

COMMUNICATION AND NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT*

傳播與國家發展

Cheng Jei-Cheng
*Associate Professor of
Graduate School of Journalism*

鄭 瑞 城
新聞研究所專任副教授

ABSTRACT

The subject of communication and national development has drawn much attention from the scholars of various fields, and a great deal of research related to it has been produced over the past decades. The present synthesis and review, with its emphasis on research findings and theoretical implications, combines the results of important classical research with up-to-date studies which are pertinent to our current level of understanding. This study divided the review into two major sections: the theory of development; and the relationships between communication system and social system. The second section was further categorized into three subgroupings: the role of communication in development; the societies' influence on communication; and the interaction between communication and development.

摘 要

在過去數十年中，傳播與國家發展問題受到許多學者極大的關切與注意。本文旨在歸納並評述過去之重要研究發現，以及最新發展，以提供未來研究及理論推展之參考。本研究分從兩個大主題來探討：第一，發展理論；第二，傳播系統及社會系統之關聯。第二主題又分為三個次題：(1)傳播在發展上之角色；(2)社會其他層面對傳播系統的影響；及(3)傳播系統與社會其他層面之交互作用。

The major problem for most countries (particularly the less developed ones) in the world today obviously is development. Communication scholars generally agree that a nation can not afford to ignore the communication dimension in its total development plan (19, 24, 36, 37, 61, 62, 71, 79, 81, 86). A great deal of

* Paper presented at 32nd Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, Boston, the United States, 1982.

research related to communication and national development has been produced over the past decades. To some extent, knowledge derived from the past studies seems to be confounding and fragmentary. This article attempts to analyze and synthesize relevant and important studies of this area through which it is hoped that more systematic and concrete knowledge might be obtained and used as a basis for future theoretical thinking and research orientation. The research concerning this area can probably be grouped and reviewed along two lines: (a) the theory of development; (b) the relationships between communication system and social system. In each of the topic areas discussed here, research which has been of seminal value to our knowledge of communication and national development has been reviewed along with studies which are pertinent to our current level of understanding.

THEORY OF DEVELOPMENT

Scholars seem to hold that the relationships between communication and national development can be better understood if the notion of development is first defined. The notion of development has drawn much attention from specialists in a variety of fields. Teheranian (89, p.17) noted that national development for countries that have made the historical transition from an agrarian to an industry society "has involved three fundamental revolutions, which may be identified as 'economic', 'political', and 'communication'." He further observed that the industrial world is possibly going through a fourth revolutionary process that has not yet taken a distinct shape. According to Teheranian, these four revolutionary processes have emerged as fulfilling the hierarchy of human needs proposed by Maslow: physiological needs, safety needs, belongingness and love needs, esteem needs, self-actualization needs, and aesthetic needs (46).

Frey (19) further proposed and elaborated four leading theories of development: economic, psychological, political, and communication. Most theories of economic development have their origins in the tradition of economic growth (see 68, 74). Economic growth through industrialization is seen as the key to development, and at the heart of industrialization were "technology and capital, which substituted for labor" (71, p.214). Thus, the level of development for a society at any given point in time has been the gross national product or, when divided by the total population in a nation, per capita income. Moreover, central economic planning, according to economists, was considered as a legitimate and reasonable means by which a nation should seek development goals.

The best examples of psychological theories of development can be found in

the studies done by McClelland (47) and Hagen (23). In a cross-societal empirical study, McClelland contended that the need for achievement, which referred to an individual's motivation to establish himself and then to meet a demanding standard of excellence, is a significant factor in economic development. According to McClelland, an individual's need for achievement denotes his desire to do well, to be tested, and to succeed; this in return fosters entrepreneurship, and therefore is strongly and causally related to the economic development of societies. He also identified two other needs – affiliation and power – as psychological determinants of economic development.

In an attempt to find out why the people of some societies entered upon technological progress sooner or more effectively than others, Hagen (23) concluded that the factor affecting it is personality. One of Hagen's major assertions thus is that for a society to move from a traditional system to a modern system requires an extensive alternation in personality type. Hagen considered "status respects" as one of the most critical personality types that need to be shattered if a society expects development to occur. Hagen argued that the authoritarian personality in traditional society display rigidity and resistance to innovation, which then is an obstacle for development. Other scholars also identified other types of so called "modernizing personality" – e.g., empathy (35) and innovativeness (72).

The theorists of political development have defined their focus in many ways. In comparing the levels of development in various social systems, Almond and Powell (2) suggested the use of degree of structural differentiation and cultural secularization as criteria in differentiating the level of political development in different systems. Pye (66) indicated democracy, stability, and mobilization as determinants of political development. Other indicators of political development include domestic order and political institutionalization (88) and the institution of public opinion and independence of the army (83).

Communication theories of development are in fact the theories of diffusion (19). The justification is simple; new ideas must be invented, brought in, and spread/communicated to the individuals of societies in order for social change and development to happen (25, 26, 72). Since mass media are very effective and essential in spreading and conveying new ideas to the masses (72), it is therefore assumed that the direction of social change within a society has always been from oral system to the media system (35). The implication here, also revealed in many other studies, is that the yardsticks of communication development are the growth of mass media, i.e., the number of newspaper circulations, newsprint consumption, the radio and television sets in use, the capacity of cinema seating, the proportion of home-made television program, and the degree of media freedom (see 8, 14, 82, 88, 93).

After briefly reviewing the literature on theories of development, one thing seems to be certain that in the economic, psychological, and political theories of development, communication plays "a rather latent and general role, albeit an important one if the theories are scrutinized deeply" (19, p.392). However, it is communication scholars who naturally and deliberately put communication at the very heart of an explanation of development. In the study of communication and national development, the tendency has been centered around two broad but fundamental questions: (a) what has been the impact of communication system upon society? (b) what has been the impact of society on communication system? The implication of this pursuit is that communication is one of the social institutions or system which inevitably and actively interacts with other social systems (80, 97).

COMMUNICATION SYSTEM AND SOCIAL SYSTEM

This research orientation commonly employed by the students of communication and national development probably has its root in two of the major U. S. communication schemes – the effects and functional models. The effects model placed "a high emphasis on the receiver so that research could determine how commercial or political persuasion was effectively exerted on him" (3, p.108). The notion of the effects model has drawn much criticism. In discussing classical effects model: who says what in which channel to whom with what effect (32), Janka (29, p.5) contended that the effects model "has been perceived as having left aside the study of the communicators of the prevailing mass communication system and the object of communication." This is particularly true when the American-made model is applied to other developing countries. It probably suffers from insensitivity to contextual and social-economic-political factors in that society (3, 4).

In attempting to refine the effects model in general, and Lasswell's paradigm (32) in particular, Wright (95) suggested a functional perspective for the study of mass communication, placing emphasis on functional analysis of the consequences of mass communication for the society rather than for the individual. Functional analysis is primarily concerned with the consequences of standardized, patterned, and repetitive social phenomena, such as institutional patterns and social roles (50, 96). In order to appreciate and understand the forms of mass communication as one of social institution, it requires, as the functional theorists suggested, a consideration of the relationship between mass communication institutions and other social institutions (97). The implication here is that the study of mass communication

Communication and National Development

should insert the model in a more social-minded, relational direction.

It seems that the students of communication and development, notably American, have largely built their theoretical framework upon the effects and functional schemes, especially the latter in the sense that many of their studies have sought to determine and interpret the relationships between communication system and other social systems. These studies can probably be categorized into three sub-groupings: (a) the role of communication in development; (b) the societies' influence on communication; and (c) the interaction and interdependence between communication system and other social systems.

Role of Communication in Development

Much of debate, among communication scholars, about what constitutes development has revolved around changing notions of media's role in development. Researchers generally acknowledged the media's role in development, but they seem to see differently on the degree of importance of media in development. Earlier studies tended to suggest that the role of communication media was direct and powerful. Later its importance was gradually toned down as the concept of development changed (see 71) and research focus shifted (see 64).

Lerner (35) suggested two elements in the social dynamics of development. The first is a "mobile personality," who is high in empathy; being able to see oneself in the other fellow's situation. The second is what he calls "the mobility multiplier: mass media." The mass media, as Lerner described, "disciplined Western man in those empathic skills which spell modernity. They also portrayed for him the roles he might confront and elucidated the opinion he might need. Their continuing spread in our century is performing a similar function on a world scale" (35, p.54). His conclusion, therefore, is that mass media serve as a kind of "magic multiplier" for development.

Lerner saw media system in the tradition-transition-modernity continuum, and acknowledged its powerful influence on moving a society from a traditional stage to a modern stage. Pye seemed to reflect Lerner's viewpoint as he said:

it was the pressure of communication which brought about the downfall of traditional societies. And in the future it will be the creation of new channels of communications and the ready acceptance of new content of communications which will be decisive in determining the prospects of nation building Similarly, the process of recreating a coherent modern society rests upon the ways in which people come to accept and utilize new dimensions of social communication. (65, p3-4).

Lerner and Pye's theoretical orientations were further supported by Rao (67).

After a comparative study between the traditional and modernizing villages in India, Rao concluded that the amount of information available and the wideness of its distribution is a key factor in the speed and smoothness of development. Like Lerner, Rao considered the development of empathy and mobile personality key variables in bringing about change.

The theories developed by Lerner, Pye, and Rao can be characterized by their considerable optimism about the powerful contribution of communication to development, and its potential impact on society. This point seems to be shared, to some extent, in many other studies. Hornik (27, p.23) asserted that "communication technology can take a myriad of roles in development and its success in those roles depend on how it is done and in what circumstances." Several studies further specified the impact of communication technology on the integrity of national cultures (see 39, 63). The role of media in general (31), and television in particular, in preserving and maintaining the national and regional values, traditions, and philosophies was also strongly emphasized in the case study of Lebanese (6) and Indonesia (10). Sommerlad (86, p.25) further suggested that "mass media played a vital role in building the scene of national community." This notion was echoed in the other case studies of Philippines, Tanzania, Sri Lanka and Japan (73), China (9, 40, 98), and Soviet Union and China (43). Also, mass media growth was identified as a source of political stability (11, 38, 88) or instability (13, 22).

As noted before, since the change of research focus and the concept of development from the mid-1960s through 1970s, communication researchers have begun to question viewpoints held by Lerner and the others, the important and typical example can be found in Schramm's study. Schramm observed:

... increasing the number of radios, newspapers, and cinemas will not necessarily bring about a corresponding increase in the rate of social change. Merely multiplying messages and channels is not enough . . . there are some tasks the mass media can do and some they can not do and some they can do better than others, and that how they are used has much to do with their effectiveness. (79, p.114)

It seems to be that Schramm considered mass media contributory and supplementary forces in facilitating development, not a "magic multiplier" for development as Lerner (35) described.

The assumption that mass media alone can bring about development also drew much criticisms from scholars of the Third World. Their criticisms mainly centered on two points, communication scholars often disregarded the possible contextual influences when they studied communication effects in and for foreign countries. Second, they usually assumed that increased production and consumption of goods

Communication and National Development

and service constitute the essence of distribution. In other words, scholars primarily see “the obvious ways for less developed countries to develop was for them to become more like developed countries” (71, p.217). And one of serious errors in communication research has been the way the researchers “have gone about testing overseas generalization based on research in U. S.” (54, p.47). Thus, it is feared that communication theory may be, resulting from this practice, pulled “further and further away from the realities confronting the major population groups in Third World” (18, p.34). The best way to resolve this problem is that the Third World must overcome their mental compulsion to perceive their own reality through foreign concepts and ideologies and learn to look at communication and adoption from a new perspective (5).

The perspective calls for abandoning the old paradigm of development and the role of communication in development. Development was redefined, according to the developed new paradigms, as a powerful change toward the kind of social and economic system that a country decides its needs (81), or as a widely participatory process of social change in a society, intended to “bring about both social and material advancement (including greater equality, freedom, and other valued qualities) for the majority of the people through their gaining greater control over their environment” (71, p.215). Based on these notions the alternative pathways to development are proposed to include (a) the equality of distribution of information, socioeconomic benefits; (b) self-reliance and independence in development, with an emphasis upon the potential of local resources; (c) popular participation in self-development planning and execution; and (d) integration of traditional with modern system, so that modernization is a syncretization of old and new ideas, with the exact mixture somewhat different in each locale. The rise of a new paradigm of development implied that the role of communication in development must also change. It is generally recognized that the need for social-structural change in addition to communication if development were to occur (71). The slow progress exhibited in some less developed countries is vivid evidence on hand; in these countries communication can hardly be expected to be a main contributor to profound and popular transformation since communication itself is so subdued to the influence of the ruling minorities, whose primary concerns are not social change and development (3).

While many communication researchers mentioned above attempt to delineate and understand the role of communication in development and its influence on societies; some of them and many others also look at another way around and study societies' influences on communication system. The research orientation of

these two lines is different, but they are similar in at least two aspects. Firstly, the purpose of both lines of research is geared to understanding mass communication system and its relationship with other social systems. Secondly, the basic assumption common to both lines is that mass communication as a system (or institutionalized system), which has an interactive relationship with other social systems.

Societies' Influences on Communication

Researchers in this line of study usually attempt to set up criteria, according to political, social, and economic conditions in societies, as a starting point (may be called "categorical independent variable") in order to depict media system (dependent variable). Among these criteria, political philosophies, ideologies, and styles are used most often (12). Siebert et al.'s (84) study is one of the best and well-known examples. They stressed that a society's politics and philosophy are the best rationales in depicting its mass communication system. They stated:

the press always takes on the form and coloration of the social and political structures within which it operates To see the differences between press system in full perspective, then, one must look at the social systems in their true relationship to the press, one has to look at certain basic beliefs and assumptions which the society holds: the nature of man, the nature of knowledge and truth. (84, p.1-2)

Although they used the word "press", the notion can probably be applied to other media. Based on the criteria, they developed the four theories of mass communication: authoritarian, libertarianism, Soviet Communist, and social responsibility. Siebert et al. observed the kinship between authoritarianism and communist theories by saying that the latter can probably be described as an offshoot of the former. Similarly, the social responsibility theory was presented as a new libertarian theory resulting from the changing nature of some libertarian societies.

According to Siebert et al., under the authoritarian theory, the media are clearly subordinate to the state and are restrained from expressing serious criticism of the government or its officials or both. On the contrary, the libertarian theory emphasizes the freedom of media, especially freedom from government control. The media in most of communist countries are committed to carrying communist theory and policy to the masses, rallying support for the party and government, which exercise all but complete control over the media. Social responsibility stressed the social and moral responsibilities of the persons and institutions that operate the mass media.

Merrill (49, p.24) seems to reflect! Siebert et al's viewpoints as he stressed

Communication and National Development

that “journalism is largely determined by its political-social context, and when it functions basically in accord with this national ideology it is considered – or should be, I maintain – social responsible in a macroscopic sense.” He further noted that since the total society is influenced primarily by its political system, journalism can only exist if it is compatible with its political philosophy. However, he criticized the typology developed by Siebert et al., especially the concept of the social responsibility for two reasons. First, the implication of a social responsibility theory is that the other three media systems can not be responsible for their own societies. Second, Siebert’s typology tends to treat classifications as largely mutually exclusive and independent.

Also dissatisfied with Siebert’s “the four theories” typology, Lowenstein (41) suggested a modification. Authoritarian and libertarian, in Lowenstein’s typology, remain the same, but he discarded Soviet Communist and replaced it with what he called “social-centralist.” He also abandoned the term “social responsibility”, and coined a new term “social libertarian” for it. It is reasoned that the social centralist type would provide a broad enough spectrum to include all the nations of the Eastern bloc, and yet removes the negative connotations of the term “communist” so that it may also be used to describe those centrally guided press systems in many developing nations. Lowenstein’s social libertarian type aims to substitute the ambiguous concept social responsibility with a more discriminating and meaningful term.

While the American scholars attempt to formulate the theories of the media, in Western Europe, Williams (94) and others made a similar efforts. Williams developed another set of four theories of the media system, i.e., authoritarian, paternalism, commercialism, and democratic. The starting point for Williams and Siebert et al.’s formulation of communication system is the same. They both held that the conflict between freedom and control is the basic factor in classifying a media system. However, they differ in that the Siebert group suggested social responsibility of the media as a guiding principle for solving the current questions of media performance. Williams, on the other hand, presented the democratic type of mass communication as an ideal (53). In addition, some other studies suggested that the media system in the developing countries can be divided into authoritarian, liberal, and evolving three categories (85); or to view the media system on the bases of the degree of government vs. private control, and the degree of sophistication and diffusion (12).

While many communication scholars have sought to delineate theories of communication system from political perspectives in a prescriptive and normative manner, some researchers attempted to find empirical evidences to support the

theoretical assumption (e.g., 14, 15, 20, 51).

In a study of the relation of communication growth to national political systems in less developed countries, Fagen (14) used the political typology as an independent variable, and media growth (newspaper circulation and radio sets per hundred persons) as dependent variables. The political typology developed by Fagen included modernizing autocracies, modernizing democracies, status-quo autocracies, and colonies. The outcome of this study revealed that a political typology did discriminate between those nations which were growing rapidly in the radio sector and those which were not; the newspaper growth was less influenced by the political system. In a follow-up study, Fagen (15) again compared the growth of newspaper and radio in communist and non-communist countries. His finding suggested that communist countries generally have a more rapid rate of radio growth and newspaper circulation than non-communist countries.

Focusing on a narrower scope than Fagen's cross-national studies, Gerbner (20, p.495) conducted a case study of political tendencies in news reporting and found that *L'affaire Amiel*, a France's emerging commercial press, "does not escape from politics; its ideological perspectives lie between those of the left press and the right, but closer to the latter." In sum, after reviewing the above and related literatures it is obviously that a society's political ideologies and social system do influence the performance of mass media and the status of the information enterprise in that society (51).

On the other hand, Lerner (35) and Pye (65) proposed that the type of a society's communication system can be sufficiently revealed by the levels of modernization and development of that society. Societies, as Lerner sees it, can be categorized into three types: modern, transitional, and traditional. In traditional societies, the messages are primarily transmitted through the oral channel. In transitional societies, both media and oral channels are used. While in modern societies, the media system is the most important instrument for transmitting messages. Pye further observed that due to the nature of the traditional society, the characteristics of the communication process in this type of society are not organized as a distinct system sharply differentiated from other social processes. Information usually flowed along the lines of the social hierarchy. Conversely, the communication system in modern society involves two levels. The first is that of person-to-person communication, and the second is that of the highly organized and structured mass media.

As just mentioned above, political ideologies, social philosophies, and levels of development were regarded as most possible and powerful forces that influence

communication system. Still there are many other lines of pursuits and reasonings. For example, the impact of technological development on the forms and function of mass media, which then in turn influence other social phenomena (see 7, 57, 60); the influences of the developed countries on the mass media and social-cultural performance of the less developed countries (30, 33, 44, 45, 58, 59, 69, 70, 75, 76, 77, 92); political and cultural determinants of media policy (see 21, 28, 87); the impact of region and urbanization on the newspaper readership (e.g., 91); and the effects of industrialization on the growth of mass communication (e.g., 42).

After reviewing the literature about the role of communication in development and societies' influences on communication, it seems obvious that both lines of research explicitly or implicitly assume that there is a possible causal relationship between communication and its environment; yet they present and perceive differently in its direction of causality. This is an issue hard to be resolved. The reasons behind this difficulty can be more or less grasped from the theoretical assumptions underlying the third approach, which one might call the "interaction and interdependence" approach.

Interaction and Interdependence

Research of this line generally theorized that media systems are merely reflectors or indicators of a nation's modernization and progress, not determinants or change agents as suggested by many previously discussed literatures. One of the studies of this line indicated:

... the media and other factors and forces operating simultaneously within a nation bring about growth and progress. They are inseparable but correalational ... In a sense, I am saying that for all practical purposes the chicken and egg develop simultaneously and are interrelated, that we must talk about 'chicken-egg relationships' and not about chickens causing eggs or eggs causing chickens. (48, p.239)

Mass communication system is, according to this line, a force of a society in which there is a reciprocal influence in operation among all the interacting social forces including the other systems of institutions that serve the society (see 62, 90). The causal proof between mass media system and social system seems hardly to be obtained. The reason lies in the basic intrinsic weakness of social science itself; there are just too many human and social variables to make a neat experiment (48). Therefore, the question should be focused on the process of interaction or on interrelationships (43), and that cause-effect, though important, should be deemphasized (48).

As reflectors of other social systems, one study further specified that the size

of communication activity reflects the economic development of society; the ownership and control patterns of mass communication reflects the political development and philosophy of society; and the content of communication in general reflects the value pattern of society (see 78, p.34).

The assumption that there is an interactive and interdependent relationship between communication and social systems has generated a host of empirical studies. Unesco (93), among others (e.g., 16, 17, 55, 56), has measured the associations among industrialization, urbanization, literacy, income distribution, and indices of media distribution (e.g., newspapers/capita, newsprint/capita, television/capita, cinema seat/capita etc.) Unesco reported the rank-order correlation among variables created by assigning 50 countries to the appropriate categories. The study showed a high correlation between the development of mass media and indices of economic, social-cultural development.

Farrace and Donohew (17) conducted a rather comprehensive study. They first developed 43 variables, across 115 countries, which seem to be of importance in relation to the level of a country's communication system. These 43 variables then were grouped into six major categories: religion, population characteristics, per capita income, education, political characteristics and communication. The findings revealed that eight of these 43 variables were highly correlated with mass communication levels. These eight variables are illiteracy, per capita income, ideological orientation, population, secondary enrollment ratio, life expectancy, legislative-executive structure and newspaper circulation.

Farrace (16) later conducted a follow-up study, which explored the extent to which 54 different variables of 109 countries including 12 indices of media development that can be explained by a single national development continuum. In this study the variables were classified into eight sectors: political factors, health and nourishment capabilities, agricultural productivity, climate, population characteristics, cultural indicators, economic factors and the mass media. Two principle conclusions were derived from this study. The first is that the development in one line can never far outpace development in the others. The second is that media are related closely to many aspects of a country's development in other sectors. This lends further support to the notion that mass media development is interdependent with achievement in many aspects of the way of life in a country.

Focusing a much smaller number of variables, Nixon (55) made a cross-country comparison of four variables in 85 national press systems. He first identifies three variables: per capita income, adult illiteracy, and daily newspaper circulation, which were presumably considered related to press freedom. Nixon then set up a five-way

Communication and National Development

classification of press freedom, ranging from a free press system to an authoritarian press system. The countries studied were then assigned to each of these classifications. The finding of this study strongly suggested that there is a definite and systematic relationship between the degree of freedom and three other variables. The same conclusion was obtained in Nixon's (56) latter study, but only with the classifications of press freedom expanded to nine scales.

CONCLUSION

This review has attempted to analyze and synthesize major research present in the field of communication and national development. Generally speaking, the theorists of development tend to assert that a nation's development should be observed and measured from overall dimensions simultaneously; e.g., socioeconomic, psychological, political, and communication perspectives. The implication of this is that the development in every line should keep pace with one another; the development in one line can never far outpace or lag far behind development in the others. The important indicators for each development perspective include per capita income, income distribution, literacy, and urbanization (socioeconomic development); degree of empathy, innovativeness, and needs for achievement (psychological); structural differentiation, political institutionalization, democracy, and stability (political); and press freedom, media distribution, and media independence (communication).

Communication has in general regarded as crucial constraints on the character and prospects for socioeconomic, psychological, and political development, and vice versa. Earlier studies tend to suggest that the role of communication is direct and powerful, served as a kind of "magic multiplier" for a nation's development. Later the importance of communication is gradually toned down as the concept of development changed and research focus shifted. On the other hand, the political ideologies, social philosophies, and the levels of moderization are considered the most significant factors that might influence communication in a society. The levels of technological development, industrialization, and the state of international information flows are the other important factors in this regard.

The past decades of research in the field of communication and national development have produced a wealth of information. This information is potentially useful in understanding the context of national development, the nature of communication, and the relationships between communication and national development. Nevertheless, most of the studies, to name just a few, have largely been

descriptive and speculative (e.g., 19, 36, 37, 44, 49, 52, 53, 61, 62, 79, 81, 84, 89). Many research focus only on a very narrow dimension of the system; e.g., press freedom (55, 56), political development (1, 2, 65, 66). Still many others concentrate mostly on the description of a single system on a country-by-country basis. For example, the Middle East (35, 52), Asia (10, 11), Soviet Union and/or China (9, 40, 43, 98).

In other words, most studies seem to suffer from one or more of the following drawbacks. First, conclusions derived from the past studies usually lack consistent empirical supports. The few existed empirical studies were carried out in the early 1960s. Their derived conclusions can be challenged in view of the changing concept of development and the role of communication in national development. Second, the past empirical studies only measure the relationships between limited variables such as press freedom, newspaper circulation, per capita income, and literacy, etc. Therefore, they can hardly be claimed as "system" research in the sense that they only measured the components of the system rather than the system itself. Third, they generally focused on a single system on a country-by-country basis, exhibiting the lack of comparative communication policy research on a cross-national basis. Thus, they were generally limited in their generalizability and applicability.

Therefore, it is desirable that the future research efforts should involve more empirical and more systematic and policy-oriented research. By so doing the problem of communication and national development can be expected to be genuinely and thoroughly examined and reviewed, and thus more systematic and useful knowledge can be obtained. And, more importance is that if the basic aim of science is theory, then by so doing more solid theory concerning communication and development can probably be established. This paper can only best be considered as an attempt to analyze and synthesize relevant and important literatures on the field of communication and development. It should be noted that the problems of how to direct research toward more systematic and policy-oriented and theory-building are beyond the scope of this paper. Further discussion and elaboration on these perspectives should be much valuable and desirable.

REFERENCES

1. Almond, G. A. *Political Development*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1970.
2. Almond, G. A. and G. B. Powell, Jr. *Comparative Politics*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1966.
3. Beltrans, L. R. "Alien Premises, Objects, and Methods in Latin American Communication Research." *Communication Research* 3, 1976, pp. 107-134.
4. Bordenave, J. D. "New Approaches to Communication Training for Developing Countries."

Communication and National Development

- Paper presented at the Third World Congress of Rural Sociology, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1972.
5. Bordenave, J. D. "Communication and Adoption of Agricultural Innovations in Latin America." Paper presented at International Symposium on Communication Strategies for Rural Development, Cornell University, Institute for International Agriculture, Ithaca, New York, 1974.
 6. Browne, D. R. "Television and National Stabilization: The Lebanese Experience." *Journalism Quarterly* 52, 1975, pp.692-698.
 7. Bushkin, A. S. and J. H. Yarrow. *The Foundation of United States Information Policy*. Washington, D. C.: National Telecommunications and Information Administration, 1980.
 8. Cheng, J. C. *Media Policies and National Developmental Characteristics of Sixteen Asian Countries*. Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1978.
 9. Chu, G. *Radical Change through Communication in Mao's China*. Honolulu, Hawaii: East-West Center, the University of Hawaii, 1977.
 10. Chu, G. and Alfian. "Programming for Development in Indonesia." *Journal of Communication* 30(4), 1980, pp.50-57.
 11. Cutright, P. "National Political Development Measurement and Analysis." *American Sociological Review* 28, 1963, pp.253-264.
 12. Davison, W. P., J. Boylan, and F. T. C. Yu. *Mass Media*. New York: Praeger, 1976.
 13. Deutch, K. W. "Social Mobilization and Political Development." *American Political Science Review* 55, 1961, pp. 493-514.
 14. Fagen, R. R. "Mass Media Growth: A Comparison of Communist and Other Countries." *Journalism Quarterly* 41, 1964a, pp.563-567; 572.
 15. Fagen, R. R. "Relations of Communication Growth to National Political System in Less Developed Countries." *Journalism Quarterly* 41, 1964b, pp.87-94.
 16. Farrace, V. A. "A Study of Mass Communication and National Development." *Journalism Quarterly* 43, 1966, pp.305-313.
 17. Farrace, V. A. and L. Donohew. "Mass Communication in National System: A Study of 43 Variables in 115 Countries." *Journalism Quarterly* 42, 1965, pp.253-261.
 18. Feltstehausen, H. "Conceptual Limits of Development Communication Theory." Paper presented at the Association for Education in Journalism, Columbia, South Carolina, 1971.
 19. Frey, F. W. "Communication and Development." In I. de S. Pool, W. Schramm, F. W. Frey, N. Maccoby, and E. B. Parker (Eds.) *Handbook of Communication*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973, pp.337-461.
 20. Gerbner, G. "Ideological Perspectives and Political Tendencies in News Reporting." *Journalism Quarterly* 41, 1964, pp.495-516.
 21. Gerbner, G. "Comparative Cultural Indicators." In G. Gerbner (Ed.) *Mass Media Policies in Changing Culture*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1977, pp.199-205.
 22. Gurr, T. and C. Ruttenberg. *The Conditions of Civil Violence: First Tests of a Causal Model*. Princeton: Center of International Studies, Princeton University Press, 1967.
 23. Hagen, E. E. *On the Theory of Social Change*. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1962.
 24. Hancock, A. *Communication Planning for Development: An Operation Framework*. Honolulu, Hawaii: East-West Communication Institute, 1978.

25. Heine-Geldern, R. "Diffusion: 1. Cultural Diffusion." In D. Sills (Ed.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social Science*. Volume 4, New York: Macmillan, 1968, pp.169-173.
26. Herskovits, M. J. *Man and His Works*. New York: Knopf, 1969.
27. Hornik, R. "Communication as Complement in Development." *Journal of Communication* 30, 1980, pp.10-23.
28. Horton, P. C. (Ed.) *The Third World and Press Freedom*. New York: Praeger, 1978.
29. Janka, M. Z. D. "Mass Communication in the Context of Development: With Special Reference to Latin America." Research paper for Diploma in International and National Development, Netherlands Institute of Social Science, The Hague, Netherlands, 1973.
30. Katz, E. and G. Wedell. *Broadcasting in the Third World: Promise and Performance*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1977.
31. Katz, E. "Cultural Continuity and Change." In K. Nordenstreng, and H. I. Schiller (Eds.) *National Sovereignty and International Communication: A Reader*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex, 1979, pp.65-81.
32. Lasswell, H. D. "The Structure and Function of Communication in Society." In L. Bryson (Ed.) *The Communication of Ideas*. New York: Harper & Row, 1948, pp.37-51.
33. Lee, C. C. *Media Imperialism Reconsidered*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1981.
34. J. A. R. *Toward Realistic Communication Policies: Recent Trends and Ideas Compiled and Analyzed*. Unesco Reports and Papers on Mass Communication, No.76, Paris: Unesco Press, 1976.
35. Lerner, D. *The Passing of Traditional Society*. New York: Free Press, 1958.
36. Lerner, D. and L. M. Nelson (Eds.) *Communication Research: A Half Century Appraisal*. Honolulu, Hawaii: East-West Center, University of Hawaii, 1977.
37. Lerner, D. and W. Schramm (Eds.) *Communication and Change in the Developing Countries*. Honolulu, Hawaii: East-West Center, University of Hawaii, 1967.
38. Lipset, S. M. "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic and Political Legitimacy." *American Political Science Review* 53, 1959, pp.69-105.
39. Littunen, Y. "Cultural Problems of Direct Sattellite Broadcasting." *The International Social Science Journal* 32, 1980, pp.283-303.
40. Liu, A. P. L. *Communication and National Integration in Communist China*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.
41. Lowenstein, R. *PICA: Measuring World Press Freedom*. Freedom Information Center Report, No.166, Columbia, Missouri: Freedom Information Center, University of Missouri, 1967.
42. Maisel, R. "The Decline of Mass Media." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 37, 1973, pp.159-170.
43. Markham, J. W. *Voices of the Red Giants: Communication in Russia and China*. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1967.
44. MacBride, S. et al. *Many Voices, One World: Communication and Society Today and Tomorrow*. New York: Unipub, 1980.
45. Martterlat, A. *Multinational Corporations and Control of Culture: The Ideological Apparatuses of Imperialism*. Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1979.
46. Maslow, A. H. *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper & Row, 1954.
47. McClelland, D. C. *The Achieving Society*. Princeton: Van Nostand, 1961.

Communication and National Development

48. Merrill, J. C. "The Role of Mass Media in National Development: An Open Question for Speculation." *Gazette* 17, 1971, pp.236-242.
49. Merrill, J. C. *The Imperative of Freedom*. New York: Hasting House, 1974.
50. Merton, R. K. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1968.
51. Mond, G. "Press Concentration in Socialist Countries." *Gazette* 20, 1974, pp.145-161.
52. Mowlana, H. "Mass Media System and Communication Behavior." In M. Adams (Ed.) *The Middle East: A Handbook*. London: Anthony Blond, 1971a.
53. Mowlana, H. "Toward a Theory of Communication System- a Developmental Approach." *Gazette* 17, 1971b, pp.17-28.
54. Myren, D. T. "Comments on the Beltrans and Colle Papers." Paper presented at International Symposium on Communication Strategies for Rural Development, Cornell University, Institute for International Agriculture, Ithaca, New York, 1974.
55. Nixon, R. B. "Factors Related to Freedom in National Press System." *Journalism Quarterly* 37, 1960, pp.13-28.
56. Nixon, R. B. "Freedom in the World's Press: A Fresh Appraisal with New Data." *Journalism Quarterly* 42, 1965, pp.3-4.
57. Nora, S. and A. Minc, *The Computerization of Society: A Report to the President of France*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1980.
58. Nordenstreng, K. and H. I. Schiller (Eds.) *National Sovereignty and International Communication: A Reader*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex, 1979.
59. Nordenstreng, K. and T. Varis. *Television Traffic – a One Way Street?* Unesco Reports and Papers on Mass Communication, No.70, Paris: Unesco Press, 1974.
60. Parker, E. B. "Technological Change and the Mass Media." In I. de S. Pool, W. Schramm, F. W. Frey, N. Maccoby, and E. B. Parker (Eds.) *Handbook of Communication*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973, pp.619-645.
61. Pool, I. de S. "The Mass Media and Politics in Modernization Process." In L. Pye (Ed.) *Communication and Political Development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963, pp.234-253.
62. Pool, I. de S. "The Rise of Communication Policy Research." *Journal of Communication* 24, 1974, pp.31-42.
63. Pool, I. de S. "Direct Broadcasting Satellite and the Integrity of National Cultures." In K. Nordenstreng, and H. I. Schiller (Eds.) *National Sovereignty and International Communication: A Reader*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex, 1979, pp.120-153.
64. Portes, A. "On the Sociology of National Development: Theories and Issues." *American Journal of Sociology* 82, 1976, pp.55-85.
65. Pye, L. W. *Communication and Political Development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.
66. Pye, L. W. *Aspects of Political Development*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1966.
67. Rao, Y. V. L. *The Role of Information in Economic and Social Change: Reports of a Field Study in Two India Villages*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1963.
68. Ranish, G. "Economic Growth: 11. Theory." In D. Sills (Ed.) (*International Encyclopedia of Social Science*. Volume 4. New York: Macmillan, 1968, pp.408-417.
69. Read, W. H. "Global TV Flow: Another Look." *Journal of Communication* 26, 1976a,

- pp.69-73.
70. Read, W. H. *America's Mass Media Merchants*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1976b.
 71. Rogers, E. M. "Communication and Development, the Passing of the Dominant Paradigm." *Communication Research* 3, 1976, pp.213-240.
 72. Rogers, E. M. and F. F. Shoemaker. *Communication of Innovation* (2nd ed.) New York: Free Press, 1971.
 73. Rosario-Braid, F. *Communication Strategies for Productivity Improvement*. Tokyo: Asian Productivity Organization, 1979.
 74. Rostow, W. W. *The Stage of Economic Growth*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
 75. Schiller, H. I. *Mass Communication and American Empire*. New York: Kelley, 1969.
 76. Schiller, H. I. *The Mind Manager*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1973.
 77. Schiller, H. I. *Communication and Cultural Domination*. White Plains, New York: International Arts and Science Press, 1976.
 78. Schramm, W. L. "Communication Development and Development Process." In L. W. Pye (Ed.) *Communication and Political Development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963, pp.30-57.
 79. Schramm, W. L. *Mass Media and National Development*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964.
 80. Schramm, W. L. *Man, Media, and Message*. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
 81. Schramm, W. L. and D. Lerner (Eds.) *Communication and Change*. Honolulu, Hawaii: East-West Center, University of Hawaii, 1976.
 82. Schramm, W. L. and W. L. Ruggels. "How Mass Media System Grow." In D. Lerner and W. L. Schramm (Eds.) *Communication and Change in Less Developing Countries*. Honolulu, Hawaii: East-West Center, University of Hawaii, 1967, pp.57-75.
 83. Shils, E. A. *Political Development in the New States*. (4th printing) Paris: Mouton, 1968.
 84. Siebert, F. S., T. Peterson, and W. L. Schramm. *Four Theories of the Press*. (8th printing) Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1973.
 85. Sommerlad, E. L. *The Press in Developing Countries*. Sydney, Australia: Sydney University Press, 1966.
 86. Sommerlad, E. L. *National Communication Systems*. Unesco Reports and Papers on Mass Communication, No.74, Paris: Unesco Press, 1975.
 87. Szecsko, T. "The Development of a Socialist Communication Policy." In G. Gerbner (Ed.) *Mass Media Policies in Changing Culture*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1977, pp.225-234.
 88. Taylor, C. L. "Communication Development and Political Stability." *Comparative Political Studies* 1, 1969, pp.557-563.
 89. Teheranian, M. "Communication and National Development, Reflections on Theories and Policies." In M. Teheranian, F. Hakimzadeh, and M. L. Vidale (Eds.) *Communication Policies for National Development, a Comparative Perspective*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977, pp.17-50.
 90. Tichenor, P., G. A. Donohue, and C. N. Olien. "Mass Media Function, Knowledge, and Social Control." *Journalism Quarterly* 50, 1971, pp.652-659.
 91. Tillinghast, W. A. "Declining Newspaper Readership: Impact of Region and Urbanization."

Communication and National Development

- Journalism Quarterly* 58, 1981, pp.14-23.
92. Tunstall, J. *The Media Are American: Anglo-American Media in the World*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1977.
 93. Unesco. *Mass Media in the Developing Countries*. Unesco Reports and Papers on Mass Communication, No.33, Paris: Unesco Press, 1961.
 94. Williams, R. *Communication*. (3rd ed.) London: Penguin, 1976.
 95. Wright, C. R. "Functional Analysis and Mass Communication." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 24, 1960, pp.605-620.
 96. Wright, C. R. "Functional Analysis and Mass Communication Revisited." In J. G. Blumler and E. Katz (Eds.) *The Uses of Mass Communication*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage, 1974, pp.197-212.
 97. Wright, C. R. *Mass Communication, a Sociological Perspective*. (2nd ed.) New York: Random House, 1975.
 98. Yu, F. T. C. *Mass Persuasion in Communist China*. New York: Praeger, 1964.