Development Communication in a Global Perspective

Saqib Riaz
&
Saadia Anwar Pasha
Allama Iqbal Open University
Islamabad.

The paper discusses the discourse of development communication which, ever since the end of World War II, has named certain nations developed and others underdeveloped. In the discourse as well as in practice, communication was co-opted as an instrument for development. These notions have evolved. But even today the idea that you can make people change their behavior to emulate Western developed countries still lingers in the mind of "development "agent. The paper advocates an approach in which true dialogue is itself part of the development process. In this view true dialogue is at once dialectical and dialogical giving their place to both mind and heart.

Key Words: Development, Communication, Underdeveloped, Media images, Globalization, Paradigms, Dialogical dialogue.

Naming the underdeveloped

Since the time after World War II numerous statements have been made about "development". Along with these statements, various projects and reports were formulated.

Together these constitute the "development discourse". Very soon communication was co-opted in the development discourse as well as in the development activity. That, in turn, found expression in a still more complex discourse, the "development communication discourse."

Here discourse does not mean a long speech. The concept of discourse has evolved out of post-structuralisms and semiotics (Fiske, J., et al., 1994).

Some experts like Gustavo Esteva (1992) argue that to define some nations as developed and the rest as developing or underdeveloped is to define "a heterogeneous and diverse majority simply in the terms of a homogenizing and narrow minority". Gardner and Lewis (1996) agree that one way to understand development, particularly in its historical context, is as a "starkly political project of continued Northern dominance over the South" (p. 1). Despite its problematic nature, the concept and practice of development continues to be employed on a global scale, and as such it remains an important element in global relations. (Gardner and Lewis, 1996)

The acceptance of the media standards as norm which developing countries should strive to achieve has had incalculable, harmful, effects on these countries. It has colonized them. They have internalized somebody else's thought about their own reality. They have developed a sense of inferiority. They have grown ever more convinced that the developed West was the model to emulate.

A discourse is a consistent set of utterances-verbal or iconographic-on a subject by a particular group of people. For instance, the patriarchal discourse on women is the set of thoughts propounded in words or in images by persons belongs to patriarchal group. A discourse serves the interests of the group that utters it. A discourse is uncritical and takes many things for granted. Such is also the "development communication discourse". Discourse is both a verb and a noun. As a verb, discourse is a performative act. Discourse names things and to an extent creates them. For instance, the so-called developed countries utter the development discourse and in doing so they create underdevelopment by naming certain socio-economic situations. For instance, "discourses on globalization function to name, and thus help bring into being, what they are supposedly designating or describing..." Hopefully "the powerless will…invariably find ways of renaming." (Schirato & Webb,2002).

The acts of communication, collaboration, and cooperation between a community and development agencies is credited with the successful attainment of some levels of development , however, it can only be referred to as part of the success story of the development program.

Development is an on-going process, the continuous interaction to create social arrangements that provide an equal platform for the exchange of ideas between program sponsors, and recipients will provide sustainable improvement in the lives of recipients.

The Right to Development was included in the Declaration on the Right to Development adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 4 December 1986by an overwhelming majority, with the United States casting the single dissenting vote. The Declaration states that "the right to development is an inalienable human right by virtue of which every human

Correspondence concerning this article to be addressed to Saqib Riaz saqibriaz2001@yahoo.com, Post Doctorate Scholar at Indiana University Bloomington, USA,
Saadia Anwar Pasha is Lecturer, Department of Mass Communication, AIOU Islamabad.

person and all peoples are entitled to participate in, contribute to, and enjoy economic, social, cultural and political development, in which all human rights and fundamental freedoms can be fully realized. The right includes: full sovereignty over natural resources, self-determination, popular participation in development, equality of opportunity and the creation of favorable conditions for the enjoyment of other civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights."

The Declaration recognizes development to be a comprehensive economic, social, cultural and political process, which aims at constant improvement of the well being of the entire population and all individuals on the basis of their active, free and substantial participation in the development process.

The World Conference on Human Rights, held in Vienna in 1993, dealt extensively with the right to development. It adopted the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, which recognizes that democracy, development and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms are interdependent and mutually reinforcing. The World Conference reaffirmed by consensus the right to development as a universal and inalienable right and an integral part of fundamental human rights. It further stated that, while development facilitates the enjoyment of all human rights, lack of development may not be invoked to justify the abridgement of internationally recognized human rights.

The Discourse on Development Communication

Dr. Silvio waisboard has written a concise and clear Report on "Development communication." (Waisbord S, 2001) His document is an excellent summary of the evolution of the "Development communication discourse" and its present inherent contradictions. The Report discusses the main ideas of development communication, with their presuppositions, and the practices derived from these ideas, along with the alternatives, mostly oppositional, and the practices that have developed in time. The Report refers to nearly 125 books and articles, about 100 of which were published in the 1990s, and thus it gives an up-to-date idea of the development discourse.

Nora Quebral(1975), defines development communication as follows: Development communication is the art and science of human applied to the speedy transformation of a country and the mass of its people from poverty to a dynamic state of economic growth that makes possible greater social equality and the larger fulfillment of the human potential.

During the past fifty years, the words "communication," "development," and "development communication" have been used to mean several things-at times at odds among themselves. For some people, development is simply a matter of imitating the achievements of the so-called developed countries; whereas for others, development is unfolding of harmony among people living in justice, in conversation and in respect of their physical environment;

Communication has different meanings for different people. For some, communication is mainly a transfer of messages, while for other it is mainly a matter of achieving close association through conversation;

Development communication is mainly a transfer of information or knowledge leading to desired changes in behavior; in that view communication is merely instrumental, whereas for others, development communication is itself a part of development process.

Based on these premises, the dominant paradigm is characterized by a mechanistic, behaviorist, scientific approach placing emphasis on a predictable and controllable cause-effect relation. That trunk of the family tree has branched out into two main practices, social marketing and entertainment education. The oppositional paradigm, or second trunk of the tree, criticized the dominant approach on grounds that, among other things, it creates dependency on the "recipients" or "target" groups, and, in turn, the oppositional paradigm adopted different methods or techniques: participatory approaches, media advocacy and social mobilization.

In the concluding part of his Report, Waisboard asks pertinently: "Can the two broad approaches that dominated the field of development communication, namely, diffusion and participatory models converge around certain principles and strategies? There can be observed some rapprochement between different groups. But Waisbord has perhaps not discussed the fact that the dominating paradigms, namely diffusion of modernization through change in behavior, represent what Paul Lazarsfeld had already called the "administrative" point of view. (Gitlin, 1995) On the other hand, the trunk of the development communication tree is oppositional not just on theoretical ground but in this that it mostly opposes the administrative point of view. There little chance of a convergence of two models and such convergence may not be desirable. Perhaps one might conclude, provisionally, that each situation calls for a particular approach, the ultimate aim remaining the fulfilling of each person's human vocation in a social environment supportive of such a fulfillment.

The Failures of Development Communication

This is a fact that the Development Communication could not achieve its objectives. The decades of "development communication" have not been satisfactory. That is not to deny that they led to some positive results. Still there is one question about the intentions of the promoters of development and of its attendant communication. But we must courageously face the fact: more and more fellow men, women, youth and children are suffering from essential needs. And there is no reason to believe that their needs will be met in the foreseeable future.

For example, since slavery is illegal in the whole world, there is a belief that there are no slaves today. Yet, according to Naomi Klein, "twenty-seven million people worldwide are now

living and working in brackets, these brackets, instead of being slowly removed, just keep getting wider." These brackets are the "free trade zones" or "export processing zones." (Klein, 2000). The magazine Scientific American recently published a study, "The Social Psychology of Modern Slavery," which discusses several contemporary forms of slavery in several countries, including Pakistan (Bales, 2002). We can disagree with this argument but this is a fact that child labor exists in our country. Many labors and forced workers are underpaid by the employers. It might be considered as some form of the slavery. Media can play its role in eradication of these problems.

It is also clear that in spite of attempts at adopting a dialogical approach and at enlisting the participation of the poor in development activities, development, as an international project, has been defined, initiated and implemented by the so-called developed countries. The countries deemed "underdeveloped" have been the "targets" of development campaigns. They were at the receiving end.

The notion of development has evolved radically in the second half of the 20th century. But it has remained foreign to those deemed in need of development. The promoters of development soon felt that there was a communication problem. They felt that the "message" was not reaching out to the people they consider in need of "development". There was, indeed, a communication problem. But it was not one message. It was one language: developed and underdeveloped did not speak the same language, did not talk about the same "reality," and did not express themselves "freely."

Development was defined in terms of the standards achieved by the developed nations. The indicators of development were defined in terms of the developed. A striking example of this is the set of indicators propounded by media scholars, in fact by the UNESCO, regarding the media requirements of a country. Because developed countries had a certain number of newspapers, telephones, radio and television sets for a definite number of inhabitants, it was assumed that a country that did not have, for example, 10 newspaper copies per 100 inhabitants was underdeveloped and needed to develop with regard to the media. Figures were quoted also for radios, telephone, and television sets. We know from World Bank and UNDP figures that over a billion people live on less than one dollar a day, and around 2.7 billion people try to survive on less than two dollars per day; each year six million children die of malnutrition before their fifth birthday; more than 40 per cent of the world's population do not have basic sanitation, and in excess of one billion people have no choice but to use unsafe sources of drinking water.

Now, in 2012, when one decade of the new millennium has been passed, there is a considerable development in the communication system of the developing countries. It can be seen a rapid growth in the communication channels in Pakistan. There are more than 80 television channels and dozens of newspapers of international standard. Correspondents of the world media are also present in the country. The issues of memo gate scandal and NRO are very much being covered by the national and international media. It can be hoped that in the coming years Pakistan media will be able to play a vital role in the development of the society.

Development communication as a special area within the field of mass communication focuses on the use of mass communication tools for socio-economic development in developing countries. In order to understand the role of development communication in the development process, there is the need for a systematic understanding of development and communication as two processes that are inseparable by their nature when defined in relationship to their environment and others within the environment. (Steeves., 1993).

Good news spreads. That is, what is relevant, useful, important to people, spreads, irrespective of the communication technology. On the other hand, don't we know even with the best communications media, what is relevant to us does not always reach us?

"There is no vaccine against resistance or refusals that are rooted in social-cultural, religious and political contexts. No supply chain can overcome issues of gender-based decision-making in households. Medical approaches alone can not address certain community concerns...These challenges demand effective communication action..."

Development programs focus attention on the socio-economic development of the recipient community. Development communication serves as a common platform between funding agencies or implementers of development programs and program recipients, by creating an avenue for dialogue and the exchange of ideas.

While we, in Pakistan, had our own way of thinking our reality, we became adept at thinking it the way development agencies did. It is not a matter of asserting that one way thinking is superior to another. It is a matter of acknowledging that there are different ways of thinking. Some ways may be more appropriate. In any case, thinking in one's own way is a form of freedom we lost to an extent during the development communication decades. We were not even aware of the loss. And the communication problem we alluded to earlier is a problem of communication between ways of thinking, ways of seeing, ways of hearing and ways of feeling. It is a problem of intercultural dialogue. That problem is to be solved not by "winning over" the weaker parties involved or by obliterating their ways. The solution lies in the acceptance of others' cultures. Pakistan is a country having different types of cultures and identities in its different geographical parts. People lining in Punjab have different way of life than tribal areas of the country. Baloch people have their own identity. In such situations, inter-culture harmony is the only solution for development of the society. This harmony can be extended beyond the boundaries of the country

Scholars like Shannon and Weaver have proposed their diagram of the communication process, there have been several variations on the model. We could have more. But the basic assumption that communication is the transfer of a message will always lead to similar conclusions, to a similar understanding of the "process." What is required is a new way of thinking about communication and, of course, about development. Such a new way may have been exemplified by the semioticians who consider communication not just as a transfer of messages, but as a dialogue on meaning among the people involved. In that approach, the Shannon- Weaver diagram is of little interest, and variations on the diagram are of a lesser interest still. In a word-a word once uttered by Sergei M. Eisenstein-you can change, improve, develop a bullock cart without end; you will never arrive at a locomotive. For, a locomotive depends on a new form of energy, namely, steam. What we need with regard to the welfare of humankind is a new idea, an idea that will generate a new form of action.

The Unfolding Of Harmony

Since development is a project of the developed, development agents engage in a dialogue with the underdeveloped and utter the developmentalist discourse. In doing so, they articulate some or most of the axioms just mentioned. There is no room or reason for development agents to listen to the underdeveloped. The latter are supposed to have a culture of underdevelopment and, hence, have nothing positive to contribute.

One question is asked several times: is underdevelopment the same as poverty? What is difference between these two terms? When poverty becomes a lack of what is necessary for one's development as a human person, then it is a case of underdevelopment. Persistent poverty of that type generates an adjustment to that lack. It determines certain behaviors of survival rather than uplift. It prevents the individual from perceiving his/her own individual potential as well as that of his/her society. It is not so much an acceptation of the present situation as it is incapacity of perceiving oneself in any other predicament. This results in a culture of poverty that prevents development. For instance, bonded laborers who have been helped financially to free themselves, have returned to bonded labor because the newly acquired freedom created a state of anxiety about the future. It is such a culture of poverty that prevents development. No culture or religion would prevent development. It may be that some scholars have not distinguished the culture of poverty from other cultures.

Besides, as Amartya Sen has emphasized, "culture is the essence of development it is the fountain of our creativity and progress Central to culture is freedom to decide what we have reason to value, and what lives we have reason to seek." (Pandya, 1997)

Development agencies receiving funding from various interest groups, act on directives and pressures from these groups in the global market place and assign themselves the power to select and frame social conditions and groups as problematic. A social group's selection is based on the assessment of certain social and demographic indicators such as population, economic standards, and literacy rates: some of the factors used to determine socio-economic problems (Wilkins, & Moody, 2001). The problem with this selection process is the lack of input from recipients of the program. The result is the lack of "insider" contribution on social, cultural, and political information that might not be openly available to outside observers like development agencies.

Nothing is more abhorrent to development agents than mythology. For, they rightly hold that mythology is not rational thinking and development agents admit of only one sort of thinking, namely, the rational. That, in turn, is a myth. Panikkar defines myth as "that in which we believe without believing that we believe in it." Or, again "We believe in it to such a point that we do not believe that we believe in it."[1] Perhaps, more simply, a myth is a belief or opinion that is unquestioned and that is not perceived as a belief or an opinion. In Panikkar's vocabulary, it is a "presupposition."

Modern man has a number of myths, like those of science, rational thought, democracy and development. There is no possibility of dialogue between developed and underdeveloped so long as each party involved does not acknowledge that his or her thought rests on a number of myths. The main positive achievement of dialogue is to help each one unveil one's own myths. Not that the unveiling will be the end of myth. On the contrary, once unveiled a particular myth will give place to a next one. For, believes Panikkar, a human cannot think without myth.

The problem with the people of the modern society is that they do not acknowledge that their "scientific" and "rational" rest on myths. Yet, they more or less consciously want to impose their myths onto other people, and they fail to appreciate the myths of these other people.

Take, for instance, the myth of democracy. Among Greeks, who apparently first experienced democracy, that system was open to a small population. It was government by the people, but not everybody was part of the people. Apart from that fact, democracy is a political system that may be questioned. The Mohawks, in particular, were horrified at the fact that the Canadian Government would have liked them to allow 51 out of 100 persons to decide for the other 49 persons. That, for them, was absolutely unusual. People living in harmony, they thought, arrive at important decision by consensus. If the establishment of democracy is development, then, they did not want development.

Another study is also important in this regard. This is Lerner's foundational study, modernizing the Middle East: The Passing of Traditional Society, published in 1958, which established the idea of using mass communication to aid in the process of moving individuals and societies from traditional to modern. The dominant paradigm of development communication, rooted in Lerner's model of communication

and modernization (defined as individuals changing their behaviors and "lifeways" to emulate the ways of the white west that were shown in western media), did not become dominant because it was somehow naturally superior and obviously correct. It became dominant through the powerful policing of intellectual territory staked out by American functionalists and behavioralists interested in foreign policy initiatives esigned to establish geopolitical bulkheads against the Soviets during the Cold War (Gilman, 2003).

In any case, modernization did become the dominant paradigm underlying research into and the practice of development communication, defined broadly as communication-based interventions for social and economic improvement (Singhal and Rogers, 2001).

Kim (2005) suggested that modernization had resulted in economic growth in many cases researchers had been too quick to reject development communication researchers. She did not take into account, however, that the benefits of growth had been unevenly distributed. The analysis reported here suggests not only that modernization has not been rejected completely, but also that development communication may result in uneven gains in which only certain classes and groups benefit (Kim, 2005).

From the late 1950s through much of the 1960s, modernization-based development projects were planned for and implemented in the postcolonial world primarily by Western institutions and scholars (Melkote, 2002).

Intellectuals in the postcolonial world were increasingly critical of the modernization approach. Dependency theorists from Latin America led the attack on modernization theory (e.g., Frank, 1969), their arguments reflecting the general critique of global capitalism and colonialism offered earlier by C.L.R. James, Eric Williams, and Amilcar Cabral, among others (Blaut, 1993). Soon, Latin American scholars such as Beltrán (1976) and Díaz Bordenave (1976), challenged the modernization-based approach to development communication as well. By the mid 1970s, Rogers (1976), who had trained many of those critics, edited a special issue of Communication Research titled "Passing of the Dominant Paradigm." In the place of modernization theory a number of alternatives had entered the arena. Though many concepts from the tradition of US communication science retained their influence over the field (e.g., agenda setting, knowledge gap, and even the hypodermic-needle model of media effects), development communication practices also were informed by newer approaches such as participatory communication, dialogic theory, and theories of cultural integration. Technological innovations have rekindled confidence in the Lernerian version of communication and development. This renewed hope in Lerner's model is an old story: Each new technological innovation in the postcolonial world since 1958 – television, satellites, microwave, computers, call centers, wireless telephony – has been accompanied by determined hope that Lerner's modernization model will work increase

growth and productivity and produce modern cosmopolitan citizens. Fair and Shah (1997) noted that technological advances had forced development communication researchers to accommodate new media into development communication theory and practice. They also noted more critical theoretical approaches were used, acknowledging that development communication was a more complex affair than assumed by hypodermic needle models of media effects, which had been prominent in an earlier era. Finally, they noted that conceptualizing development communication based on alternative theoretical approaches was running ahead of actual implementation of the new ideas (Fair, and Shah, 1997).

For example, the worldwide incidence of AIDS and other health concerns has reached crisis proportion. Further technological innovation has expanded the range and scope of communication networks through the World Wide Web. Access to new technologies has improved to such an extent that, though serious gaps remain, unprecedented numbers of people now have access to telephony, computers and satellite communication.

Different people of the different societies have different way of thinking. People in the slums of Mexico, for example, did not wish to "elect" leader." They believed that their elected leaders will become corrupt. So they denied democracy. But they adopted another way accordingly. They did recognized natural leaders from their society and they were happy to follow them so long as they behaved themselves. And they gave nobody the power to represent them in negotiations with the municipality of Mexico. This model is a different shape of development. However, different societies need different types of communication models as per their socio-economic structure.

Dialogical Dialogue

Dialogue is always potentially dialectical and dialogical. Both are complementary.

Dialectical is rational, it is the part of reason: the eyes of intelligence to see with. Dialogical is the mythic, the non-rational: the ears of the heart to listen with. The dialogical is between two persons; the dialectical is between two minds.

A problem arises when only dialectical dialogue is allowed, trusted. And that problem is only too common. "The dialectical dialogue is not the only, nor even the most important form of dialogue. Discovering the capital importance of dialogical dialogue represents an important mutation in our times…It befits the "kairos"(jug) of our times to have liberated dialogue from the tutelage of dialectics."[2]

"Dialogical dialogue prevents all power relations: further intentions, like to convert, to dominate or even to know the other for ulterior motives."[3]

However, it is clear from what has been noted above about the dominant paradigms, that dialogical dialogue is not easy. Cees Hamelink concurs with that view:

"It should the foremost priority on the development agenda to develop the capacity for the world's people to converse with each other across boundaries of ethnic background, culture, religion and language.

This sounds obvious and facile. In reality however the dialogue is an extremely difficult form of speech. In many societies people have neither time nor patience for dialogical communication. The dialogue requires the capacity to listen, to be silent, to suspend judgment, to critically investigate one's own assumptions, to ask reflexive questions and to be open to change. The dialogue has no short-term and certain outcome. This conflicts with the spirit of modern achievement- oriented societies."

A complementary reflection on the role of development agent as mediator rather than intermediary can prepare the development agent for dialogical dialogue.

"We believe that just as modern culture tends to replace myth by 'logos'(reason), the symbol by the sign, words by terms, reality by its representatives/representations/meanings-and thus to reduce the former to latter- so it tends also to confuse the mediator with the intermediary and to reduce the former to the latter. Language itself has ceased to be a mediator and has become a mere intermediary, a mere vehicle. That is why we communicate a lot, but oftentimes without communing, i.e., without reaching our respective concrete and deep cultural realities, without reaching the reality of life which transcends us all." [4]

Naturally, if one holds that communication simply is the transfer of a message, then, it is enough for one to be an intermediary, a vehicle for that message. But from that position, one cannot enter into a dialogical dialogue.

"Intercultural mediation should therefore not be reduced to a technique, a science, an ideology, a model, a theory or system. Nor can it be reduced to negotiation and rational organization. It is wisdom and an art." [5]

Participatory model of development communication
In the participatory model of development communication, the transmission of information is not a vertical process of information flow from the knowledgeable to the less knowledgeable; instead, it is a horizontal process of information exchange and interaction Power in Development Communication (Morris, 2003). This model states that the purpose of development is to empower people so they have greater control and power over decisions that affect them. Thus, empowerment is achieved through information exchange and interaction between development agencies and recipients of development programs.

Development communication is not a neutral engagement between developing agencies and the beneficiaries of development programs. Instead, it is a political engagement in the form of social interventions through the negotiation, articulation and ordering of social problems to legitimize and strategize solutions towards the elimination of 'socio-economic and cultural' problems that a community faces (Wilkins, 1999).

Everette Rogers, defined development as a widely participatory process of social change and material advancement (including greater equality, freedom and other valued qualities) for the majority of the people through their gaining greater control over their environment' (Rogers 1975b : 345—358). Inayatullah (1967), on the other hand, identifies the different aspects of development. He defines development as 'change toward patterns of society that allow better realization of human values, that allow a society greater power over its environment and over its own political destiny, and that enables its individuals to gain increased control over themselves.

Development is a versatile concept. It generally means different things to different people, ranging from the self-reliance, acquisition of new knowledge and skills, control over oneself and one's environment, greater equality, freedom, ability to understand one's potentials and limitations, and to improve on existing conditions.

Communication is exchange of ideas. It is not the mechanical transfer of facts and figures as the mathematical model of communication (Shannon and Weaver 1949) would appear to indicate. It is also not talking at people. It is an interactive process that works in a circular, dynamic and on-going way (Hiebert etal. 1985). It is talking with people, a process with no permanent sender and no permanent receiver. In communication, the roles of sending and receiving change hands, depending on who is talking and who is listening. This implies freedom, equality and shared interest.

Development, Communication and the relation between them is profoundly complex and holistic phenomena. We must concede that there can be no development of any description that ignores the material needs and wants of society. What is a 'need' for some group may be a 'want' for another. They vary across societies and over time.

Development would mean different things to different people in different countries depending upon the national priorities: one child family in China, decreased pesticide use in Philippines, creating Computer culture in Singapore and in Pakistan government is giving top priority to the uplift of under-developed regions, particularly Balochistan.

Development and Communication in Asian societies
Development and communication have guided Asian societies under the following approaches. The first approach appropriate to the Asian context put emphasis on rapid economic growth by means of industrialization. Heavy

emphasis was laid on capital-intensive technologies and centralized planning. The guiding thought seems to have been that productivity is the key to development and that the most productive sector of modern society is the industrial sector.

Mass media such as newspapers, radio, and television were deployed for the purpose of creating a more favorable climate for rapid modernization and industrialization. This was evident in countries like Japan, Korea, Hong Kong, and Singapore. This approach of development and communication was very powerful in the 1950s and 1960s.

The second approach of development and communication emphasized both capital-intensive and labor-intensive technologies, centralized and decentralized planning, and exogenous and endogenous factors of development. This was particularly advocated in India, Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Bangladesh. The advocates of this approach raised a number of important issues related to development and communication: self-reliance, self-development, and popular participation combination of the old and new media of communication and culture as an ally and facilitator of development. This change of emphasis regarding the meaning of development was escorted by a parallel shift of emphasis in the meaning of communication. The old mechanistic, linear, one-way model of communication was replaced by a process-oriented two-way approach to communication (Participatory Communication). The emphasis was on the facilitation of information exchange related to development through mass media and interpersonal channels.

The third approach to development and Communication focused on centralized planning within nations, emerging in communist countries like China, North Korea, and Vietnam. This approach has to be understood against the backdrop of socialist ambitions and agendas, which placed emphasis on centralized planning and command economies. Capitalist individualism and private entrepreneurship were shunned and collective activities encouraged. In this approach, media of communication played a propaganda role in mobilizing the people behind this set of goals. As is now evident, after the fall of the Soviet empire and the increasing globalization of the world, this approach has lost much of its gloss.

The fourth approach to development and communication was encouraged by communication scholars in countries such as Japan, Korea, and Taiwan, who were in some ways embittered with the development in their respective countries. Their approach focused on the interdependence of the developed and developing countries, and how developed countries are responsible for the underdevelopment in the poorer countries. The advocates of this approach demonstrated the ineffectiveness of discussing communication and development in a national setting, when the global experience influences the possibilities and constraints for social change in nations and communities.

The fifth and the last approach to development and communication was spotlight and gave attention to self-reliance. In this approach the focus was on grassroots development, integrated village development, use of appropriate technology, productive use of local resources, maintenance of the ecological balance, and culture as a mediating force for development. Non Government Organizations (NGOs) across Asia played a critical role in the propagation of this approach. In countries such as Pakistan, India, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Philippines, Bangladesh, and Nepal, it was easy to see the way that this approach was being popularized. In recent times the emergence of the concept of sustainable development has strengthened this approach.

Conclusion

Development communication has a pivotal role in strengthening societies in the modern world. But not as it was defined so far in what we have called "the development communication discourse." In that discourse, the development agents have defined unilaterally both development and communication. What is advocated in this article is another form of communication for another form of development, i.e. another development communication; one that fosters the unfolding of harmony among people. Development communication is a more complex process that Lerner's model and hypodermic-needle media effects models imply. The recognition of complexity is reflected in, for example, the popularity of conceptualizing media effects in the contexts of participatory communication and edutainment approaches. Both take into account the multiple layers of social and cultural life that even small communities embody. These approaches also consider the complications involved in how people make and take meanings from media messages and employ interdisciplinary message theories to analyze effectiveness of development communication programs. On the other hand, however, conceptualization and theorizing about development communication continues to run ahead of operationally measures. The most popular measures to determine impact of development communication is knowledge gain, frequency of media use, and behavior change – all of them individual level measures.

References

Blaut, J. (1993). Colonizer's History of the World. New York: Guilford Press.

Bales, K. (2002). The social psychology of modern slavery. *Scientific American*, 286.

Fiske,J., et al.(1994). Key concepts in communication and cultural studies. {2[nd]. ed.}. London: Rountledge

Fair, J.E. & Shah, H. (1997). Continuities and discontinuities in communication and development research since

1958. *Journal of International Communication* 4(2), 3-23.

Gustavo, E. (1992), 'Development' in Wolfgang Sachs (ed) The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power, London: Zed Books.

Gustavo, E. & Prakash, M. S. (1998*). Hope at the Margins: Beyond Human Rights and Development*. London: Zed Books

Gardner, k. & Lewis, D. (1996) Anthropology, Development and the Post-Modern Challenge, London: Pluto Press.

Gitlin, T. (1995). Media sociology: the dominant paradigm. In Boyd-Barrett, O. and Newbold, C. (eds) Approaches *to Media*: A Reader. London: Arnold.

Gilman, N. (2003). *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Goonasekera, A., & Kuo, E. C. Y. (2000). Towards an Asian theory of communication? [Special issue]. *Asian Journal of Communication*, (10) (2), 1–123.

Human Rights (1996). Human Rights Commission; Vienna

Hiebert, et al. (1985). Mass Media IV: An Introduction to Modern Communication, Longman, New York, pp. 23.

Inayatullah (1967). Introduction to Development Communication, East-West Communication Institute, East-West Center, Honolulu.

Klein,N.(2000).No space no choice no jobs no logo. London: Flamingo.

Kim, Y.Y. (2005). Inquiry in intercultural and development communication. Journal of communication 55(3), 554-577.

Melkote, S. (2002). Theories of development communication. In W. Gudykunst and B.

Mody (Eds.), *Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Morris, N., (2003). A comparative analysis of the diffusion and participatory models in development communication. *Communication Theory, 13*(2), 225-248.

Pandya, M. (1997). Western democracy is of very recent origin. Little India, 7(2).

Quebral, N.(1975). Development Communication, In Jamais, J., Laguna; UPLB College of Development Communication.

Rogers, E. M. (1975b). The Anthropology of Modernization and the Modernization of Anthropology', *Reviews in Anthropology* 2:345—358.

Singhal, A. & Rogers, E. (2001). *India's Communication Revolution:* From Bullock Carts to Cyber Marts. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Steeves, H. L. (1993). Creating imagined communities: Development communication and the challenge of Feminism. *Journal of Communication, 43*(3), 218-229.

Schirato T & Webb J (2002) 'what's in a Name: *Globalisation and its Discourse*s' Inter/Sections (UK) Vol. 2 No 3/4 Summer pp 3-10

Wilkins, K. G., (1999). Development discourse on gender and communication in strategies for social change. Journal of Communication, 49(4), 46-68.

Wilkins, K. G., & Moody, B., (2001). Reshaping development communication: Developing communication and communication development. Communication Theory, 11(4), 385-396.

Waisbord, S. (2001). Family Tree of Theories, Methodologies and Strategies in development Communication: Convergences and Differences. Place on http://www.comminit.com/stra tegicthinking/stsilvioc omm/sld-1775.html

Endnotes

_____

[11] INTER Culture,127,p.38.
[2] INTER Culture,129,p.2.
[3] INTER Culture,129,p.3.
[4] Vachon, 129,p.29
[5] Vachon, 129,pp..31-32