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Abstract / Through the technique of meta-analysis, this study investigates the scholarly articles appearing in peer-reviewed online and offline journals that address the topic of communication and development from 1998 to 2007 to determine publication trends in the field. The research was prompted by the sense that development was moving off the research agenda of most communication scholars. This seemed surprising in the era of globalization and it was decided to examine the literature for evidence. The study finds that published studies have moved away from mass communication and toward ICTs’ role in development, that they infrequently address development in the context of globalization and often continue to embrace a modernization paradigm despite its many criticisms. In addition, International Communication Gazette was found to be the only mainstream communication journal to include a significant number of articles on development communication.
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Nowadays, the term ‘development communication’ is showing its age and perhaps its lack of relevance in an era of globalization where every part of the world appears to be intimately connected to every other part. Whether constituting a utopian or dystopian discourse for gathering the world into one economic system, the flat world, as foreign affairs columnist for The New York Times Thomas Friedman (2005) has called it, is with us to stay for a while. Historians argue that ‘contemporary global integration is both exaggerated and preceded’ (Lang, 2006: 901). Sparks (2007: 135) writes that scholars can agree that the trend is toward ‘greater connectedness and action at a distance’, but there is no general agreement on the theories of the concept. However, a lack of theoretical clarity has not stopped economists, political scientists and popular pundits from writing extensively on the impact of the ‘new’ global economy on the world’s citizens. Media scholars are no exception. Enhanced technological capabilities that have brought us borderless information and entertainment have also caused us to rethink the meaning of national press and broadcast systems and to be more concerned about setting up cultural protections against the invasion of the local by the global. But as Sparks points out, the
world’s media products are still largely produced for domestic markets and not for
global consumption.

Somewhere in the shifting conversation about what is local or national and
what is global or glocal, the concept of development communication may have lost
its purpose. The discourse of globalization has left the poor nations and the even
poorer people in those nations on the margins. As La Pastina asks in an essay on
the global media in Brazil:

How does globalization apply to societies on the verge of development or in developing stages
like the nations of Latin America? Does globalization in Latin America speak about the pro-
cesses of class stratification where the elites are becoming more and more dissociated from
the rest of nations’ populations due to an increasing gap in economic, symbolic and cultural
capital and consumer taste, or does it speak about a growing awareness of the interconnected
economic and social processes that affect the livelihood of rural and low-income residents all
over the world? (La Pastina, 2005: 37)

La Pastina concludes that globalization in Brazil affects the marginalized popu-
lations by sweeping them along in the ‘currents of globalization, rather than influ-
encing them’ (La Pastina, 2005: 40). Though information and communication
technologies (ICTs) may play a crucial role in stimulating development in this net-
worked global world, Castells argues that the stimulation of development cuts two
ways. ‘On the one hand, it allows countries to leapfrog stages of economic growth
by being able to modernize production systems’ and become better competitors.
‘On the other hand, for those economies that are unable to adapt to the new tech-
nological system, their retardation becomes cumulative’ (Castells, 1999: 3). In order
for the former scenario to take place, Castells says that investments in technology
and education, the establishment of a worldwide network of science and technol-
y and the reversal of policies that marginalize people must be adopted (Castells,
1999: 12).

Perhaps the introduction of ICTs into the discourse of development has caused
some scholars to forget that technology cannot provide a magic multiplier effect for
the poorest of the poor. Jeffrey James is critical of that view in his analysis of the
ICT4D (ICTs for development) literature (James, 2005). He observes that the focus
on ICTs in field research has abandoned consideration of traditional media. Such an
approach also does not acknowledge the contributions to the critical literature made
by scholars in communication and development in the last decades and may make
the mistake of uncritically embracing the modernization paradigm based on the use
of newer information technologies. His analysis finds that the research in this area
‘is almost totally devoid of analytical categories that can bring some order to a
vast, descriptive literature’ where the ‘field experiences remain separated from the
process according to which paradigms are created and changed over time’ (James,

Because ICTs are a fundamental part of the globalization process, policy-makers
may view the introduction of telecenters or information kiosks and other methods
of diffusing computer and Internet access in developing countries as the solution
to becoming linked to the global economy and lifting the local economy out of
poverty. It is reasonable to think that globalization and the role played by ICTs in
that process may have detracted from a focus on development, but scholars like Castells (1999) and Huesca (2001) believe that they go hand in hand.

This study of the scholarship published in refereed journals focusing on development communications and ICTs from 1997 to 2007 seeks to answer several questions related to the trends in this field in an era of globalization. Is the focus on communication and development declining in the academic literature? How is the newer focus on ICTs in development situated vis-a-vis traditional media? How is the discourse on globalization related to the discourse of development in the communication literature? And finally, what paradigms and theories are being adopted to understand communication and development in the 21st century?

Overviews and Meta-Analytical Research in Development Communication

In his review of the place of theory in development communication, Roman situates the research in this field in the social science tradition, tracing its roots to the media-effects theories (Roman, 2005: 314). As he and many others have pointed out, the beginnings of this field incorporated the modernization paradigm that ‘categorized mass media as one of the independent variables in the neoclassical equation of economic prosperity’ (Roman, 2005: 315). Roman traces the work accomplished in theory building in development communication up to the current era through three perspectives: media effects, critical theory and pragmatist philosophy. Though he holds out promise for research on new social movements, Roman concludes that little theoretical creativity exists in this field, primarily because of its ‘investment in social relevance’ (Roman, 2005: 323). The major challenge for development communication is ‘preserving the values of social relevance without threatening the opportunities for theoretical creativity’, Roman (2005: 323) argues.

Roman’s analysis cites a variety of scholarship over the years, but does not systematically evaluate the contents of the corpus of research in development communication. Two other studies take on that task. Trends in scholarly work addressing communication and development have been the focus of two meta-analyses of development communication research (Fair, 1989; Fair and Shah, 1997). Both of these studies attempt to assess the role of traditional media in the literature of development communication as ‘agents of behavioral attitude and knowledge changes of audience members’ (Fair, 1989: 129). Fair compared the studies conducted from 1958 to 1975 with those conducted from 1976 to 1986 to determine whether there were differences in the studies published following the challenge to the modernization paradigm that guided the early research. She found that researchers in the latter period continued to support the modernization paradigm through positivist approaches and functionalist analyses. She also noted that discussions of unequal power relationships were rarely included in any of the studies in either period. Fair and Shah’s (1997) study examined the period between 1987 and 1996, asking the same question concerning media’s role in development. As in the earlier research, Fair and Shah evaluated theoretical approaches, assertions about the media as variables, choices related to methods and consequences, generalizations and conclusions that
were generated by the research findings (Fair and Shah, 1997: 4). The results of this study revealed that development had grown beyond its Third World focus, including the newly independent nations of Eastern Europe and some marginalized groups in western countries. New media (though not yet the Internet) were added to the mass media in the later period. The authors also point out that the mass media were only one of many factors that impact development. In addition, a wider range of frameworks and approaches was taken in that period that moved the focus away from the modernization paradigm somewhat – including the ‘feminist, dialogic, participatory, and public sphere’ (Fair and Shah, 1997: 20). The authors also found that studies had reflected the modernization critiques, but they called for a skeptical postmodernist orientation that would examine the structures of inequalities. Such an approach, they said, would help us understand why specific groups – ‘women, children, the dispossessed – continue to be ignored while the rhetoric of development suggests that these groups are of central concern’ (Fair and Shah, 1997: 20).

Nancy Morris also contributes to the analysis of the scholarship in the field through her evaluation of the objectives and outcomes of 44 development projects. Based on her view that the field of development communication has been dominated by two conceptual models, diffusion and participation (Morris, 2003: 225), she examined the empirical research based on these models. A major finding of her study was that though the two models are frequently discussed as if they were polar opposites (top-down vs bottom-up, for example), they often informed one another in their use in development communication projects. She found that the two approaches can overlap in both the objectives of the studies and in the outcomes, such that ‘the distinction between participatory and diffusion approaches may be justifiably described as a false dichotomy’ (Morris, 2003: 241).

The present study of the period beginning in 1998 and ending in 2007 tries to add to the findings of the several studies cited, bringing the globalization and ICT focus of recent years into the inquiry.

Methodology

This research combines meta-analysis – a quantitative form of literary review that summarizes the results of numerous works on the same topic – with qualitative content analysis of the main themes that emerge in the reviewed articles. Meta-analysis methodology has proven to be a useful tool to assess the current state of knowledge, identify directions for future research, advance theory and guide policy decisions (Guzzo et al., 1987). A strength of meta-analysis is that conclusions are based on a much larger sample than any of the studies included in it. However, one weakness of this methodology relates to its structure and mechanical procedure (Lipsey and Wilson, 2001). For this reason, to enrich the findings of the study, we analyzed the main themes of the included studies to add to the information provided from the quantitative examination of the 211 scholarly articles.

One characteristic of meta-analysis is that the researcher is very explicit about the population of research studies that will be included, which in turn provides essential guidance during the process of inclusion and exclusion (Lipsey and Wilson,
The main criteria guiding our article selection process were: (1) studies have to deal with the relationship between communications and development in developing countries; (2) be published in peer-reviewed journals found in the Communication and Mass Media Complete database; and (3) be published between 1998 and 2007.

For this study, we excluded research that appeared in books, book chapters, convention papers and dissertation research. The rationale for this exclusion is that most empirical research published in other forms (books or book chapters in particular) is likely to appear in academic journals first. Since our study was interested in the most current empirical research in the field, the selection of peer-reviewed journals fulfills this criterion.

**Literature Search**

After the rules have been established, finding studies to incorporate into the meta-analysis is the first step of the process, which is followed by selecting the content for analysis (Chaffee and Lieberman, 2001).

First, we selected the Communication and Mass Media Complete online database entering keywords contained in the subject terms of the articles for our search. Computer searches are assumed to be convenient and relatively reliable sources (Guzzo et al., 1987: 418). In addition, we also searched the Directory of Open Access Journals for additional online-only peer-reviewed journals and used our own knowledge of the field to complement the final list of online journals. Selected online journals were searched manually issue by issue.

The key words ‘development communication’ resulted in many articles that did not fulfill the criteria for inclusion, so we developed a more precise search strategy. We combined keywords ‘development’ and ‘communication’ with ‘globalization’, ‘transition’, ‘health’, ‘governance’, ‘education’, ‘ICTs’, ‘democracy’ and ‘economy’ one at a time. Once a final list was obtained, we further culled that list by reading the abstract for each article to determine whether it fit our criteria. The online database search together with our manual search generated a sample of 211 articles. Though this list may not be exhaustive, it likely comes close to the complete list of articles published in this field during the 10-year period.

**Coding Procedure**

We developed a coding sheet that included categories and variables based on the Fair (1989) and Fair and Shah (1997) studies. However, our coding sheet and coding procedures were refined further to serve the particular purpose of our study.

All research articles in our sample were coded for the location of the study and location of the author; level of focus; theoretical approach and stage of the theory; paradigms used or criticized; strategies taken in the study; research methods; the focus of the media and media role; and the use of globalization in an article’s discourse.

Moreover, each coder took notes on the main themes that appeared in the coded articles. Up to three themes were marked for each article. The themes were
collected in a word document to be textually analyzed further in the qualitative part of our study.

Intercoder reliability was determined to be .847 as calculated by the composite reliability coefficient. This is generally determined to be an acceptable level.

Findings

Our study of 211 studies located in peer-reviewed research journals between 1998 and 2007 finds some interesting differences from the previous analyses of development and communication literature. The new focus on ICTs may have driven this change, as the publication of articles in the 10-year period only really increased after 2003, when the Internet had begun to diffuse more widely in developing countries (see Figure 1). We could say that development and communication research was in great decline in the first five years of the study, as only 24 articles or 11.3 percent of the total were published in the peer-reviewed scholarly journals we searched. By contrast, 80 percent of the total number of scholarly articles published in this period appeared between 2004 and 2007. Of all the primary approaches adopted for the study, ICT4D comprised 42.3 percent (and an additional 12.5 percent of the secondary approaches) of the total and 40.8 percent used ICTs as the media focus of the research. This is in stark contrast to the findings in the Fair (1989) and Fair and Shah (1997) studies where ICTs were not even listed as media and ICT4D was not included as an approach.

Because we expected that globalization would frame many of the studies in the 10-year period, it was surprising that 81 percent of the articles made no mention of globalization, and indeed, 61.1 percent of the articles conducted their work on a micro level. We might expect research that included a globalization perspective
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to more frequently take a macro-level approach, and of the 30 articles that included a globalization discourse in their study of development, 66.7 percent adopted a macro-level approach. Of the 41 articles that mentioned globalization, three-quarters mentioned globalization in relation to the development issues raised in the article. For the rest, the term just appeared somewhere in the articles unconnected from the major focus.

We wondered if the newer interest in ICTs would also be defined in new research paradigms. By the mid-1970s several scholars had already begun to criticize the use of the modernization frame to understand the process of development. As Fair states, ‘the problem with the dominant paradigm research was that while it described the industrialized developed world, it failed to account for many of the social, political, and economic (structurally related variables) important to the process of national development in developing countries’ (Fair, 1989: 137). Rather than disappear from the literature, it seems there has been a resurgence of the use of this paradigm, either explicit or implicit, as fully 37.3 percent of the articles made use of this frame for their research (see Figure 4). The next most popular paradigm was participatory, with 18.4 percent adopting that approach. When ICT4D was the research approach taken in the article, 44.7 percent situated that research within the modernization paradigm, while an additional 27.1 percent were guided by no paradigm whatsoever (see Table 1).

We also found a similar trend to that found by Morris (2003) in combining a modernization with a participatory framework (11.4 percent), while 23.9 percent used no particular paradigm at all for the research. We believe that the renewed focus on modernization has taken place because the scholars conducting their work

| TABLE 1 | Communication Paradigms by Primary Strategy Adopted in the Research |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                | ICT4D | Community participation + AIDS | Health communication | Develop. support comm. | All other strategies | Total |
| Modernization  | 38    | 9                              | 7                | 6               | 15              | 75   |
|                | 44.7% | 27.3%                          | 33.3%            | 46.2%           | 30.6%           | 37.3% |
| Participation  | 10    | 7                              | 4                | 3               | 13              | 37   |
|                | 11.8% | 21.2%                          | 19%              | 23.1%           | 26.5%           | 18.4% |
| Mix of modernization and participation | 8 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 23 |
|                | 9.4%  | 6.1%                           | 14.3%            | 7.7%            | 18.4%           | 11.4% |
| No paradigm    | 23    | 13                             | 7                | 1               | 4               | 48   |
|                | 27.1% | 39.4%                          | 33.3%            | 7.7%            | 8.2%            | 23.9% |
| All other paradigms | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 18 |
|                | 7.1%  | 6.1%                           | 0                | 15.4%           | 16.3%           | 9%   |
| Total          | 85    | 33                             | 21               | 21              | 49              | 201  |
|                | 42.3% | 16.4%                          | 10.4%            | 6.5%            | 24.4%           | 100% |

\[ \chi^2 = 27.755, \text{ d.f.} = 16, \, p < .034. \]
on ICT4D come from disciplines outside communications and may not be familiar with the critical writing in the field over the last 30 years. We should also add that only 42 articles or 19.9 percent of the total criticized any of the communication paradigms used to frame development. The modernization paradigm on its own or alongside other paradigms (dependency, participatory) received the bulk of that criticism (42.9 percent of the 42 articles).

As in the earlier studies, the trend to conduct a-theoretical research in this field persists. Three-quarters of all the studies used no theory to define their work. Though many of those articles may have mentioned theory used in other work, the majority of the authors did not use it to build (2.8 percent), test (10.4 percent) or extend (2.8 percent) that theory in their own work. Even if they did not use theory for their own studies, 9 percent did include a critique of previous theory, however.

We coded the data for the location of the first author of the study. The largest number of first authors were located in North America (34.1 percent). Another sizeable portion of the authors came from Western Europe (14.9 percent). But the encouraging news is that 16.3 percent were located in sub-Saharan Africa, and smaller percentages came from Latin America (2.9 percent), Central Asia (2.4 percent), East Asia (4.3 percent), the Middle East and North Africa (4.8 percent). In other words, many of the authors of studies on development actually come from developing countries, which had not occurred in such numbers in much of the history of publication in mainstream journals in this field.

Perhaps because so many of the poorest nations in the world are located in sub-Saharan Africa, the largest percentage of the articles focused on that region (25.6 percent), while Southern Asia came in second with 19 percent and another 18 percent talked more generally about development communication and did not focus on any particular part of the world (see Figure 2).

We were concerned that because of the difficulties posed in the conduct of empirical research on development we would find fewer studies adopting this
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method. That was not the case. More than half of the total of articles analyzed adopted empirical approaches (55.5 percent), while only 14.4 percent used non-empirical methods and 30.1 percent used no method at all (because they were usually analytical essays on development communication topics) (see Figure 3). When the articles used empirical methods, the most popular was survey, content analysis or a combination of methods. Quantitative methods were used in 45.3 percent of the empirical studies while qualitative methods were used in 35 percent and a mixture of the two was used in the remaining 19.7 percent of the studies.

The non-empirical research included literature reviews of a particular subject (22 percent), described an aspect of communication and development (8.8 percent), developed an argument related to the topic (48.4 percent) or represented action research focused on bringing about a specific change (15.4 percent). The rest of the non-empirical studies were interpretive (2.2 percent), political economy analyses (2.2 percent) or could be considered future-oriented research (1.1 percent).

**Media Shifts**

Mass media had mostly gone out of fashion as the instruments to deliver development messages in this 10-year period. Since all of the studies were included in a communication database, we expected that they would all have media as their core variables. As mentioned earlier, however, ICTs have captured the attention of scholarly articles on development communication for 44.1 percent of the articles examined. Further, ICTs in conjunction with mass media added another 2.8 percent to the total. When mass media were used, that happened more frequently in combinations of media (12.0 percent) than as a single medium (television – 7.1 percent; radio – 1.4 percent; print – 5.2 percent). The rest of the studies focused on some other combination of multiple media (22.7 percent) or took interpersonal communication as their focus (9.0 percent) or interpersonal in combination with mass media.
Finally, a few studies discussed telecommunications generally or audio recorders. But whatever media were selected by the authors, 77.7 percent of the articles discussed the role of those media as a prime mover in the development process, while another 12.8 percent considered media as a complement and only 1.9 percent assigned it a minimal role and 7.6 percent included no role for media (see Table 2).

The articles that used ICT4D as their strategy for development more frequently considered the media as prime mover (89.8 percent). A similarly high percentage was found for those articles that used development support communications as their approach (92.3 percent). Somewhat smaller percentages for media as prime mover were found for articles dealing with health communication or community participation.

The move to a greater focus on ICTs in development can also be seen in the titles of the journals in which these articles appear. The top journals for articles that include communication and development research are the following: *International Journal of Education and Development Using Information and Communication Technology* (34); *Global Media Journal* (26); *Journal of Health Communication* (24); and *Journal of Development Communication* (18). With the notable exception of *International Communication Gazette* (17), our study found little attention to this subject in some of the major journals in the field of communication – *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* (0); *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media* (2); *Journal of Communication* (1); and *Media, Culture and Society* (6).

**Themes**

In addition to the quantitative analysis of the articles, we also listed the themes found in the research. These themes grew out of the conclusions and the discussion sections
of each article. We divided the articles according to the primary and secondary approaches or strategies taken by the authors. Here we report on the themes of the top three primary strategies: ICT4D – 50 percent of the total; community participation (including the AIDS/HIV community approach) – 17 percent of the total; and health communication – 11 percent of the total. Though we selected the primary approach based on the authors’ framing of the research, analysis of the themes showed that the approaches are not mutually exclusive and that there was much overlap and blending of these approaches. Nonetheless, the discussion that follows examines the approaches in categories.

**ICT4D**

As the focus of the bulk of the work done in communication and development in the last decade, ICTs have been identified as important tools in the alleviation of poverty in a sustainable manner, in enhancing economic development and in empowering marginalized sections of the population. Many articles also pointed out, however, that governments, businesses and not-for-profit organizations need to change their policies and practices in order to build infrastructures to accommodate the use of the new technologies.
Other research, however, viewed ICTs as having the power to leapfrog over other societal problems to achieve development goals – including the empowerment of women, the obtainment of measurable increases in economic development and the adoption of more democratic policies. Some authors cautioned that ICTs can be a double-edged sword that can be used to transform and liberate but also to exclude women, deepen the digital divide and reproduce existing inequalities. Still others pointed to the need to change national policies to support IT adoption and application, and to also encourage more domestic innovation and local creation of ICTs. In order to make these changes, authors argued that such policies be sustainable by having different segments of society – policy-makers in government and NGOs, community representatives and leaders in the private sector – work together to ensure that ICTs are used for both human development and security and are the outcomes of community efforts and goals.

Community Participation
This approach usually overlapped with one of the other strategies – often ICTs or health communication. For example, articles would criticize the lack of effective community participation in approaches that took a top-down approach to provide ICTs in villages and towns. Authors noted that the sustainability of ICTs in communities depended on community engagement in all phases of such projects. More generally, the articles taking this approach illustrate how dialogues between communicators and target audiences contribute to the understanding and maintenance of behaviors and practices. Community participation approaches were applied to the use of community radio, use of blogs to participate in democratic forums and the application of peer education to improve the understanding of good health practices. Even traditional interpersonal strategies such as story telling and community-based counseling were described in the context of community participation. The authors who advocated this approach argued that it can facilitate community development and empowerment. Marginalized groups, and especially women, whose voice has not been heard because of cultural norms or unequal power structures, are able to effect social and political change through community participation using communication tools like ICTs or mass media.

Health Communication
The overwhelming majority of health communication articles in this study dealt with the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Whether the research was located in South Africa or Nepal, Brazil or Zambia, the articles all seemed to address the same barriers and potential areas of success. Overlap with community participation was a clear feature of these articles. The only way a health communication effort can be successful, the authors point out, is if it involves the community. And that involvement should run through every aspect of the campaign, from creation to implementation. Several of the studies found that existing social networks play a large role in whether or not a behavioral change will be adopted, and can sometimes be more important than mass media efforts.
In addition to issues of community involvement, there is also some emphasis on gender in the health communication research. Most studies seem to find that targeting women with messages about health and behavioral change is an effective way to disseminate knowledge about a topic like HIV/AIDS. But focusing on women will only take the campaign so far. Some research noted that if health researchers want to effect major changes, especially regarding sexual behavior, they must find a way to engage the men in societies or their efforts are doomed to failure.

For researchers looking to engage a society on a particular health topic, entertainment was selected as a successful strategy. But the storylines must reflect the culture in which a program is shown and speak to the audience, not preach at it.

These summaries of the main themes found in the articles illustrate that a struggle over perspectives on the role of communication in development still exists. Though the modernization paradigm that is based on top-down approaches and external infusion of ideas and technologies is still being applied in projects and in perspectives, it is clear that some scholars are arguing for more holistic approaches that do not presume that experts from the West have the answers to the problems of poverty and poor health and lack of education.

Discussion

The meta-analysis of 211 peer-reviewed articles appearing in the Communication and Mass Media Complete database that focused on development communication asked first whether the literature in this field has been declining. In terms of actual numbers, that was the case in the years from 1998 to 2003. In 2003, the research pace began to pick up a bit, but mostly due to the new focus on ICTs that began in that year and which has continued through to the present. The fading of mass communication initiatives in development is consistent with the outcome of an International Telecommunications Union (ITU) survey that asked about the relative importance of 10 targets for ICT connectivity (which included mass media) The ITU study found that ‘ensuring that all the world’s population has access to television and radio services’ came an absolute last in importance. Connecting colleges, research centers and secondary schools with ICTs was found to have much higher priority (Minges, 2006: 127). Though the authors explained that the lack of attention to mass communications may be based on the more widespread diffusion of those technologies relative to the problems of diffusing ICTs, the sense that ICTs are the important technologies of today and tomorrow was also a factor.

We believe that the more recent attention to ICTs has to do with the constant search for the magic solution to bringing information to people to transform their lives, allowing them to improve their economic condition, educate their children, increase literacy and the levels of education and spread democracy in their countries. Despite years of research that tells us that information is necessary but insufficient to bring about this change, ICTs have become the most recent iteration of the holy grail for development. And even if communication scholars know better because critical scholarship written over the last 30 years has told them so, newcomers to this field from other information-based disciplines may not have such
close acquaintance with that literature. Furthermore, because of the appeal of the modernization paradigm, there is a tendency to forget that it cannot work.

To be fair, many of the researchers who framed their studies in this paradigm also recognized that individual participation as well as community involvement may be necessary even when the innovation is provided by external agents of change. As it took the early proponents of the modernization paradigm at least a decade to conclude that a different approach was needed, it may also take the ICT4D scholars some time to adopt similar thinking. Already, there are signs of that appearing in the literature. As Torero and von Braun note in their recent book, ‘ICT is an opportunity for development, but not a panacea. For the potential benefits of ICT to be realized in developing countries, many prerequisites need to be put in place’ (Torero and von Braun, 2006: 343). The authors are critical of the ICT4D research that has focused almost exclusively on ‘connectivity’, while the ‘capability’ to use the new technologies has been overlooked. They claim that all three need to be addressed if success is to be achieved.

Overall, the trend in international communications research to embrace the topic of globalization may be viewed in the context of current dominant economic practices around the world.2 We can also see that trend in the graduate curricula in communications in the US, where courses in development communication are dropping out of sight. A search of 40 of the graduate programs offering doctoral degrees in mass communications, which have either been known to include a development focus in the past or where scholars conducting research in this area have been employed, turned up only 12 courses in 10 schools on the topic. Several schools have newer courses on globalization or use the more general ‘international communications’ in the title of the offered courses. We view these attempts to remain current as positive in helping students to understand the most recent trends, but we worry that the communication needs of the poorest countries in the world will be forgotten in this shift.

We are hopeful that we will see greater emphasis on communication and development in the research of the future and that such research will appear more frequently in mainstream communication journals like International Communication Gazette, rather than being relegated to journals that specialize in health communications or community informatics, for example. And we also look forward to seeing scholars directly engage the concept of globalization in conjunction with that of development in their communication research.

Notes
1. The strategies were adopted from those listed by Jan Servaes (2007) in his article, ‘Harnessing the UN System into a Common Approach on Communication for Development. The strategies included extension/diffusion of innovations; network development and documentation; ICTs for Development (ICT4D); training/education and capacity building/strengthening; social marketing; edutainment (EE); health communication; social mobilization; information, education and communication (IEC); institution building; knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP); development support communication (DSC); HIV/AIDS community approach; and community participation.
2. Failing to find many articles on the topic of development incorporating the globalization discourse, we conducted an additional search of the Communication and Mass Media Complete
index for articles that combined ‘communication’ with ‘globalization’ in their key terms to locate the topics of those articles apart from development. Here is the summary of the analysis of 140 abstracts of articles located in that search.

Although ‘globalization’ and ‘communication’ were located as key terms in the 140 articles, little integration of the literature with that focused on developing countries was found. The state of research on globalization has been approached differently among disciplines, making globalization an area for theory in some fields and an area for practice in others. Disciplines have looked at this phenomenon differently, which led to the separation of their literatures. Globalization was mentioned in 40 articles (19 percent) in the literature of development communication and in some situations where it was mentioned, it was merely suggested as an area to be included in future research of development communication or as a word used in the introduction to describe the current state of the world’s economy. (See Roberts and Hite [2007] on the interdependence and integration of today’s globalized world.)

In the literature that combined communication with globalization (not necessarily including development as a focus), a cultural studies approach is more frequently adopted, where issues of global production of media content or identity for marginalized groups are treated. In other words, cultural studies has added globalization to the discourse on relations of power, commodification and cultural process. On the other hand, the work in communication and development more often takes an empirical social science approach and seeks answers to society’s problems or ways to bring about social change in developing countries. As Roman puts it, ‘development communication scholars in this area study the process of personal and community empowerment. They adopt different intellectual perspectives and multimethod approaches that are conducive to a practical theory of organizational communication for community development’ (Roman, 2005: 29). Such approaches may be viewed by cultural studies scholars as inconsistent with research conducted on globalization.
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