

# Communicating for Development

*A New  
Pan-Disciplinary  
Perspective*



Andrew A. Moemeka, *Editor*

# 1

## Development Communication: A Historical and Conceptual Overview

### HISTORICAL BRIEF

Although the concept of development communication has been with us for a long time, recognition of its importance for sociocultural, economic, and political development, and utilization of its approaches and methods (see chapter 4) did not gain public and academic acceptance until the early 1960s. Its development, problems, and potentials, outlined and critically examined in this text, reflect the thorny road it has traveled. It has been subjected to intellectual skepticism and public doubts and has been misinterpreted and misapplied; recently, questions of its relevance to developed societies have been raised. Chapter 3 shows how the road has been or is being cleared, and points out that contrary to widely held views, especially in the developed societies of the world, development communication is a universal need—a devel-

opment imperative without which concrete economic and social developments would be difficult to achieve

The place of communication in the development process was given a boost when Lerner (1958) wrote his famous treatise, *The Passing of the Traditional Society*, in which he acknowledged that mass media growth was one of the three phases of democratic political development. He pointed out that the mass media had the power to create opportunity for empathy which "disciplined western men in skills that spell modernity." A further boost was given by Klapper (1960) with his book *The Effects of Mass Communication* which discussed the impacts that the mass media have on society. Although couched in general terms, such impacts included increase in general and specific knowledge which cannot but affect development—both human and socioeconomic. In more specific terms, Schramm (1964), in what many have classified as the best known exposition of the relationship between the mass media and national development in the 1960s, lists twelve areas of influence for the mass media in the task of national development. They include widening horizons, focusing attention on relevant issues, raising aspiration, creating a climate for development, helping change strongly held attitudes or values not conducive to development, feeding interpersonal channels of communication, conferring status, broadening the policy dialogue, enforcing social norms, helping form tastes, affecting attitudes lightly held and canalizing stronger attitudes, and helping substantially in all types of education and training.

These pioneers in the field of communication and development, though basically concerned with mass media communication, showed such strong faith in communication's power to help cause development that they succeeded in winning the support of researchers in other disciplines, especially in political science. Almon and Verba (1963) agreed that communication was essential in political integration. Pye (1963) thought that the problem of political development is one of cultural diffusion and of adapting and adjusting old patterns of life to new demands. Such diffusion, adapting, and adjusting can only be done through communication. Because communication is the web of society, its flow determines the direction and pace of dynamic social development. In more emphatic words, Deutsch (1964) pointed to communication as a prerequisite for successful political democracy. And Cutwright (1964) asserted the importance of communication in development

by holding that communications development is the strongest socioeconomic correlate of political development.

Important though these pioneering attempts to expose the power of communication in development are, they fell prey to the paradigmatic environment in which they were made. The conception of "communication" with which the researchers worked was not significantly different from the discredited Bullet (or Hypodermic Needle) theory that treated the mass media as an all-powerful institution. Emphasis was on what communication can do and/or the effect it can have on literacy, aspiration, empathy, attitudes, agricultural production, health, and so on. Very little or no attention was given to the cultural and socioeconomic realities of the communities studied. The social and historical contexts of the variables they used were not studied. Neither was sufficient thought given to how the variables were logically linked with one another. The researchers would appear to have believed that the social structure of recipient villages or communities was not important; that the type of interest groups and social relationships and the economic, political, educational, and social institutions within the communities were not relevant to the influence of communication. As Golding (1974) points out, the old paradigm of communication's role in development conceives the "developing countries as emerging from static isolation, requiring an external stimulus to shake them into the twentieth century." Does this sound familiar with regard to the conception of communication's role in social change activities in the so-called developed societies? In bemoaning this lack of sensitivity toward the realities of recipient communities and therefore the absence of relevant data, the Commission on Health Research for Development (1990) refuted the claim that research was a luxury in countries struggling to meet basic human needs, pointing out that research is essential for these countries precisely because of the need to empower those who must accomplish more with fewer resources.

Not only was the old paradigm of communication unilinear it was also "transportational." It assumed that communicating to or informing the elite, the well-to-do, the articulate, and the educated was all the impetus needed to ensure communication effectiveness; that the "inevitable" benefits deriving from the responses of these highly placed members of the communities to the communication would, of necessity, trickle down to the masses. Of course, this did not happen. In a 1974 report, the World Bank said, *inter alia*: "These efforts at using the mass media in development

did not appreciably affect, in positive ways, the lives of the people in the developing countries." Many reasons have been given for this failure. Among the most important (Moemeka, 1985) are the complete neglect of the sociocultural environment in which the mass media were supposed to function effectively as well as the equation of the mass media with Communication and the complete absence of audience-oriented feedback.

Because the dominant development paradigm in the 1960s was predicated on industrial growth and increased GNP, the pioneer researchers in the field of development communication saw economic growth as the final goal of development and geared all their efforts toward using communication to help achieve this goal in the developing societies. But, as research has shown, their efforts left much to be desired. By the early 1970s, it was clear that the vast majority of people in the developing countries were not benefiting from the numerous capital-intensive, industrial growth-based, unilinear communication-supported development programs executed in their communities. The Green Revolution programs directed toward increased agriculture production and the various health and family welfare programs seemed to be producing adverse effects (Beal and Jussawalla, 1981; and Stewart and Streeten, 1976). In fact, the attempt at industrialization caused large-scale migration from the rural areas; technology fostered greater dependency rather than self-reliance; and Western values and behaviors (e.g., high degree of self-interest and individualism) successfully threatened indigenous cultures and social institutions. A simplistic approach to communication in support of development, which was a natural counterpart of the simplistic model of economic development that held sway in the 1960s, had failed.

This failure led to a decline of emphasis on bare economic growth. It also helped to expose the limitations of UNESCO's quantitative approach contained in the celebrated "norms" for developing countries—ten daily newspaper copies, twenty radio sets, and two cinema seats per 100 people—which ignored the important issues of media content, the context of media messages, and access to mass media channels and utilization capacities and patterns. As a result, a slow but conscious realization began to emerge that development for each country has to be seen in terms of that country's own needs, which, in turn, must be related to its unique circumstances of climatic, historical, cultural and social conditions as well as human and physical resources. Attention to

variability, Bebe (1987) pointed out, was expected to lead to new extension approaches that present people with options that they can adapt to their existing systems as opposed to packages of technology or ideas that they are expected to adopt in place of their existing systems.

The immediate result of such rethinking was manifest in sensitivity to the structural and cultural constraints on the impact of communication, in addition to conscious awareness that the mass media were just a part of the total communication infrastructure. It became evident that successful and effective use of communication in any community requires adequate knowledge of the availability, accessibility, relationships, and utilization of communication infrastructure and software in that community. Because this calls for a holistic understanding of the communication environment, ethnocommunication (Eilers and Oepen, 1991), that is, the description and study of communication means, structures and processes in a cultural unit, was advocated. Three studies are relevant here. Donohue et al (1975) studied the phenomenon of Information Gap, and pointed out some of the effects of community structure on the role of communication. Rogers (1976a), in a review of past studies, noted the weaknesses in the study of diffusion (e.g., psychological bias ignoring the social structural variables and a reliance on the individual as the unit of analysis). Halloran (1981) called for critical, problem/policy-oriented research concerned with questioning the values and claims of the system, applying independent criteria, suggesting alternatives, and exploring the possibility of new forms and structures.

What might be described as the real turning point for the study of communication in the service of development was the 1975 experts conference held in Honolulu, Hawaii to review the use of communication in economic and social development. At the conference, the two best known pioneers in this area of study—Lerner and Schramm—admitted that the model of "trickle down" communication in development (the unilinear approach) had been proven ineffective. This admission gave the impetus for making concerted efforts toward finding alternative approaches that would be efficient and effective. Many studies were conducted. Some of the better known were published in a book edited by Rogers (1976b) titled *Communication and Development: Critical Perspectives*. A sample of the articles (chapters) includes "New Perspectives on Communication and Development"; "Alien Premises, Objects and Methods in Latin American Communica-

tion;" "How Communication Interfaces with Change"; and "Communication and Development: The Passing of the Dominant Paradigm." These articles examine critically the dominant paradigm of communication in development and propose a new development model based on the ideal of social equality rather than economic growth. The following is a summary of backgrounds and contents of the emergent alternatives as compared with the dominant paradigm (Rogers, 1976):

Table 1.1  
Emergent Alternatives to the Dominant Paradigm of Development

<i>Main Elements in the Dominant Paradigm of Development</i>	<i>Emerging Alternatives to the Dominant Paradigm</i>	<i>Possible Factors Leading to the Emerging Alternatives</i>
1. Economic growth	1. Equality of distribution	1. Development weariness from the slow rate of economic development during the 1950s and 1960s 2. Publication of the Pearson Report 3. Growing loss of faith in the "trickle down" theory of distributing development benefits
2. Capital-intensive technology	1. Concern with quality of life 2. Integration of "traditional" and "modern" systems in a country 3. Greater emphasis on intermediate-level and labor-intensive technology	1. Environmental pollution problems in Euro-America and Japan 2. Limits to growth 3. The energy crisis following the 1973 Yom Kippur War
3. Centralized planning	1. Self-reliance in development	1. The People's Republic of China experience with decentralized participatory self-development (known elsewhere after 1971)

(continued)

Table 1.1 (Continued)

<i>Main Elements in the Dominant Paradigm of Development</i>	<i>Emerging Alternatives to the Dominant Paradigm</i>	<i>Possible Factors Leading to the Emerging Alternatives</i>
	2. Popular participation in decentralized self-development planning and execution (e.g., to village level)	
4. Mainly internal causes of underdevelopment	1. Internal and external causes of underdevelopment	1. The rise of "oil power" in the years following the energy crisis of 1973-74 2. Shifts in world power illustrated by the voting behavior at the United Nations 3. Criticism of the dominant paradigm by radical economists such as Frank and other dependency theorists

Source: Everett M. Rogers; *Communication and Development: Critical Perspectives* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1976) 132.

The new development paradigm repudiates the one-dimensional approach of the old paradigm which was predicated solely on economic growth or increases in the gross national product. It takes a multidimensional approach that incorporates equity, social justice, and economic growth. In addition, it addresses the relationship among these four sets of variables: social structural variables; communication potentials and tasks; the psycho-cultural factors of the social actors at both the individual and societal levels; and the socioeconomic goals of development. Congenial to this new paradigm of development, the new model (concept) of development communication sees development not only in physical (economic growth) but also in sociocultural (human) terms. It stresses access to the media of communication, participation in communication activities, and relevance of communication content to sociocultural contexts.

#### CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The new and culturally relevant role assigned communication in the task of development under the new order required a redefinition of development communication. In 1973, when opin-



ions were molding in support of equity, social justice, access, and participation, a working committee of the International Broadcast Institute meeting at Cologne on "Communication in Support of Development" defined the key concepts of the paradigm thus:

*Development:* The improvement of the well-being of the individual and the betterment of the quality of his/her life

*Communication:* The transfer of information between individuals or groups of individuals by human or technical means

*Development Support Communication:* The systematic use of communication in the planning and implementation of development.

While these definitions would appear to capture the central issues of these key concepts, they are not operational enough. They fail to provide the framework for explanations and/or demonstrations to enable in-depth understanding and realistic and practical application. Hence, specialists, especially those from developing countries who know "where the shoe pinches" set themselves the task of fashioning more appropriate definitions that are operationally relevant to the new paradigm. What follows is a discussion of some of the definitions of the concepts.

### *Development*

Even at the time when the world was still basing all hopes of development on industrialization and economic growth, Inayatullah (1967: 101) drew attention to what development meant in reality to developing countries. His aim was to identify the specific roles which development should play, giving it a holistic perspective. Thus, he defined the concept as "change toward patterns of society that allows better realization of human values, that allows a society greater control over its environments, and over its own political destiny, and that enables its individuals to gain increased control over themselves." In support of Inayatullah, and to show that his views about development have changed in line with the new paradigm, Rogers (1976b: 345) redefined 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."

These two definitions show clearly that development is a multifaceted concept. This is why it generally means different things to different people, and in different disciplines. In discussing the concept, most psychologists, for example, lay emphasis on such individual or personality variables as self-reliance, achievement motivation, self-worth, and self-actualization. For the sociologist, the concept of development tends to revolve around the process of differentiation that characterizes modern societies. The political scientist is mainly concerned with developing a capacity to innovate change, increase political awareness, and improve the ability to resolve conflict in political situations. The communication specialist (the development communicator) tends to see development as the acquisition of new knowledge and skills, increased self-confidence, control over oneself and one's environment, greater equality, freedom, ability to understand one's potentials and limitations, and willingness to work hard enough to improve on existing positive conditions.

These different angles from which development is viewed are, of course, not exclusive; they are interwoven. Together, they stress the fact that development is a normative concept in that it assumes that existing conditions are no longer conducive to human dignity and socioeconomic advancement, and therefore should be changed for the better. Therefore, though seen from different perspectives, development means one basic thing in all perspectives and to all people—a change for the better in the human, cultural, socioeconomic, and political conditions of the individual and consequently of the society. It is not solely a matter of technology or of gross national product; more importantly, it is a matter of increased knowledge and skills, growth of new consciousness, expansion of the human mind, the uplifting of the human spirit, and the fusion of human confidence.

### *Communication*

Communication is the 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 instead an interactive process that works in a circular, dynamic and ongoing way (Hiebert et al, 1985). It is talking with people—a process with no permanent

sender and no permanent receiver. In the process of 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.

Communication defined this way departs from what Beltran (1974: 13) has identified as "the classical mechanistic-vertical model," which sees communication as a process of transmission of modes of thinking, feeling, and behaving from one or more persons to another person or persons. In this classical model, the paramount goal of communication is persuasion, and the element of feedback is important chiefly as a message-adjusting device to enable the communicator to secure the performance of the expected response from the receiver. This is the model which assigns an actively predominant role to the communicator, and a very passive role to the communicatee—a sort of one-way communication in which emphasis is on the effects that communication can have on people or on ways in which *messages can use people*. The new concept of communication—the humanized democratic-interactive model (Beltran, 1974)—places emphasis on how *people use communication or messages*. It stresses genuine dialogue, or free and proportioned opportunity to exert mutual influence and rejects the idea that *persuasion* is the chief role of communication. In this new order, *understanding* is the crucial factor; it is recognized as the chief role of communication. Because of this, audience-oriented feedback is imperative; its importance lies in the opportunity it creates for understanding the receiver's point of view, and therefore, for ensuring co-orientational influence.

### *Development Communication*

In a very concise way, development communication is the application of the processes of communication to the development process. In other words, development communication is the use of the principles and practices of the exchange of ideas to achieve development objectives. It is, or should be, therefore, an element of the management process in the overall planning and implementation of development programs. In a very broad sense, development is "the art and science of human communication applied to the speedy transformation of a country (economic growth, modernization, industrialization, etc.) and the mass of its people (self-actualization, fulfillment of human potentials, greater social justice, etc.) through the identification and utilization of appropriate expertise

in the development process that will assist in increasing participation of intended beneficiaries at the grassroots level" (Rosario-Braid, 1979).

Because it is communication with a social conscience, development communication is heavily oriented toward the human aspects of development. This means that physical and economic growth are important only in so far as they help to improve the human condition, that is, if functionality of physical conditions does not produce dysfunctions in human conditions. Even though development communication is primarily associated with rural development and the developing societies, it is also concerned with urban and suburban problems, as well as with social problems in developed societies. It plays two broad roles. The first is the transformation role through which it seeks social change or development in the direction of higher quality of life and social justice. The second is the socialization role through which it strives to maintain some of the established values of society that are consonant with development and social change. In playing these roles, development communication tries to create an enhancing atmosphere for exchange of ideas that produces a happy balance in social and economic advancement between physical output and human interrelationships (Moemeka, 1987).

## INTERFACE OF COMMUNICATION AND DEVELOPMENT

A close examination of the basic tenets of the new development paradigm (Rogers, 1976) and of the ultimate requirements of the new communication approach to development (Beltran, 1974) would reveal very close similarity between them. To begin with, participation is the key variable in the new development paradigm, just as it is for the new communication approach to development. In broad terms, the ultimate objectives of national development (urban and rural) are economic growth, equitable distribution of facilities and of benefits, national cohesion, and human development. These are also, in broad terms, the ultimate objectives of development communication, even though, because of the importance attached to intelligent understanding of development issues, development communication gives the pride of place to human development. In order to achieve these ultimate objectives, both the new development paradigm and the new communication

approach stress the need for the following which Rogers (1976) identified as the key characteristics of the new order:

- equality of the distribution of social and economic benefits, information, and education
- popular participation in development planning and execution, accompanied by decentralization of activities to local levels
- self-reliance and independence in development with emphasis on the potential of local resources
- integration of traditional with modern systems, so that development is a syncretization of old and new ideas, with the exact mixture somewhat different in each locale

However, further demands are made from communication for specific actions that are necessary to smooth the path to the above goals. At the International Conference on Communication Policies for Rapidly Developing Societies held at Mashad, Iran (UNESCO, 1975), a working group identified specific activities that development communication must strive to accomplish if it is to contribute effectively to development. These include:

- determination of the needs of the people and the provision of sufficient citizen access to the communication systems to serve as effective feedback to the government
- provision of horizontal and vertical (interactive) communication linkage at all levels of society and communication channels through which people at all levels of society and in all regions and localities have the capability to communicate with one another in order to accomplish coordination necessary for human and material development
- provision of local community support for cultural preservation, and provision of local media to serve as effective channels
- provision of relevant information
- support for specific development projects and social services
- raising people's awareness of development projects and opportunities and helping to foster attitudes and motivations that contribute to development

Development communication is not merely a matter of transmitting information about how things can be done better by using available resources and facilities. It is much more than the exchange of problem-solving information. It also involves the gen-

eration of psychic mobility or empathy, raising of aspirations and willingness to work hard to meet those aspirations, teaching of new skills, and encouragement of local participation in development activities. In addition, it performs the broader function of helping people to restructure their mental framework in interpreting specific events and phenomena and to relate to the broader world beyond their immediate environments. To be effective in doing this, communication activities in development must be interwoven with sociocultural, economic, and political processes.

True and effective community development requires the participation of every segment of the nation—rural, urban, city, suburban, and every sector—government and private and public business. These groups and sectors must establish new social relations with one another before they can collectively be effective. It is the task of development communication to facilitate the growth and development of such human relationships. But it cannot perform this role effectively unless it is incorporated into the total development process. Such deliberate incorporation also helps put communication in a favorable position to positively affect the achievement of the four cardinal elements without which no development activity can succeed, that is, to provide the information and intellectual environment that will help the people to

know *what* to do  
know *how* to do it  
be *willing* to do it, and  
have the *resources* to do it.

If any of the four elements is missing from the equation, development will not occur. But each of them could very easily be left out, intentionally or not, unless communication, whose primary duty it is to ensure the first three and which is also expected to help create the climate in which the fourth can obtain, is well integrated into the planning and execution of development projects.

These four cardinal elements emphasize the all-important and pervasive nature of communication in human development efforts and they stress its important role in the planning and implementation of development and social change programs. Of course, recognition of the place of communication in development is not new. There have been calls, since the mid-sixties for the integration of communication into development plans. The International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems

(McBride, 1980) re-echoed this call emphatically when it called on nations to incorporate communication policies into development strategies "as an integral part in the diagnosis of needs, and in the design and the implementation of selected priorities." Unfortunately, not much has changed. As Servaes (1991) points out, existing national communication policies are characterized by fragmentation and by uncoordinated and sometimes contradictory objectives, thus creating a wide gap between what is advocated and the reality of the ad hoc nature of national communication policies, especially in most of the developing world.

Also stressed by the four elements is the importance of economic or material resources without which development efforts cannot go beyond the ideas and willingness stages. The new development paradigm, no doubt, attempts to reorient development toward models that can truly "put people first, and poor people first of all" (Jamieson, 1991), but it also does not lose sight of the importance of economic (physical) resources. In today's world, it is foolhardy to talk about development without reference to technology and industry and the goods and services they produce to make the sociocultural and human environments worthwhile. "Money speaks," says an Igbo adage. Indeed, Money speaks, in the development arenas of the world. Hence the importance of economic development.

It is true, as a number of researchers have shown (Chen et al, 1990; Gupta and Ball, 1990; Kjeloström and Rosenstock, 1990; Romieu et al, 1990; FASE, 1991; Masironi, 1988; Takeichi, 1992; Rowley, 1986; Todaro, 1977; Kumar, 1980; Beal and Jussawalla, 1981; Stewart and Streeten, 1976) that most economic development outcomes, even though successful economically, bring with them numerous social, health, human, environmental, and even economic problems. For example, the Green Revolution and similar large-scale agricultural development programs of the 1970s achieved dramatic increases in food production in the core areas of many parts of the world (e.g., Central Thai plain, East and Central Java). But the success of such enterprises (Jamieson, 1991) has served to divert resources from and impede the creation of techniques that can help resource-poor farmers in the hinterland, characterized by extreme cultural and ecological diversity, and has served as (Moemeka, 1987) a disincentive to grow more crops among rural farmers in Nigeria. However, it is also true that economic development makes it possible to solve many of these problems by creating the financial environment in which resources can

be made available to meet community and national needs. Therefore, it is now admitted that the physical (economic) and sociocultural (human) aspects of life are complementary in the process of development; that unless they are effectively integrated in both the planning and the implementation of development programs (a task which communication is well suited to do) they would each be a drag on the other.

Two concepts that have become very important in the application of the new development paradigm are privatization and interdependence. This aspect of the new paradigm attempts to combine economic (material) development with social justice. Privatization attempts to restructure economic and industrial activities within the nation in order to make them more efficient in operation and more effective in meeting the human and social needs of the population. Interdependence stresses the fact that no country can exist and survive on its own without any interaction—social or economic—with any other country. Because every country has some problem or problems—social, economic, political, or cultural—which it cannot solve by itself, cooperation between and among countries is imperative for survival. It aims at maximizing the strengths of individual countries and minimizing their weaknesses, thereby strengthening the overall economic output of the participating countries to the greater advantage of all.

Examples of the impact of privatization on the economic and social life of citizens abound in both the developing countries and in the newly industrialized countries (NIC). The first attempts at privatization by regional governments in Nigeria turned heavily indebted government transport companies into profitable ventures. This gave an impetus to the establishment of a national Technical Committee on Privatization and Commercialization (TCPC) charged with the responsibility of selling state-owned ventures to private organizations. Here, privatization is as much geared toward efficiency and profitability as it is toward spreading ownership of industrial ventures to as many Nigerians as possible. In the newly industrialized countries known as the Four Dragons—Singapore, Korea, Hong Kong, and Taiwan—privatization is directed at consolidating healthy industrial ventures in the hands of private citizens who can afford to buy them. This is the type of privatization that is also seen as a major factor in Mexico's rebounding economy (Perry, 1992). In the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), privatization appears to be directed toward the sale of state ventures to foreign nationals and organizations. The existing variabili-



ty in privatization strategies is dictated by the realities of each country's socioeconomic condition. And the fact that each has succeeded where it has been applied is a reflection of the importance of *relevance*, which generally obtains as a result of genuine dialogue and discussion, effective communication, and understanding.

Interdependence (inter-state and/or regional cooperation) has also taken different forms depending on the socioeconomic and political realities of each country or region. In Africa, and against the advice of the World Bank that "export-led" development programs (more intensive export of tropical products and minerals to pay for manufactured and industrial goods from outside) should be intensified, the Organization of African Unity has opted for "Collective Self-Reliance" (Browne, 1992). At the Heads of State Summit (Abuja, 1991), African leaders unanimously agreed to focus their energies on producing the products that Africa consumes, and committed themselves to working toward the integration of their economies, first on a subregional and later on a continent-wide (African Economic Community) basis.

In Saudi Arabia, internal capital and external technology and expertise have joined to produce the "wonders" of Jubail and Yanbu (*Development Review*, 1990 and 1992). These are two entirely new cities built in the desert and provided with every modern amenity—schools, hospitals, water, electricity, supermarkets, housing—as well as modern commercial and industrial ventures—iron and steel, methanol, petrochemical, gas, polypropylene, etc.

In Asia, where Japan is seen as the "guiding hand that uses aid to coordinate the region's economy" (*Wall Street Journal*, 1990; *The Economist*, 1991), interdependence would seem to be aimed at "teaching how to fish" rather than "giving fish." The Japanese provide the financial capital and the technical know-how used within each country by the nationals of these countries. In the process, education and training is not only improved but also expanded within each of these participating countries. These countries are now moving toward closer ties among themselves. For example, Singapore, Malaysia, and Indonesia are trying to forge a "Growth Triangle" (*Business Times*, 1991), and Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, the Philippines, and Thailand have put together plans for a Southeast Asia Economic Integration (Pura, 1990).

These seemingly pure economic development programs would certainly not have succeeded to the extent that they did if there had been no effective communication component built into the programs, and if the results deriving therefrom had not included social and cultural benefits. It was the effective communication component that created the climate in which discussions and dialogues led to understanding of the ramifications of the development projects and to the full and active participation which made the projects successful. The truth of this appears to have been summarized in the comment by Worthy (1991) on the success of Japan both within and outside her borders: "Their products (and influence) seem to be everywhere, but not because of innovative marketing techniques. The real reason: good information, personal relationships and patience . . . (effective communication)."

## REFERENCES

- Almond, G., and Verba, S. 1963. *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Beltran, L. R. 1974. Rural Development and Social Communication: Relationships and Strategies. *Communication Strategies for Rural Development*. Proceedings of the Cornell-CIAT International Symposium, March 17-24, New York State College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, New York.
- Beal, G., and Jussawalla, M. 1981. Old and New Paradigms of Development: Concept and Issues. Paper presented at the Conference on Communication Policy for Rural Development. Dhmbol Dam, Thailand.
- Bebe, J. 1987. Rapid Appraisal: The Evolution of the Concept and the Definition of Issues. Proceedings of the 1985 International Conference on Rapid Rural Appraisal (pp. 47-68), Khon Kaen University, Thailand.
- Browne, R. S. 1992. The Lagos Plan: Revising Africa's Last Hope. *Emerge (International)*, Vol. 3, No. 10, Sept., pp. 12-13.
- Business Times. 1991. An Asian 'Growth Triangle'. Section 3, Oct. 13.
- Chen, B. H. et al. 1990. Indoor Air Pollution in Developing Countries. *World Health Statistics Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 3, pp. 127-38.

- Commission on Health Research for Development. 1990. *Health Research: Essential Link to Equity in Development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Deutsch, K. S. 1964. Communication theory and Political Integration. In Jacob, P. E., and Tascano, J. V. (eds.), *The Integration of Political Community*. New York: Lippincott.
- Donohue, G. A., et al. 1970. Mass Media and the Knowledge Gap: A Hypothesis Reconsidered. *Communication Research 2 (1)*, January.
- Eilers, F., and Oepen, M. 1991. Communication and Development: Mainstream and Off-Stream Perspectives—A German View. In Casmir, L. (ed), *Communication in Development* Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing Corporation. 305.
- FASE. 1991. Exporting Banned and Hazardous Pesticides. *FASE Reports 9(1)*:51-58.
- Golding, P. 1974. Media Role in National Development: a Critique of a Theoretical Orthodoxy. *Journal of Communication 24(3)*, Summer.
- Gupta, P. C., and Ball, K. 1990. India: Tobacco Tragedy. *Lancet 335*:594-95.
- Halloran, J. 1980. The Need for Communication Research in Developing Countries. *Media Asia*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 137-44.
- Hiebert, R.E., et al 1985. *Mass Media IV: An Introduction to Modern Communication*, Longman, New York, pp. 31-32.
- International Broadcast Institute 1975. Communication in Support of Development. IBI Annual Meeting: *Report of Working Committee I* (Mimeographed). See also Working Committee I: Development Support Communication. *Intermedia*, (IBI) 3, No. 2, p. 5.
- Inayatullah. 1967. Quoted in Hamdan bin Adnan et al (1985). The Nature of Development. In Clayton, V., and Simmons, J. (eds.), *Development Communication: A Resource Manual for Teaching*, p. 4. Singapore: Asia Mass Communication Research and Information Centre.
- Jamieson, N. 1991. Communication and the New Paradigm of Development. In Casmir, Fred L. (ed.). *Communication in Development . . .* p. 31.
- Kjellstrom, T., and Rosenstock, L. 1990. The Role of Environmental and Occupational Hazards in the Adult Health Transition. *World Health Statistics Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 3, pp. 186-96.

- Klapper, J. T. 1960. *The Effects of Mass Communication*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.
- Kumar, K. (ed.). 1980. *Transnational Enterprises: Their Impact on Third World Societies and Culture*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview.
- Lerner, D. 1958. *The Passing of the Traditional Society*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.
- Masironi, R. and Rothwell, K. 1988. Smoking Trends and Effects Worldwide. *World Health Statistics Quarterly* 41: 228-41.
- McBride, S. (ed.). 1980. *Many Voices, One World: Communication and Society, Today and Tomorrow*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Moemeka, A. A. 1985. Communication in National Development: The Use of the Mass Media in Rural Development. *Informatologia Yugoslavica*, Vol. 17, Nos. 1-2, pp. 171-85.
- . 1987. *Rural Radio Broadcasting and Community Health Practices in Nigeria: A Case-Study of Radio O-Y-O On the Move*. Ph.D. Dissertation, State University of New York, Albany.
- . 1987. Integrated Rural Development in Bendel State: The Role of and Strategy for Mass Media Communication. In Omu, Fred A. I., and Makinwa-Adebusoye, P. K. (eds.), *Integrated Rural Development in Nigeria and Women's Role*, pp. 131-42. Heineman Educational Books (Nig) Ltd.
- Perry, N. J. 1992. What's Powering Mexico's Success. *Fortune* Feb., p. 109.
- Pye, L. W. (ed.). 1963. *Communication and Political Development*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Rogers, E. M. 1976a. Where are We in Understanding the Diffusion of Innovations. In W. Schramm and D. Lerner (eds.), *Communication and Change: The Last Ten Years—And the Next*, Honolulu: 204-22. The University Press of Hawaii.
- . (ed.) 1976b. *Communication and Development: Critical Perspectives*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Romieu, I., et al. 1990. Urban Air Pollution in Latin America and the Caribbean: Health Perspectives. *World Health Statistics Quarterly*, Vol. 43, No. 3, pp. 153-67.
- Rosario-Braid, F. 1979. A User-Oriented Communication Strategy. In Rosario-Braid (ed.), *Communication Strategy for Productivity Improvement*. Tokyo: 34. Asian Productivity Organization.

- Rowley, C. D. 1986. *Recovery: The Politics of Aboriginal Reform*. Australia: Penguin Books.
- Royal Commission for Jubail and Yanbu. 1990. Jubail Industrial City. *Jubail Development Review*, Vol. 5, No. 1, June. Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1992. Flaring Economy. *Jubail Development Review*, Vol. 7, No. 1, June. Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.
- Schramm, W. 1964. *Mass Media and National Development*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Servaes, J. 1991. Towards a New Perspective for Communication and Development. In Casmir, Fred L. (ed.), *Communication in Development . . .* 52.
- Shannon, C. E., and Weaver, W. 1949. *Mathematical Theory of Communication*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.
- Stewart, F., and Streeten, P. 1976. New Strategies for Development: Poverty, Income Distribution and Growth. In C. K. Wilbur (ed.), *The Political Economy of Development and Underdevelopment*. New York: Random House.
- Takeichi, H. 1992. *Environmental Pollution and Japan (The Japanese—Their Possibilities)*. Tokyo: Veritas Shuppansha.
- Todaro, M. P. 1977. *Economic Development in the Third World: An Introduction to Problems and Policies in a Global Perspective*. New York: Longman.
- UNESCO. 1975. *Report of the Meeting of Experts on Communication Policies for Rapidly Developing Societies, Mashad, Iran*. See also, UNESCO (1975). *Report of the Meeting of Experts on Communication Policies and Planning in Asia, Philippines*, Oct. 4–8, pp. 5–10.
- Wall Street Journal. 1990. The Guiding Hand—Using Aid to Coordinate Asia's Economy. (Eastern Edition) Aug., p. 1.
- Worthy, F. S. 1991. Keys to Japanese Success in Asia. *Fortune (Special Report)*, Oct., p. 157.
- World Bank. 1974. *Rural Development: Sector Working Paper*. Washington, D.C.