ranked below this level.

2.4 “To use interpersonal communication tools. Twenty eight percent (28%) very well achieved this, 60% rated well achieved and 12% averagely achieved.

2.5 “To evaluate the progress of the Isang Bagsak program. Sixty percent of the workshop participants rated the objective as very well achieved, 32% well achieved and 8% never responded but nobody rated it below these levels.

3. Strengths and Weaknesses

3.1 Strengths:

3.1.1 Interpersonal relationships and good rapport
- Small number of participants allowed easy learning.
- Full participation of all members.
- Idea sharing.
- Inter-team interaction high.
- Confidence building among teams
- Rich experiences on how to use different tools in PDC and to apply it (PDC) in our respective team projects.
3.1.2 Workshop content
- Topics were related to the workshop objectives
  - Diversity of content learnt
  - Hands-on work (practicals)
  - Quality of communication tools and activities
  - Use of camera and other audio visual tools
  - Capacity building of the participants.

3.1.3 Workshop set-up/organization
- Good organization (activities, facilities, venue, agenda, face to face contact)
- Silent [quiet] venue was selected
- [Warm] Hospitality

3.2 Weaknesses:

3.2.1 Interpersonal relationships/rapport
- Language problem (12%)
- Some people kept silent during the workshop (8%).
- Most of the inter-personal skills, games, role-play could not be shared among groups (4%).

3.2.2 Subject content
- Lack of enough equipment for practicing (32%).
- Few hand-outs were given to participants (20%).
- Workshop did not discuss in detail about facilitation skills in CBRM research (8%).
- Less time for practicing communication tools (8%).
- Much time spent on theory and less on practical (8%).
- Sometimes teams tended to be behind the schedule (not cover the assignment given on time) 4%.
- Less discussion on participation skills (4%).

3.2.3 Organization and set-up
- Field trip was allocated a short time (8%)
- Limited time for a discussion (12%)
- Workshop duration was too long (20%)

3.3 Participants contributed the following suggestions to overcome the above weaknesses:
- More equipment to be provided for each team
- Preparation of hand-outs to cover all presentations
- More time for practicing communication skills
- Training time should be allocated such that 80% covers practical and 20% theory
- Reduce on the content
- Allow the participants to use local language for easy understanding
- More time for clarifying a discussion

4. Organization and Management of the Workshop
The different items were rated as Poor, Fair, Good and Very Good as shown in the table below. The figure given under each score in each item is the percentage of the participants that rated it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>V.Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-workshop arrangement</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel arrangements</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop structure</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop duration</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After work-hour activities</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue(workshop facilities)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-visual aid equipment</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-cultural exchange</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For some items where the percentages do not add to 100% (Such as: meals, and accommodation) means some participants did not rate these items.

The majority of participants ranked the workshop organization as very good. However, a significant number expressed dissatisfaction with the workshop duration.
5. Presentation and Training
The rating scale of Poor, Fair, Good, and Very Good and percentages were used for the following items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>V.Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of presentation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of visual aids</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time for the discussion</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity and content of handouts &amp; training materials</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand-on training</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of participation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field activities</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Preparedness</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team participation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time keeping</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of participants were happy with the presentations and training. However, the following areas could benefit from improvements at the next such workshop: Handouts and training materials, hands-on training, games, level of participation, field activities and team preparedness.

6. Additional Topics
Participants suggested the following to be the additional communication topics they would have liked to be included in the training:
- Up-loading and down-loading of information at the Isang Bagsak website.
- Prepare publications for non-scientists.
- How to produce documentaries.
- Training on adult learning skills.
- Facilitation skills.

7. Communication
Evaluation results showed that 36% of the participants were not affected by the use of English language in their understanding and participation, 24% less affected and then 12% for less-less and much affected.

The suggestions for improvement given by those who were affected are:
- Hand-outs can be helpful in reading and understanding better, in cases of different accents.
- Presenters/participants should speak more slowly and should be precise to the point.
- Should allow sometime for interpretation.

8. Additional Comments and Suggestions
A number of additional suggestions were given regarding the following:

8.1 E-forum
- Scaling up of the e-forum, the more teams participating the better results.
- Encourage all participants to take part in the e-forum.
- Need to improve facilities for accessing the e-forum for each country.
- Continuing to exchange experiences among the three teams on the e-forum

With regards to applying a communication strategy, each team should share lessons learnt and discuss through e-forum.

8.2 Workshops/training
- Need for a second/other face-to-face workshop(s) to follow up and reflect the results after the first workshop.
- Increase on the practical work than theory during training.
- Incorporate adult learning in Isang Bagsak training’s.
- All participants should contact each for more information sharing.
- Through such workshops, the participating teams exchange their own cultural features for the other teams to know.
- Need for more time to learn audio-visual tools.
- Need for more time to share experiences between the three teams and practice the communication plan.
- Reduce the workshop workshop duration (10 days at most).
- Next training should avail more equipment for each participant.
- All participants should be encouraged to participate actively in the workshop.
- Need for hand-out for each presentation to help easy understanding and digesting points.
- The respective teams should use real examples of their achievements or challenges.