

Paradigm Shifts in Development Communication

Olasunkanmi Arowolo¹

Abstract

The way and manner development is conceived, to a great extent determines the path to modernisation and how communication are designed. Hence, communication in the development process has always give well deserved pride of place. This article attempts a theoretical exploration of development communication, the dominant paradigms of development, and the shifts in development communication.

Introduction

When the thought of development communication is brought to the fore-front, what comes to mind is the role of communication in development process. More so, ‘the concept of development communication has been with us for a long time, recognition of its importance, sociocultural, economic and political development and utilisation of its approaches and methods did not gain public and academic acceptance until the early 1960s’ (Moemeka A. A., 1994, p. 3).

Moemeka (1989) defines development communication as the application of the processes of communication to the development process (p.5). While development is a path, communication is the drive. In this sense, development agenda are strategically embedded and communicated through various media channels using appropriate integrated strategies towards mobilising people to participate in the development process. Therefore, development communication is by its role is “an element of the management process in the overall planning and implementation of development programmes” (Moemeka A. A., 1989, p. 5). A well-planned communication for development mediated through “mass media can reach large audiences targeting social norms, stimulating debate” (Remafoko, n.d.). Preceding planning is conception ideological agenda to mobilise for development. In conceiving developmental plans, Oso (2002) notes that the way development is conceived has “impact on how we in turn conceive communication, how we use it and relation to other social institutions and processes; especially the process of social change (Oso, 2002, p. 1).

Development Paradigm: Historical Overview

Communication on Information Development Communication issues both information and communication but always gives well deserved pride of place to communication (Moemeka A. A., 2000) while information is the foundation upon which communication builds on , Moemeka

¹ School of Communication, Lagos State University, Ojo, Lagos.

writes “information is important because without it communication would be impossible” (ibid p. xiii).

From here, it can be understood that the place of information is key to communication and the place of communication is sacrosanct to development. This is in agreement with (Oso, 2002), asserting that the way and manner development is conceived, the information we get about development over the years shape how we will communicate development and development agenda. This is why Andrew Moemeka say that “information is...the first step in the process of creating...reorientation...mutual understanding—which is the primary objective of communication” (p. xiii), especially communicating for development.

The idea of communicating for development came up at the end of the World War II when the United States of America map out a plan to rebuild “war-devastated Western Europe. The plan known as the ‘Marshall Plan’” (Moemeka, 2002, p. 1). The collapse required re-inscribing political lines over much of the world (Pearce, 2000) with over 100 new nations/creative with varying challenges, pressing social needs inadequate cadres of professionals and insufficient or wrongly focused economic infrastructure (Pearce, 2000).

The Marshall plan which became a huge success in the West and the Third World Countries. By the time many of these third world countries, otherwise referred to as developing countries has just gained independence...colonial power and we strategizing towards establishing social-economic structure that will help position the new independent. Moemeka argues that two forces colonial powers/colonies from which they have just being freed the colonized can also tap into the plan and benefit from same, believe it is believed that if it could work for “colonial powered countries the marshal “plan could work successfully anywhere” (Moemeka, 2002, p. 1)

The second, as Andrew Moemeka puts it, was the impatience of the developing countries to develop and catch up with the developing nations of the west. The Marshall plan had worked like magic. In less than ten years...and industrialization (Moemeka, 2002, p. 1). The sudden turnaround of the plan for the colonial masters became a master plan that was glorified and marked as most effective and efficient development strategy. Which could improve their own social and economic conditions (Moemeka, 2002, p. 2). As an outcome of this, the developed nation took advantage of this ideological believe, being eager to help and the underdeveloped third world countries being in desperate need help to reach fast development. This ideological background then lead to what is known as the dominant paradigm. Andrew Moemeka quoted that the Marshall plan had a message “Rapid development of...society is possible if adequate international financial and technological assistance were forthcoming. This message became popular and was infused globally and some has ...reception by the third world countries who were in desperate need for assistance from the super power (developed nations). Thus, the economic growth paradigm is grounded. This paradigm had three ‘sign posts’

- The infusion into the economy of large sum of money and modern technology
- Which make possible the establishment and growth...
- Yields large profits for investors and industries and economic incentives for workers (Moemeka, 2002, p. 2).

Paradigm in Development Communication

Since the popularization of Economic Growth paradigm in 1950s, Hamid Mowlana (2000) noted three categorical approaches of dominated the development communication paradigm. Mowlana (2002, p. 25) listed the first as cause and effect relationship. The second cost benefit analysis or... and the third as infrastructural analysis.

Cause and effect relationship as its name suggests the implement of an action and achieving a result. This idea, according to Mowlana correspond with Daniel Learner's 1958 work and scholars in the school of modernization. (Mowlana, 2000), writes:

“The causal mode suggests a sequence of institutional developments leading to self-sustaining growth and modernization: Urbanization, Literacy, Extension of the mass media, higher per capital income and political participation (p.26).

Daniel Learner's argument centres around the belief that growth in any of these identified areas will sequentially result to a growth in the economic growth which will moves the country, from traditional society towards modernization.

Within this context, for a country to develop, the role of communication plays out when the mass media is employed to popularise the path and practices that with enhance or dance a nation toward development. Here, the use of the mass media to mobilise the people to be educated, to move and/or develop rural society to modernised and urbanise society, harmonised efforts that will result in higher per capital income, increase/even political participation and in fact, multiplicity and extension of the mass media will go a long way to augment communication in the development process. By extension of the mass media, the implication is that the society will “change from oral communication system to mass communication system” (Mowlana, 2000, p. 27). The rationale behind this change is embedded in the reality of mass communication process being characterised with capacity to reach larger heterogeneous audience, teaching adaptable and understandable “new skills, attitudes and behaviour” (Mowlana, 2000, p. 27). Thus, “the mass media are considered “mobility *multiplier* that have the capacity to communicate both the character and the possibility of change to a growing audience” (p. 27).

On the significant height of the role of mass media in development process, Mowlana (2002) explaining Learner's assertions writes that:

An interactive relationship exists between the media index of modernisation and other social institution ... access to mass media is a precondition for participation in modern society and that the mass media directly affect personal attitude and behaviour (Mowlana, 2000, p. 27).

Therefore, it must be in this light, (Pearce, 2000) say communication was one of the many tools used by developer to bring about modernisation. He explained the structure of theses aspects of the dominant paradigm as:

Development	=	Modernisation
MEANS	=	<i>(Capital-intensive investment)</i>
		COMMUNICATION

(Top-down transfer of information, persuasion and education)
(Pearce, 2000, p. 54)

To Barnett Pearce, “communication was treated as an effective tool for informing the masses (e.g. creating discontent with traditional agricultural methods and thus needs for modern farming implements) and persuading them to adopt innovation (Pearce, 2000, p. 53). From Pearce’s model of the dominant paradigm, communication (top-down transfer of information, persuasion and education) is perceived and rated as most effective means to development, viz-a-viz modernisation.

The concept of communication stands in sharp-contrast to that in the dominant paradigm (Pearce, 2000, p. 61).

Approaches to communication and development practices, over the period, sprouted from some identified major concepts. According to (Sylvester, 2016), “approaches in communication practices for development programmes have emanated from the major concept of development (Modernisation, dependency, and Multiplicity/Another Development)”. These three concepts are fundamental constructs that has shaped communication and development practice in different ways over the years.

Major Constructs (Paradigm) of Development Communication

Since 1949, when development began to play out as “an organized activity/intervention to improve the living standards of a people by international, national or institutionalized bodies” (Sylvester, 2016, p. 320), three dominant concepts – modernization, dependency and multiplicity have shaped and reshaped how development is conceived and how development communication practices are approached.

Modernization Paradigm

This as one of the leading concept in development communication explains gradual movement from a traditional or local society to a conceivable modern/globally adapting way of life. During 1950s and 1960s, modernisation was one of the approaches to development, nation building (Mowlana, 2000). In fact, Jan Servaes and Patchanee Malikhao explains that the United States of America was defining development and social change as the replica of its own political-economic system and opening the way for the transnational corporation (Servaes & Malikhao, 2005).

One of the classical scholars of Development Communication, Everett Rogers describes the idea of modernisation as “the process by which individuals change from a traditional way of life to a more complex, technologically advanced, and rapidly changing style of life” (Rogers, 1969). Black (1966) also defined modernisation as “the process by which historically evolved institutions are adapted to the rapidly changing functions that reflect the unprecedented increase in men’s knowledge, permitting control over his environment”.

The idea in the modernisation theory as a matter of its nature emphasises new culture, and how to move gradually from aging old ways of doing things to new (modern) ways of doing things. One of the arch priest of American functionalism, (Wilbert, 1963, p. 89) in (Offiong, 1980), sees:

Modernisation as a “total transformation” of traditional or pre-modern” societies into the types of technologies and associated social organisation that characterise the advanced, economically prosperous, and politically stable nations of the Western world”

Irrespective of how simple modernisation approach has been popularized over years, scholar like (Oso, 2002, p. 7) argues that “the dichotomy between traditional and modern societies made by modernisation theorist is largely false”. He further raise arguments on how the Western world define negatively, traditional society in relation to the modern society. By this, the Professor of Mass Communication explains that any society not like the attractive community of developed nations (The West) is traditional. Hence, (Oso, 2002) points out in his critique stating that, “differences among these societies are not recognised”. Oso’s position is built on (Bernstein, 1971) observation:

Empirical investigation shows that there are traditional societies which among others have an achievement in important areas of social life, just as ascription plays a major role in the organisation of modern societies (Bernstein, 1971, p. 146)

Another limitation of modernisation paradigm is its ethnocentric positioning of stressing patterns. Oso (2012) describes this pattern as “the psychological make-up of Third World people”. Concerns in development process are listed: poverty, ignorance, illiteracy and social inequality (Alao, Uwom, & Alao, 2013, pp. 78-79). This emphasise the view that a local practices as “backward, poor in motivation, lack of entrepreneur spirit” (Oso L. , 2002, p. 8) and this is inadequate to accommodate evolving development.

Oso similarly noted:

a major inadequacy of the theory which has formed the platform of Neo-Marxist critique of underdevelopment is that it failed to consider the historical origin of the problem of underdevelopment and dependency, (Oso L. , 2002, p. 9).

Dependency Paradigm

Before the attainment of independence in most countries of the world, there exist a pre-independence structure conceptualised as “dependency”. Literarily the idea of independency emphasise a condition of one entity (inferior) being subjected or at the mercy of another entity (superior). The dependency theory first emerged in the 1950s, when Paul Prebrisch research found that the wealth of poor nations tended to decrease when the wealth of the rich increased (Anaeto & Solo-Anaeto, 2010).

According to Alao, Uwom, & Alao (2013) “dependency saw the nations of the world as divided into core of wealthy nations, that is, the more advanced or developed nations which dominate the periphery of poor nations that provide cheap labour and raw materials for them to exploit”.

According to the Gatung (1971), “dependency of the periphery (third and fourth world nations) on the centre (first world nations) occurs as a result of the imperialist structure which maintain vertical interaction relations and a feudal interaction structure between the centre and the periphery” (Adnan, Lim, & Nikahetiya, 1985).

The concept of dependency according to (Anaeto & Solo-Anaeto, 2010) explain that:

“the underdevelopment of the third world countries is as a consequence of the international capitalist system which favoured the developed nations to the detriment of the developing nations. The developing are said to be retarded in their development because they are caught up a dependence and dominance relationship with developed countries (Anaeto & Solo-Anaeto, 2010, p. 9)

Dependency concept/theory assumption are captured in Solomon Anaeto and Margaret Solo-Anaeto writing:

- Underdevelopment is not an original state which every country must begin from in its quest for development;
- Contemporary underdevelopment has been created by the process of global capitalist development and expansion;
- The economies of the developing countries have been shaped by that of the developed countries and so the developing nations become dependent on the advanced nations;
- Dependency is created as a result of the penetration of the foreign banking, manufacturing, advertising, communication and education sectors;
- Economic surplus of the developing nations is systematically drained and transferred to the advanced nations;
- As condition of uneven development deepen, the developing nations are forced to seek aids, grants and loans from international financial institutions, government and private lending bodies. They become more dependent on loans and are thus controlled and manipulated by these outside institutions; and
- For nations to develop authentically, foreign capital and penetration have to be eliminated. This will bring about economic sovereignty, production and distribution of basic necessities according to the needs of the people.

(Anaeto & Solo-Anaeto, 2010, p. 10)

From the foregoing assumptions of dependency theory, it is observed that dependency is multifaceted. This is so because it involves “economics, media control, politics, banking and finance, education, sports and all aspects of human resource development “ (Anaeto & Solo-Anaeto, 2010). Thus, understanding dependency, theorist argues that it “must be based on an examination of the international system as an integrated unite of economics interaction” (Oso, 2002, p. 13).

In attempt to have a broad scope of the theory, “it is important to identify the specific historical experiences of the underdeveloped countries in terms of their incorporation into the capitalist economy, their functions within it, and the mechanisms for sustaining the condition of underdevelopment (Ollawa, 1983).

On a last note, the concept of dependency, (Anaeto & Solo-Anaeto, 2010) argue that first world nations actively perpetuate dependency through various policies and initiatives. Therefore, the idea of development can be said to be Western. It has also been popularised to require

westernised approaches such as the use of mass media, integrated strategies, interpersonal strategies as discussed in (Moemeka A. , 2000), to attain development.

The last concept, **multiplicity/Another Development** is the most recent. Within this paradigm, Sylvester explains:

Development is seen as a product of collaboration and participation of all stakeholders and communication is seen as an essential tool for participation. The concept hold that true development is endogenous, taking into account users felt needs and getting them in the process to proffer solution. (Sylvester, 2016, p. 322)

He also noted that multiplicity and another development paradigm employs participatory model of communication. Participatory model is of course imperative and is a two way process of communication. Participatory in this paradigm implies active mass involvement of citizens in the process of elaboration, implementation and follow up of development plan (Adnan, Lim, & Nikahetiya, 1985, p. 8). In this regard, the citizens freely take up responsibilities to shape together the future they collective or agreed to live by.

Abdalla (1977) and (Arent, 1972) in (Adnan, Lim, & Nikahetiya, 1985) put forward useful perspectives on the place and role of mass mobilisation and participation in national development planning:

Appropriate motivated – both morally and materially they supply planner at all levels with information that no census man can gather completely and accurately. Old people can bring in their experience (which is not always obsolete) and the young their bold ideas (which are not always impractical). Worker's representation in the managing organs of enterprises, elected members of local and regional governing bodies, small producers' associations, co-operative, democratic organisations of workers, peasant youth and women, consumer unions, scientific and professional societies, ... are some of the main channels of people's participations in the development planning process (Abdalla, 1977).

Development Reconsidered sets forth a strategy for development – a strategy in which participation by all the people is both the means and the end to development itself. The analysis is based more on recent historical audience than on theory. The salary is distilled from relatively successful development experience of pre-war Japan, Taiwan, Korea, Egypt, Yugoslavia and although they are commonly considered special cases, Puerto Rico and Israel. It sets forth a policy under which the great mass of small producers – farmers, artisans, 'tiny' entrepreneurs – can be involved in development in contrast to the current policy of concentrating investment in a small number of capital intensive endeavours, mainly 'modern' fractions in the big cities on large farms (Arent, 1972).

A very good example of the adoption of multiplicity paradigm is Garland (2005b) in Sylvester (2016) where Barragan's Methodology of community media, laid emphasis on interactivity identifying eight steps – *identification of needs, concretisation, selecting, formulation, identification of the amount information, action Executive, expansion and Liaison with constructive system* which Ebibagha Sylvester identified. In his original words, he write:

The first step is the **Identification of the felt needs by means of direct interaction with the receivers**. The second is **Concretization, which examines the needs identified by the receivers in the light of local conditions**. The third is **Selection of priority problems by the receivers**. The fourth step is **Formulation of a durable methodology for seeking solutions to priority problems of felt needs**. The fifth step is **Identification of the Amount of Information Required and Access to this information**. The sixth is **Action Execution by thorough participation of the receivers of the project that they have designed**. The seventh step is the **Expansion towards the outside to make known the point of view of the receivers to other group of receivers or to the authorities**. And the eight step is the **Liaison with the communication system to make known the action of the receivers to others that could benefit from the experience of the receivers, who carry out actions to execute identified needs** (Sylvester, 2016, p. 323).

Participatory communication requires first of all changes in the thinking of ‘communicators’ (Servaes & Malikhao, 2005, p. 91). Development thrives on communication. It also relative in regarding “the needle targets, and audiences of communication and developments, combined with self-righteousness, titles and insecurities, perhaps sprinkled with a dash of misdirected, often render “experts a bit too verbose and pushy” (Servaes & Malikhao, 2005, p. 91).

This version of the Garland’s (2005b) identified eight (8) steps later, compressed into four (4) steps (Garland, 2005c): Diagnosis (1), planning (2), intervention or experiment (3), and assessment (4). These steps, both the comprehensive and the compressed version are considered endogenous because “ideas spread from inside to outside” (Sylvester, 2016, p. 323).

The Linear Development Paradigm and Model

This is, perhaps, one the earliest paradigm following the colonial path to development. The development of this paradigm gained popularity alongside moderation theory and other accompanying theories (such as dependency) between the 1950s and the 1960s. The linear paradigmatic view of development sees development as *arrays of trade and industrial upgrading*.

Similarly, the linear path, according to (Anaeto & Solo-Anaeto, 2010, p. 6) emphasize “a linear progression with a series of successive stages of economic growth”. The author explain further the orientation of linear school of thought on how nations become developed. This linear school believes that for a society to become developed, they must pass through what is above described as ‘arrays of trade and industrial upgrading’, what (Anaeto & Solo-Anaeto, 2010) refer to as ‘series of successive stages of economic growth’ or level of progress.

Historically, patterns and experience of developed nations of the World – the United States and Europe has adopted the linear paradigm to transform their respective economy, from ‘poor’ subsistence farming or traditional society to modern industrial producing society. These developed nations of the world, otherwise referred to as the First World countries proposes and propagate same to underdeveloped and developing nations of the world. Their embedded agenda, which are often strategic and striking advocate that the Third and Fourth World Countries like Africa, Asia, and Latin America should follow the linear path to ascertain development (Oso, 2002) notes that,

“it is clear that the adherents of development journalism are motivated by certain nobles about how to make the mass media in countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America more

responsible and sensitive to local needs and realities. Without any attempt to down play its achievement and potentials, it seems, however, that a more meaningful approach has to start from a critique of the class and the unequalitarian social structure character of the state, development projects and the system of production and material reward in society. As of now these crucial issues are missing from the literature on development journalism. This may be due to the fact that the concepts and categories used in defining and describing the ‘new journalism are borrowed from the western social responsibility theory of the press and liberalism” (Oso, 2002, p. 126).

In his classic book, *The Stage of Economic Growth: A Non-Conformist Manifesto*, (Rostow, 1960) advocates five (5) stages that developing countries should follow to be developed. These stages is listed as movement from *traditional society* (1) which he describes as ‘peasant-based, lacking in significant economic growth, custom-bound, hierarchical unproductive, and characterized by authoritarian personality, long-run fatalism, and low ceiling of attainable output per head because of the primitive nature of its technology’², to the second stage – *pre-condition for take off* (2) – where according (Anaeto & Solo-Anaeto, 2010) “condition begin to appear that will lead the traditional society into becoming modern”. Briefly, it as ‘a period of economic changes and the non-economic aspect of this change changes is the appearance of a new elite who consider economic modernization as being both possible and desirable’ (Offiong, 1980) . At this stage, there will be conception of emerging ideas which will more likely to be in harmony and favourable to desired economic projection as well as progress. So, of their possible values and ideas will include: “a new levels of education, entrepreneurship and institutions capable of mobilizing capital” (Anaeto & Solo-Anaeto, 2010, p. 6). Consequence to this, concerned developing country will have no problem proceeding to the next stage *take off* (3). At the takeoff level,

‘the society begins to grow at a steady rate, both in quantity and quality...political, social and manufacturing sectors are reformed to allow growth within all aspects of the country, and the society supposedly emerging as a modern, typically capitalist civilization” (Anaeto & Solo-Anaeto, 2010).

Another scholar, (Offiong, 1980) say the take off stage, “the resistance to steady growth is vanquished and growth now becomes an integral part of the society”.

After sustainable progress at the takeoff stage, a nation will then move to the next level, then comes a *drive to maturity* (4), as (Anaeto & Solo-Anaeto, 2010) puts it, it “is the expansion of the newly developed ideas and technology into other division of society”. The movement towards maturity is guided by consistency, adaptable and strategically workable development agenda and committed practices. Drive to maturity, to (Offiong, 1980) “takes about 20 years ... [because] ... according to Rostow, “an economy demonstrates that it has the technological and entrepreneurial will to produce not everything, but anything it chooses to produce”.

At the peak of maturity is the last stage, *age of high mass consumption* (5) where basic societal needs are adequately satisfactory “and the social focus change to social welfare and security”

² Rostow, W. (1960). *The Stage of Economic Growth: A Non-Conformist Manifest*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. As paraphrased in (Offiong, 1980)

(Anaeto & Solo-Anaeto, 2010, p. 6). To (Offiong, 1980), he thoroughly captures this stage below:

This is a stage in which the leading sector shift towards the production of durable consumer's goods and services. At this stage incomes have climbed to levels where clothing, basic food and shelter are no longer the main consumption concerns of workers. Television sets, refrigerators, automobiles, phonographs, radiograms, and a host of other items, begin to interest consumers. At this stage also, many resources are allocated to social welfare and security; this is brought about by the political process. (Offiong, 1980, p. 42).

It is important to note for the purpose of criticism that this path is centrally a lined economic trail to development as it has its focus mainly on economic matters and does not seem to consider existing but varying complexities of underdeveloped countries of African and Asia (a good of a complex African country is Nigeria, who is still battling with her developmental agenda amidst diverse challenges in between complexities). In this light, (Anaeto & Solo-Anaeto, 2010) argues that the linear approach has no regard for necessary structural, institutional and attitudinal condition to make the process a reality.

As synopsis, the linear model emphasize savings, investment and international intervention as part of what drive a developing nations stage of economic growth.

Economic Paradigm/Approach to Development

Very close to the linear model of development is the economic paradigm because of their similar emphasis on the economic progress as central of development. This paradigm however focus its attention within the purview of economic growth (Anaeto & Solo-Anaeto, 2010).

In this approach, while the linear paradigm define sets of steps/stages to the attainment of development, economic paradigm is concerned about “outputs and income, institutions and attitudes, levels of productivity and levels if living are considered an important elements in development” (Anaeto & Solo-Anaeto, 2010, p. 7).

The mechanism of the economic model secreted in the ability to generate huge national and increase savings and investments. Just like the linear model, the economic model according to (Anaeto & Solo-Anaeto, 2010) advice that developing nation should “seek to fill gap through foreign aids and private foreign invest” where projected minimum required savings and investment needs cannot be met by the concerned nation.

The economic approach, against the linear approach justifies the need to seek foreign assistance based on the need for capital and technological advancement from the developed West.

Other identified paradigms

Lorenzo Belli, in a sponsored report, identify “a number of possible development” (Bellui-Lorenzo, 2011). Some of the paradigms are: *Free-market Trickle-down Growth led* development path believes that if even if development it accrues to the rich, trickledown effect will redistribute, to the poor through regular income and the function of free-markets; *Pro-poor (broad-based or balance) growth led* development paradigm believes that growth matter for development only if associated with an equitable distribution of income is to be achieved through promotion of activities generating a broad-based primary income distribution and institutional fiscal system (e.g. fiscal system) without relying on trickle down mechanism; *low-*

Wage Industry-Led—this approach establishes heavy industry having capital accumulation and extraction of surplus value from labour. This usually occur to rural people in urban setting. *Low-wage labor-intensive export-led*—this is a variant of *low-wage industry-led* with focus on exportation and industrialisation (good examples of a country that have successfully towed this path is China).

Another approach to development is the *Agricultural Based*—this paradigm believes agricultural growth direct contribute to various aspects of socio-economic development. This does not only improve the economy but also reduces the poverty level. *Endogenous Growth-based* development does not have to come from outside national socio-economic systems and transferred but on internal effort by “learning-by-doing”, others are *Rural Development paradigm*, *Washington Concensus-Based Development* (believe development only possible if countries benefit from globalized environment). This, I see, as is a variant of dependency paradigm; *Strategic-Openness-Based* (strategically considering Washington paradigm to protect local industry); *Exhaustible-Resource Export-Led* development (e.g. Oil production management); *Agricultural commodity expot-led* development (exporting exportable primary resources like cocoa, cotton, etc.); *Emigrgration based* development, *immigration-based* development (that is attracting labours, physical capital, know-how, etc.); *FDI-based* development (using what you have to get what you desire championed towards accumulating capital to startup and/feed development. Natural resources like minerals, land, water, oil and cheap labour may be considered) and the last, among others is *Foreign Aid Based* (Bellui-Lorenzo, 2011, pp. 35-38).

Rational for shifts in development communication paradigm

In the book, *Paradigm Shift and the Centrality of Communication Discipline*, (Wang, 2011, p. 1458) in full swing states that “unlike most disciplines, communication studies have since theory heyday been kidnapped by the development of media technologies” and evolving contemporary changes and realities.

Metaphorically, George Wang say to easily discuss the centrality of communication within development boarder “in this era of dazzling technological change is therefore more light attempting to sketch a train as it shoot by” (Wang, 2011, p. 1458).

As a consequence false impression in continuous shifts, dominant paradigm rise and from time to time, especially in areas of studies (Kuhn, 1962). George Wang (2011) also observed that:

Once we are accustomed to a paradigm, we are no longer aware of its existence. To grasp the essence of the rapid changes, we are often encouraged to think “outside the box” but the question is, are we aware of the existent of “the box” and what it looks like? (Wang, 2011, p. 1459).

While (Wang, 2011) nitpicks causes of new approaches, he noted that (Zelizer, 2011) warned us against what she described as “subdisciplinary nearsightedness”. Wang argues in the same vein stating that while “Journalism, for example has survived in communication studies (Wang, 2011, p. 1459) “primarily in a way that match the contemporary interests of the subfield invoking it” (Zelizer, 2011, p. 10), communication studies has not successfully survived in ways that adequately match contemporary interest of the subfield entreating it.

Throwing a poser on why shifts keep reoccurring, (Wang, 2011) question thus:

Is this nearsightedness a sign of the growing inadequacies of the existing dominant paradigm, in guiding communication studies?

As a contributing response to this poser; Katz (2009) in (Wang, 2011) had found thousands of television studies to be “unsuited” to the task of identifying larger or more enduring effects. George Wang again, throws another poser when he asks:

While more systematic undertaking may produce more desirable outcomes, can it also be that “effect” is an elusive concept to begin with and that the dominant paradigm has led to an overemphasis of its importance of our understanding of the workings of the media? (Wang, 2011, p. 1459).

Conclusion

Noticeable paradigmatic approaches are several. The multiplicity is according to various scholarly works, approach and interpretation. We have considered a number of qualitative literatures that has taken us through the nooks and crannies of development communication and the dominant paradigm of development. The concept of development, the route and accomplishing development means different things to different people or school of thought. Similarly, the approaches varies from one school of thought to another.

However, above all for as long that development is a path, communication, observably remains the drive. This means that developmental programme uses communication media to mobilise people for development just as mass media mobilises mass heterogeneously diversified audience for communicated development. Hence, development is not fetched when economic and modernisation agenda are strategically planned and mediated through a purposive or carefully selected media towards educating, informing, “edutaining”³ coupled with an ultimate intention of getting the people to willingly participate in the a defined development sequence.

Some relevant scholarly arguments, criticism of the path to development which should be carefully taken into consideration were pointed while (Wang, 2011) posers will go a long way, guiding development communication process.

³ To educate through entertainment.

References

- Adnan, M., Lim, K. Y., & Nikahetiya, S. (1985). The Nature of Development. In S. Kwame-Boafo, *Modules on Development Communication* (pp. 1-14). Nairobi, Kenya: African Council for Communication Education (ACCE).
- Alao, D., Uwom, O., & Alao, A. (2013). *Theory and Practice of International Communication*. Sagamu, Ogun: Pola Consult International.
- Anaeto, S. G., & Solo-Anaeto, M. (2010). Meanings and Theories of Development. In S. G. Anaeto, & M. Solo-Anaeto, *Development Communication: Principles and Practice* (pp. 4-21). Lagos, Ibadan, Benin City, Jattu-Uzairue: Stirling-Horden Publishers Ltd.
- Bellui-Lorenzo, G. (2011). *Development and Development Paradigm: A (Reasoned) Review of Prevailing Visions*. EASYPol: Resources for Policy Making, FAO.
- Bernstein, H. (1971). Modernisation Theory and the Sociological Study of Development. *Journal of Development Studies*, 7(2).
- Kuhn, T. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago, Illinois, USA: University of Chicago Press.
- Moemeka. (2002). Development, Social Change, and Development Communication: Background and Conceptual Discussion. In A. Moemeka, *Development Communication in Action* (pp. 1-18). Lanham, New York, Oxford: University Press of America.
- Moemeka, A. (2000). Development Communication: Strategies and Methods. In A. Moemeka, *Development Communication in Action: Building Understanding and Creating Participation* (pp. 115-132). Lanham, New York, Oxford: University Press of America.
- Moemeka, A. A. (1989). Perspectives on Development Communication. *Africa Media Review*, 3(3).
- Moemeka, A. A. (1994). Development Communication: A Historical and Conceptual Overview. In A. A. Moemeka, *Communicating for Development: A Pan- Disciplinary Perspective* (pp. 1-22).
- Moemeka, A. A. (2000). Preface. In A. Moemeka, *Development Communication in Action* (p. xiii). Lanham; New York; Oxford: University Press of America.
- Mowlana, H. (2000). Communication and Development: Everyone's Problem. In A. Moemeka, *Development Communication in Action: Building Understanding and Creating Participation* (pp. 17-38). Lanham, New York, Oxford: University Press of America, Inc.
- Offiong, D. (1980). *A Critique of Modernisation Theories of development*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- Ollawa. (1983). Focus on the Political Economy of development: A Theoretical Reconsideration of some Unresolved Issues. *African Studies Review*, 28(1).
- Oso, L. (2002). Perspective on Development Journalism. In L. Oso, *Communication and Development: A Reader* (pp. 111-133). Abeokuta: Jedidiah Publishers.

- Oso, L. (2002). Theories of Development and the Democratisation of Communication. In L. Oso, *Communication and development: A reader* (pp. 1-28). Abeokuta: Jedidiah Publishers.
- Oso, L. (2002). Theories of Development and the Democratisation of Communication. In L. Oso, *Communication and Development: A Reader* (pp. 1-28). Abeokuta: Jedidiah Publishers.
- Pearce, W. (2000). Religion, Development and Communication: A proposal for taking a "Communication Perspective". In A. Moemeka, *Development Communication in Action: Building Understanding and Creating Participation* (pp. 53-68). Lanham, New York, Oxford: University Press of America.
- Remafoko, L. (n.d.). *Using communication for social change*. Financial Education Through Innovative Channels .
- Rogers, E. (1969). *Modernisation among peasants: The impact of communication*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Rostow, W. (1960). *The Stage of Economic Growth: A Non-Conformist Manifest*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Servaes, & Malikhao. (2005). *Participatory Communication: The New Paradigm*. Latin American Council of Social Sciences (CLACSO).
- Sylvester, E. Z. (2016). Major Development Communication Paradigms and Practices: Implications for Graphic Communication. *African Research Review: An International Multi-disciplinary Journal, Ethiopia*, 317-337.
- Wang, G. (2011, April 24). Paradigm Shift and the Centrality of Communication Discipline. *International Journal of Communication* 5 , 1458-1466.
- Wilbert, E. M. (1963). *Social Change*. Englewoodd Cliff, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Zelizer, B. (2011). Journalism in the service of communication. *Journal of Communication*, 61(1), 1-21.