7.

Development Communication Approaches in an International Perspective

Jan Servaes & Patchanee Malikhao
Research Center 'Communication for Social Change' (CSC), K.U. Brussel

In this chapter, we present the general concepts which are normally referred to in discussions on development communication. We will address the topic from a historical perspective.

Firstly, in theory, one observes a shift from modernization and dependency theories to more normative and holistic approaches. We have attempted to group these new insights as 'One World, Multiple Cultures' or 'Multiplicity'.

Secondly, also at the policy and planning level one can distinguish between different approaches which could be identified as the 'diffusion model' versus the 'participatory model'.

Thirdly, we will assess the changes which took place throughout the years.

Changing Theories of Development

Modernization

Historical Context
After the Second World War, the founding of the United Nations stimulated relations among sovereign states, especially the North

Atlantic Nations and the developing nations, including the new states emerging out of a colonial past. During the cold war period the superpowers—the United States and the former Soviet Union—tried to expand their own interests to the developing countries. In fact, the USA was defining development as the replica of its own political-economic system and opening the way for the transnational corporations. At the same time, the developing countries saw the 'welfare state' of the North Atlantic Nations as the ultimate goal of development. These nations were attracted by the new technology transfer and the model of a centralised state with careful economic planning and centrally directed development bureaucracies for agriculture, education and health as the most effective strategies to catch up with those industrialised countries.

Modernization and Development

The modernization paradigm, dominant in academic circles from around 1945 to 1965, supported the transferring of technology and the socio-political culture of the developed societies to the 'traditional' societies. Development was defined as economic *growth*. The central idea in the modernization perspective is the idea of evolution, which implies that development is conceived as firstly, directional and cumulative, secondly, predetermined and irreversible, thirdly, progressive, and fourthly, immanent with reference to the nation state. The developed western societies or modern societies seem to be the ultimate goals which the less developed societies strive to reach.

All societies would, passing through similar *stages,* evolve to a common point: the modern society. In order to be a modern society, the attitudes of 'backward' people—their traditionalism, bad taste, superstition, fatalism, etc.—which are obstacles and barriers in the traditional societies have to be removed. The

differences among nations are explained in terms of the degree of development rather than the fundamental nature of each. Hence, the central problem of development was thought to revolve around the question of 'bridging the gap' and 'catching up' by means of imitation processes between *traditional and modern sectors,* between retarded and advanced or between 'barbarian' and civilized sectors and groups to the advantage of the latter. These two sectors, the traditional and the modern, were conceived of as two stages of development, co-existing in time, and in due course the differences between them were to disappear because of a natural urge towards equilibrium. The problem was to remove the obstacles or barriers, which were only to be found in the traditional society. These 'barriers' can be 'removed' through at least five mechanisms: through 'demonstration', whereby the developing world tries to 'catch up' with the more developed by adopting more advanced methods and techniques; through 'fusion', which is the combination and integration of distinct modern methods; through 'compression', whereby the developing countries attempt to accomplish the task of development in less time than it took the developed world; through 'prevention', that is, by learning from the 'errors' made by the developed countries; and through the 'adaptation' of modern practices to the local environment and culture. Consequently, the *means of modernization* were the massive transfer of capital, ideology, technology, and know-how, a world-wide Marshall Plan, a green revolution. The measures of progress were G.N.P., literacy, industrial base, urbanization, and the like, all *quantifiable criteria*. Everett Rogers (1976:124) writes that although: "India, China, Persia, and Egypt were old, old centres of civilization ... their rich cultures had in fact provided the basis for contemporary Western Cultures ... their family life

displayed a warmer intimacy and their artistic triumphs were greater, that was not development. It could not be measured in dollars and cents".

Another characteristic of modernization thought is the emphasis on *mono-disciplinary explanatory factors*. The oldest is the *economic* variant, associated with Walt Rostow (1953). As each discipline within the social sciences approaches the modernization process from its own expert point of view, the scholarship on modernization has become increasingly specialized. Therefore, the orthodox modernization theories fall into one or a combination of the following four categories: *stage theories, index theories* (of mainly economic variables), *differentiation theories* (largely advanced by sociologists and political scientists), and *diffusion theories* (advanced primarily by social psychologists, suggesting that the development process starts with the diffusion of certain ideas, motivations, attitudes or behaviors). Nonetheless, the economic root has always remained the essence of the modernization theory.

In practice modernization accelerated the westernized elite structure or urbanization. With the help of foreign aid the rural backward areas needed to be developed in the area of agriculture, basic education, health, rural transportation, community development, etcetera. Therefore, the government service bureaucracies have been extended to the major urban centres. The broadcasting system was used mainly for entertainment and news. Radio was a channel for national campaigns to persuade the people in very specific health and agricultural practices. According to Robert White (1988:9): "The most significant communication dimension of the modernization design in the developing world has been the rapid improvement of the transportation, which linked

rural communities into market towns and regional cities. With improved transportation and sources of electric power, the opening of commercial consumer supply networks stretched out into towns and villages carrying with it the Western consumer culture and pop culture of films, radio and pop music. Although rural people in Bolivia or Sri Lanka may not have attained the consumption styles of American middle-class populations, their life did change profoundly. This was the real face of modernization".

Critique

Under the influence of the actual development in most Third World countries, which did not turn out to be so justified as the modernization theory predicted, the first *criticisms* began to be heard in the 1960s, particularly in *Latin America*. In a famous essay, the Mexican sociologist, Rodolfo Stavenhagen (1966) argued that the division into a traditional, agrarian sector and a modern, urban sector was the result of the same development process. In other words, growth and modernization had brought with them greater inequality and underdevelopment. Stavenhagen tested his theses against the situation in Mexico, while others came to similar conclusions for Brazil, and Chile.

The best known critic of the modernization theory is Gunder Frank (1969). His criticism is fundamental and three-fold: the progress paradigm is *empirically untenable*, has an *inadequate theoretical* foundation, and is, in practice, *incapable of generating a development* process in the Third World. Moreover, critics of the modernization paradigm charge that the complexity of the processes of change are too often ignored, that little attention is paid to the consequences of economic, political, and cultural macro-processes on the local level, and that the resistance against change and modernization cannot be explained only on the basis of

traditional value orientations and norms, as many seem to imply. The critique did not only concern modernization theory as such, but the whole (Western) tradition of evolutionism and functionalism of which it forms part.

Therefore, referring to the offered unilinear and evolutive perspectives, and the endogenous character of the suggested development solutions, these critics argue that the modernization concept is a veiled synonym for *'westernization,'* namely the copying or implantation of western mechanisms and institutions in a Third World context. Nowhere is this as clear as in the field of political science. Many western scholars start from the assumption that the US or West-European political systems are the touchstones for the rest of the world. The rationale for President J.F. Kennedy's Peace Corps Act, for instance, was totally ingrained in this belief.

Dependency

Historical Context
The dependency paradigm played an important role in the movement for a New World Information and Communication Order from the late 1960s to the early 1980s. At that time, the new states in Africa, Asia and the success of socialist and popular movements in Cuba, China, Chile and other countries provided the goals for political, economic and cultural self-determination within the international community of nations. These new nations shared the ideas of being independent from the superpowers and moved to form the Non-Aligned Nations. The Non-Aligned Movement defined development as *political struggle.*

Dependency and Development

At a theoretical level, the dependency approach emerged from the convergence of two intellectual traditions: one often called neo-Marxism or structuralism, and the other rooted in the extensive Latin American debate on development that ultimately formed the ECLA tradition (the United Nations' Economic Commission for Latin America). Therefore, in contrast to the modernization theory, the dependency perspective was given birth in Latin America. The so-called 'father' of the dependency theory, however, is considered to be the American, Paul Baran (1957), who is spokesperson for the North American Monthly Review group. He was one of the first to articulate the thesis that development and underdevelopment are *interrelated processes*, that is, they are two sides of the same coin. In Baran's view, continued imperialist dependence after the end of the colonial period is ensured first and foremost by the reproduction of socioeconomic and political structures at the Periphery in accordance with the interests of the Centre powers. This is the main cause of the chronic backwardness of the developing countries, since the main interest of Western monopoly capitalism was to prevent, or, if that was impossible, to slow down and to control the economic development of underdeveloped countries. As Baran uncompromisingly puts it, the irrationality of the present system will not be overcome so long as its basis, the capitalist system, continues to exist.

Some dependistas worked exclusively with economic variables, while others also took social and political factors into consideration in their research. Typically the scientific divisions of economics, political science, sociology, history and the like, which were being used in the West, were less rigidly distinguished in the Latin American division of scientific labour. Some stressed the sectoral

and regional oppositions within the dependency system (e.g., Sunkel); others (e.g., Cardoso) were more concerned with possible class oppositions. Opinions also differed about one of the central elements in dependency theory, that is, the specific relationship between development and underdevelopment. While Frank observes what he termed 'a development towards underdevelopment', Cardoso argued that a certain degree of (dependent) capitalist development is possible.

However, as varied their approaches may be, all dependistas will agree to the basic idea exemplified in the following definition by Dos Santos (1970:231): "*Dependence* is a conditioning situation in which the economies of one group of countries are conditioned by the development and expansion of others. A relationship of interdependence between two or more economies or between such economies and the world trading system becomes a dependent relationship when some countries can expand through self-impulsion while others, being in a dependent position, can only expand as a reflection of the expansion of the dominant countries, which may have positive or negative effects on their immediate development. In either case, the basic situation of dependence causes these countries to be both backward and exploited. Dominant countries are endowed with technological, commercial, capital and socio-political predominance over dependent countries—the form of this predominance varying according to the particular historical moment—and can therefore exploit them, and extract part of the locally produced surplus. Dependence, then, is based upon an international division of labour which allows industrial development to take place in some countries while restricting it in others, whose growth is conditioned by and subjected to the power centres of the world."

Critique

Hence, according to the dependency theory, the most important hindrances to development are not the shortage of capital or management, as the modernization theorists contend, but must be sought in the present international system. The obstacles are thus not internal but external. This also means that development in the Centre determines and maintains the underdevelopment in the Periphery. The two poles are structurally connected to each other. To remove these external obstacles, they argue, each peripheral country should dissociate itself from the world market and opt for a self-reliant development strategy. To make this happen, most scholars advocated that a more or less revolutionary political transformation will be necessary. Therefore, one may say that the dependency paradigm in general as well as in its subsector of communication is characterized by a global approach, an emphasis on external factors and regional contradictions, a polarization between development and underdevelopment, a subjectivist or voluntaristic interpretation of history, and a primarily economically oriented analytical method.

As a result, the only alternative for non-aligned nations was to *disassociate* themselves from the world market and achieve self-reliance, both economically and culturally. The *New International Economic Order* is one example of attempts toward this end. However, many non-aligned countries were simply too weak economically, and too indebted, to operate autonomously. As a result, attempts to legislate integral, coherent national communication policies failed because of the resistance of national and transnational media interests. As Friberg and Hettne (1985:212) point out, "Self-reliance is a difficult option in the context of the present world order." Because of this, McAnany

(1983:4) characterized dependency theory as "... good on diagnosis of the problem ... but poor on prescription of the cure." Dependency addressed the causes of underdevelopment, but did not provide ways of addressing that underdevelopment.

Multiplicity/Another Development

Historical Context

Since the demarcation of the First, Second and Third Worlds is breaking down and the cross-over centre-periphery can be found in every region, there is a need for a new concept of development which emphasizes cultural identity and multidimensionality. For example, some countries may be dependent economically but have greater cultural 'power' in the region. Therefore, the previously held dependency perspective has become more difficult to support because of the growing interdependency of nations. The concept of *'another development'* was first articulated in the industrialized nations of northern Europe, particularly by the Dag Hammarskjold Foundation in Sweden and the Green political movement in Germany. This does not mean, however, that the 'another development' concepts and perspective is Western. It can also be traced back in Third World environments.

Multiplicity and Another Development

The Dag Hammarskjold Foundation established three foundations for another development: (1) Another Development is geared to the satisfaction of needs, beginning with the eradication of poverty; (2) Another development is endogenous and self-reliant; and (3) Another development is in harmony with the environment. Another development applies to all levels of all societies, not just the poor of the non-aligned world. It grew from a dissatisfaction in the 'consumer society,' with what is sometimes termed

'overdevelopment' or even 'maldevelopment', as well as the growing disillusionment with the modernization approach.

The central idea, which is pointed out by almost everybody who is searching for new approaches towards development, is that there is *no universal path to development*, that development must be conceived as an *integral, multidimensional, and dialectic process* which can differ from one society to another. This does not mean, however, that one cannot attempt to define the general principles and priorities on which such a strategy can be based. Indeed, several authors have been trying to gather the core components for another development. From the search of these authors, we would cite six criteria as essential for 'another' development.

Such development must be based on the following principles:

(a)   *Basic needs*: being geared to meeting human, material and non-material, needs.

(b)   *Endogenous*: stemming from the heart of each society, which defines in sovereignty its values and the vision of its future.

(c)   *Self-reliance*: implying that each society relies primarily on its own strength and resources in terms of its members' energies and its natural and cultural environment.

(d)   *Ecology*: utilizing rationally resources of the biosphere in full awareness of the potential of local ecosystems, as well as the global and outer limits imposed on present and future generations.

(e)   *Participative democracy* as the true form of democracy: not merely government of the people and for the people, but also, and more fundamentally, 'by the people' at all levels of society.

(f)   *Structural changes* to be required, more often than not, in social relations, in economic activities and in their spatial distribution, as well as in the power structure, so as to realize the conditions of self-managements and participation in decision-making by all those affected by it, from the rural or urban community to the world as a whole.

In practice, adopting some or all of the above principles, new forms of communication have been emerging. Decentralized media systems and democratic communication institutions, such as Mahaweli community radio in Sri Lanka and Radio Enriquillo in the Dominican Republic, emphasize self-management by local communities. New concepts of media professionalism bring a greater knowledge of and respect for forms of people's communication, and emphasize the recognition of and experience with new formats of journalism and broadcasting which are more consonant with the cultural identity of the community, and a greater awareness of the ways democratization of communication is taking place and can take place.

Mixed Approaches

This review of three perspectives on development reveals a number of *shifts in scientific thought*:

1- from a more positivistic, quantitative, and comparative approach to a normative, qualitative and structural approach;

2- from highly prescribed and predictable processes to less predictable and change-oriented processes;

3- from an ethnocentric view to an indigenistic view and then to a contextual and polycentric view;

4- from endogenism ('blame the victim') to exogenism ('blame the outsider') and then to globalism and holism;

5- from an economic interest to more universal and interdisciplinary interests;

6- from a primarily national frame of reference to an international perspective and then to combined levels of analysis;

7- from segmentary to holistic approaches and then to more problem-oriented approaches;

8- from an integrative and reformist strategy to revolutionary options and then to an integral vision of revolutionary and evolutionary change;

9- from technocratic/administrative views on development to more problem-posing and participatory perspectives.

Theoretical Approaches to Development Communication (Devcom)

Communication theories such as the 'diffusion of innovations', the 'two-step-flow', or the 'extension' approaches are quite congruent with the above modernization theory. According to Everett Rogers, one of the leading proponents of the diffusion theory, this perspective implies "that the role of communication was (1) to transfer technological innovations from development agencies to their clients, and (2) to create an appetite for change through raising a 'climate for modernization' among the members of the public" (Rogers, 1986:49).

The elitist, vertical or *top-down orientation of the diffusion model* is obvious. However, the reality often proves much more complex than the theory. Therefore, many authors and development workers point out that decision-making and planning cannot be done by bureaucrats and policymakers for the people but only by these 'experts' together with all concerned institutions and together with the people. In other words, in accordance with discussions on international political and academic forums like UNESCO, FAO or IAMCR, these people refer to newer insights on the role and place of communication for development which favours *two-way and horizontal communication:* "The systematic utilization of appropriate communication and techniques to increase peoples' participation in development and to inform, motivate, and train rural population, mainly at the grass-root level" (FAO, 1987:4). Though it can be argued that this approach still remains 'paternalistic' or a social marketing strategy, it at least

distinguishes between policy and planning-making at micro and macro levels.

Before we elaborate on the related changes in strategies and techniques, we summarize the major theoretical characteristics of both theoretical approaches to Development Communication: the Diffusion/Mechanistic Model and the Participatory/Organic Model.

The Diffusion Model

General

The 1950s was the *decade of the communication model.* Interestingly, one of the earliest and most influential of these came not from the social sciences or humanities, but from information engineering. Shannon and Weaver's linear "source-transmitter-channel-receiver-destination" model eclipsed the earlier, more organic, psychological and sociological approaches. Lasswell, Hofland, Newcomb, Schramm, Westley and Mclean, Berlo, and others each devised a model of communication as they conceived it. This profusion of communication models may be attributed to three reasons.

First, because they identified communication basically as the *transfer* of information (the stimulus), they were amenable to empirical methodology, thus establishing the basis for communication as a distinct and legitimate science.

Secondly, theorists focused on the efficiency, or *effects,* of communication (the response), thereby holding vast promise for manipulation or control of message 'receivers' by vested interests, or the 'sources'.

Finally, the communication models fit neatly into the nature and mechanics of mass or *mediated communication*, an emergent and powerful force at that time.

Therefore, in these years the discipline of communication was largely, and most importantly, its effects. The 'bullet' or 'hypodermic needle' effects of media were to be a quick and efficient answer to a myriad of social ills. Robert White (1982:30) writes "This narrow emphasis on media and media effects has also led to a premise ... that media information is an all-powerful panacea for problems of human and socioeconomic development," not to mention dilemmas of marketing and propaganda. Falling short of exuberant claims, direct effects became limited effects, minimal effects, conditional effects, and the 'two-step flow'.

More Specific Communication Approaches
In these years, more sociological, psychological, political, and cultural factors were considered in the view of modernization. The place and role of the communication processes in the modernization perspective was also further examined, with the American presidential election campaigns functioning as the theoretical framework.

These models saw the communication process as a message going from a sender to a receiver. Out of a study in Erie County, Ohio, of the 1940 US presidential elections came the idea of the so-called *'two step flow of communication'* (Lazarsfeld et al., 1944). Although the researchers expected to find that the mass media (radio and press) had a great influence on the election, they concluded that voting decisions were chiefly influenced by personal contacts and face-to-face persuasion. The first formulation of the two-step-flow hypothesis was the following: "Ideas often flow from

radio and print to opinion leaders and from these to less active sections of the population" (Lazarsfeld, 1944:151). Thus, two elements are involved: (a) the notion of a population divided into 'active' and 'passive' participants, or 'opinion leaders' and 'followers'; and (b) the notion of a two-step-flow of influence rather than a direct contact between 'stimulus' and 'respondent' (or the so-called bullet or hypodermic needle theory). Since that time the concept and role of 'personal influence' has acquired a high status in research on campaigns and diffusions, especially in the US. The general conclusion of this line of thought is that mass communication is less likely than personal influence to have a direct effect on social behavior. Mass communication is important in spreading awareness of new possibilities and practices, but at the stage where decisions are being made about whether to adopt or not to adopt, personal communication was far more likely to be influential.

Therefore, we could characterize this era as *'sender- and media-centric'*. The new models, in conjunction with the obsession with the mass media, led to a conceptualization of communication as something one does to another. White (1984:2) argues this pro-media, pro-effects, and anti-egalitarian bias of communication theory "...has developed largely as an explanation of the power and effects of mass communication and does not provide adequate explanation of the factors of social change leading toward democratization."

Building primarily on sociological research in agrarian societies, Everett Rogers (1962, 1973) stressed the *adoption and diffusion processes of cultural innovation*. Modernization is here conceived as a process of diffusion whereby individuals move from a traditional way of life to a more complex, more technically

developed and more rapidly changing way of life. This approach is therefore concerned with the process of diffusion and adoption of innovations in a more systematic and planned way. He distinguishes between five phases in the diffusion process: awareness, interest, evaluation, trial and adoption. The role of the mass media is concentrated on the first stage of the process, whereas 'personal sources are most important at the evaluation stage in the adoption process' (Rogers, 1962:99). In a second edition of his work (Rogers,1973), there are only four crucial steps left in the process of diffusion and adoption: (a) the knowledge of the innovation itself (information), (b) the communication of the innovation (persuasion), (c) the decision to adopt or reject the innovation (adoption or rejection), and (d) the confirmation of the innovation by the individual.

Three more approaches contributed to the success of this diffusion model: that is, a psycho-sociological, institutional and technological interpretation of communication for modernization.

The *psycho-sociological or behavioristic perspective* on communication and modernization is particularly concerned with the individual value and attitude change. Rokeach (1966) defined *'attitude'* as "a relatively enduring organization of beliefs about an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner". 'Attitude change' would then be "a change in predisposition, the change being either a change in the organization or structure of beliefs, or a change in the content of one or more of the beliefs entering into the attitude organization" (Rokeach, 1966:530). Central in the view of Daniel Lerner (1958), one of the main representatives of this communication for modernization paradigm, is the concept of *'empathy',* that is, "the capacity to see oneself in the other fellow's situation, ... which is

an indispensable skill for people moving out of traditional settings'. The major hypothesis of his study was that 'high empathic is the predominant personal style only in modern society, which is distinctively industrial, urban, literate and participant" (Lerner, 1958:50). Central in his research design was the individual-psychological capacity of people to adjust themselves to modern environments. Empathic persons had a higher degree of mobility, meaning a high capacity for change, being future oriented and rational, more than so-called traditional people. Therefore, according to Lerner, mobility stimulates urbanization, which increases literacy and consequently also economic and political participation. Also the role and function of the mass media is carefully examined in this context: "He (that is, the modern man, JS) places his trust in the mass media rather than in personal media for world news, and prefers national and international news rather than sports, religious or hometown news" (Inkeles, 1972:112). In other words, the media stimulate, in direct and indirect ways, mobility and economic development; they are the 'motivators' and 'movers' for change and modernization.

Wilbur Schramm (1964), building on Lerner, took a closer look on this *connection between mass communication and modernizing practices and institutions*. The modern communication media supplement and complement as 'mobility multipliers' the oral channels of a traditional society. Their development runs parallel to the development of other institutions of modern society, such as schools and industry, and is closely related to some of the indices of general social and economic growth, such as literacy, per capita income, and urbanization. So he claimed that "a developing country should give special attention to combining mass media with interpersonal communication" (Schramm, 1964:263). In

Schramm's opinion, mass media perform at least three functions: they are the 'watchdogs', 'policymakers', and 'teachers' for change and modernization.

A third, *technologically deterministic approach*, sees technology to be a value-free and politically neutral asset that can be used in every social and historical context. Within this perspective at least four different points of view can be distinguished. A first rather optimistic view shares the conviction that the development and application of technology can resolve all the varied problems of mankind. The second view comes the previous one to the opposite extreme, namely the conception that technology is the source of all what goes wrong in societies. A third variant expresses the view of technology as the prepotent factor in development, it sees technology as the driving force to development. The fourth variant has become popular by Marshall McLuhan (1964). It views technology as an inexorable force in development, an irresistible as well as an overwhelming force. As McLuhan (1964:VIII) puts it: "Any technology gradually creates a totally new human environment," or, in other words: the medium is the message.

The 'Framework of Reference' of Modernization and Dependency
While supporters of the communication for modernization theory take the *nation state* as their main framework of reference, dependistas believe in a predominantly *international level of analysis*. They argue that the domination of the Periphery by the Centre occurs through a combination of power components, that is, military, economics, politics, culture, and so on. The specific components of the domination of any nation at a given point of time vary from those of another as a result of the variations in numerous factors, including the resources of the Centre powers, the nature or structure of the Periphery nation, and the degree of

resistance to domination. Nowadays the cultural and communication components have become of great importance in continuing the dependent relationships. Because, as many scholars argue, we stand within the rather paradoxical situation that, as the Third World begins to emancipate itself economically and politically, cultural dominance increases. While the former colonialist was largely out to plunder economically profitable areas and showed often only moderate interest in political administration, the technological evolution of the communication media have contributed to a cultural and ideological dependence.

In many ways dependency is the antithesis of modernization, but at the level of communication it is a continuation of it. Dependency theory argues that the prevailing conditions in the non-aligned world are not a stage in the evolution toward development, but rather the result of extant international structures. In other words, whereas the modernization perspective holds that the causes of underdevelopment lay mainly *within* the developing nation, dependency theory postulates the reasons for underdevelopment are primarily *external* to the dependant society.

The Participatory Model

General

The participatory model incorporates the concepts in the emerging framework of multiplicity/another development. It stresses the importance of *cultural identity* of local communities and of *democratization and participation* at all levels—international, national, local and individual. It points to a strategy, not merely inclusive of, but largely emanating from, the traditional 'receivers'. Paulo Freire (1983:76) refers to this as the right of all people to individually and collectively speak their word: "This is not the

privilege of some few men, but the right of every man. Consequently, no one can say a true word alone—nor can he say it for another, in a prescriptive act which robs others of their words".

In order to share information, knowledge, trust, commitment, and a right attitude in development projects participation is very important in any decision making process for development. "This calls for new attitude for overcoming stereotyped thinking and to promote more understanding of diversity and plurality, with full respect for the dignity and equality of peoples living in different conditions and acting in different ways". (International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems, 1980:254) This model stresses reciprocal collaboration throughout all levels of participation. Listening to what the others say, respecting the counterpart's attitude, and having mutual trust are needed.. Participation supporters do not underestimate the ability of the masses to develop themselves and their environment. "Development efforts should be anchored on faith in the people's capacity to discern what is best to be done as they seek their liberation, and how to participate actively in the task of transforming society. The people are intelligent and have centuries of experience. Draw out their strength. Listen to them." (Xavier Institute, 1980:11).

Cultural Identity, Empowerment, and Participatory Communication

According to many authors, authentic participation directly addresses *power* and its distribution in society. Participation "may not sit well with those who favor the status quo and thus they may be expected to resist such efforts of reallocation more power to the people." (Lozare, 1989:2). Therefore, development and participation are inextricably linked.

Participation involves the more equitable sharing of both political and economic power, which often decreases the advantage of certain groups. *Structural change* involves the redistribution of power. In mass communication areas, many communication experts agree that structural change should occur first in order to establish participatory communication policies. Mowlana and Wilson (1987:143), for instance, state: "Communications policies are basically derivatives of the political, cultural and economic conditions and institutions under which they operate. They tend to legitimize the existing power relations in society, and therefore, they cannot be substantially changed unless there are fundamental structural changes in society that can alter these power relationships themselves".

Since dialogue and face-to-face interaction is inherent in participation, the development communicator will find him/herself spending more time in the field. It will take some time to develop rapport and trust. Continued contact, meeting commitments, keeping promises, and follow up between visits, is important. Development of social trust precedes task trust. Both parties will need patience. It is important to note that when we treat people the way we ourselves would like to be treated, we learn to work as a team, and this brings about rural commitment and motivation too. Thus honesty, trust, and commitment from the higher ups brings honesty, trust, and commitment for the grass-roots as well. This brings about true participation. And true participation brings about appropriate policies and planning for developing a country within its cultural and environmental framework.

Consequently also the perspective on communication has changed. It is more concerned with *process and context,* that is, on the exchange of 'meanings,' and on the importance of this process,

namely, the social relational patterns and social institutions that are the result of and are determined by the process. 'Another' communication "favors multiplicity, smallness of scale, locality, de-institutionalization, interchange of sender-receiver roles (and) horizontality of communication links at all levels of society" (McQuail, 1983:97). As a result, the focus moves *from a 'communicator-' to a more 'receiver-centric' orientation, with the resultant emphasis on meaning sought and ascribed rather than information transmitted.*

With this shift in focus, one is no longer attempting to create a need for the information one is disseminating, but one is rather disseminating information for which there is a need. Experts and development workers rather respond than dictate, they choose what is relevant to the context in which they are working. The emphasis is on information exchange rather than on the persuasion in the diffusion model.

Two Major Approaches to Participatory Communication

There are two major approaches to participatory communication which everybody today accepts as common sense. The first is the dialogical pedagogy of Paulo Freire, and the second involves the ideas of access, participation and self-management articulated in the Unesco debates of the 1970s. Every communication project which calls itself participatory accepts these principles of democratic communication. Nonetheless there exists today a wide variety of practical experiences and intentions. Before moving on to explore these differences it is useful to briefly review the common ground.

The Freirian argument works by a dual theoretical strategy. He insists that subjugated peoples must be treated as fully human

subjects in any political process. This implies dialogical communication. Although inspired to some extent by Sartre's existentialism -- a respect for the autonomous personhood of each human being --, the more important source is a theology that demands respect for otherness—in this case that of another human being. The second strategy is a moment of utopian hope derived from the early Marx that the human species has a destiny which is more than life as a fulfillment of material needs. Also from Marx is an insistence on collective solutions. Individual opportunity, Freire stresses, is no solution to general situations of poverty and cultural subjugation.

These ideas are deeply unpopular with elites, including elites in the Third World, but there is nonetheless widespread acceptance of Freire's notion of dialogic communication as a normative theory of participatory communication. One problem with Freire is that his theory of dialogical communication is based on group dialogue rather than such amplifying media as radio, print and television. Freire also gives little attention to the language or form of communication, devoting most of his discussion to the intentions of communication actions.

The second discourse about participatory communication is the Unesco language about self-management, access and participation from the 1977 meeting in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. The final report of that meeting defines the terms in the following way:

Access refers to the use of media for public service. It may be defined in terms of the opportunities available to the public to choose varied and relevant programs and to have a means of feedback to transmit its reactions and demands to production organisations.

Participation implies a higher level of public involvement in communication systems. It includes the involvement of the public in the production process, and also in the management and planning of communication systems.

Participation may be no more than representation and consultation of the public in decision-making. On the other hand, *self-management* is the most advanced form of participation. In this case, the public exercises the power of decision-making within communication enterprises and is also fully involved in the formulation of communication policies and plans.

These ideas are important and widely accepted as a normative theory of alternative communication: it must involve access and participation. However, one should note some differences from Freire. The Unesco discourse includes the idea of a gradual progression. Some amount of access may be allowed, but self-management may be postponed until some time in the future. Freire's theory allows for no such compromise. One either respects the culture of the other or falls back into domination and the "banking" mode of imposed education. The Unesco discourse talks in neutral terms about "the public". Freire talked about the oppressed. Finally, the Unesco discourse puts the main focus on the institution. Participatory radio means a radio station that is self-managed by those participating in it.

Assessing the Changes

In his summary of the Asian development communication policies and planning, Peter Habermann reaches the following conclusions: "The difficulties for the adoption of a viable development communication policy are caused very much by the fact that the planning of such a policy has to take into account that there is a

horizontal and a vertical level which requires simultaneous approaches. The horizontal and vertical level consists of diversified institutions such as governmental developments, semi-governmental agencies (Rural extension Service etc.), independent development organizations, and private media, which are all active in communication in one way or the other. The coordination of these institutions, e.g. the problem of assigning them to communicative tasks they are able to perform best becomes thus a major item of a meaningful development communication policy. The vertical level is defined by the need for a mutual information flow between the population base and the decision-making bodies. On this level even more institutions are involved because of the local and supra-local administrations which of course are active in handing out directives and in feeding back reports to the government. Coordination of development communication becomes a more difficult task on this level because with the exception of the governmental extensions no institution is really prepared until now to pick up the information from the grass root levels and feeding them back meaningfully to the administration" (Habermann, 1978: 173).

Neville Jayaweera (1987), in the introduction of the follow-up on Habermann & de Fontgalland's publication, specifies that (a) the pursuit of the modernization model, as recommended by the modernization and diffusion theorists and policymakers, was neither practicable nor desirable; (b) Third World societies should aim instead to satisfy the 'basic needs' of their people; (c) fundamental reforms in the structures of international trade and monetary institutions were a necessary condition of development; (d) likewise, fundamental structural reforms within Third World societies themselves, such as land reform, opportunities for

political participation, decentralization etc., were a prerequisite for development; (e) reliance on foreign aid and capital intensive technology must give way to self-reliance and appropriate technology, and that the bias for industry must give way to a greater commitment to agriculture; and (f) development is unthinkable except within a framework of culture (Jayaweera, 1987: xvii).

In accordance with the findings of these and other scholars we perceive a number of changes in the field of communication for development which may have considerable *consequences for communication policy and planning-making:*

The Growth of a Deeper Understanding of the Nature of Communication Itself

Early models in the 50s and 60s saw the communication process simply as a message going from a sender to a receiver (that is, Laswell's classic S-M-R model). The emphasis was mainly sender- and media-centric; the stress laid on the freedom of the press, the absence of censorship, and so on. Since the 70s, however, communication has become more receiver- and message-centric. The emphasis is more on the process of communication (that is, the exchange of meaning) and on the significance of this process (that is, the social relationships created by communication and the social institutions and context which result from such relationships).

A New Understanding of Communication as a Two-Way Process

The 'oligarchic' view of communication implied that freedom of information was a one-way right from a higher to a lower level, from the Centre to the Periphery, from an institution to an individual, from a communication-rich nation to a communication-

poor one, and so on. Today, the interactive nature of communication is increasingly recognized. It is seen as fundamentally two-way rather than one-way, interactive and participatory rather than linear.

A New Understanding of Culture

The cultural perspective has become central to the debate on communication for development. Consequently, one has moved away from a more traditional mechanistic approach which emphasized economic and materialistic criteria to a more multiple appreciation of holistic and complex perspectives.

The Trend towards Participatory Democracy

The end of the colonial era has seen the rise of many independent states and the spread of democratic principles, even if only at the level of lip-service. Though often ignored in practice, democracy is honored in theory. The world's communication media are still largely controlled by governments or powerful private interests, but they are more attuned to and aware of the democratic ideals than previously. At the same time, literacy levels have increased, and there has been a remarkable improvement in people's ability to handle and use communication technology. As a consequence, more and more people can use mass media and can no longer be denied access to and participation in communication processes for the lack of communication and technical skills.

Recognition of the Imbalance in Communication Resources

The disparity in communication resources between different parts of the world is increasingly recognized as a cause of concern. As the Centre nations develop their resources, the gap between Centre and Periphery becomes greater. The plea for a more balanced and equal distribution of communication resources can

only be discussed in terms of power at national and international levels. The attempt by local power-elites to totally control the modern communication channels—press, broadcasting, education, and bureaucracy—does no longer ensure control of all the communication networks in a given society. Nor does control of the mass media ensure support for the controlling forces, nor for any mobilization around their objectives, nor for the effective repression of opposition.

The Growing Sense of Globalization and Cultural Hybridity

Perhaps the greatest impetus towards a new formulation of communication freedoms and the need for realistic communication policies and planning have come from the realization that the international flow of communication has become the main carrier of cultural globalization. This cultural hybridity can take place without perceptible dependent relationships.

A New Understanding of What is Happening Within the Boundaries of the Nation-State

One has to accept that "internal" and "external" factors inhibiting development do not exist independently of each other. Thus, in order to understand and develop a proper strategy one must have an understanding of the class relationships of any particular peripheral social formation and the ways in which these structures articulate with the Centre on the one hand, and the producing classes in the Third World on the other. To dismiss Third World ruling classes, for example, as mere puppets whose interests are always mechanically synonymous with those of the Centre is to ignore the realities of a much more complex relationship. The very unevenness and contradictory nature of the capitalist development process necessarily produces a constantly changing relationship.

Recognition of the 'Impact' of Communication Technology

Some communication systems (e.g., audio- and video-taping, copying, radio broadcasting) have become cheap and so simple that the rationale for regulating and controlling them centrally, as well as the ability to do so, is no longer relevant. However, other systems (for instance, satellites, remote sensing, transborder data flows) have become so expensive that they are beyond the means of smaller countries and may not be 'suitable' to local environments.

A New Understanding towards an Integration of Distinct Means of Communication

Modern mass media and alternate or parallel networks of folk media or interpersonal communication channels are not mutually exclusive by definition. Contrary to the beliefs of diffusion theorists, they are more effective if appropriately used in an integrated fashion, according to the needs and constraints of the local context. The modern mass media, having been mechanically transplanted from abroad into Third World societies, enjoy varying and limited rates of penetration. They are seldom truly integrated into institutional structures, as occurs in Western societies. However, they can be effectively combined, provided a functional division of labor is established between them, and provided the limits of the mass media are recognized.

The Recognition of Dualistic or Parallel Communication Structures

No longer governments or rulers are able to operate effectively, to control, censor, or to play the role of gatekeeper with regard to all communications networks at all times in a given society. Both alternate and parallel networks, which may not always be active, often function through political, socio-cultural, religious or class structures or can be based upon secular, cultural, artistic, or

folkloric channels. These networks feature a highly participatory character, high rates of credibility, and a strong organic integration with other institutions deeply rooted in a given society.

Conclusion

It should be obvious by now that no all-embracing view on development is on offer. No theory has achieved and maintained explanatory dominance. Each of the above three theoretical perspectives still does find support among academics, policy makers, international organizations, and the general public. In general, adopted and updated versions of the ideas upon which the modernization theory is built—economic growth, centralized planning, and the belief that underdevelopment is rooted in mainly internal causes which can be solved by external (technological) 'aid'—are still shared by many development agencies and governments. A *revitalised modernization perspective* in which some of the errors of the past are acknowledged and efforts are made to deal in new ways (as outlined in the multiplicity view) *remains the dominant perspective in practice but becomes increasingly more difficult to defend in theory.* On the other side, while the multiplicity theory is gaining ground in academic spheres, in practice it is still looked upon as a sympathetic though idealistic side show.

References

ALBROW, M. & KING, E. (eds.) (1990). **Globalization, Knowledge and Society**, London: Sage.

AXINN, G. (1988). **Guide on Alternative Extension Approaches**, Rome: FAO.

BALIT, S. (1988). Rethinking Development Support Communication, **Development Communication Report**, 3:62.

BARAN, P. (1957). **The Political Economy of Growth**, New York: Monthly Review Press.

BELTRAN, L.R. (1993). **Communication for Development in Latin America: A Forty Years Appraisal**, Keynote speech at the Opening of the IV Roundtable on Development Communication, Instituto para America Latina (IPAL), Lima, February 23-26.

BERRIGAN, F. (1979). **Community Communications. The Role of Community Media in Development**, Paris: Unesco.

BLOMSTROM, M. & HETTNE, B. (1984). **Development Theory in Transition. The Dependency Debate and Beyond**, London: Zed.

BOAFO, K. (1989). **Communication and Culture: African Perspectives**, Nairobi: ACCE.

BOYD-BARRETT, O. (1982). Cultural Dependency and the Mass Media. In: GUREVITCH, M., BENNETT, T., CURRAN, J. & WOOLLACOTT, J. (eds.), **Culture, Society and the Media**, London: Methuen.

CASMIR, F. (ed.) (1991). **Communication in Development**, Norwood: Ablex.

CHILCOTE, R. & JOHNSON, D. (eds.) (1983). **Theories of Development. Mode of Production or Dependency?**, Beverly Hills: Sage.

CINCO (1987). **Comunicacion Dominante y Comunicacion Alternativa en Bolivia**, La Paz: Cinco/IDRC.

CLEGG, S. (1989). **Frameworks of Power**, London: Sage.

DECKER, P. (1989). **Que siga adelante ... The role of Grassroots Communications in Community Development: Experiences from Tijuana, Mexico**, Stanford: Center for Latin American Studies, Stanford University.

DE SCHUTTER, A. (1983). **Investigacion Participativa: una Opcion Metodologica para la Educacion de Adultos**, Mexico: Crefal.

DOS SANTOS, T. (1970). The Structure of Dependency, **American Economic Review**, 60(21), May.

ESCOBAR, A. & ALVAREZ, S. (eds.) (1992). **The Making of Social Movements in Latin America: Identity, Strategy and Democracy**, San Francisco: Westview.

FALS BORDA, O. (1985) (ed.). **The Challenge of Social Change**, London: Sage.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION (1987). **Perspectives on Communication for Rural Development**, Rome: FAO.

FOX, E. (1988). **Media and Politics in Latin America. The Struggle for Democracy**, London: Sage.

FRANK, A.G. (1969). **Latin America : Underdevelopment or Revolution**, New York: Monthly Review Press.

FREIRE, P. (1983). **Pedagogy of the Oppressed**, New York: Seaburg Press.

FREIRE, P. (1970). Cultural Action and Conscientization, **Harvard Educational Review**, 40(3).

GALTUNG, J. (1980). **The True Worlds. A Transnational Perspective**, New York: Free Press.

GRAFF, R.D. (ed.) (1983). **Communication for National Development. Lessons from Experience**, Cambridge: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain.

GUNDER, F. & FUENTES, M. (1988). Nine Theses on Social Movements, **IFDA Dossier**, 63:27-44.

HABERMANN, P. & DE FONTGALLAND, G. (eds.) (1978). **Development Communication—Rhetoric and Reality**, Singapore: AMIC.

HAMELINK, C. (1983). **Cultural Autonomy in Global Communications. Planning National Information Policy**, New York: Longman.

HANCOCK, A. (1992). **Communication Planning Revisited**, Paris: UNESCO.

HARRISON, D. (1988). **The Sociology of Modernization and Development**, London: Unwin Hyman.

HEDEBRO, G. (1982). **Communication and Social Change in Developing Countries. A Critical View**, Ames: Iowa State University Press.

HETTNE, B. (1982). **Development Theory and the Third World**, Stockholm: SAREC.

HOFMANN, R. (1981). **Kommunikation und Entwicklung. Applikation eines Lateinamerikanischen Modells (Paulo Freire-Mario Kaplun) in Indonesien**, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

HULME, D. & TURNER, M. (1990). **Sociology and Development**, New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

INKELES, A. & SMITH, D. (1974). **Becoming Modern. Individual Change in Six Developing Countries**, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

JAMIAS, J. (ed.) (1975). **Readings in Development Communication**, Laguna: UP at Los Banos.

JAYAWEERA, N. & AMUNAGUMA, S. (eds.) (1987). **Rethinking Development Communication**, Singapore: AMIC.

KORTEN, D. (ed.) (1986). **Community Management: Asian Experience and Perspectives**, West Hartford: Kumarian Press.

KUMAR, K. (ed.) (1988). Communication and Development, special issue of **Communication Research Trends**, 9(3).

KUNCZIK, M. (1985). **Massenmedien und Entwicklungsländer**, Köln: Böhlau.

LAZARSFELD, P., BERELSON, B. & GAUDET, H. (1944). **The People's Choice**, New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce.

LERNER, D. (1958). **The Passing of Traditional Society. Modernizing the Middle East**, New York: Free Press.

LERNER, D. & SCHRAMM, W. (eds.) (1967). **Communication and Change in the Developing Countries**, Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

LONG, N. & LONG, A. (eds.) (1992). **Battlefields of Knowledge. The Interlocking of Theory and Practice in Social Research and Development**, London: Routledge.

LOUW, E. (1993). Participative Media: Whose Agendas? Some Thoughts on the Practices of Funding Agencies and the Consequent Empowering of Factions, **PCR-Newsletter**, 1(2):1-3.

LOZARE, B. (1989). **Power and Conflict: Hidden Dimensions of Communication, Participative Planning and Action**, Paper presented at 'Participation: A Key Concept in Communication for Change and Development, University of Poona, Pune, February.

MacBRIDE, S. (ed.) (1980). **Many Voices, One World. Communication and Society. Today and Tomorrow**, Paris: UNESCO.

MARTIN-BARBERO, J. (1993). **Communication, Culture and Hegemony. From the Media to Mediations**, London: Sage.

MATTELART, A. (1983). **Transnationals and the Third World. The Struggle for Culture**, Massachusetts: Bergin & Garvey.

McANANY, E. (1983). From Modernization and Diffusion to Dependency and Beyond: Theory and Practice in Communication for Social Change in the 1980s, **Development Communications in the Third World**, Proceedings of a Midwest Symposium, University of Illinois, April.

McANANY, E. (ed.) (1980). **Communications in the Rural Third World: The Role of Information in Development**, New York: Praeger.

McKEE, N. (1992). **Social Mobilization & Social Marketing in Developing Communities. Lessons for Communicators**, Penang: Southbound.

McLAREN, P. & LEONARD, P. (eds.) (1993). **Paulo Freire. A Critical Encounter**, London: Routledge.

McLUHAN, M. (1964). **Understanding Media**, New York: Signet books.

McQUAIL, D. (1983). **Mass Communication Theory**, London: Sage.

MIDGLEY, J. (ed.) (1986). **Community Participation, Social Development, and the State**, London: Methuen.

MOORE, S. (1986). Participatory Communication in the Development Process, **The Third Channel**, 2.

MOWLANA, H. & WILSON, L. (1987). **Communication and Development: A Global Assessment**, Paris: Unesco.

O'CONNER, A. (1990). Radio is Fundamental to Democracy, **Media Development**, 37(4).

O'SULLIVAN-RYAN, J. & KAPLUN, M. (1979). **Communication Methods to Promote Grassroots Participation**, Paris: Unesco.

PERROUX, F. (1983). **A New Concept of Development**, Paris: Unesco.

PHILDHRRA (1986). **Participatory Research Guidebook**, Philippine Partnership for the Development of Human Resources in Rural Areas, Laguna.

POOL, I.D.S. (1983). **Technologies of Freedom**, Cambridge: Belknap Press.

ROBERTSON, R. (1992). **Globalization. Social Theory and Global Culture**, London: Sage.

ROGERS, E.M. (1986). **Communication Technology: The New Media in Society**, New York: The Free Press.

ROGERS, E.M. (1983). **The Diffusion of Innovations (3ʳᵈ ed.)**, New York: The Free Press.

ROGERS, E.M. (1962). **Diffusion of Innovations**, New York: Free Press.

ROGERS, E.M. & SCHOEMAKER, F. (1973). **Communication of Innovations**, New York: Free Press.

ROGERS, E.M. (ed.) (1976). **Communication and Development**, Beverly Hills: Sage.

ROKEACH, M. (1966). Attitude Change and Behavioral Change, **Public Opinion Quarterly**, 30(4).

RONDINELLI, D. (1993). **Development Projects as Policy Experiments. An Adaptive Approach to Development Administration**, London: Routledge.

ROSTOW, W.W. (1953). **The Process of Economic Growth**, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

SAID, E. (1993). **Culture and Imperialism**, New York: Alfred Knopf.

SAVIO, R. (ed.) (1990). Communication, Participation and Democracy (special issue), **Journal of the Society for International Development**, 2.

SCHILLER, H.I. (1976). **Communication and Cultural Domination**, New York: International Arts & Sciences Press.

SCHRAMM, W. (1964). **Mass Media and National Development. The Role of Information in the Developing Countries**, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

SCHRAMM, W. & LERNER, D. (eds.) (1976). **Communication and Change. The Last Ten Years - and the Next**, Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

SERVAES, J. (1999). **Communication for Development. One World, Multiple Cultures**, Creskill: Hampton Press.

SERVAES, J. (1989). **One World, Multiple Cultures. A New Paradigm on Communication for Development**, Leuven: Acco.

SERVAES, J. (1987). **Media Aid. Naar een 'Ander' Communicatie- en Ontwikkelingsbeleid**, Leuven: Acco.

SERVAES, J. (1983). **Communication and Development. Some Theoretical Remarks**, Leuven: Acco.

SKLAIR, L. (1991). **Sociology of the Global System**, New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

SOMAVIA, J. (1981). The Democratization of Communication: From Minority Social Monopoly to Majority Social Representation, **Development Dialogue**, 2.

SPYBEY, T. (1992). **Social Change, Development and Dependency. Modernity, Colonialism and the Development of the West**, Cambridge: Polity Press.

STAVENHAGEN, R. (1966). Siete Tesis Equivocados Sobre América Latina, **Desarrollo Indoamericano**, 4.

SUNKEL, O. & FUENZALIDA, E. (1980). La Transnacionalizacion del Capitalismo y el Desarrollo Nacional. In: SUNKEL, O., FUENZALIDA, E., CARDOSO, F.H. et al., **Transnacionalizacion y Dependencia**, Madrid: Ed. Cultura Hispania.

SUNKEL, O. (ed.) (1993). **Development from Within. Toward a Neostructuralist Approach for Latin America**, Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

TAYLOR, J. (1979). **From Modernization to Modes of Production**, London: MacMillan.

TEHRANIAN, M. (1979). Development Theory and Communication Policy. The Changing Paradigm. In: VOIGT, M. & HANNEMAN, G. (eds.), **Progress in Communication Sciences. Vol. 1**, Norwood: Ablex.

THOMAS, P. (1993). Communication and Development: Freirean Cultural Politics in a Post-Modern Era, **PCR-Newsletter**, 1(1):2-3.

THOMPSON, J. (1990). **Ideology and Modern Culture. Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication**, Cambridge: Polity Press.

UGBOAJAH, F.O. (ed.) (1985). **Mass Communication, Culture and Society in West Africa**, München: Saur.

VAN NIEUWENHUIJZE, C.A.O. (1982). **Development Begins at Home. Problems and Projects of the Sociology of Development**, Oxford: Pergamon Press.

VOGLER, C. (1985). **The Nation State: The Neglected Dimension of Class**, Hants: Gower.

WALLERSTEIN, I. (1979). **The Capitalist World Economy**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

WANG, G. & DISSANAYAKE, W. (eds.) (1984). **Continuity and Change in Communication Systems. An Asian Perspective**, Norwood: Ablex.

WHITE, R. (1988). **Media, Politics and Democracy in the Developing World**, draft Center for the Study of Communication and Culture, London, April.

WHITE, R. (1984). **The Need for New Strategies of Research on the Democratization of Communication**, Paper ICA Conference, San Francisco, May.

WHITE, R. (1982). **Contradictions in Contemporary Policies for Democratic Communication**, Paper IAMCR Conference, Paris, September.

XAVIER INSTITUTE (1980). **Development from Below**, Ranchi: Xavier Institute for Social Service.