CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

The researcher has reviewed the literature to become familiar with existing published work. These efforts allowed the researcher to ensure that his research questions have not been previously answered, identify gaps in the literature and note possible research methods for his own studies. This literature review will identify previous research that has been done on social capital, community broadcasting services and development.

This research draws on Denis Mc Quail’s democratic participant media theory and development support communication within mass communication theories, but also looks into the field of social studies in order to construct a suitable theoretical framework appropriate to analysing the research question. Consequently Putnam’s social capital theory is combined with the above said, and a framework is constituted. Concepts within these theories will be further developed through a discussion of contemporary research concerned with development issues both internationally and within India.

The major aim during the phase of literature review was to find out the answers for the following questions.

What does literature reveal about broadcasting and community radio stations? What does it reveal about development function of community radio? Does social capital have any relationship with the development of the people? Can social capital be boosted by any means? And does participation in media leads to development? By the end of the literature review I got a comprehensive picture of the entire scenario which helped me create a framework to measure social capital and rural development.
Adequate research has been done in community radio sector but the majority are regarding policy studies, structural studies of community radio stations and studies on financial sustainability, human capital and physical capital. There are a couple of qualitative studies done from the social capital perspective. But the majority of the studies concentrate on developing a successful CRS model which ensures financial sustainability. It is widely believed that with financial capital other barriers can be easily eradicated. But the point is, as far as community radio is concerned intense participation can only determine success. A famous idiom goes like this: *You can lead a horse to water, but you can’t make it drink.*

With surplus financial capital we can develop physical infrastructure, create human capital in the form of paid staff and volunteers and even distribute free radio sets to the community members; but how to ensure participation? This is a million dollar question and I have tried to study whether any relationship lies between social capital and the participation of community members in CRS which will lead to development.

2.2 Information, Communication and Development

The relationship between information flows and national or local-level development have become better understood in recent years; as has the role of communication processes in mediating social and individual change. Basically, communication is a social process that produces changes in the knowledge, attitudes and behaviours of individuals and groups through providing factual and technical information, through motivational or persuasive messages, and through facilitating the learning process and social environment. These results might then lead to increase in the mastery of crucial skills by the individual, and to enhancing the achievement of various instrumental goals.
Other possible consequences of communication include enhancement in self-esteem and well-being through participation in community and social life, increasing the individual’s perceived efficacy in dealing with other people, reinforcing mutual respect and enhancing confidence among social groups and building trust within communities. These outcomes are the ingredients that contribute to the creation of those positive individual, community and societal changes that together are often referred to as development. Communication can thus positively influence development.

But using communication for development means different things to different people. It has even been viewed differently in different eras, considered variously as social engineering or giving voice to the voiceless. Both as idea and as practice, the relationship of communication to development has been problematic, as it has raised many questions. Can we show that communication has a place in the development process? What kind of communication has what kind of effect and on what aspects of development? The questions are intriguing and intractable. Often the gains from communication become apparent only when something goes wrong in society.

Although the relationships are not clearly established, the Human Development Index (HDI) shows marked differences in the communication profiles of countries of high, medium and low human development. The indicators generally employed in the HDI are mostly infrastructural and technological, e.g. access to radio, television, published book titles, post offices, main telephone lines, fax machines, mobile cellular telephone subscribers, Internet users, personal computers. It is probably the case that the opportunities that these channels provide for carrying information and messages and for allowing multiple social interactions that drive social progress are a crucial contribution to the level of socio-economic development of societies.
2.3 Defining Community broadcasting

Community broadcasting is a non-profit service that is owned and managed by a particular community, usually through a trust, foundation, or association. Its aim is to serve and benefit that community. It is, in effect, a form of public-service broadcasting, but it serves a community rather than the whole nation, as is the usual form of public broadcasting described above. Moreover, it relies and must rely mainly on the resources of the community. A community is considered to be a group of people who share common characteristics and/or interests. The commonality of interests may be based on: the sharing of a single geographical location, that is to say those living in a specific town, village, or neighbourhood; the sharing of economic and social life through trade, marketing, exchange of goods and services.

2.4 Defining Community Radio

Community Radio definition as provided in the guidelines of Ministry of Information

(a) A ‘community’ is considered to be a group of people who share common characteristics and / or interests such as sharing a single geographical location e.g. a specific town, village, or neighbourhood; sharing of economic and social life through trade, marketing, exchange of goods and services.

(b) A non-profit service will be in charge of ‘Community Radio’ broadcasting activities. It should be owned by a particular community, usually through a trust, foundation, or association. Its aim is to serve and benefit that community. It is, in effect, a form of public-service broadcasting, but it serves a community rather than the whole nation, as is the usual form of public broadcasting described above. Moreover, it relies and must rely mainly on the resources of the community.
(c) Community radio is a medium that gives a voice to the voiceless, serves as a mouthpiece of the marginalized and is central to communication and democratic processes within societies.

(d) Community Radio is a broadcasting system established by the efforts of a specific community, operated by the community for the purpose of the community’s welfare

2.5 Principles of Community Radio Operation

a) Access to the facility is the primary step towards the full democratization of the communication system. People have access not only to the media products but also to the media facilities. The feedback channel is always open and full interaction between the producers and receivers of messages is maintained.

b) Participation in the production and management of media is the logical step after access. Citizen’s participation in radio is allowed at all levels – from planning to implementation and evaluation of the project. It involves the citizens in the decision-making process, including making decisions about the contents, duration and program schedule. The citizens, or their representatives, also have a voice in the management and in financing radio program projects.

c) Self-management of the communication facility follows participation. Once the community members gain necessary experience and assimilate the required skills there is no reason for preventing them from managing and owning the radio station.

d) Community mandate is the inevitable result of the process of democratizing the communication system. Community mandate encompasses not only management but also ownership of the radio.

e) Accountability is exercised. There is no sense in having the opportunity to operate, control and manage the station when accountability is not in the hands of the managers and broadcasters.
There are three key principles or aspects that define community sound broadcasting, namely:

(i) Community participation – which is seen as an active participation of the community, whether it be in the creation of news, information, entertainment or culturally relevant material, with an emphasis on local issues or concerns, or participation in the management or simply making inputs around the scheduling and content of programming at the station;

(ii) Non-profit Making – the spirit in which the station operates is focused on serving the community and not making profit or serving the interests of the advertisers. In this sense there are closer linkages with public sound broadcasting rather than with commercial sound broadcasting;

(iii) Community Ownership and Control – it is the involvement of community members at the level of the Board which is democratically elected by the community that distinguishes community sound broadcasting from commercial sound broadcasting. It is this which leads to stations dedicated to the development of education and people’s empowerment, while promoting the principles of democracy and grassroots community participation (Icasa, 11:2005).

Tabing (11:2000) adds the following as unique characteristics of a community radio station:

- It uses technology appropriate to the economic capability of people, not that which leads to dependence on external sources;
- It promotes and improves community problem solving.

2.6 The Evolution of Community Radio

The pioneering experiences from which today’s community radio has evolved began some 60 years ago in Latin America. Poverty and social injustice were the stimulus for those first experiences, one beginning in Bolivia in 1947 and known as the Miners’ Radios and another in Colombia in the same year, known as Radio Sutatenza. These experiences in Bolivia and
Colombia set a trend, even though today’s concept of community radio has evolved considerably undergoing certain changes. For example, the Miners’ Radios in Bolivia were working in the decades of ideological clash between Marxism and capitalism. Thus, their principal focus was to unite the community of miners to battle for better and fairer working conditions. They were generally considered to be trade union radios, even if the miners provided much of the finance for the purchase of equipment and running costs.

Radio Sutatenza in Colombia, although inspired by the aim of supporting the community of peasants, was not owned or directly managed by them. There was much feedback from peasants – some 50,000 letters a year – and these certainly ensured the integration of the peasants’ desires and needs into the radio’s programming. But it was not truly ‘radio by the people for the people’, which is today’s aim. Even so, this first systematic effort by Radio Sutatenza to educate by radio created a movement that “…spread and was later consolidated through ALER, the Latin American Educational Radio Broadcasting Association. This inter-linkage of radio and education is basic to the idea of public service and marked the birth of community media in Latin America.” However, even if the groundbreaking work was in Latin America, it was in Europe that community radio first became a vital phenomenon, an alternative to – or a critique of – mainstream broadcast media.

The first challenges to state public service broadcasting were in the 1960s-70s when “swashbuckling entrepreneurs boarded the airwaves illegally and seized as much of the audience as they could carry away from the treasure chest monopoly controlled by the state.” In the West, these pirate stations proved a catalyst in motivating governments and national broadcasting systems to introduce legitimate local radio. In Africa, the establishment of community radio became, in a broad sense, a social movement after the demise of the
apartheid regime in South Africa. This was followed by democratization, decentralization, and to some extent structural adjustment, elsewhere in that continent.

The pressure groups that have instigated community radio in many parts of the world (e.g. miners, pirate radio operators, missionaries and democracy movements) have been less present in Asia. In their place, international agencies such as UNESCO and other external donors have often taken initiatives to help get community radio off the ground. And in some cases, it has been the national broadcasting organization that has itself started community radio services.

2.7 Community Radio in South Asia

Globally, the community radio movement is strongest in Latin America and Africa. In Latin America, where there is no public service broadcasting, community radio is used particularly for educational purposes. In Africa, it has taken on the character of a social movement. It has developed rapidly in the new South Africa and is now available in 13 African countries.

It is extraordinary that for almost fifty years after independence from colonial rule, India, Pakistan and Bangladesh, the three largest countries in South Asia, with a population of 1.3 billion people and more diverse cultures than almost any other region of the world, had relied exclusively on a centralised system of state broadcasting and had not permitted any real media decentralisation or diversity. Even today, much that is called community radio is conducted under the auspices of national broadcasters or other national institutions.

The situation in Asia is far less favourable than in Africa, and India provides a good illustration of the problems. Nepal and Sri Lanka show ways of solving problems. All India Radio (AIR) was established as a state broadcasting monopoly in 1935 in line with the British model, the BBC. The debate about breaking that monopoly began more than 30 years ago with the Chanda Committee report. Subsequent committees have specifically recommended
decentralizing broadcasting to institutionalize the process of participation and to meet people’s fundamental right to information. The Supreme Court passed a landmark judgement in 1995 declaring that the airwaves were a ‘public good’ and stressing the importance of maintaining a balance in broadcasting between market (commercial) forces, government monopoly, and meeting the people’s needs and rights to receive and impart information.

This judgement opened the door to the granting of licences to local stations for public participation and territorial/sectoral broadcasts, but the legislation necessary to allow this to happen has still not been passed. It seems, however, that it is under preparation at the time of writing. The main results so far of the decades of debate on the subject has been some decentralization by AIR to ‘local’ stations, and a recent and rapid expansion of commercial stations using FM frequencies belonging to AIR that have been leased to private operators. Some of the AIR ‘local’ stations try to get closer to the community and use community radio styles. But for the most part, these ‘local’ stations merely relay urban-oriented programmes from the national or from regional capitals, rather than producing locally relevant materials. Commercial broadcasting is only allowed to provide entertainment. News and current affairs, and even sex education, are banned. Thus, the private FM stations, which have been expanding in response to market forces, have created a profile as ‘electronic discos’ for urban youth. A consultation session attended by more than 60 broadcasters, legal specialists, university staff, and development communicators met in Bangalore, India, in September 1996 and signed the Bangalore Declaration urging the government to take steps to legitimatize and promote community radio. Pressure has thus been building, and there appears to be light at the end of the tunnel.

In Nepal, the Government-owned radio service was the only one broadcasting until May 1997, when Radio Sagarmatha came on air. The present government policy on broadcasting,
which goes back to legislations passed in 1993, favours a mix of government, commercial, and community broadcasting, but even so, it took from 1994 to 1997 before the first community radio licence was awarded to Radio Sagarmatha. Its success has been such that community radio is now set to expand in the country. The existing framework of broadcasting in Nepal makes no separate legal provision for community radio broadcasting. Community broadcasters are allowed to carry commercial and sponsorship programmes, like their commercial rivals, to sustain themselves. At the moment community radio broadcasters are “self-disciplinary regimes” but after a review of the Broadcasting Act and regulations, the government had decided to bring in amendments “to reflect the need for... greater participation and investment by private sectors.”

In Sri Lanka, another country with a government-owned broadcasting service, it was this service itself that began community broadcasting in 1983 with Mahaweli Radio. It later expanded community radio to cover other parts of Sri Lanka, mainly in support of rural development. However, in mid-1997, a Supreme Court ruling put an end to the government monopoly of the airwaves, and a parliamentary committee was established to prepare a new broadcasting bill. This will certainly recognize and promote community radio, for it is a branch of broadcasting that has become well entrenched in Sri Lanka, based on the long experience of Mahaweli Community Radio.

In Asian countries that have essentially followed the North American pattern of commercial broadcasting, such as the Philippines, community radio stations often function without licences. Nepal is the only South Asian country that is a significant exception to this rule. In Nepal, independent local radio - both community radio and commercial radio – has grown dramatically in recent years. In the five years since the founding of Radio Sagarmatha, five
other community radio stations have been started and there are now more than 25 independent FM stations.

Elsewhere in Asia, community radio is making slow progress. In Thailand the first community radio station has now been set up at Chiang Mai and with legislation in place it is hoped that others will soon follow suit. Mongolia has recently set up its first community radio. Indonesia has nearly 1200 local radio stations but has not yet permitted community radio stations to be set up. Community radio is attracting new interest in South Asia as a means of strengthening local culture and empowering local communities in an era of increasing globalisation. The Pakistan government had recently announced that private television and private radio would now be permitted. South Asian governments had deregulated some of the newest communication technologies – like cell phones, the internet and FM radio – but not AM radio which has such reach and is so affordable. This may be because governments know it is too important to let go.

2.8 Community Radio in India

In India, the campaign of Community radio started in the mid 1990s, soon after the Supreme Court of India approved the idea, passed on its judgment in the month of February 1995, and declared “airwaves are public property”. This notion of the Indian government was passed on as an inspiration to groups across the country and community radio started with only educational (campus) radio stations under somewhat strict conditions.

Anna FM is India’s first campus ‘community’ radio that was launched on 1 February 2004, controlled by Educational Multimedia Research Centre (EMRC) and the students of Media Sciences at Anna University produce all programmes. On 16 November 2006, the government of India advised a set of new Community Radio Guidelines that allowed the NGOs and other civil society organizations to possess and operate community radio stations.
According to government sources, about 4,000 community radio licenses had been on offer across India. By 30 November 2008, the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting already received 297 applications for community radio licenses, including 105 from educational institutions, 141 from NGOs and other civil society organizations, and 51 for farm radio stations to be run by agricultural universities and agricultural extension centres like the ‘Krishi Vigyan Kendra’ s. Among these, 107 community radio stations have been approved for licensing through the issue of Letters of Intent. 13 Grant of Permission Agreements (GOPA) was signed with license applicants under the new scheme by the Indian Government.

By 30 November 2008, there had been 38 operational community radio stations in India. Of these, NGOs and educational institutions control majority of the radio stations. The first community-based radio station in India was licensed to an NGO that was completely separate from campus-based radio and was launched on 15 October 2008. The ‘Sangham Radio’ in Pastapur village, Medak district, Andhra Pradesh was switched on at 11.00am unanimously to hear the shows. Sangham Radio, which broadcasts on 90.4 MHz, is applicable to execute the Deccan Development Society (DDS). This is an NGO that works with women’s groups in about 75 villages of Andhra Pradesh. General Narsamma and Algole Narsamma manage this community radio station.

The second NGO-led community radio station in India was started on 23 October 2008 at Taragram in Orchha in the state of Madhya Pradesh. This community radio channel was named ‘Radio Bundelkhand’ after the Bundelkhand region of central India where it was mainly broadcasted. This radio station is licensed to the Society for Development Alternatives (DA), a Delhi-based NGO.
Under the new community radio policy accredited by the government, any not-for-profit ‘legal entity’, other than individuals, political parties and their affiliates, criminal and banned organizations can also apply for a CR license. Central funding is not available for such radio stations, and there are stern limitations on fundraising from other resources. Only organizations that have been registered for a minimum period of three years and with a ‘proven’ path record of local community service can apply. License conditions unreservedly favour well-established stations as against low-priced low power operations, several of which include Mana Radio in Andhra Pradesh and Raghav FM in Bihar that run successfully on shoe-string budgets before the obligation of any community radio policy.

The Indian Government approved a community radio license that entitles the channel owners to operate a 100 watt (ERP) radio station, with a coverage area of almost 12 kilometres radius. A maximum antenna height of 30 meters is permissible and these radio stations are expected to produce at least 50% of their programmes in the local range and the programmes should be presented in the local language or dialect at the maximum extent. The prime focus is on developmental programming, though there is no clear restriction on entertainment. News programmes are prohibited on community radio in India, as also on commercial FM radio.

The government, however, has recently opened some new categories of news and varied forms of communication that are permitted on radio, including sports news and commentaries, information on traffic and weather conditions, exposure of cultural events and festivals, information on educational events, civic announcements adhering to the utilities like electricity and water supply, disaster warnings and health alerts. Five minutes of advertising per hour is allowed on the Indian community radio. Sponsored programs are strictly prohibited except when the program is sponsored by the Government at the Centre or State level.
As on January 2011 the following is the status of Community Radio Stations in India:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOIs issued</th>
<th>263</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOPAs signed</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Community Radios</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Radios run by NGOs</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Radios run by Educational Institutions</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Radios run by Agri. Universities. &amp; KVKs</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.9 Democratic participant media theory and community media

Various theoretical approaches on the media of communication and their diverse applications have evaluated their liberating role in terms of either promoting participatory communication, or advancing the democratization of communication, or even encompassing modes of subversive action. Whether the interest of such concerns is focused on large or small-scale media, their considerations have pointed out the need of setting the very communication process beyond the realm of mass communication, acknowledging thus a wider field of its practice, where the communication process is addressed not only in representative terms (‘for the people’), but in participatory terms as well (‘from the people’).

Brecht highlighted the democratic potential of radio broadcasting, pointing out the possibility of the two-way practice of communication. By criticizing the fact that radio was one-sided, “a pure instrument of distribution that hands things out”, Brecht evaluated its 39mancipator dimension, attributing to the radio a new function. “Radio should be converted from a distribution system to a communication system … if it were capable not only of transmitting but of receiving, of making the listener not only hear but also speak, not of isolating him but
of connecting him. This means that radio would have to give up being a purveyor and organise the listener as purveyor” (Brecht 1983, 169).

From this perspective, Brecht supported the view that radio technology does not presuppose a certain form of broadcasting, but allows for its exploitation in various cultural forms. Thus, although technology was advanced enough to produce radio in various forms, it was the ‘public’ that had to take advantage of it. Moreover, Brecht conceptualised the exploitation of the two-way practice of radio broadcasting in pedagogic terms, through the interface between radio and art. As such, the function of radio in such a project is constituted in the realm of actuality; the listener is activated and ‘re-employed as a producer’. “The technique of such a project will be directed towards the prime task of ensuring that the public is not only taught but must also itself teach” (Ibid, 171). In this context, Brecht evaluated the full realization of participatory communication.

Enzensberger distinguished between the repressive use of media – centrally controlled, with one-way flow of messages, produced by specialists for isolated individuals, and promoting passive consumption; and an emancipator use of media – decentralised, linking many to many, fostering interactivity, collectively produced and actively used, promoting collective mobilization (Ibid, 113). In this regard, Enzensberger approached the consciousness industry beyond its ‘bourgeois dark side’, evaluating its socialist possibilities.

Such a revolutionary model of the media is conceptualised here in terms of another social context, ‘in which people using small-scale media prevail and large media institutions and undifferentiated content can no longer be found’ (Mc Quail 1987, 88; quoted also in Atton 2002, 8). Based on Enzensberger’s positions, Mc Quail has proposed a normative type of media theory (democratic participant), ‘in recognition of new media developments and of increasing criticism of the dominance of the main mass media by private or public
monopolies’ (Mc Quail 1994, 131). Such a proposal raises relevant issues in the contexts of both developed and developing societies. Concerning developed societies, the term democratic participant “expresses a sense of disillusionment with established political parties and with a system of parliamentary democracy which has seemed to become detached from its grass-roots origins, to impede rather than facilitate involvement in political and social life” (Mc Quail 1987, 122).

In this context, the democratic-participant paradigm points out the failure of the mass media to meet the needs that arise from the daily experience of citizens, to offer space to individual and minority expressions. Overall, the theory rejects both the centralism and bureaucratisation of public broadcasting (‘elitist’, ‘paternalist’) and the commercialisation and monopolisation of privately owned media (‘professionalized’, ‘monolithic’) that prevent media systems from assisting “in the long process of social improvement and democratic change”. Consequently, in the democratic-participant theory, media are ideally constituted in small-scale terms, favouring horizontal patterns of interaction, and facilitating the expression of citizens’ needs. The empirical manifestations of such a model are many and varied, including the underground or alternative press, pirate radio, community cable television, samizdat publication, micro-media in rural settings, neighbourhood media, wall posters, and media for women and ethnic minorities (Mc Quail 1994, 132).

Such a participatory model grounds developmental process at a local/community level (in its own culture, intellect, and environment) through the active participation of ‘ordinary’ people (the key agents), involving the “strengthening of democratic processes and institutions, and the redistribution of power” (Ibid, 93). Moreover, this perspective questions the conceptualisation of a universal model of development, “favouring a multiplicity of
approaches based on the context, the basic, felt needs, and the empowerment of the most oppressed sectors of various societies at divergent levels” (Ibid, 271).

2.10 Development Support Communication (DSC)

The practice of Development Support Communication, DSC, is a multi-sectoral process of information sharing about development agendas and planned actions. It links planners, beneficiaries and implementers of development action, including the donor community. It obligates planners and implementers to provide clear, explicit and intelligible data and information about their goals and roles in development, and explicitly provides opportunities for beneficiaries to participate in shaping development outcomes. It ensures that the donor community is kept constantly aware of the achievements and constraints of development efforts in the field.

Development Support Communication makes use of all available structures and means of information sharing. Therefore it is not limited to mass media alone. It also uses both formal group and non-formal channels of communication, such as women’s and youth associations, as well as places where people gather – markets, churches, festivals, and meetings. But its contribution is in using these in a systemic, continuous, co-ordinated and planned manner, to perform linkage and enabling functions. It requires analysis of the communication environment, of the available and needed communication competencies and resources (hardware, software, financial and human), and clearly indicates expected results from specific resource inputs, so as to maintain accountability.

In short, DSC is a legitimate function of development planning and implementation. DSC therefore needs to be examined as a valuable ‘technology’ for using the social communication process to foster and strengthen sustainable development at local and national
levels. It should be taken more seriously in programs of social change, and should be reflected explicitly in development policy and strategy. One way of doing so is through the enunciation of a national information and communication policy, which can be explicitly integrated into national development thinking and practice.

A sample of underlying principles includes:

- Democratisation
- Popular participation
- Equity/Access to information and communication
- Freedom of expression and reception
- Social integration
- Cultural promotion and preservation
- Responsibility in public communication
- Communication rights
- Coherence with other social/sectoral policies.

2.11 Conceptualising and Measuring Social Capital

Social capital, as a concept, is rooted in social networks and social relations, and must be measured relative to its root. Social capital can be defined as resources embedded in a social structure which are accessed and/or mobilized in purposive actions. By this definition, the notion of social capital contains three ingredients: resources embedded in a social structure; accessibility to such social resources by individuals; and use or mobilization of such social resources by individuals in purposive actions. Thus conceived, social capital contains three elements intersecting structure and action: the structural (embeddedness), opportunity (accessibility) and action-oriented (use) aspects.
These elements have been mentioned by most scholars working on social capital. The social resources theory (Lin 1982) has specifically proposed that access to and use of social resources (resources embedded in social networks) can lead to better socioeconomic statuses. Further, the theory proposes that access to and use of social resources are in part determined by positions in the hierarchical structure (the strength of position proposition) and by the use of weaker ties (the strength of tie proposition). Bourdieu defines the volume of social capital as a function of the size of the network and the volume of capital (economic, cultural and symbolic) possessed by networked individuals. Burt (1992) postulates that certain network positions (structural holes and structural constraints) have effects on individuals getting better positions or rewards in organisations. Flap (1995) defines social capital as a combination of network size, the relationship strength, and the resources possessed by those in the network. Portes (1998) also advocates focusing on social relations and networks in the analysis of social capital. Research on the social resources theory (Lin 1999) has verified the proposition that social resources or social capital enhances an individual’s attained statuses such as occupational status, authority, and placement in certain industries. Through these attained positions, social capital enhances economic earnings as well. These relationships hold up after family background and education are taken into account.

Burt (1997, 1998) and others (Podolny & Baron, 1997) have shown that advances and economic rewards are also enhanced in organisations for individuals at strategic locations in the informal networks. For those closer to structural holes or bridges, and thus, less structural constraints, they seem to gain better returns, presumably because such locations give these individuals better opportunities to access certain capital in the organization. Research is Progressing on how organisations use social capital in recruiting and retaining individuals. Fernandez and associates (Fernandez & Weinberg, 1997) have shown that referrals increase applications, recruit better qualified candidates, and reduce costs in the screening process.
In Putnam’s studies (1993; 1995a; 1995b), this is indicated by participation in civic associations (e.g., churches, PTAs, Red Cross) and social groups (bowling leagues). Coleman (1990) provides examples of diffusion of information and mobilization through social circles among radical Korean students (i.e., network as capital), a mother moving from Detroit to Jerusalem in order to have her child walk to playground or school safely (norm as capital); and diamond traders in New York making trades through informal ties and informal agreements (network and trust as capital).

At the meso-network level, the focus is shifted to how individuals have differential access to resources embedded in the collective. The question posed is: In a given collective, why do certain individuals have better access to embedded resources than others? The nature of social networks and social ties becomes the focus of analysis. Granovetter (1973; 1974; 1982; 1985; 1995) proposes that bridges, as usually reflected in weaker ties, provide better access to information. Burt (1992; 1997; 1998) sees that strategic locations in the networks, structural holes or structural constraints, imply better or worse access to information, influence, or control. Lin (1982; 1990; 1994a; 1995; 1999) has suggested that hierarchical positions as well as network locations facilitate or hinder access to embedded resources. Embedded resources are indicated by the wealth, status, and power of social ties.

At the micro-action level, social capital is reflected in the actual linkage between the usages of embedded resources in instrumental actions. For example, there is substantial literature on how informal sources and their resources (contact resources) are mobilized in job searches and their effects on attained socioeconomic statuses (Lin, Ensel & Vaughn, 1981; De Graaf & Flap, 1988; Marsden & Hurlbert, 1988). Research has also been extensive in the area of expressive actions’ returns. Much is known about the indirect effects of networks on mental health and life satisfaction (Lin 1986; House, et al. 1988; Berkman & Syme, 1979; Berkman,
1984; Hall & Wellman, 1985; Wellman, 1981; Kadushin, 1983). That is, network locations enhance the likelihood of accessing social support which, in turn, improves one’s physical or mental well-being.

2.12 Prior research

2.12.1 Studies in social capital

It should be stressed from the outset that there are a number of reasons why obtaining a single true measure of social capital is probably not possible. First, the most comprehensive definitions of social capital are multidimensional, incorporating different levels and units of analysis. Second, the nature and forms of social capital change over time, as the balance shifts between informal organizations and formal institutions. And, third, no long-standing cross country surveys were initially designed to measure “social capital”, leaving contemporary researchers to compile indexes from a range of approximate items (e.g., measures of trust, confidence in government, voting trends, social mobility, modern outlook, hours spent volunteering, etc.). New surveys currently being tested will hopefully produce more direct and accurate indicators across and within countries.

Measuring social capital may be difficult, but several excellent studies – using different types and combinations of qualitative and quantitative research methodologies – have nonetheless identified useful measures of and proxies for social capital. The researcher will review briefly some of the studies which have attempted to quantify social capital for the purposes of deriving measures that can be aggregated beyond the community level.

One clear and commonly used measure of social capital is membership in informal and formal associations and networks. In developing countries generally, and rural areas in particular, measures to capture the informal give-and-take through community wide festivals, sports events, and other traditional methods of fostering connectedness are very important.
The national participatory poverty assessment in Tanzania included a household poverty and social capital survey based on 1400 households in 87 villages across Tanzania (Narayan, 1997). Based on data from this survey, Narayan and Pritchett (1999) developed an index of social capital at the household and community level which included both density and characteristics of informal and formal groups and networks to which people belonged. The dimensions of this index included group functioning, contributions to groups, participation in decision making and heterogeneity of membership. A series of measures was also constructed on interpersonal trust and changes over time. These measures demonstrated that for Tanzanian villagers, social capital was indeed both “social” and “capital”, generating returns that exceeded those to human capital.

In tandem with the Tanzania study, the Social Development Department of the World Bank launched the Local Level Institutions Study in three countries – Indonesia, Bolivia and Burkina Faso. In addition to the measures used in the Tanzania study, the LLI studies included more detailed qualitative information on service delivery issues, with subsequent quantification of these variables. Results from these studies demonstrate that the questionnaire items do in fact capture different dimensions of social capital at the household and community level that certain dimensions of social capital contribute significantly to household welfare and that social capital is the capital of the poor.

The most important variables in these studies are density of associations, heterogeneity of membership in associations, and active participation in them (see Grootaert, 1999; Grootaert and Narayan, 1999). Another manifestation of social capital includes norms and values which facilitate exchanges, lower transaction costs, reduce the cost of information, permit trade in the absence of contracts, encourage responsible citizenship, and the collective management of resources (Fukuyama 1995). Ronald Inglehart’s (1997) work on the World Values Survey
(WVS) is the most comprehensive work in this area. With economists being drawn into the social capital issue, the most used questions from the World Values Survey have become the questions on generalized trust (e.g., “Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you can’t be too careful in dealing with people?”). Knack and Keefer (1997), for example, use WVS trust data from 29 countries to show the positive relationship between trust and levels of investment in a country.

While there has been a recent proliferation of research attempting to identify the nature of the relationships between social variables and development, everyone recognizes that the quality of data is less than ideal. With mounting pressure to provide simple measures of inherently complex and interdependent relationships, there is a very real danger that expectations will exceed capacity, and that hastily assembled, poorly conceived measures will jeopardize the agenda they purport to serve. We recognize these dangers, even as we maintain that the goal of having valid and reliable cross-national measures of social capital is a desirable one. We feel that the best way to strike the balance between quality and quantity measures is to begin by unbundling social capital into its dimensions, and to generate new data sets on social capital that are comparable across many countries.

Four recent studies attempt to develop indices of social capital at the national or sub national levels. In the US, spurred by Robert Putnam’s “Bowling Alone” thesis (Putnam 1995, 2000), several new surveys of civic engagement have been conducted, in addition to the mining of data already collected in surveys conducted by the private sector to measure consumer preferences and changes in lifestyles. The National Commission on Philanthropy and Civic Renewal (1998), in collaboration with researchers from the University of Connecticut, has developed a National Index of Civic Engagement (NICE) based on a national sample of 1000 people. This index includes five dimensions: the giving climate, community engagement,
charitable involvement, the spirit of voluntarism, and active citizenship. Related work has been done by The National Commission on Civic Renewal, housed at the University of Maryland, which has developed an Index of National Civic Health (1998). The Index measures and combines trends over the past quarter century in political participation, political and social trust, associational membership, family integrity, and stability and crime.

In exploring the roots and determinants of Hindu and Muslim riots in India, Varshney (2000) focuses on the role of inter-communal networks. In cities where Hindus and Muslims have little interaction, Varshney shows, latent communal conflict has few channels for peaceful resolution, and periodically descends into violence; in cities where there are overlapping associational memberships and frequent everyday interaction, on the other hand, conflict is anticipated and dissipated. This research was based on six Indian cities carefully arranged in three matched pairs that were similar in terms of Hindu-Muslim demographic composition and dissimilar in that one city experienced recurrent riots while the other city remained calm. Varshney’s work shows that diversity can be a source of strength where there are social ties transcending different community boundaries.

To assess social capital at the community level, Onyx and Bullen (2000) developed a questionnaire for the state of New South Wales (Australia), from which they isolated eight underlying factors as constituting social capital. The eight factors (identified through factor analysis) were: participation in local community, proactivity in social context, feelings of trust and safety, neighbourhood connections, family and friend connections, tolerance of diversity, value of life, and work connections. Based on an individual’s social capital score, the authors could predict the community to which the person belonged, thus raising the prospects for this instrument being used for planning and monitoring community development activities.
Building on this work, attempts are now under way at the World Bank to develop social capital instruments that can be used as a diagnostic tool at the community level and across countries. Because the forms of social capital are society-specific and change over time, such a social capital instrument must focus on a range of dimensions of social capital, assuming that different forms and combinations of dimensions of social capital will be important in different societies. Such instruments have recently been piloted in Ghana and Uganda (Narayan 1998), and by the World Bank’s Social Capital Initiative 13 in Panama and India (Krishna and Shrader 1999). Both instruments include a variety of questionnaires and open-ended methods to collect data at the household and community level.

This idea has its origins in Georg Simmel, who wrote extensively on the social boundaries separating ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’. Simmel (1971: 253, 255) also recognized that development and an expanding division of labour produced a need and an inclination to reach out beyond the original spatial, economic, and mental boundaries of the group and, in connection with the increase in individualization and concomitant mutual repulsion of group elements, to supplement the original centripetal forces of the lone group with a centrifugal tendency that forms bridges with other groups.

These results entail the logical conclusion that there must be two basic dimensions of social capital at the community level, namely ‘strong’ intra-community ties (“bonds”) and ‘weak’ extra-community networks (“bridges”): both are needed to avoid making tautological claims regarding the efficacy of social capital. (Without this distinction, for example, an argument could be put forward that successful groups were distinguished by their dense community ties, failing to consider the possibility that the same ties could be preventing success in another otherwise similar group.) Accordingly, the networks view argues that communities can be characterized by their endowments of these two dimensions of social capital, and that
different combinations of these dimensions account for the range of outcomes associated with social capital (See next figure).

Michael Woolcock and Deepa Narayan in their study Social Capital: Implications for Development Theory, Research, and Policy (December 2009) proposed a perspective called the communitarian view that equates social capital with local level organizations, namely associations, clubs, and civic groups. This view, measured most simply by the number and density of these groups in a given community, implies that social capital is inherently “good,” that “more is better,” and that its presence always has a positive effect on a community’s welfare. This perspective has made important contributions to analyses of poverty by
stressing the centrality of social ties in helping the poor manage risk and vulnerability. As Dordick (1997) notes, the poor have “something left to lose”, namely each other.

There are few studies concerned with measures of social capital (Onyx & Bullen 1997; Putnam 1993; Williams 1995). Social capital, however, has much in common with a pluralist research tradition. This argues that voluntary organisations enable individuals to directly participate in political activity, or in the case of organisations without political aims, widen people’s interests and contacts, and provides them with leadership skills which ultimately results in political mobilisation (Pickvance 1986: 225-6). Pluralist studies are mainly based on quantitative survey research of large populations. As such they are unable to shed light on the nature of participation at the organisational and individual level.

2.12.2 Studies on community radio sector

There is little research that addresses the community development capacity of community radio (Barlow 1998; Coates 1997). Apart from short review papers on issues facing community radio stations by NGOs, not a lot of research has been done on how the effectiveness of community radio stations can be improved, thus leading to their sustainability. Although there are many case study descriptions of community radio stations around the world, there are very less published books of case studies on community radio stations in India.

The title Other Voices – The struggle for Community Radio in India (Vinod Paravala, Kanchan K. Malik, 2007), arguably the first book on CR in India, narrates the evolution of broadcasting mechanisms and policies and their subsequent bearing on CR initiatives and concerns. CR initiatives in India have been studied in light of the role of broadcasting (in the development process), role of gender and the role of globalised media. The book resonates the sound of the ‘other voices’ and is endowed with insights and comparisons. The book
provides for a global perspective of CR and draws references and comparisons between the status of CR in India and that of other countries – including the developed and developing ones.

The book is endowed with case studies on four CR projects undertaken by NGOs in four states of India viz. Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Jharkhand and Karnataka, that help establish the extent to which CR contributes to enhancing access and building sustainable development networks. The book recommends a unique policy for CR in India on the basis of the existing CR framework as also on the basis of a comparative analysis of CR details like licensing procedures, ownership and management, regulation and monitoring etc. of Australia, Ireland, South Africa, Canada and United States.

In 2003 Tanja Estella Bosch submitted a doctoral thesis called ‘Radio, Community and Identity in South Africa: A Rhizomatic study of Bush Community Radio in Cape Town’ to the College of Communication of Ohio University, USA. This thesis dealt with the history of Bush Radio; the new theoretical direction for community radio stations and Bush Community Radio’s diverse programmes on children, youth, HIV/AIDS, gays and lesbians. However, Bosch’s research is narrative and focuses mainly on programming. There is little information on how Bush Community Radio managed to be financially viable and sustainable. This could be attributed to the fact that when Bush Community Radio was formed, many international donors were donating a good amount of money to community radio stations to ensure that South African communities were educated about democracy.

In 2003, John Van Zyl edited a book called “Community Radio, The People’s Voice”. One chapter in this book deals with how to make a radio station self sustainable. It was merely a guide to communities who want to set up and manage a community radio station. Because the
book emphasised the non-profit status of a community radio station, it did not encourage a business approach.

Enzensberger (1974) distinguished between the repressive use of media – centrally controlled, with one-way flow of messages, produced by specialists for isolated individuals, and promoting passive consumption; and an emancipatory use of media – decentralised, linking many to many, fostering interactivity, collectively produced and actively used, promoting collective mobilisation.

Rodriguez shows how “alternative media function as environments that facilitate the fermentation of identities and power positions… spin transformative processes that alter people’s senses of self, their subjective positionings, and therefore their access to power” (2001:18). She objects to theorists who approach alternative media with a binary approach to the concept of power – with large mainstream media organisations being seen as powerful and small scale alternative media seen as powerless. This, she feels is to misunderstand lived experiences of ‘power equations’ that are in fact dynamic and shifting (Ibid.16). On an everyday level participants in alternative media experience ‘multiple subjectivities’ and various and shifting power equations. She proposes that if we shift from the term ‘alternative media’ to ‘citizens’ media’ we will avoid binary oppositions (such as alternative: mainstream) and see participation as not merely a resistance to the ‘alienating power of mainstream media’ but an enacting of citizenship ‘actively intervening and transforming the established mediascape’ (Ibid.:20).

Port Elizabeth (Nov, 2008) in his study developing a business model for a community radio station ascertains that if community participation exists and the mission as well as the vision of the community radio station influence all the policies and operations of a community radio station, then there would be good governance and operational effectiveness at that
community radio station. The station would provide a better community broadcasting service and have a better relationship with its stakeholders. The community, donors, advertisers and collaborative partners would support the community radio station with volunteering, sponsorship and finances. The community radio station would then be able to retain, maintain and acquire the resources it needs to continue providing a community broadcasting service. Sustainability would be enhanced.

Icasa (37:2005) states that many community sound broadcasters have been encountering problems as staff and management within the stations are not adequately trained, nor do they have the capacity to handle the running of a community broadcasting service provider. Moreover, according to Walker (1:1997), community radio relies on local volunteers for most of its programming and day-to-day administration. Resources are a challenge to many community broadcasting service providers. According to Inman (4:2004), providing a service requires sound management of staff and resources, if the particular need is to be adequately addressed. A business model for a community radio station may assist management in that regard and that is the purpose of this research.

Ian Pringle and Bikram Subba prepared a report for UNESCO named Ten Years On: The State of Community Radio in Nepal in which they recommended that volunteerism should be promoted as a pillar of community radio. Voluntary inputs are an important part of community radio sustainability. By developing strong systems to support community volunteers, including recruitment, training, ongoing programming support and incentives, radio stations lower their budgets and the requirements for paid programme staff. Community volunteerism is an excellent means of community participation and social investment, factors that in turn strengthen sustainability. They have also recommended that Community stations
need to be far more proactive in ensuring representation of women, indigenous groups, Dalits and people with disabilities.

In 2000, Area Development Management, the body which oversees the local development partnerships under the aegis of the NDP’s Local Development Social Inclusion Programme (LDSIP) in Ireland states that “community development is about enabling people to enhance their capacity to play a role in shaping the society of which they are a part. It works towards helping groups and communities to articulate needs and viewpoints and to take part in collective action to influence the processes that structure their everyday lives. It is recognised that the ability to participate fully in society is open more to some groups and individuals, therefore the priority is to engage with the most marginalised and socially excluded groups and communities”.

The ADM summarises community development as being characterised by the following factors:

- Collective action
- Participation
- Empowering
- Product and process focused
- Innovative and creative
- Improves the quality of life and
- Confronts prejudice and inequality

From the literature, it is possible to add to this that community development is also about enhancing participative as opposed to representative democracy. This is seen in the set up in each county of community fora under the aegis of the city and county development boards and the strategic policy committees (of the local authorities).
Gavan Titley (2003) in his report submitted for the community radio forum of Ireland argues that “engaging comprehensively with the possibilities and difficulties of participative media offers an option for the digital age. If digital appears to imply a future of increasingly limited programming, then providing the possibility for people to interpret their realities by representing them, and to developing the spectrum of perspectives necessary to imagine what a poly vocal, globalising island could actually be like seems like public service to me”.

2.12.3 Studies on community radio and social capital

Kitty van Vuuren, December, 2000 in his study, Beyond the Studio: A Case Study of Community Radio and Social Capital, presents the results of qualitative research designed to explore the community development function of community broadcasting. The researcher defines community development as ‘the enhancement of the whole community and its citizens’ Onyx and Bullen (1997: 25-26). This definition rests on the principle of subsidiarity, which holds that decisions should be made by those most directly affected by the outcomes of those decisions. Community development further rests on the principles of personal empowerment and the development of structures and processes by which groups can meet their own needs.

In this paper the results of a survey conducted at three non-metropolitan community radio stations, conducted between September 1998 and December 1999 were presented. Although the research tool is quantitative, the results form part of a qualitative study in which the researcher has adopted a range of techniques. This approach provides depth to the research but rules out generalisation. The results are specific to the selected stations, although connections can be made with aspects of the community broadcasting more generally.

The three non-metropolitan stations selected for the study had all been broadcasting for 10 years or more. Kitty has compared these three stations in terms of organizational structure,
listeners’ profile, volunteers’ profile, reach, financial success, programme content and, of course, the store of social capital.

The measures of social capital in this study were restricted to participation in networks and reciprocity. Participation in networks is the element of social capital that refers to the ‘more or less dense interlocking networks of voluntary and mutual relationships between individuals and groups’ (Onyx & Bullen 1997:5). Research of voluntary organisations already assumes a store of social capital, but there may be significant differences between similar organisations. Aspects of participation examined in this research are volunteer recruitment, duration and hours of volunteer involvement, and networks beyond the community radio station. Reciprocity refers to the services provided by an individual to others in the general expectation that this kindness will be returned at some undefined time in the future (Onyx & Bullen 1997:5). In this section the author has restricted an examination of reciprocity in terms of the motivation for volunteers to become active in community radio and the personal benefits obtained from their activity.

The results of the case study raise implications for the performance of generalist community radio stations as well as for future research. It demonstrates that a station’s financial success is not necessarily related to the size of the host population. Instead, I present a case for taking into account a station’s volunteer structure, in which age, and possibly the gender balance, appears to be the primary underlying factors. It appears that a cross-section of age groups, and possibly the greater proportion of female volunteers, has proven to be beneficial for 2TEN. The study also confirms the importance of participation in volunteer networks that go beyond the radio station and into the community – an important element of social capital. The results suggest that an emphasis on community development, which encourages broad participation from the community, can result in a successful community radio station. It
suggests that this is more important than programming, although programming is the vehicle through which community development takes place. Hence the importance of programming is not ruled out, but it should come second.

Finally, the research is intended to add to a growing body of qualitative work on Australian community broadcasting. While the research is essentially qualitative, the use of a quantitative tool raises the possibility of the development of a measure of social capital in community radio more generally.

2.12.4 Studies on community radio and its social impact

The World Association of Community Radio Broadcasters, AMARC conducted in 2006 a long-range participatory action research seeking to identify the barriers that limit the potential positive impact of community radio and explore ways to increase the effectiveness of community radio in achieving poverty reduction, development objectives, inclusiveness and democracy building in local communities.

The evaluation process highlighted that communities have sought in community radio a means to express their own issues, concerns, cultures and languages. Community ownership of the media and participation in programming have led to communication processes that are effectively empowered local actors to achieve poverty reduction, forward development objectives, encourage inclusiveness and participation, peace building, good governance and accountability. AMARC and other stakeholders have contributed strongly to the expansion of scattered CR experiences into a dynamic and diverse global sector of broadcasting that has become an alternative to commercial and state owned media, which often neglect representation of the poor, the marginalized, particularly women.

The evaluation process has pointed to the lack of proper enabling legislation as the single most important barrier to increased effectiveness of CR social impact. It has also revealed the
rich experience of CR movement and the need to encourage exchanges of best experiences in order to better highlight CR social impact. There is need for appropriate tools and indicators to evaluate CR social impact that go beyond information dissemination indicators or small project impact in individuals. Some specific experiences point to the need for further research on how to increase the effectiveness of CR. To do so, the most important challenge is to embed participatory monitoring and evaluation across the CR network.

**Key findings on the Social Impact of Community Radio**

*Community radio achievements are not properly highlighted and/or disseminated.*

One general perspective arising from the evaluation process is that in spite of a large body of evidence on community radio social impact, CR practitioners and stakeholders have not taken the time and the effort needed to present systematically the achievements of community radio worldwide.

*Measurements of Community Radio Social Impact must be people centred*

Community Radio practitioners and stakeholders agree that measurement of Community radio social impact should be people-centred and based on multi dimensional understanding of poverty. In this perspective the key indicators of community radio social impact are related to voice, empowerment and local ownership of communication processes.

*Quantity indicators do not tell the whole story.*

Community Radio participants insisted on the fact that quantity indicators such as measurement of audience, number of hours of programming dedicated to a specific topic, number of organizations interviewed tell only part of the story of the social impact of community radio. This said, it becomes clear that in absence of sufficient knowledge sharing, relationship between CR and the donor community tend to make them respond to donor pre-
established indicators instead of clarifying the need for more appropriate indicators to render CR impact.

Quality indicators are needed to measure the impact of the communication process facilitated by CR.

For the CR practitioners the main characteristic of CR is to initiate and facilitate a communication process that allows for interaction and interchange ability between the listener and the producer. Quality indicators such as life stories of individual and collective social change can render the process on how this communication process has a social impact. The main recommendation is on the use of participatory monitoring & evaluation process.

Time is a key factor when measuring CR social Impact.

CR experiences show that CR social impact is dependent on the time factor. The longer the period the more easily it is to measure the social impact of CR. A good example of this is the experience of CR in Nepal that after 10 years of experiences became a contributing factor in the return of democracy after the Royal Coup of February 2005.

It was also stressed that the use of the tools for measurement should correspond to the social impact being evaluated. For peace building and conflict resolution for instance the Listeners clubs, feedback and letters measurements need to be fine-tuned. The main indicators for CR social impact can be drawn from the use of Audience research, phone-in, letters, SMS feedback, listeners clubs, and focus groups to the measurement through official statistics on the political, social and economic changes in the communities. It can consider the increased participation of citizens in setting the public agenda to the resolution of existing problems through collective action facilitated by the communication processes initiated by CR.

The main social Impact of Community Radio is Voice for the poor and marginalized.

For most community radio practitioners, the social impact of community radio is evidence on
itself. The sole existence of community radio has a positive impact in the communities. CR allows local communities to experience alternative experiences through their access to a proximity media. For some participants this explains the lack of understanding on some stakeholders on what is the impact of CR: they have difficulties in differentiating between mass media (they see CR as a lower example of mass media), and the participatory and communication rights perspective of CR, the essential medium to allow the voices of the poor and marginalized be heard.

*Community radio is effective in poverty reduction.*

Access to voice, information, and knowledge are vital factors in facilitating the achievement of poverty reduction and sustainable human development. Voicelessness is a key dimension of poverty and exclusion.

*CR is effective in ensuring proper governance.*

Community radio can contribute to rendering governments accountable by enabling ordinary people to question their leaders on matters such as the use of public resources.

*CR is effective in achieving development goals.*

Community radio is effective in facilitating communication for key development sectors such as health, education and livelihoods.

*CR is effective in empowering Women.*

Community radio is effective in empowering women to actively participate in their communities and to become citizens whose voices are heard.

*CR is effective in ensuring inclusion of the marginalized.*

Community broadcasting plays a specific and crucial role in encouraging public participation, facilitating community level debate, facilitating inclusion and cultural diversity. The
influence of community and independent radios in Nepal’s return to democracy are good examples. Rural community radios in Latin America and Africa show the importance of CR in democratic processes and in ensuring salvage of local languages and knowledge.

**CR is effective in conflict resolution.**

Community radios in countries in conflict are known to have an important social impact in conflict resolution and peace building. The cases of RDC, Nepal, Sri Lanka, and El Salvador are some key examples on how radio can have a positive impact in addressing this issue.

**CR has an effective impact in disaster prevention/relief.**

CR has proven very effective in prevention or confrontation of disaster and relief management following natural disasters. The examples range from the Tsunami in Asia to the Katrina disaster in New Orleans; in Sub-Saharan regions radios are effective in confronting consequences of desertification.

### 2.12.5 Studies on community radio and community development

The broadcasting commission of Ireland conducted a study in 2003 to evaluate the contribution of community radio for community development. Specifically, the research aimed to examine the role and contribution of community radio in community development work. The areas or themes that the Forum was also interested in exploring included:

- The disadvantaged groups the community radio works with;
- The contribution of community radio to community development;
- Collaborative work undertaken by community radio;
- Community radio’s role in addressing the “digital divide”.

Given below are some initial findings that the study has highlighted.

One thing that is apparent across the range of the community development continuum or spectrum from product to process, or, on the one hand, collective action, self-help, the development of community spirit and material benefits to, on the other hand, participation, combating disadvantage, inequality and social exclusion, empowerment and group capacity building – is that community radio stations fall along this variegated continuum depending on the particular view of community development that they pursue. One obvious conclusion that can be made here is that these two ends of the continuum of community development are apparent within community radio, which suggests the closeness of community radio in practice to community development.

At one end, we see more process oriented community development, which has a clear focus on disadvantaged groups, participation, social exclusion and empowerment. At the other end are community stations that can be seen as being closer to the provision of a local service to the community, and the development of a sense of community. The reality is that not all the stations fit easily into one model or the other and they can differ from time to time and issue to issue.

The findings of the research suggest that there are three overarching factors that serve to distinguish stations in terms of community development: first, their length of time as community radio stations, second, their origins in terms of the principles and ethos adopted which is also based on the persons and groups who played a part in the establishment of stations, and third, whether they are based in a rural or urban environment.

The longer established stations tend to be more sophisticated in their community development activities. This is evidenced by the adoption of a comparatively more planned or strategic approach in this work, their targeting of particularly disadvantaged groups and the
relative variety of the socially excluded groups that they work with. For these stations also, a lot of work takes place outside of broadcasting alone. For the more recently established stations, they are more likely to work with a smaller variety of groups and are less likely to be planned in terms actively targeting the most disadvantaged in their catchments. The research suggests however that both groups work with socially excluded groups and that the longer a station is in operation the more advanced its community development work becomes. This is also true of collaborative work.

The origins of stations and the particular perspective on community and community development that the originators maintained, seems to go a long way in dictating the focus of the station along the continuum of community development. For instance, it is clear that those stations most likely to adopt the AMARC principles are also those that adopt the more process perspective of community development in their work.

The character of social exclusion and disadvantage – that is, the numbers and diversity of groups that are excluded – is different for rural and urban areas for a range of historical, economic and structural reasons. The nature and diversity of groups that the stations work with corresponds also to these differences as expected. Generally, however, the stations can be seen to work with the main disadvantaged groups in their respective catchments in tandem with whether they are located in a rural or urban area.

The study clearly establishes that there exists a conspicuous relationship between what is understood as community development, including the understanding informing its practice in various current programmes throughout the state, and the aims and principles of community radio. The community development nature of community radio is clearly established in a range of official definitions of community radio. For our purposes, this is clearest in the definitions provided by the BCI, AMARC and its European Charter, and UNESCO’s
Community Media Programme. Notwithstanding this, this study delved into the relationship between community radio and community development in practice on the ground to establish this basis of this relationship empirically.

This research has shed light on the community development role of community radio and has established that there is a pronounced relationship between community radio and the practices and principles of community development in Ireland.

At the outset, it was demonstrated how aims and principles of community radio are in keeping with those of community development. It is evident from the body of the research that, at the empirical level of day to day activities in the catchments in which they function, although nominally termed “radio” stations, community radio has more in common with the community and voluntary sector than with both public and, especially, commercial radio.
2.13 Chapter summary

A key question of this research is around the contribution of community radio to community development and the factors affecting the participation of the community members in CRS. The answer to this question as a result of literature review indicated that, although difficult to quantify in any systematic way, communities, community radio practitioners, volunteers and other stakeholders feel that community radio makes a valuable contribution to community development based on their experiences. The main ways in which the stakeholders conceive of this valuable contribution is a new dimension, avenue or approach in community development work. In this regard also, the literature review suggests strongly that the broad community radio sector was of benefit to disadvantaged groups in their catchment areas. The researcher has reviewed some relevant literature related to Community radio broadcasting, Measuring Social capital, Community radio and Social capital and the social impact of CRS which gives a fair idea about the previous research done in this field. This also helped the researcher to outline a suitable theoretical framework for this study.