From Modernization to Alternative Paradigm: Development in History and Ideological Implications of Unequal Relations for the Periphery

JEGEDE, Emmanuel
Centre of Excellence on Development Communication,
Department of Theatre and Performing Arts,
Ahmadu Bello University Zaria - Nigeria
+2348028264767
jegedewisdom@gmail.com

Abstract

There has long been a history of ideological contention between the 'Core' and the 'Periphery' on   development framework and practice. The Core represents the highly industrialized nations of the North while the Periphery stands for the poor dependent nations of the South. Indeed, several scholars have argued that what seems to be a state of underdevelopment today in the Third World countries is firstly the consequence of unequal ideological relations and secondly the emulation of   development models prescribed by the industrialized nations of the North to the detriment of the South's fertile reserve of traditional wisdom, cultural nuances, creativity and enterprise. The West, specifically the US provided a development framework to be emulated by the rest of the world. The potency of this western prescription has crumbled in the face of apparent contradictions and catastrophic economic and social results it produced for   the Southern nations especially Nigeria. Consequently, there have been several frantic struggles and efforts to retrace steps and locate an alternative pathway to development since the 1970s. In view of this, using the lens of theories as an analytical tool, this paper therefore contends that development is a historically produced discourse traceable to the consolidation of the US hegemony in the period 1945-1967. This was occasioned by the need to expand the market for the US produced goods and the need to find new sites for investment of US surplus capital. The paper also unveils the implications of what this mistaken emulation of western models have caused Nigeria and suggests what can be done to avoid a national baleful and lurid destiny in future.

KEY WORDS: History, Theories, Development, Ideology. Implications,
            Periphery

Background

Several development scholars believe that development is a historically produced discourse traceable to the consolidation of US hegemony in the period 1945-1967. It was occasioned by the need to expand the market for US produced goods and the need to find new sites for investment of the US surplus capital. Emphatically, the mainstream construction of development however hinges on**:** modernization, industrialization, urbanization, agricultural technification and economic growth. The architectural basis for the concept and programme of development was laid in 1949 by the US President, Harry Truman. In the point four of his inaugural address, Truman declares:

> We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas. More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap to both them and more prosperous areas (Escobar Aturo1995; Okwori et al 2013:1)

The above has been the basic design or conceptualization of development**.** It draws a clear line between the developed and the underdeveloped; it stipulates that absence of scientific and industrial progress equals underdevelopment. Truman's speech also introduced new meaning to development: opposite of underdevelopment-synonym for poverty. There are other implications of Truman's conceptual foregrounding: that underdevelopment can be solved if certain stages are followed; that intervention from those already developed was justifiable and necessary; it gave development a Messianic thrust of salvation and worthy of note is that the intervention this presented into the internal affairs of other nations was not to be challenged. From this framing, the world became divided into the 'haves' and 'have nots'. Over 2 billion people were consigned to the dustbin of history. The lessons from the above therefore, remain as follows:

- This is the background to the major prescription for development which pre-occupied scholarly thought at the United Nations first development decade, 1960-1970. It was the "GNP-trickle down" theory. This model equates development with the stages of urbanization in countries of the North.

- It is believed that industrialization, capital investment and Gross National Product (GNP) output are the chief determinants of development. The underlying assumptions for this are predicated on the belief that development was only a problem to the South,
- That a centralized control of economy emphasizing industrialization, urbanization and modernization leads to rapid economic growth; that internal accumulation of wealth garnished by foreign capital and technology brings about development and that the benefits of these arrangements will then filter down to the people to bring about material well-being.

- The potency of this prescription has crumbled in the face of apparent contradictions and catastrophic results. Economic and social conditions in the South especially in Nigeria have continued to degenerate instead of improving.
- Even the so-called developed countries of the North have not wiped out internal economic and social inequalities which place the conditions of some of its people on the same level of poverty as the South. (Escobar Aturo1995)
- The prescriptions paved the way for the introduction of development plans. Several post-independence National Development Plans: 1962-1968; 1970-1974; 1975-1980; 1981-1985; the three year Rolling Plans of the Babangida regime and NEEDS

What these mean simply is that there is a mistaken emulation of Western models to the detriment of the south's fertile reserve of traditional wisdom, creativity and enterprise. This is happening when the world is shifting towards participatory paradigms of development. A shift necessitated by the realization that increased economic productivity and Gross National Product (GNP) are not effective measurements of the standard of living of a people. This paper therefore seeks to conceptualize the term development and trace the history of development schools of thought (theories) chronologically and highlight its attendant implications for the countries of the south otherwise called the periphery. We address the paper from a historical perspective observing a shift from modernization and dependency theories to more normative and holistic approaches. But in the first place, what does development mean?

Conceptualizing Development
Over the last few decades, there has been greater study on the concept of development, including not only indicators like economic growth or

production, but also incorporating factors currently considered essential for full development, a non-linear development, and conceived as a complex process involving different fields and characteristics. Development is complex and interdisciplinary. Several scholars have attempted to conceptualize development. To Rogers (1976):

> Development is a widely participatory process of social change in a society, intended to bring about social and material advancement (including greater equality, freedom, and other valued qualities) for the majority of the people through their gaining control over their environment. Rogers stressed the endogenous dimension of development. It must be through people's participation, exploiting their own environment to improve their situation rather than expecting development to "fall from heaven" as it were.

In the same vein, Inayatullah (cited in Soola 2003:13), asserts that "development is change toward patterns of society that allow better realization of human values, that allow a society greater control over its environment and over its political destiny, and that enables its individuals to gain increased control over themselves". Todar and Smith (2003) however, stress that development involves both the quality and quantity of life. Quality of life refers to opportunities and availability of social, health and educational concerns. Quantity of life involves the amount of economic and political participation of the people. This definition shifts the attention and aim of development away from an economic to a more humanizing conceptualised one. Todar and Smith (2003; Oyero 2008) identify three objectives of development:

1. To increase the availability and widen the distribution of basic life sustaining goods such as food, shelter, health and protection.
2. To raise levels of living in addition to higher incomes, the provision of more jobs, better education, and greater attention to cultural and human values, all of which will serve not only enhance material well-being but also to generate greater individual and national self-esteem.
3. To expand the range of economic and social choices available to individuals and nations by freeing them from servitude and dependence, not only in relation to other people and nation- states but also to the forces of ignorance and human misery. Having conceptualized the term development,

it is germane to consider the different paradigms or movements of development and their implications for the wellbeing of the countries of the South otherwise known as the Periphery. The development movement or progression discussed in this paper spans from modernization paradigm through dependency and the world system theory to the alternative paradigm. These progressions will be critically considered and their implications established.

Modernisation Paradigm & Implications

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. 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 and social change as the replica of its own political-economic system and opening the way for the transnational corporations (Jan Searves 2008).

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 centralized 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 industrialized countries. This mainly economic-oriented view, characterized by endogenism and evolutionism, ultimately resulted in the modernization and growth theory. It sees development as a unilinear, evolutionary process and defines the state of underdevelopment in terms of observable quantitative differences between so-called poor and rich countries on the one hand, and traditional and modern societies on the other hand (Jan Servaes 2008).

 From the above, it is clear that the birth of modernization paradigm sets the stage for the tripartite account of development theories. The USA, in its agenda to replicate its development in developing countries, therefore contributed to the humble beginnings of the Modernization paradigm as

already captured in the background. Modernization paradigm was the dominant academic perspective on development from 1945 to 1965(Servaes, 1999). Among the protagonists of the paradigm included Daniel Lerner and Wilbur Schramm. Other scholars who played a critical role in the propagation of the theory include Harold Lasswell and Everett Rogers (Melkote&Steeves, 2001). Singhal, (1987) pays special tribute to Wilbur Schramm —whom he calls the fifth founding father of communication, after Harold Lasswell, Kurt Lewin, Carl Hovland and Paul F. Lazarsfeld. Development would only flourish in developing countries once such countries rid themselves of the obnoxious traditional model. The traditional model was the greatest obstacles to development and any developing country had to disengage the traditional elements so as to be like the First World countries.

Modernization paradigm was also propelled by Walter Rostow's*takeoff* model. The coexistence of the traditional and modern models was only temporary because the urge for equilibrium was expected to favor modernization over the traditional. For Rostow, the stages through which a traditional society ends up to modernization followed a lineal outline from traditional to pre-takeoff stages, takeoff stage, to road to maturity and finally to a mass consumption society (Servaes, 1999; Aswani, D. R. and Wekesa A.S.2014). In summing up what entailed the differences between underdevelopment and the modernity of societies, Servaes (1999: 19) writes : "Underdevelopment reveals perceptible, quantitative differences between the rich and the poor countries while Development means bridging the gaps by means of imitation processes between traditional and modern, retarded and advanced, or barbarian and civilized sectors and groups to the advantage of the latter." Development could therefore be manifested through urbanization, literacy and exposure to mass media (Narula, 2006).

The modernization paradigm was not entirely a foolhardy idea. Robert White (cited in Servaes & Malikhao 2008:159; Aswani, D. R. and Wekesa A.S.2014) underscored some positive aspects as a result of the theory. According to him, "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 lives did change profoundly. This was the real face of modernization." (Aswani, D. R. and Wekesa A.S.2014).

In support to White's assessment of the modernization paradigm, it was evident that the dominant paradigm saw loans advanced to the Third World countries and to businessmen and farmers. Government revenues in form of taxes collected were used to construct roads and offer public services to the citizenry. The agricultural extension services thrived during the modernization paradigm which saw the rise of agricultural centers of experimentation. In Kenya for example, Aswani, and Wekesa (2014) reveal that the establishment of Bukura Agricultural Institute in Kakamega Country still thrives to date. In line with the desire to improve productivity of labor, the modernization paradigm saw the setting up of instrumental ministries in modern governments such as education, health, agriculture, roads and communication. Production was also increased through import substitution. The import of all these incentives left many Third World countries with colonial effects. Nothing can be further from the truth now that popularization of the modernization paradigm coincided with the colonial era in many Third World countries. The modernization theory premises have received a sufficient rebuttal, most of the rebuttals contributed to the reconsideration of the development agenda.

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 especially for the nations of the south. Stavenhagen tested his theses against the situation in Mexico, while others came to similar conclusions for Brazil, and Chile (Jan Servaes & Patchanee Malikhao).

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.

Similarly, Melkote&Steeves (2001) tear into the dominant paradigm refuting the claim that the media was such a powerful instrument in the hands of the powerful means that the audiences are manipulated and that they were victims of propaganda. The duo- Melkote&Steeves dwell on the concomitant failures of modernization theory. While debunking the notion that development was a corollary of dropping backward traditional model of society, Melkote&Steeves interrogate the ethnocentric bias in modernization. The perspective that the West and specifically America was the citadel of development was naïve and one that thrived on ignorance (or perhaps, arrogance). Secondly, the duo applaud the deep seated tradition in the Third World countries. Also in the assessment of the modernization paradigm, Servaes &Malikhao (2008:159) write—"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.

Still on the implications of modernization theory for the countries of the south-the periphery, there is little consensus on whether modernization can reduce inequalities between the Core and Periphery. Based on this,

Nimusabe, (2013) submits that it is good to observe and imitate what happens elsewhere, but it is up to the individual to effect change in his/her own situation. Development as a process cannot be achieved without considering men and women as agents of change. In addition, because it is difficult to reach consensus about definitions of development, it is also difficult to plan the development of a country based on the development pattern of another country. In the same light, Apffel-Marglin and Marglin (1990) argue that development interventions in less developed countries are not just a matter of transferring information and technology from more developed contexts. This top-down approach to development has failed to recognise local resources and the problems involved in the cultural and material differences between contexts. It is important to find other reasons and apply them in order to improve the living situations of people in poor countries. Today, the question of why the Third World continues to copy models drawn from the Western World is still current (Nimusabe, R.P. 2013).

In a nutshell, modernization failed because it never attained what it portended to achieve (Servaes &Malikhao, 2008; Melkote&Steeves, 2001; and Singhal, 1987). Any paradigmatic shift was to involve the concerns of the people who were the direct beneficiaries of development. The citizens of the Third World countries can narrate their problems with alacrity and as such they ought to be included in development projects. Such opinion is likely to propel the projects to sustainability. The culture of a people ought, in Marxist tradition, to be the infrastructure of development ——one that helps development to respond to their call. The ultimate failure of modernization theory was the fact that monies went to intermediaries and not to the intended people. This failure successively led to dependency model which thrives in the Third World especially where colonialists made every effort to disabuse horizontal communication and enforce policies through fear (Aswani, D. R. and Wekesa A.S.2014).

Reinforcing the argument, Ferraro, (1996) believes that the dominant paradigm of development did not yield good results in the third world countries, as the effect was indirect. Dominant paradigm operates top-down approach of development which is actually based on Dimension of Development Communication activities like construction of huge hydroelectric dams, development of hybrid seed varieties, development of huge media networks etc. The dominant paradigm has failed due to traditionalism, widespread poverty, illiteracy, growing population and inadequate institutional mechanism to pass on the fruits of economic growth to the general population, especially the disadvantaged sections of the

countries of the South. In addition to these conditions, redtape, inefficiency and corruption acted as contributing factors. Industrialization in the third world countries led to reduction in labour, increased unemployment and large-scale migration from villages to cities.

Media operations also followed the centralised system of communication of the dominant paradigm and this has a lot of implications for the development of the countries of the South. Following the top-down approach, the media started serving the elite and the privileged classes of the countries within the periphery. The programming turns towards the issues relating to the elite and the ruling classes and news stories are selected from big cities only. The common man disappears from the newspapers, radio and television. Villages are hardly seen. If they are seen somewhere, then it is only in negative news. Red-tape, inefficiency and corruption play a vital role here also. The media has lost democratic values. It has been converted into a marketing industry no more working for the welfare of the larger population.

In terms of communication,   Communication systems and theories under this paradigm were expected to help modernize people's attitudes and ways of thinking, which would be conducive to support the economic model already adopted successfully by the west, in accordance with the belief that individuals have to change before development could truly take off. Summarily, communication in the dominant paradigm was basically associated with the linear, mass media model aimed at transmitting information and messages from one point to another or many others, usually in a vertical top-down fashion which was definitely not in favour of the nations within the periphery.. This idea was rooted in the strong belief in the persuasive power of the medium, especially before the 1970s. It was associated with the use of media to persuade people to achieve, maintain, and strengthen development goals, and the media's role was paramount in this campaign (Milkote and Stevens, 2001;Jegede 2015).

The failures of modernization paradigm caused a rethinking of the theoretical models of reference for communication. This is because it became increasingly evident that the media alone would not change people's mind-sets and behaviors. Theories such as "the Hypodermic Needle Theory" or "the Bullet Theory" which over-emphasized the power of media over people lost their relevance. With time, it became progressively more evident that media impact was not as direct and as paramount as commonly believed, and that audiences were also not as passive as believed. Even though

communication studies reviewed and downgraded the influence of media, giving more relevance to the role of interpersonal communication, the model of reference remained the same. None of the newly emerging theoretical approaches questioned the overall validity of the one-way and usually top-down flow of information. Although it would be unfair to label them as propaganda, it is not difficult to see the manipulative potential of many communication applications within the modernization paradigm. In the late 1980s, most development institutions conceived and applied communication primarily for the dissemination of information and adoption of innovations. The emphasis placed on tangible communication products neglected the potential of communication as dialogic, cross-cutting, investigative tool. This emphasis was so pervasive that the medium appeared to be more important than the content itself, which echoes Marshall McLuhan's famous slogan, "The Medium is the message'. Unfortunately, the available data indicated that the most important message was that media were not the answer to development problems, at least, not in the way and manner they were being used.The process of communication use for development in dominant paradigm had developed a minority of nations in the world, and a small number of individuals and groups in the remaining nations. However, it had underdeveloped a majority of individuals and groups, especially in the periphery (Third World nations), poverty, unemployment and income inequality seemed to be on the rise in the Third World (Melkote and Stevens, 2001).

Development scholars in Africa, Asia, and Latin America have shown how in the preceding decades economic policies, international aid, trade, etc. focused on the exploitation of the periphery (i.e. Third World Nations) by the Center (i.e. Industrial Countries); they emphasized structural imbalance between the Periphery and the Center which was responsible for the underdevelopment of the Third World (Frank, 1969). These development scholars explained how and why the trickle down of economic and social benefits of development was not being felt in the Periphery. The decade of the seventies, therefore, was a period of ferment in the field of development in general, and development communication in particular. The general note of optimism that reigned in the fifties and sixties regarding the role and potential of the mass media in the development process in the Third World turned sour in the seventies. Administrators and researchers alike realized that the development process was not as straightforward and clear – cut as it was earlier conceptualized. There were too many extraneous variables that impacted on the process. The mass media, far from being the independent

variable in the change process, were themselves affected by extraneous factors.

An important conceptual problem in theories of modernization was the level at which change was sought to be introduced. The unit of analysis was predominantly centered within the individual (Fair, 1989). The underlying theme in this approach was that the benefits of modernization would accrue by changing the traditional attitudes, values and aspirations of the individual peasants in developing nations. Exposure to new ideas and practices usually through the mass media could help remove traditional attitudes which posed impediments to progress (Lerner, 1958; Shore 1980). This psychological bias in research, Rogers stated, could be traced to the fact that several early scholars in communication had psychological backgrounds and so it was obvious that their views of communication and change neglected the influence of social – structural variables that affect communication (Rogers, 1976a). Much of the early research, therefore, placed an exaggerated emphasis on the individual as the locus of control for change to the neglect of the group and also the relations between sources and receivers. This resulted in the individual constituting the unit of response and the unit of analysis, and consequently, the unit of change (Coleman 1958; Rogers, 1976a).

In summary, the dominant paradigm has been criticized by several people for its reductionism. It did not take sufficiently into account the different types of target populations (e.g., prosperous farmers who own land and are open to new techniques versus other farmers who are illiterate, poor and exploited) (Mefalopulos, 2008). It also failed to take into account the impact of the economic and political structures on the capacity to adopt innovations. The same charge of blindness where social, political and economic factors are concerned also applies to innovations that require a process of diffusion. Finally, communication channels and sources were generally used within the framework of vertical, unilateral, top-down communication. There was never any mention of horizontal communication between the groups in the communities affected by the problem that the innovation was meant to resolve. There was also a lack of vertical, bottom-up communication, which would have made it possible to bring the people's problems to the attention of the decision makers and the experts. Emphasis was on civilization at the expense of basic needs and poverty alleviation; It is one way, top down, vertical information transmission; it focuses on persuasion rather than cultivation of trust and mutual understanding; It is ethnocentric; it is imbued with religious bias; it encouraged cultural imperialism and insensitivity; it exaggerates the power of mass media and overlooked the importance of

interpersonal communication; it ignores ecological issue and promotes national-level programs rather than local-level actions. These weaknesses brought a lot of criticisms against the paradigm by the nations of the Periphery until it gave way for the dependency theory and perspective (Oyero 2008).

Dependency Theory& Implications

Dependency theory originates from a criticism of modernization theory. The modernisation theorists argued that poor countries would catch up to the West after imitating what happened in Western countries, but this did not happen. In the 1960s and 1970s, the originators of dependency theory insisted that   the Third World development should be treated as a historically distinct problem. The idea of dependency emerged from a research report written by a group led by Raul Prebish in the 1950s and an essay by Cardoso and Faletto in the mid-1960s. They were preoccupied, like so many dependency theoreticians, by Latin-America and tried to understand why, after 200 years of pervasive political, economic and cultural interchange with Europe and the United States, the degree of underdevelopment vis-à-vis the advanced industrial countries had changed so little (Nimusabe, 2013). Thus they developed dependency theory to explain the causes of this stagnation. There are two dependency theory traditions: Structuralist Dependency Theory and Radical Dependency Theory or Marxist Dependency Theory (Todaro, 2003; Dos Santos, 2002).

The 'dependistas' according to Searves , J.(2008), were primarily concerned with the effects of dependency on peripheral countries, but implicit in their analysis was the idea that development and underdevelopment must be understood in the context of the world system. This paradigm emerged in Latin American countries and it is relevant to these countries because these countries achieved freedom long ago but continue to face problems of poverty in large sections of the population, regional inequalities, alongside social inequalities and sectoral divisions in the economy that are similar to the more recently liberated countries. According to Ferraro (1996) these Latin American countries were forced to use their raw materials and cheap labour for the welfare of the dominant states instead their own development.

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 *(*Jan Servaes & Patchanee Malikhao)**.**

However, Mefalopulos (2008) regrets that the proponents of the dependency theory vigorously supported rethinking the communication agenda along the lines of a more balanced flow of communication at the international level. Yet, at the national level, they often neglected to consider the horizontal component of communication within countries and failed to give proper attention to the potential of privately owned media and community media. While arguing against the "free-flow" argument proposed by the United States and its allies, the "dependentistas" remained rooted in the classic media-centric conception of communication, mostly from the state perspective. Ideally, the state is expected to represent the wider public's interest, but reality shows that this has seldom been the case. Dependency theories did not consider and support the wider role that "freer" communication , and not just media, at different levels could play in creating spaces and actively engaging broader sectors of society in development. Despite the significant differences between modernization and dependency theories, their communication model was basically the same: a one -way communication flow, with the main difference between the two theories being who was controlling and sending the message and for what purpose.

To this end, 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 the hindrances are found 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; but can that really be possible? 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 J (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 concrete ways of addressing that underdevelopment. In a bid to fill the gap created by the dependency thinking, the world systems theory emerged.

World Systems Theory

Just as the dependency school was a child of its time, so were the world systems theories. This approach was developed in the mid-1970s, when East Asian countries were experiencing swift growth that could no longer be described as dependent development, particularly as they had begun to challenge the economic superiority of the USA in a number of areas. Another factor conducive to the rise of the world systems theories was the then impending crisis in socialist countries. The failure of the Cultural Revolution in China and economic stagnation in the Eastern Bloc led to an opening in the direction of international capital. Previously unthinkable alliances were formed: for example between Washington and Peking. These were developments to which revolutionary Marxism could contribute nothing. It could be said that developments were happening on a world scale that was not covered by contemporary development theories. Wallerstein was the most outspoken figure in this new terrain. His works from the mid- 1970s onwards were strongly based on the ideas of André Gunder Frank and other dependentistas. Unequal trade, the exploitation of the periphery by the core, and the existence of a world market were concepts taken from dependency school thinking. Like Frank, Wallerstein argued that a capitalist world economy had existed since the 16th century, that is, since the beginning of the colonial era. He saw non-capitalist modes of production as a part of capitalism, the definition of which (based on 19th-century England) he saw as

too narrow. Increasingly, countries, which were previously isolated and self-supporting, became involved in the world economy.

The final result is the creation of a core and a periphery, with a number of semi-periphery countries in between. The core consists of the industrialized countries, the periphery of the agricultural export countries. The semi-peripheral countries (like Brazil), which act as a buffer between the core and the periphery, are differentiated from the periphery by their more significant industrial production. The semi-periphery functions as a go-between: it imports hitech from the core, and in return exports semi-manufactured goods to the core. It imports raw materials from the periphery and in turn exports the finished products to the industrialized countries. Wallerstein saw the Newly Industrialized Countries as examples of the semi-periphery. A peripheral country can achieve the status of semi-periphery and in this way can be brought into the core. These were areas where Wallerstein clearly diverged from dependency school of thinking, if only in that dependentistas did not reason in terms of a semi-periphery.

The world systems concept was seen, in this period, as a handy solution to a problem that *dependentistas* were increasingly confronted with: how to differentiate between internal and external factors as explanations for underdevelopment. The world systems theory offered a simple solution: in moving to a more abstract level (with countries as global analysis units) there are no more external factors. There are also no longer different sorts of capitalism, such as core capitalism and peripheral capitalism; instead there is one capitalist world system. The origin of development and underdevelopment is then found in the incorporation of countries within the world system. Underdevelopment occurs because countries are subject to a trade regime and produce for a world market that is characterised by unequal trade. Wallerstein was criticised by followers of the modes of production theory, who argued that there were a number of production modes, each articulating in its own way with the dominant capitalist mode.(Oyero 2008; Jegede, 2012; BTC 1998;)

Another world systems author is Samir Amin, who began publishing on this topic in 1976. In contrast to Wallerstein, Amin did not agree with the presence of a capitalist mode of production in Latin America from the 16th century. He did agree with the existence of a noncapitalist mode of production, which saw its surplus appropriated through unequal trade. This unequal trade led to a stagnation in the expansion of the national market and thus to a disarticulated economic system. Like Wallerstein, Amin argued for the existence of the go-betweens, the semi-peripheral countries. In

general, the criticism of the world systems approach is the same as that of the dependency theories: the neglect of class analysis, the neglect of the diversity of the Third World, and the assumption of non-workable political options such as self reliance and a socialist world government. In taking a global view, the findings are difficult to translate to the concrete realities of the Third World countries. As with previous approaches, the world systems theory was also pushed to the background in the 1980s. It was only during the 1970s and early 1980s that new perspectives in development communication began to grow stronger. The Latin American school of thought was very influential in promoting the new communication concept, based on the two-way horizontal model. Lius Ramiro, Beltran Salmon (2006a), and Juan Diaz Bordenau (2006) were some of the influential scholars working on this idea.

Participation Paradigm & Implications

Oyero (2008; Servaes 2002) reveal that the promises of the modernization paradigm failed to materialise, and its methods came increasingly under fire, and the dependency theorists failed to provide a successful alternative model. With the modernization paradigm and dependency theory in place, the implication of absolute poverty became egregiously enormous world wide, that is to say people who cannot meet their basic needs. About a third of the population in the so-called developing countries are in this category. The common starting point therefore is the examination of the changes from 'bottom-up', from the self-development of the local community. The basic assumption is that there are no countries or communities that function completely autonomously and that are completely self sufficient, nor are there any nations whose development is exclusively determined by external factors. Every society is dependent in one way or another, both in form and in degree. Thus, a framework was sought within which both the Center and the Periphery could be studied separately and in their mutual relationship.

More attention is also being paid to the content of development, which implies a more normative approach- which Another development questions whether 'developed' countries are in fact developed and whether this genre of progress is sustainable or desirable. It favors a multiplicity of approaches based on the context and the basic, felt needs, and the empowerment of the most oppressed sectors of various societies at divergent levels. A main thesis is that change must be structural and occur at multiple levels in order to achieve these ends. In view of this, Servaes (2002) reveals that a different approach focusing on people's participation began to emerge. This

participatory model is less oriented to the political-economic dimension and more rooted in the cultural realities of development. The search for a different and better vision in development practices is currently linked to people's participation and empowerment. The justification for participatory model, according to Thomas(1994), was that the worldwide poverty situation could be solved by participatory communication. The use of participatory communication education mechanisms could bring about social change and development through sustained improvements in agriculture, health, education, politics and economics over a sufficiently long enough time to make a considerable proportion of the population less poor, both in material as well as immaterial ways. Participation is a concept that has been gaining increasing recognition and prestige in the development discourse and its practices. Participatory approaches require a shift in the way individuals are considered, from passive recipients to active agents of development efforts. There are a number of reasons for this shift, a major one of which is presented by Ascroft and Masilela (1994: 282): "If peasants do not control or share control of the processes of their own development, there can be no guarantee that it is their best interest that is being served."

World Bank (1994: 3) believes that, internationally, emphasis is being placed on the challenge of sustainable development, and participation is increasingly recognised as a necessary part of sustainable development strategies. Meaningful participation cannot occur without communication. Participation paradigm is based on the assumption that the common people are intelligent and can be active agents of change. Development efforts should then be based on people's capacity to contribute and participate actively in the task of transforming their society. It emphasizes the endogenous nature of development as something that must evolve from the people as opposed to 'trickle-down' belief. It also emphasizes self reliant growth, stressing that people have the ability to face their problems with resources or ideas emanating from within without relying on external help. Self reliance thus has three components:
· The development of the consciousness in people that they are in charge of their destiny;
· That people can think or reason and achieve any height by themselves; and
· That people can acquire the attitude for solving problems that confront them by their own initiative and skills (Oso, 2002:10).

 However, Oyero (2008) notes that the development focus has shifted from economic growth to include other social dimensions needed to ensure meaningful results in the long run—as indicated by the consensus built in the

definition of the Millennium Development Goals. Sustainability and people's participation became key elements of this new vision. The alternative paradigm emphasizes not only material development but also the development of values and cultures. Where development communication interventions are concerned, it emphasizes the small media operating in networks and the use of grassroots communication approaches. According to this paradigm, grassroots participation reinforces the chances that communities will adopt activities appropriate for them. One of the models attached to this paradigm is the methodology of community media (Oyero 2009;Berrigan 1981;Jegede 2015).

The participatory model, by implication,according to servaes(2002), incorporates the framework of multiplicity;it stresses the importance of cultural identity of local communities and of democratization and participation at all levels—international, national, local and individual; and it points to a strategy, not merely inclusive of, but largely emanating from, the traditional 'receivers'. Paulo Freire (1997) 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. Therefore, the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems argues that "this calls for a 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" (MacBride, 1980). This model stresses reciprocal collaboration throughout all levels of participation.

There are many reasons for the adoption of participation in development, some of which relate directly to the enhancement of project results. As early as 1982,White (as cited in McKee 1994: 215) summarized the major reasons for the adoption of this approach in development initiatives, maintaining that (1) services can be provided at a lower cost; (2) participation has intrinsic values for participants, alleviating feelings of alienation and powerlessness; (3) participation is a catalyst for further development efforts; (4) participation leads to a sense of responsibility for the project; and (5) participation ensures the use of indigenous knowledge and expertise. Despite these and other benefits, participation has remained a highly praised

term, but a poorly adopted one. This is probably owing to the concerns that managers may experience failure when not in total control of a project, as well as participation's multifaceted conception and the many sensitive issues involved in its application.

Many development practitioners and managers have their own understanding of participation, leading at times to divergent views on what it truly entails and how it should be applied. The richness, or "broadness," of the concept of participation is not considered a problem by everybody. Servaes argues that in dealing with participation, rigidly defined theoretical structures are neither feasible nor desirable (Servaes, Jacobson, and White 1996). He claims that participation's strength derives from its flexibility in adapting its strategic approach according to the situation. Other scholars tend to differ: they believe that this adaptability constitutes a major weakness of participatory approaches, which can be easily modified and used in a number of ways, often not consistent with a genuine participatory philosophy.

Huesca (2000: 75) confirms this point: "Indeed, participation has been embraced by development scholars who have incorporated this notion into modernization practices, such as message development and social integration. The pluralistic spirit of the participatory turn in development communication has had the ironic effect of redeeming the dominant paradigm from its critics." This statement is a further indication of the complexity and ambiguity that this concept implies. That participation is not an absolute concept, and that it can be conceived and applied in different degrees, is part of the problem. Pretty devised a typology that includes seven different types of participation as interpreted and applied by various development organizations (Pretty et al. 1995). This taxonomy ranges from passive participation, where people are simply told what is happening and their participation is conceived as a mere head-counting, to self-mobilization, where people not only have the power to make decisions but can also initiate the process. In between these two extremes, there are other kinds of participation with varying degrees of people's involvement.

The full categorization, starting from the least participatory, includes passive participation, participation in information giving, participation by consultation, participation for material incentives, functional participation, interactive participation, and self-mobilization. The World Bank (1995) identified four types of participation: (1) information sharing, (2) consultation, (3) collaboration, and (4) empowerment. Information sharing

and consultation are considered low-level forms of participation, while the other two are considered high-level forms. These types are consistent with others, such as the classification derived by a literature review by Mefalopulos (2003), which includes (1) passive participation, when stakeholders attend meetings to be informed; (2) participation by consultation, when stakeholders are consulted but the decision making rests in the hands of the experts; (3) functional participation, when stakeholders are allowed to have some input, although not necessarily from the beginning of the process and not in equal partnership; and (4) empowered participation, when relevant stakeholders take part throughout the whole cycle of the development initiative and have an equal influence on the decision-making process.

The most developed form of participation is self-management. This principle implies the right to participation in the planning and production of media content. However, not everyone wants to or must be involved in its practical implementation. More important is that participation is made possible in the decision-making regarding the subjects treated in the messages and regarding the selection procedures. One of the fundamental hindrances to the decision to adopt the participation strategy is that it threatens existing hierarchies. Nevertheless, participation does not imply that there is no longer a role for development specialists, planners, and institutional leaders. It only means that the viewpoint of the local groups of the public is considered before the resources for development projects are allocated and distributed, and that suggestions for changes in the policy are taken into consideration(Servaes 2002).

Conclusion

Most development communicators agree that Modernization theory has concomitant dependence on the power of western technology and adapting modern technologies made the poor Third World countries ever more dependent on the First World. Moreover, these technologies could not be adapted exactly, as many of these countries lacked basic infrastructure items like electricity and transportation. The dependency argument played an important role in the movement for the New Information and Communication Order in the 1970s (MacBride, 1980). Since it has been opulently argued that the modernization paradigm has enormous negative implications for the development of the periphery, one should therefore, pause and ponder a little on what the likely remedy may be. Actually, there is no doubt that all paradigms have their own limitations and none of them is

infallible. But be that as it may, participation paradigm, despite its loopholes, still has a little merit over the other paradigms spoken about in this paper. Based on this, it is suggested on a very strong note that development should be conceived from participatory point of view; this is because development needs a method of communication that is liberating, egalitarian, indigenous, local or endogenous and geared towards the betterment of all, especially the poor, the marginalized, and women. The answer to this is found in participatory approaches using accessible media that are culture-specific and cater for a large mass of people. Participation promotes interactivity; creates community and communality; liberates; develops and supports cultural identity. People-based Participatory Research on how inclusive mechanisms affect social change is another component of using participation for development. Such research involves the public at large and draws attention to the scope of a programme and creates awareness among the target audience. For example, research among the target audience on the effect of an entertainment- education program in a village would show how much discussion and study of the issue at hand occurs at the village level.

References

Ascroft, J., and S. Masilela. 1994. "Participatory Decision-Making in Third World Development." In *Participatory Communication: Working for Change and Development,* ed. S. White with K. S. Nair and J. Ascroft, 259–94. New Delhi, India: Sage Publications.

Aswani, D. R. and Wekesa A.S.(2014) " A Review of Relevant Literature on Development Communication and its Implications for Kenya"in *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Vol. 4, No. 11; September 2014*

Anaeto, S. G. and Solomon-Anaeto (2010). *Development communication: Principles and Practice*. Ibadan: Stirling-Horden Publishers

Apffell-Marglin, F. & Marglin, S.A. (1990). *Dominating knowledge: Development, culture and Resistance.* Oxford: University Press Oxford

Baran, S. J.and Davis D. K. (2003). *Mass communication theory, foundations, ferment, and future,* Belmont (USA): Thomas-Wardworth.

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

Baran, S. J. (2009). *Introduction to mass communication: Media literacy and culture* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Berrigan, F. J. (1981). *Community media and development*. Paris: UNESCO Inkeles, A., and Smith, D.H. (1974). *Becoming modern: Individual change in six developing countries* . Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Carmen, R. 1996. *Autonomous Development.* New York: Zed Books

Development Theories – Lecture Notes. BTC 1998.

Dos Santos, T. (1970). The Structure of Dependency, American Economic Review, 60(21), May.
Escobar Aturo (1995) Encountering Development: The making and Unmaking of the Third World, Princeton: Princeton University Press

Ferraro, V. (1996). Dependenay Theory : An Introduction.www.vinnie.com

Freire, P. (1997). Pedagogy of the Heart (D. Macedo & A. Oliveira, Trans.)

FAO. 1981. *Communication for Rural Development*. Rome: FAO.
———. 1984. *Expert Consultation on Communication for Development*. Rome: FAO.

Huesca, R. 2000. "Communication for Social Change among Mexican Factory Workers on the Mexico-United States Border." In *Redeveloping Communication for Social Change: Theory, Practice, and Power,* ed. K. G.Wilkins, 73–87. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield

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

Jacobson, T. 1994. "Modernization and Post-Modernization Approaches to Participatory Development Communication." In *Participatory Communication: Working for Change and Development,* ed. S. White with K. S. Nair and J. Ascroft, 60–75. New Delhi, India: Sage Publications.

Melkote, S.R. (1991). *Communication for Development in the Third World*. New Delhi: Sage Publications

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

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.

Nimusabe, R.P. (2013) 'Piloting The Reflect Approach With A Rwandan Potter Community' A Thesis submitted to the School of Education, Faculty of Humanities, of the University of the Witwatersrand in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education School of Education Faculty of Humanities, The University of the Witwatersrand

Marx, K. (1995). *A new abridgement.* D. McLellan (Ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press

Melkote, S. R. 1991. *Development Communication in the Third World: Theory and Practice.*
New Delhi, India: Sage Publications

McKee, N. 1994. "A Community-based Learning Approach: Beyond Social Marketing." In *Participatory Communication: Working for Change and Development,* ed. S.White with K. S. Nair and J. Ascroft, 194–228. New Delhi, India: Sage Publications.

Mody, B. (1991). Designing Messages for Development Communication: An Audience Participation-Based Approach, New Delhi: Sage.

Macbride, S. *(1980). Many Voices, One World, Kogan Page: London/UNESCO.*

*Me*falopulos, P. (2008) *Development communication sourcebook: Broadening the boundaries of communication*. Washington DC: The World Bank

Moemeka A. A. (1994). Development communication: A historical and conceptual overview. In A. A. Moemeka (ed.), *Communicating for*

development: A new pan-disciplinary perspective. State University of New York Press, Albany.

Mefalopulos, Paolo (2008) Development Communication Sourcebook Broadening The Boundaries Of Communication, : /The World Bank

Narula, U. (2006). *Communication Models*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Distribution (P) Ltd.

Narula, U. (2006 b).*Dynamicsof Mass Communication: Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Distribution (P) Ltd

Okwori, J.Z. (2012) **"**The Architecture of Development' Post graduate Lecture Materials, Centre of Excellence on Development Communication, Department of Theatre and Performing Arts,Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.

Oso, L. (2002). Communication theories and development communication. In Oso, L.(ed.), *Communication and development: A reader*. Abeokuta: Jedidah Publishers. 151-168

Oyero,Olusola.(2009) Development Journalism and Broadcasting (Development Communication). MAC 341 Victoria Island: NOUN Publications

Pretty, J. N. I. Gujit, J. Thompson, and I. Scoones. (1995). *Participatory Learning and Action: A Trainer's Guide.* London: International Institute for Environment and Development

Soola, E. O. (2003). Development communication: The past, the present and the future. In Soola (ed.).*Communicating for development purposes*. Ibadan: Kraft Books

Servaes, J. & Patchanee Malikhao Development Communication Approaches in an International Perspective.Research Cent
er 'Communication for Social Change' (CSC), K.U. Bru

Servaes, J. &Malikhao, P. (2008). Development Communication Approaches in an International Perspective. In Jans Servaes (ed.), *Communication for development and social change* (158-179). New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Servaes, J., &Malikhao, P. (2008). Development Communication Approaches in an International Perspective. In Jans Servaes (ed.), *Communication for development and social change* (158-179). New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Servaes, J. (1999). *Communication for development: One world, multiple cultures*. New Jersey: Hampton press, inc.

Servaes, J. 1991. "Toward a New Perspective for Communication and Development." In *Communication in Development,* ed. F. L. Casmir, 51–86. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Singhal, A. (1987). Wilbur Schramm: Portrait of a Development Communication Pioneer. *Communicator*, 21 (1-4), 18-22.

Searves , J.(2008)Communication for Development and Social Change, London: Sage Publication

Servaes, Jan (2002) (ed.) 'Approaches to Development Communication' Paris: UNESCO

Thomas, P. (1994). Participatory Message Development Communication: Philosophical Premises. In: White, S.A., Nair, K.S. & Ascroft, J. (eds.), Participatory Communication: Working for Change and Development, New Delhi: Sage, pp. 49-59.

Thomas, P. & Lee, P. (eds.) (1996). Media Development, special issue on Alternative Communication Networks, XLIII(3), London: WACC.

White, R. A. (2008). Grassroots, Participatory communication: Is a new vision of communication emerging in Africa? *African Communication Research*, 1(1), 11-45.

Rogers. E. M. (1976). Communication and Development: The passing of the dominant

paradigm. In E. M. Rogers (ed.) Communication and Development: Critical Perspectives. Beverly Hills: Sage publications.

Quebral, N. C. 1975 Development communication. In Jamias, J. F. (ed) Readings in

JEGEDE, Emmanuel

development communication. Los Banos: Department of Development
communication, College of Agriculture, University of Philipines, Los
Banos College, Laguna. Pp1-12

Okunna. C. S. (2002). A quick look at development communication. In C. S.
Okunna
(ed.) Teaching Mass Communication: A Multi-Dimensional Approach.
Enugu:New Generation Books.