Chapter II  Review of Literature

This part provides review of literature pertaining to the present study. The review has been done thematically and is divided into three sections. The first section provides an overview of the theories to communicate development. The second section explores participatory communication, the diffusion and uses of participatory communication in development programs, consequences for and popularity of participatory communication research. The last section reviews the literature on rural development emphasizing on unperceived rural poverty, periodical approaches and ideas to rural development, the role of mass media, Gandhian framework for sustainable rural development, women’s participation, disparities and selected regional perspectives focusing Uttar Pradesh, India.

Theories to Communicate Development

Theories, in general, try to express the relationships between variables in order to describe observations and predict future results. Theories are used to explain the causes and nature of a given situation; this diagnosis is then translated into strategies and specific recommended courses of action for interventions (Waisbord 2001). Generally, “theories shape the landscape of facts by guiding thinking. They tell people what to expect, where to look, what to ignore, what actions are feasible, what values to hold” (Prange 1999; 24).

Efforts to use communication to create development are based both on theories about the nature and purpose of development as well as assumptions about how people acquire information, form ideas, beliefs and act on the basis of their knowledge (Díaz Bordenave 1977). Over the past fifty years, the concepts of “development” and “communication,” as well as the philosophical thoughts underpinning them, have undergone major
transformations that reflect changes in intellectual and political debates. Overlapping theories from a variety of disciplines including international development, health, education, management, agriculture, and communication have converged to create today’s evolving field of communication for development.

Traditionally, communication efforts have tended to fulfill three main roles in development practice. First, to inform and persuade people to adopt certain behaviors and practices that are deemed beneficial to them; to enhance the image and credibility of the development organizations involved in the efforts; and last, to enable community consultation on specific initiatives (Deane & Gray-Felder 1999). The focus in more recent years has shifted to providing a forum or platform for dialogue, debate, and participation for all sectors of society, especially those that have been underrepresented.

Overall, as theories of how development have moved away from top down donor driven approaches towards more participatory and community centered methodologies, so too has communication theory. Rogers and Hart (2001) now describe communication for development as social change brought about by communication research, theory and technology designed to increase people’s social and material advancement.

Development is the process of improving the living conditions of a society. Improvement is linked to economic and material progress as well as spiritual and human growth (Melkote and Steeves, 2001). While some theorists perceive development as primarily the increase in production and distribution of capital, there is an increasing consensus to embrace development as a change in human conditions.

Communication is the complex process of creation, transmission, maintenance and transformation of information and ideas, using a mix of interpersonal and mediated channels
which are sustained by political, economic and social structures (Melkote and Steeves, 2001)\(^6\).

Development communication is the use of communication to stimulate debate and involve people in decision-making and action to bring about change. It is also the use of communication channels and messages to help people acquire the new knowledge and skills needed to perform in society and to be able to work with people from different sectors in the development process (Fraser and Restrepo-Estrada, 1998)\(^7\). Here, development communication is defined as the purposive use of interpersonal, participatory and mediated channels to buttress positive change among individuals and societies at the micro (communities), macro (nations) and meso (large regions) levels (Melkote and Steeves, 2001)\(^8\).

Participation in development is the conscious decision to reach out to and involve those people that would be most affected by the proposed development program. Specifically, participation refers to involving the un-empowered, the marginalized and the poorest people in any society (White, 1994)\(^9\).

Empowerment, when associated with development and participation in development, refers to the process by which individuals, organizations, and communities gain control over social and economic conditions (Melkote and Steeves, 2001)\(^10\). Thus, empowerment is linked to creating an environment where people who have control over situations that affect their lives are given the opportunity, knowledge, and power to bring about the change that would improve their lives.

Development communication is defined as “the integration of strategic communication in development projects” (The World Bank, 2004, para. 1)\(^11\) and is further specified as
operating “through engaging [the poor] more fully in decision-making processes that affect their lives, giving them a ‘voice’ to influence policy, or persuading them to adopt new practices that will enhance their livelihood, increase their security, advance their education and improve their health” (Rogers, 2006, p. 180). The field of study has its origins in the post-war international aid programmes of the 1950s when methods were sought to transform the newly independent nationstates of Africa, Latin America and Asia into Western-type societies (Akpan, 2003). Daniel Lerner’s (1958) classic book “The passing of the traditional society”, was the first publication of a link between development and communication (Rogers, 2006). Since then the field of development communication has been challenged by the emergence of different development and communication models that have marked development efforts up to now (Bessette, 2004; Melkote & Steeves, 2001; Rogers, 2006; Waisbord, 2001). Two major trends developed that still exist to various degrees: an approach that involves large-scale actions, relying on the mass media (diffusion model), and an approach that favours grassroots or community communication and promotes small-scale projects, relying on small media and interpersonal communication channels (participatory model) (Bessette, 2004; Morris, 2003; Morris, 2005; Rogers, 2006).

The diffusion model of communication, named after Everett M. Rogers’ (1962) ‘Diffusion of Innovation theory’, has its roots in the modernisation paradigm. According to the modernisation paradigm, all societies go through the same stages of progress in the process of development (Rogers, 2003). From this perspective, traditional societies have to adopt modern and, therefore, Western ways and attitudes to become developed. According to Lerner (2000), one of the earliest exponents of the modernisation theory and author of the
first publication on development communication, modernisation is therefore closely associated with the process of “Westernisation”.

In this school of thought, the problems of development emerge from lack of information. The value of development communication is seen in the dissemination of modern knowledge, education, and awareness-raising through international mass media, and therefore, in a top-down information transfer from the developed to the less developed countries (Lerner, 2000; Rogers, 2003).\textsuperscript{27, 28} Thus, development communication in this view is mainly considered as mass media (Bessette, 2004).\textsuperscript{29} Lerner (2000, p. 123)\textsuperscript{30} describes the mass media as a “mobility multiplier” that enables people to take part in events that are far away and at the same time promote empathy. Schramm (1964), another key modernisation theorist, sees media as a link to the wider world, transferring new models and ideas to developing countries and speeding the social transformation required for economic development. From this perspective, new knowledge leads to worldview and attitude changes and, in turn, to behaviour changes and, consequently, development (Lerner, 2000; Rogers, 2003; Schramm, 1964).\textsuperscript{32-34} The goals of diffusion communication interventions such as social marketing and entertainment-education are highly outcome-oriented: changes in knowledge, attitudes and behaviour are indicators for successful development communication (Morris, 2003; Morris, 2005; Waisbord, 2001).\textsuperscript{35-37}

Rogers (2003)\textsuperscript{38} emphasised that mass media have a key role in development and might be used for development purposes in areas such as education, family planning, nutrition, hygiene, agricultural and industrial production, and rural and urban life. In contrast to other modernisation theorists, Rogers continuously updated his framework (Rogers, 2006).\textsuperscript{39} His revised “diffusion of innovation” theory integrates the use of different communication
channels and the relevance of human agency in the process of development: “Mass media
canals are more effective in creating knowledge of innovations, whereas interpersonal
cannels are more effective in forming and changing attitudes toward a new idea, and thus
in influencing the decision to adopt or reject a new idea” (Rogers, 2003). By selecting
appropriate communication channels and addressing local opinion leaders, Rogers’ (2006) theory, therefore, considers the relevance of human agency and grassroots organisations to
improve the process of diffusion of innovations.

Newer approaches to development communication advocate the Participatory Development
Communication (PDC) model (Melkote and Steeves, 2001; Servaes, 2001; Servaes and
Malikhao, 2005). These approaches have arisen from the multiplicity paradigm or
“another” paradigm, which emerged as a criticism of the modernisation paradigm and its
diffusion model (Servaes and Malikhao, 2005). Within the multiplicity paradigm, modernisation programmes were criticised for promoting modern consciousness without
doubting whether it would be sustainable and desirable for people in less developed
countries to move from the traditional toward modern life-styles (Servaes, 2001; Servaes
and Malikhao, 2005; Tehranian, 1999). The multiplicity approach emphasises cultural
identity and multidimensionality. Contrary to the earlier paradigms which centre on national
economics, national development is here defined as the fulfilment of local basic needs with
the main focus on local culture (Servaes, 2001). Development is understood as a bottom-
up process that encourages empowerment, participation and self-development of the local
communities. Empowerment is essential to the approach, since it enables the local people to
participate actively in national development. The underlying assumption is that “one cannot
help people permanently by always doing for them what they can do for themselves or, more to the point, what they can be taught to do for themselves” (Agunga et al. 2006).50

‘Provocations for Development’ by Robert Chambers (2012)51 compiles the entertaining and unsettling collection of writings that questions concepts, conventions and practices in development. The short and accessible writing by Chambers reflects the evolution of concepts like participation and of organizations like the World Bank. Besides provocations, there is mischief, verse and serious fun. The book organized into four sections: Word Play, irreverently examines vocabularies of development and how words are instruments of power. Do we use obscure words to impress our colleagues – or fashionable ones to win research proposals? How do poor people define their poverty? How can we use aid budgets most effectively? Are many of our actions against poverty simple, direct… and wrong?; Poverty and Participation challenges concepts of poverty, presents empowering breakthroughs in the current explosion of participatory methodologies; Aid, is critical of past and present procedures and practices in aid and points to feasible changes for doing better; For our Future touches on values, ethics, gender and participation, immersions, hypocrisy, and paradigms, and sees hope in children. The final provocation invites readers to find answers to the question ‘what would it take to eliminate poverty in the world?’ An intoxicating cocktail of thought and practice, people and things, Chambers pokes and provokes us to reflect on the hubris and hypocrisy with which the “development profession” is stuffed.

Communication and Development: Issues and Perspectives, edited by S.R. Mehta (1992)52, is a fine collection of papers presented in a UNESCO-supported national seminar, reviving the concept of social development communication. The eminent scholars highlighted the
scope and vitality of integrated communication methodologies for a more desirable social transformation and emphasized on the decentralization of development communication policy. Jahagirdar in a case study, “A critical analysis of a development project of social forestry division of Andhra Pradesh” presents the non-intervention of communication system that led to the failure of that project (Singh, 2007). The project aimed at promoting tank foreshore plantations. But this social forestry project did not show much impact on the rural people. There was no mechanism to involve local people in planning and implementation of the project through various communication channels besides meeting the local people’s requirements of fuel, fodder, and small timber for agriculture implements. Communication gap between project executors and people must be bridged for the dynamic success of the development projects. This case study clearly recommends for creating a new type of social structure working in line with “participatory development institutions, in which communication foster values congruent with the need and structure of rural people.

Development Communication by B.N. Ahuja and S.S. Chhabra (1992), explores the techniques used by experts and journalists in development news coverage. Leading newspapers have, in fact, specialized development communicators to cover each field as per their interest and expertise. The fields covered give day-to-day evidence of progress achieved by both public and private institutions. Chapter 9 of the book, “Rural Development in India” highlights certain initiatives of the government development initiatives:

- Community development program: The launching of the community development program in 1952 was a landmark in the history of India which ushered in an era of development with the participation of the people. It adopted a systematic integrated
approach to rural development with a hierarchy of village-level and block-level workers drawn from various fields to enrich rural life.

- The Council for Advancement of People’s Action and Rural Technology (CAPART), an independent organization of the Department of Rural Development gives grant-in-aid to voluntary agencies for rural development.

- Computerization of Rural Information: A scheme of computerized Rural Information System (CRISP) was started on a pilot basis in 10 districts in 1985, with National Informatics Center (NIC) as the nodal agency. The experience gained under CRISP has shown that it is possible to develop quickly a computerized data base on rural development at the DRDA level. The computerization at district level will help in strengthening the monitoring and streaming the implementation of various rural development programs.

Verghese (1979)\(^{55}\) in his paper, A Philosophy for Development Communication: The View from India, states that “communications are to society and civilization what the nervous system is to man” The evolution of language, writing, printing, the telegraph, photography, radio, modern telecommunications, television, the computer and satellites are landmarks in human development. Each of these more or less changed the world and introduced a new milieu. It is also stated, “some 60 to 70 per cent of the population still continue to live in the villages though the quality of rural life will be different from what it is today with the grouping together of villages in more viable techno-economic clusters and the emergence of a large number of growth centers forming the intermediate links in a closer rural-urban nexus than that prevails today. The political and economic structure will be more decentralized and participative than at present. Such a society will be more communicative.
It will need more communications and will have more to communicate at all levels with a more assertive public opinion demanding to be kept better informed”. There will be pressures for greater accountability in the conduct of public affairs and of economic and social institutions, a hunger for reading material among tens of millions of neo literates, rising demands for the techno-scientific information and data processing at both the macro and micro levels along with a far bigger draft on communications for infotainment. Disparities on different parameters such as the class, creed, gender and others will be at the minimum by the effective understanding and application of communication strategies at the grass-root levels.

Linje Manyozo (2012)\textsuperscript{56}, in the book, ‘Media, Communication and Development’, described six schools that have grown worldwide in an effort to better the lives in the Third World which is now euphemistically labeled the developing world. These he calls the Bretton Woods School, the Latin American School, the Indian School, the African School, the Los Banos School, and Social Change School. He further reclassifies them into three approaches: the media for development approach, the media development approach and the participatory or community engagement approach, that deems to be more appropriate for the still nascent field. In all the three, the means of interaction between and among players is central. While the first two approaches are more media-oriented, the third relies more on interpersonal communication. The fourth chapter of this book ‘The Participatory Communication Approach: Emphasis on Process’ investigates the third approach to the study of media, communication and development, namely, the participatory communication approach (that is also being referred to as the community engagement approach), which ideally and normatively refers to how communication features in the grass-roots
development approaches (Willis, 2005). The approach thus refers to the organized decentralization of decision-making structures and processes that focus on the community as a collective unit of policy design and implementation at the local level. Such processes do not necessarily rely on the media but on what UNESCO (1980) described as ‘communication between men,’ or interpersonal communications that are used in the generation, exchange and utilization of development knowledge. As community engagement, participatory communication employs deliberative processes and collective decision-making mainly to foster improved livelihoods, safer communities and sustainable environment (Manyozo, 2012; Willis, 2005).

**Participatory Communication**

Participatory communication is a social process in which groups with common interests jointly construct a message oriented toward the improvement of their living conditions and the change of unjust social structures (Mody, 1991). Participatory communication provides all people, including the marginalized, with access to information and communication systems and an equal opportunity to participate in creating new information and challenging existing unjust social practices (Servaes, 1996).

Cooke and Kothari (2001) in their book Participation: The New Tyranny have focused on the growth of participation in development discourse tracing it from 1970s onwards where its widespread use could may be attributed to the endorsement of participation by a variety of international agencies, including the World Bank. Further specific ways, in which participation has failed to deliver on its promises and even served to legitimise a perpetuation of the status quo, has been explored through a series of prominent case studies.
Hickey & Mohan (2008) in their book Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation, written as a response to The New Tyranny (above) sought to reclaim the relevance of 'participation' in the processes of social transformation. Acknowledging that much that was done in the name of participation in development over the preceding 20-30 years failed to deliver on its transformative potential, the authors draw together a variety of case studies and reflections on practice based on experiences where participation has delivered on its transformative potential. More specifically, it looks at the particular conditions under which participation is able to contribute to change and the kinds of processes that can address issues of exclusion, injustice or unequal power relations. A cross-cutting feature of transformative participation is that it is inherently political, raising issues related to identity, inclusion/exclusion and power. Furthermore, the skills, capabilities, knowledge and support-base of individuals become integral to their capacity to participate in processes that enable them to influence others.

Laura Cornish and Alison Dunn (2009) in their article Creating knowledge for action: the case for participatory communication in research, explored the benefits of using participatory communication - “a citizen-led approach to both creating and expressing knowledge” - in research for social change. Evidence reveals that communication is key to the effectiveness of research in contributing to change at various levels. The authors focus on two forms of research:

1. Research that seeks to bring about change through people; and
2. Research that seeks to generate information that can be used to influence policy processes and argue that in both cases participatory communication.
They “look at how participatory communication can play a role in strengthening civil society by creating greater opportunities for more marginalised voices to participate in dialogue, contest agendas, and negotiate their demands” (p.666). Participatory communication is “grounded in citizens' own forms of expression and understanding of their culture and context” (p.667). “A continual process of dialogue, listening, learning, and action between people” that “equally values non-textual ways of expressing experiences, for example through film, music, drama story-telling, and multimedia, as well as adapting or subverting mainstream media and text-based communication to specific contexts and needs”. The authors provide a historical account of the co-evolution of participatory approaches to development and participatory communication, pointing out that while they share different origins, they both have a commitment to empowerment. Civil society is the arena for participatory communication and can be greatly strengthened by it if linked to a process of research: “it is in these spaces that citizens are able to interact, debate, contest, and renegotiate relationships”. The article then looks at the conditions under which it is appropriate to introduce participatory communication approaches in research. Through a series of case studies with reflection on theory and practice, it explores:

— Challenging traditional research paradigms through participatory communication

— Research as theory, as finding out, and as activism – and the contribution that participatory communication can make

— Theatre as participatory communication

— Participatory video

Participatory communication has different set of values, and embraces alternative forms of knowledge and expression that are usually considered inferior. However, this is precisely
what makes it more relevant to the people it is meant to benefit and therefore a more effective means of bringing about social change.

White (1996) in the book ‘Depoliticising development: the uses and abuses of participation’, has outlined four forms – or degrees – of participation: (1) nominal; (2) instrumental; (3) representative; and (4) transformative. The book also outlines the different interests each of these serves depending on whether a top-down (i.e. by those who want others to participate in their process) or bottom-up (i.e. by those who participate in others’ processes) view is taken of the particular participation situation. For each form of participation, participation can be seen to play a different function ranging from simply 'display' (for nominal participation) to 'means/end' (for transformative). The article emphasises that rather than merely being concerned with participation, it is necessary to engage with the question of how people are participating in a given process. White concludes that: (1) participation must be seen as a political process; (2) “while it has the potential to change patterns of dominance, [it] may also be the means through which existing power relations are entrenched and reproduced” (p.14); (3) “the form and function for participation itself becomes a focus for struggle.” Critically, “the absence of conflict in many supposedly 'participatory' programmes is something that should raise suspicions” (p.15).

Gaventa and Valderrama (1999) in their background note prepared for workshop on “Strengthening Participation in Local Governance”, has identified three broad concepts of participation: (1) participation of societies/communities/citizens, usually in the activities of development agencies; (2) traditional political participation of citizens in elections, lobbying, etc.; and (3) an emerging understanding, fuelled by the decentralisation of
governance, of citizenship as participation. In all cases, a variety of participatory methods are required to enable people's participation in the given domain. The authors then go on to elaborate the particular relevance of seeing ‘participation as citizenship’ and ‘citizenship as rights’, for citizens to become agents, actively shaping outcomes in their particular contexts. Drawing on cases of democratic decentralisation in various countries, they identify some of the key barriers to citizen participation in local governance and some of the strategies and approaches that may help to overcome them.

**Dilemmas**

The literature has captured the dilemmas in the application of participatory approaches by categorising different forms of participation. White (1994)\textsuperscript{67}, for instance, makes a distinction between pseudo- versus genuine participation. Pseudo-participation is described as “people’s participation in development in which the control of project and decision-making power rests with planners, administrators and the community’s elite”. Genuine participation is defined by Servaes (1999)\textsuperscript{68} as a process that “touches the very core of power relationships in society”. Pretty (1995)\textsuperscript{69} describes seven types of participation:

1. **Passive Participation:** Be told and follow; information belongs only to external professionals.

2. **Participation in Information Giving:** Participate by answering questions; no opportunity to influence conclusions and decisions beyond the professionals.

3. **Participation by Consultation:** Participate by being consulted; conclusions may be modified in the light of people's responses but professionals are under no obligation to do so.

4. **Participation for Material Incentive:** Participate by providing resources, for example
labour, in return for food, cash, or other material incentives.

5. Functional Participation: Participate by forming groups to meet predetermined objectives. Instructions can be dependent on external initiators/facilitators or become self dependent.

6. Interactive Participation: Participate in joint analysis, leading to action plans and formation of local institutions Groups take control over local decisions.

7. Self-Mobilization: Participate by taking initiative independent of external institution to change systems.

Another typology of participatory research approaches distinguishes between five types of power relationships (adapted from Lilija and Ashby 1999): 

1. Conventional: Outsiders take decisions on their own based on limited communication with local people. They may or may not consider information related to local conditions and relatives.

2. Consultative: Outsiders take decisions on their own although there is organized communication with local people. Outsiders inform themselves about local people opinions, preferences and priorities through organized one-way communication methods. They may or may not let this information affect their decision. The decision is not made with local people nor is it delegated to them.

3. Collaborative: The decision is shared between local people and outsiders and involves organized communication between these two groups. Outsiders and local people know about each other’s opinions, preferences and priorities through organized two-way communication. The decisions are made jointly after a
consideration of all opinions and suggestions. No party has the exclusive right to revoke a shared decision.

4. Collegial: Local people make the decisions collectively in organized communication with outsiders. Local people know about outsider’s opinion, preferences, proposals and priorities through organized two-way communication. Local people may or may not let this information affect their final decision.

5. Local decision making: Local people make the decisions individually or in a group without organized communication with outsiders. They may consult and consider the opinions or suggestions from outsiders, but the decision making process is not influenced or facilitated from the outside.

Types 1 and 5 can barely be called participatory as decision-making power is predominantly owned by one party. Type 2 is the typical example of pseudo-participation, which can be a stepping stone to higher levels of participation and empowerment but also leads to manipulative participation (Strauss 1998). Types 3 and 4 describe the range in which genuine participation can take place with an increasing level of empowerment. These processes were usually identified with changes in behaviors much in line with the development thinking of the modernization paradigm.

Participatory Communication: A Practical Guide (2009) a publication of the World Bank written in a warm and lively style and packed with learning tools, provides articulate insights to the following questions: What do we mean when we say participatory communication? What are the practical implications of working with participatory communication strategies in development and social change processes? What experiences exists in practice that documents that participatory communication adds value to a
development project or programme? The aim of this user guide on participatory communication is to provide answers to some of these questions. Many communication practitioners and development workers face obstacles and challenges in their practical work. A participatory communication strategy offers a very specific perspective on how to articulate social processes, decision-making processes and any change process for that matter. Participatory approaches are nothing new. However, what is new is the proliferation of institutions, especially governmental but also non-governmental, that seek participatory approaches in their development initiative. This guide seeks to provide perspectives, tools and experiences regarding how to go about it with participatory communication strategies. It is conceived as a guide that hopefully can be of relevance and utility for development workers in the field. It is targeted at both at government and their officials, World Bank staff and at civil society.

The participatory communication approach incorporates concepts in the emerging framework of multiplicity paradigm which is also referred to as another development (Servaes, 1996). The main idea in the multiplicity paradigm is that there is no universal path to development, that development must be conceived as an integral multidimensional and dialectic process that can differ from one country to another. For that reason, every society must define development for itself and find its own strategy (Servaes, 1999).

According to Servaes (1996), participation is “a term used to refer to a number of social and planning processes occurring in many different places and in many different contexts. To some, participation is a means to reach a certain goal; to others, participation is an end in itself”. Dagron (2001) is against the idea of a definition because he thinks, “the desire for a label and definition could only contribute to freeze a communication movement that is still
shaping itself, and that may be more valuable precisely because of its variety and looseness”. In the same vein, Arnst (1996)\textsuperscript{77} posits, “even though the efforts to define, model, and operationalize participation have been enormous, such efforts are largely unproductive, if not counterproductive”.

The central argument is that participation cannot be considered a unified model of communication and hence the difficulty in defining it. There is a general feeling of hesitancy in this field to arrive at a definition. This because the inherently dynamic and contextual phenomena are difficult to be defined, operationalized or institutionalized by those external to it (Arnst, 1996)\textsuperscript{78}. Servaes (1996)\textsuperscript{79} conceives that authentic participation defines itself within each unique structural, social, and cultural context as it unfolds.

On the other hand, the concept of participatory communication to social change has been defined in several ways. A seminar organized by UNESCO (1978)\textsuperscript{80} defined participatory communication as the social process in which groups with common interests jointly construct messages oriented to the improvement of their existential situation and to the change of the unjust social structure. Participatory communication to social change has also been defined as an approach that focuses on using direct, grass roots, many-to-many communications, which springs from the affected communities (Gray-Felder, 1999)\textsuperscript{81}. It is communication that gives voice to the previously unheard and communication that has a bias towards local content and ownership.

**Problem of definition**

Despite the problem of definition, there are two major approaches to participatory communication agreed upon. One is the Freire’s (1970, 1973, 1983, 1994)\textsuperscript{82-85} pedagogy of
dialogical communication and the other evolves from the ideas of access, participation and self-management articulated in the UNESCO debates in the 1970s (Servaes, 1996). Pedagogy of the Oppressed (1970) is perhaps one of Paulo Freire’s most influential works. It is in this book that he spells out his method for teaching people in Latin America how to read and be liberated from oppression. To understand Freire’s work and its impact in various academic disciplines, it is important to have some knowledge of the context he lived and worked as well as some of the main events in his life.

Freire was born in 1921 in Recife, a small port city of northeastern Brazil and a center of real poverty. In the early years of his life, Freire experienced first hand a struggle against poverty and hunger. This experience heavily influenced his later life and work. His thought on the philosophy of education was first expressed in 1959 in his doctoral dissertation and later in his work as professor of history and philosophy of education at the University of Recife. Before his exile in 1964, Freire had already begun devoting his life to the advancement of the impoverished people of Brazil. After 20 years in exile, he moved first to Chile, and then immigrated to the United States before returning to Brazil (Elias, 1994). It is in the course of his work and travels in the Third World, and as a result of his studies in the philosophy of education that he evolved a theory for the education of illiterates. In this book, Paulo Freire as an educator investigated into the link between education to society and therein he raised a number of concerns that hold relevance even today which through problem posing education introduces or begins to introduce individuals to a critical form of thinking about their world, has been widely applied in various participatory communication approaches.
Freire’s theory is based on his conviction that every human being, no matter how “ignorant” or “submerged” in the “culture of silence” is capable of looking critically at the world in a dialogical encounter with others. Provided with the proper tools for such dialogical encounter, the individual can gradually perceive his or her personal and social reality, and deal critically with it. In this process the old paternalistic depositor-depository relationship, where the teacher is the depositor and the learner a depository, is overcome. In Freire’s proposed pedagogy of the oppressed, the teacher /social change agent is no longer the authority, but a facilitator: someone who both learns and teaches in dialogue with other fellow learner-teachers. The Freirian approach therefore works from the theoretical strategy of dialogical communication based on a respect for Otherness and that human species has a destiny, which is more than life as a fulfillment of material needs (Servaes, 1996). This approach stands as a break in past theorizing and practice. It moves away from the conventional top-down development communication approaches, which Freire described as perpetuating the culture of silence of the dispossessed. He states that:

*The lethargy and ignorance being the direct product of the top-down communication process and the whole situation of economic, social, and political domination of which they are victims. Rather than being encouraged and equipped to know and respond to the concrete realities of their world, they are kept submerged.*” (p. 35).

In the conscientization process, Freire used a photograph, a picture or a drawing to represent the existing reality and a discussion would then be initiated. The participants would be encouraged to question why things were as they were what could be done to rectify the situation etc. Communication channels were used in this approach to generate a dialogue, to help people talk, and understand each other. Communication is therefore employed as a
vehicle for liberation from mental and psychological restraints that bind individuals to their existing situations (Melkote, 1991).90

The second discourse about participatory communication is the UNESCO language about *self-management, access and participation* from the 1977 meeting in Belgrade, the former Yugoslavia. The discourse includes the idea of a gradual progression. Some amount of access may be allowed, but self-management may be postponed until sometime in the future. Freire’s theory allows for no such compromise. One either respects the culture of the other or falls back into domination and the ‘banking’ mode of imposed education. The UNESCO discourse talks in neutral terms about ‘the public’. Freire talked about ‘the oppressed’. Finally, the UNESCO discourse puts the main focus on the institution. Participatory or community radio means a radio station that is self-managed by those participating in it (Berrigan, 1979).91

The development of a participatory communication model has to take place in relation with overall societal emancipation processes at local, national as well as international levels. Several authors have been trying to summarize the criteria for such a communication model. The Latin American scholar Juan Somavia (1977, 1981) sums up the following (slightly adapted) components as essential for it:

(a) *Communication is a human need*: The satisfaction of the need for communication is just as important for a society as the concern for health, nutrition, housing, education and labour. Together with all the other social needs, communication must enable the citizens to emancipate themselves completely. The rights to inform and to be informed, and the right to communicate, are thus essential human rights and these both individually and collectively.
(b) Communication is a delegated human right: Within its own cultural, political, economic and historical context, each society has to be able to define independently the concrete form in which it wants to organize its social communication process. Because there are a variety of cultures, there can therefore also arise various organizational structures. But whatever the form in which the social communication function is embodied, priority must be given to the principles of participation and accessibility.

(c) Communication is a facet of the societal conscientization, emancipation and liberation process. The social responsibility of the media in the process of social change is very large. Indeed, after the period of formal education, the media are the most important educational and socialization agents. They are capable of informing or disinforming, exposing or concealing important facts, interpreting events positively or negatively, and so on.

(d) The communication task involves rights and responsibilities/obligations. Since the media in fact provide a public service, they must carry it out in a framework of social and juridical responsibility that reflects the social consensus of the society. In other words, there are no rights without obligation.

Diffusion and Uses of Participatory Communication in Development Programs

Participatory communication posits that communities should be the main protagonists of processes of social change rather than ‘passive beneficiaries’ of decisions made by foreign experts. In this sense, it questions the view of development as an externally-driven process planned and implemented by Western technical experts. For participatory theorists, ‘developmentalism’ offers a patronizing approach that assumed that outside expertise ‘know better’ than communities. Second, participatory communication proposes a ‘communitarian’ view that makes deliberation and participation in public affairs, rather than information-
transmission (including message design and media technologies), the essential elements of communication. Third, participatory communication conceives ‘development’ as a transformative process at both individual and social levels through which communities become empowered. This differs from the view that links development to the achievement of economic progress and political institutions associated with Western democracies. Fourth, participatory communication promotes local forms of knowledge and action as the springboard for social change. This view is in sharp contrast with modernization and diffusionism that basically see local cultures as obstacles to progress and development. Although participation is essentially about, as Robert Chambers (1997)\textsuperscript{94} put it, ‘whose reality counts?,’ the literature identifies three key dimensions of participation in development programs (Uphoff, 1985)\textsuperscript{95}. First, it refers to the centrality of local knowledge in determining problems, identifying solutions, and assessing results. Communities, rather than experts or other external agents, should determine challenges and decide appropriate courses of action to tackle problems through dialogue and critical thinking. Second, communities have a protagonist role in making decisions about the goals and the direction of programs and actions. If decisions are left to agencies and their cadres of professionals, programs and actions are disconnected from the actual motivations and expectations of communities. Third, communities need to be involved in the implementation of activities. When actions are conducted by external actors, communities are displaced to a secondary role and thus remain distant from actions that are, in principle, designed to have an impact on their lives. Empowerment is the result of the process by which communities decide what to do, lead where to go, and are involved in actions. Participation plays a weaker role in the first two components than the third one. Available evidence suggests that development
programs are more likely to feature active communities involved in the implementation of activities rather than assessing problems and solutions or making decisions about goals (Holland and Blackburn, 1998). Participatory action research and similar methodologies that foreground community knowledge are circumstantially used, but they are rarely the starting point.

**Consequences for Participatory Communication Research**

Participatory research is related to the above mentioned processes of conscientization and empowerment. It was probably Paulo Freire himself who introduced the first version of this approach in his philosophy of conscientization. Rather than agenda being defined by an academic elite and programs enacted by a bureaucratic elite for the benefit of an economic or political elite, participatory research involves people gaining an understanding of their situation, confidence and an ability to change that situation. Therefore, participatory research assumes a bias toward the poor rather than the professional. Robert White (1984, p. 28) says this is quite divergent from "the functionalist approach which starts with the scientist's own model of social and psychological behaviour and gathers data for the purpose of prediction and control of audience behaviour. The emphasis is on the awareness of the subjective meaning and organisation of reality for purposes of self-determination". Participatory research is *egalitarian*. Thematic investigation thus becomes a common striving towards awareness of reality and towards self-awareness. It is an *educational process* in which the roles of the educator and the educated are constantly reversed and the common search unites all those engaged in the endeavour. It immerses the exogenous "researcher" in the setting on an equal basis. Considering the necessary trust and attitudes as
well as cultural differences, the task is not easy, and makes unfamiliar demands on researchers/educators.

**Popularity of Participatory Research**

The research article ‘Principles Of and Obstacles To Participatory Communication Research’ (Servaes and Arnst, 1994)\textsuperscript{98}, explores the recent popularity of participatory research, the act of labeling it as such may have implied that it is something special that requires a particular expertise—a particular strategy or a specific methodology. Similar to participation, there has been great effort towards definitions and models of participatory research to lend an air of "respectability." Also similar to participation, perhaps this is no more than an attempt to claim title or credit for an approach which, by its very nature, belongs to the people involved. As one is dealing with people within changing social relations and cultural patterns, one cannot afford to be dogmatic about methods but should keep oneself open to people. This openness comes out of a trust in people and a realisation that the oppressed are capable of understanding their situation, searching for alternatives and taking their own decisions.

Because there is no reality "out there" separate from human perception and, as put forth in the multiplicity paradigm (Servaes, 1989)\textsuperscript{99}, there is no universal path to development, it is maintained that each community or grouping must proceed from its own plan in consideration of its own situation. In other words, to the extent the methodology is rigidly structured by the requisites of academia, participatory research is denied. By its nature, this type of research does not incorporate the rigid controls of the physical scientist or the traditional models of social science researchers. Chantana and Wun Gaeo (1985)\textsuperscript{100} state: “There is no magic formula for the methodology of such PR projects. However, there are
common features taking place in the process: (1) It consists of continuous dialogue and
discussion among research participants in all stages; and (2) Knowledge must be derived
from concrete situations of the people and through collaborative reflection ... return to the
people, continuously and dialectically”.

Therefore, to delineate participatory research as an educational process involves three
interrelated parts:

(1) Collective definition and investigation of a problem by a group of people struggling
to deal with it. This involves the social investigation which determines the concrete
condition existing within the community under study, by those embedded in the
social context;

(2) Group analysis of the underlying causes of their problems, which is similar to the
conscientization and pedagogical processes addressed above, and;

(3) Group action to attempt to solve the problem. Therefore, the process of participatory
research is cyclical, continuous, local, and accessible. Study-rejection-action is the
integrating process in this type of research. Kronenburg (1986) gives the following
characteristics of participatory research:

It rests on the assumption that human beings have an innate ability to create knowledge. It
rejects the notion that knowledge production is a monopoly of "professionals"; It is seen as
an educational process for the participants ... as well as the researcher; It involves the
identification of community needs, augmented awareness about obstacles to need
fulfillment, an analysis of the causes of the problems and the formulation and
implementation of relevant solutions; The researcher is consciously committed to the cause
of the community involved in the research. This challenges the traditional principle of
scientific neutrality and rejects the position of the scientist as a social engineer. Dialogue provides for a framework which guards against manipulative scientific interference and serves as a means of control by the community.

**Rural Development**

Rural development defies any clear definition as it has gone through a number of changes over a period of time. Hence, there is no comprehensive universally accepted definition of rural development. Earlier, rural development was commonly understood and expressed by political leaders, academics and a whole lot of UN bodies as an enabling force for improvement of the quality of life of rural people. Development, as a process meant to empower the poor, reduce exploitation, and oppression by those having economic, social, and political power. It also means an equitable sharing of resources, improved health care and education for all. One of the major components and driving force of rural development is communication. Persuasive communication for rural development has been given highest priority for bringing about desirable social and behavioural change among the most vulnerable rural poor and women. Initially, the approach lacked gender sensitivity and empathy of the communicators and development agents who came from urban elite homes. Added to these constraints is the political will that still influences the pace and progress of rural development.

The literature on rural development is characterised by a mix of theory and practice: “that is both ideas about how ‘development’ should or might occur, and real world efforts to put various aspects of development into practice.” (Potter, 2002: 61) The vision and priorities for rural development closely reflect changing global development trends and relations of power and influence. Yet investment in and support for a broadly ‘pro-poor’ rural
development can be a useful indicator reflecting the extent to which the governments and international institutions are serious about reducing poverty and inequality.

‘Rural Development: Putting the last first’ by Robert Chambers (1983)\textsuperscript{103} evaluates rural poverty which is often unseen or misperceived by outsiders. Dr. Chambers contends that researchers, scientists, administrators and fieldworkers rarely appreciate the richness and validity of rural people's knowledge or the hidden nature of rural poverty. In the first chapter of the book ‘Rural Poverty Unperceived’, he highlights the six biases for the rural poverty un-observed. These six set of biases: (i) Spatial biases: urban, tarmac and roadside, (ii) Project biases, (iii) Person biases, (iv) Dry season biases, (v) Diplomatic biases-politeness and timidity and (vi) Professional biases, are not confined in pursuit of developing rural tourism but validates its core prospects for the scholars and practitioners in the field of rural development.

Histories of thinking about rural development often attempt to periodise different approaches and key ideas by decades. In part these reflect the preoccupations of the four United Nations (UN) development decades which commenced in the 1960s. Hence it is often said that:

- 1960s are associated with modernisation approaches emphasising technology transfer.
- 1970s are associated with large scale state development interventions and integrated rural development programmes.
- 1980s are associated with market liberalisation and attempts to roll back the state.
- 1990s are characterised as being strongly process focused with an emphasis on participation and empowerment within a context of diversifying rural livelihood opportunities.
By end of 1990s a more balanced approach had started to emerge but there remains no agreement worldwide on how to get the right mix. (Ibid)

2000s have focus poverty eradication, reinvigoration of small holder agriculture, sustainable farming systems and the location of producers within global value chains.

However, Ellis and Biggs caution that rural policies have not evolved in such a neat, linear and schematic manner and that “there are leads and lags in the transmission of new ideas across space and time” (Ellis & Biggs, 2001)\textsuperscript{104}.

The current decade has been characterised by flux and fragmentation in development thinking and rural development policy despite the overarching focus of attaining the Millennium Development Goals. This has been accompanied by increasing concern about the depoliticisation of issues inherent in policy development processes. It has been argued that rationalist models tend to depoliticise the issues which are the focus of policy through the use of neutral scientific language. ‘This masking of the political under the cloak of neutrality is a key feature of modern power (Shore and Wright, 1997 in Sutton, 1999)\textsuperscript{105}.

The start of the decade was marked by the dominance of broader livelihoods approaches which replaced a more conventional and narrow sectoral foci on small farmers, agriculture and the non farm economy. However people have experienced difficulties in practically applying livelihoods thinking to the design of rural development programmes and currently there appears to be a refocusing on the potential of agriculture and natural resources to make a contribution to economic growth and household livelihood security. This has been accompanied by an increasing emphasis on decentralisation and the principle of subsidiarity which holds that decisions need to be taken as close to the citizenry and the local level as possible. There remains a tension between more transdisciplinary thinking and the
reassertion of sector wide development approaches. Issues of good governance and
decentralisation remain important, but at the same time there has been critique of what
passes for participation and the lack of meaningful downward accountability in the
decentralisation process.

‘Planning Development and Disparities in Rural India’ edited by Ashok Kumar (1990) focuses on the diverse aspects of the subject in five sections. The rural development and its main tenets such as participation, integration and democratic decentralization have been magnified with basic issues like poverty, inequality and unemployment. The Integrated Rural Development Program, strategies and approaches have been also critically reviewed. The issues related to infrastructural framework and appropriate technology has been given due emphasis. The book encompasses a wide range of contents and approaches in its ambit and, as such, it is expected to be of much interest to a vast spectrum of scholars, planners, policy makers and administrators involved in development planning of the country in general and rural areas in particular.

Communication and Rural Development (A Village of North Karnataka), by J.B. Ambedkar (Yadav) (1992), is a socio-anthropological and holistic study of the existing media and their role in rural development. A village Pothnal in Manvi Taluka, Raichur district, Karnataka was studied for more than a year during 1975-76. A re-study was made in 1988 in order to assess the nature of changes that have taken place in the village. Rural development which includes dissemination of ideas and technology in agriculture, health, hygiene, family welfare and others from sources outside as well as within the village has been thoroughly examined in perspective with the communication approach and with the socio-economic cultural context of the village. The author’s approach to the problem of rural development is
interdisciplinary and integrated. He has taken into account the interaction of technological, economic, socio-cultural and ecological factors in the village setting and beyond. The framework includes economic activity, family, life, health care, education, television communication and others. It is also part of the Indo-US Satellite Television Program, between the summers of 1975 and 1976. NASA launched the satellite ATS-7 for India, with the technical groundwork done by the Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO) of Ahmadabad. The author was able to study the effects of these gigantic technological experiments of human communication which was quite tangible. As he points out, in the decade of 1978-1988, enormous changes took place in Pothanal with regard to the use of agricultural technology, innovation and adoption of new farming methods. There were significant changes concerning cropping patterns, average expenditure and production per acre of cultivation.

**Women and Development**

In Rural Development through Women’s Participation and Electronic Media, edited by Sawalia Bihari Verma and Shiv Kumar Singh (2004), it has been said that lack of awareness of the latest developments in the field of agriculture science among a large number of farmers is a serious constraining factor. The electronic media has revolutionized the communication process resulting in the emergence of a lot of new communication devices like interactive computer video technology (ICVI). Computer aided systems (CAS) and Internet. Besides they have improved the old technologies like radio, television and videotapes broadcasting and other devices already playing an important role in communicating the agricultural technologies to farmers thus helped in improving the process of development. The book is an attempt to study all the possible aspects of social change and
assess the influences and benefits of various schemes, projects and programs launched by the government, cooperative societies and NGOs to the rural masses. It provides useful information about recent developments. In chapter 3 of the book, Development of Rural Infrastructure in Telecommunications, S.N. Mishra and Chaitali Pal discusses infrastructure for development of telecommunications as a priority area in a developing country like India.

‘Rural Women in South Asia’ edited by Jaya Arunchalam and U. Kalpagam (2013) highlights the commonalities and differences in rural women's experiences across the South Asia region. It argues that the low status and weak empowerment of rural women is due to the structural conditions of poverty and inequality in the region, the social and cultural shaping of gender ideologies, and the multiple patriarchies and caste and class dominance through which poor women experience power relations. However, a sense of optimism pervades as country experiences reflect the renewed concerns and commitments about rural women's empowerment in both state policy and the significant snowballing of social activism in the region. The essays in the book reiterate and importance of both poverty alleviation, providing decent work opportunities, investing in education and health, and involving women in decision making and governance such that their substantive empowerment is fostered by enhancing their capabilities, entitlements and choices.

‘Mass Media and Rural Development’ by Joni C. Joseph (1997) presents the characteristic feature of the Third World countries that are predominantly rural in character and having agrarian as well as subsistence-oriented economy. The transformation of these countries by structural changes in the total society has been the major emphasis in all the models of development. The role of the media in carrying the message of modern technology to the doorsteps of the rural folk has been examined:
• To enquire whether there exists any relationship between exposure to mass media and socio-economic development of the rural population; and, if it exists so, to find out the nature and extent of the relationship between the two.

• To analyze the difference, if any, in the exposure of the rural population to the press, the radio and cinema on account of the differences in the people’s age, religions, caste affiliation, income, educational attainment, socio-economic status and residence in areas with different social overheads.

• To find out the nature of influence of the mass media in the process of rural development.

The book, ‘Mass Media and Rural Development: A Study of Village Communication in Bihar’ by Arbind Sinha (1985) provides a micro-level, in-depth, and qualitative understanding of the process of socio-cultural changes triggered by the introduction of satellite television as a new medium of communication in a village of North Bihar. Field work for eighteen-month was conducted as part of SITE Social Evaluation Study. The objectives of the study were:

• “To study the process of existing rural communication in a village of Bihar and its role in rural development;

• To study the barriers of communication hindering rural development; and

• To study the socio-cultural implications of a technological innovation like television.”

In order to conduct the study in selected villages a research design was developed which would allow diachronic of, relating to, or dealing with phenomena (as of language or culture) as they occur or change over a period of time and there on continuous observations. The study clearly reveals a positive role that a medium like television can play in rural
development and the process through which a society moves to acquire capability of enhancing the people standard of living, primarily through the solution of its economic problems or increasing the per capita income. But the analysis also shows that more than the role of the television, the role of the developmental agencies assumes higher responsibilities in the appropriate utilization of the available media for rural development.

Mehra Masani (1975)\textsuperscript{112} in the book ‘Communication and Rural Progress,’ a collection of seminar papers mention various useful studies which need to be replicated all over the country. Research must identify problems and explore solutions. Communicators in India have been deprived of accurate data. Possibility of effective rural communication without the area profile covering the major occupational, socio-economic conditions, the age and sex ratios, the opportunities and possibilities of development, and so forth is a big question. For the first time such profiles of villages was prepared for the Satellite Instructional Television Experiment. This was the beginning of systematic studies of the kind all over the country. In Appendix D, ‘Communication Strategy for Rural Development’, a paper presented by D. Aurora, discusses the need for a comprehensive view of the total system of communication media and their relevance to the process of adoption. The process of communication can have two basic roles to play (a) creation of awareness, through general information and (b) adoption of an innovation through a conscious and planned use of communication tools. Both roles are important and complementary as adoption results out of awareness, if the process is one continuous chain of messages. Techniques and tools of dissemination will, however, differ from area to area depending upon the receptivity of the audience, and their level in the stage of development. By and large, communication tools in developing countries have been designed with a universal approach; to some extent this broad based
approach might serve for programs which have a generalized base, for example, education, family planning and others. Agricultural communication, however, becomes more complex when receptivity to innovation is dependent upon a host of variables, which have a direct bearing on how a farm is structured and the stage of transition which it has reached. Before a scientific policy for communication can be developed it becomes necessary for policy makers to have a thorough understanding of the farming systems of their audience.

Pradipto Roy, Frederick B. Waisanen and Everett M. Rogers (1969) in ‘The Impact Of Communication on Rural Development: ‘An Investigation in Costa Rica and India’ present the result of a co-operative project carried out by the Governments of Costa Rica and India. The purpose of the project was to make a comparative study, in two very different cultures, in which different means of communication could bring about better knowledge and adoption of desirable innovations in rural areas. The report on the Indian part of the project was prepared by Prodipto Roy, then at the National Institute of Community Development and the Costa Rica part by Frederick B. Waisanen and Jerome T. Durlak, Department of Communication, Michigan State University. UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) and the National Institute of Community Development have collaborated and contributed to the financing of the project.

Ranjit Singh (1993) in his book ‘Communication Technology for Rural Development’ discusses about the various media that can be employed in rural development and blends theory with practical guidelines. The book provides reasons while telling how it serves the scholar as well as the planner. The potential contribution of communication media, both modern and traditional, for rural development has been strongly support for research. The author has highlighted the role of technology in rural development, as stated
“Communication technology can play a significant role in developing rural resources and motivating the masses for adoption of new technology. It has the potential to widen horizons, to focus attention, to raise aspirations and to create a climate for development. In addition to transferring technology, communication channels have the potential to confer status, to enforce social norms, to help form tastes and could also affect lightly held attitudes. The challenge is to put the resources and the power of communication skillfully and fully behind economic and social development”.

Samirendra N. Ray (1995)\textsuperscript{115} in his book ‘Communication in Rural Development: A Public Policy Perspective’ seeks to achieve the following objectives, based on a careful perusal and assessment of the limited but potentially rich data available at the macro and the micro levels:

- “To study the broad trends of development-thinking and development-communication inter-relationship in the writings of Euro-American scholars who have for long influenced and conditioned Indian academic writings, and their acceptance or otherwise in India’s development-experience in the 1950s and the 1960s;
- To trace the emergence of the changing perceptions in these fields in the 1970s and the 1980s, and how far these were reflected in Indian thinking;
- To set the pattern of communication-development relationship in the proper Indian perspective, especially in the context of Indian society and culture;
- To identify the problem-areas and to investigate whether the perceived problem-areas have been adequately realized and acted upon in terms of government policy and its implementation;
To highlight the failure of the national government to evolve an explicit, well-articulated, integrated and comprehensive national communication policy as a supportive input to development in general and rural development in particular, and its negative impact on the development-situation in the country;

To analyze the broad approaches to and strategies of rural development in India and the role of Development Support Communication in facilitating and promoting rural development policies, plans and programs;

To project the inter-active relationship between research and public policy-making, in this case, communication research and a national policy for Development Support Communication; and take a close look at the state-of-the-art communication research in India in recent years; and

To indicate the guidelines, directions, priorities and mechanism for formulating such policy and planning for the country in the light of the existing machinery and mechanism of public policy-making at the national and state levels”.

The author has examined in the Indian context, a skilful synthesis between traditional and folk media of communication on the one hand, and the modern audio-visual media including satellite communication on the other which is being attempted on a large scale. So far as programs for rural development are concerned, almost all AIR stations broadcast rural programs in different languages and in local dialects. It was in 1966 that AIR, in consultation with the Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation, set up Farm and Home Units in selected AIR stations to provide relevant and problem-oriented technical information to the farmers of a small homogenous area with similarity of agro-climatic conditions.
Sybil L. James (1994)\textsuperscript{116} in ‘Facilitating Communication within Rural and Marginal Communities: A Model for Development Support’ is an attempt for reappraisal of marginal communities. It examines development constraints and networks in rural communities and raises questions about the education of communication specialists in the Third World. It also explores the alternative ways in which development communicators can make effective use of their expertise in an arena already besieged by development workers, projects and ambivalent attitudes. In the summary part of this paper, it has been argued that “Professional communicators represent one of a number of groups working in support of development in Third World countries. Their role of interpreting communication messages and linking the people with the government is essentially a supportive one. At the same time, they have a responsibility to assist in the ‘consciousness raising’ and the ‘awakening of critical awareness in the poor and the marginal people’.

Juan E. Bordenave (1977)\textsuperscript{117}, in his book ‘Communication and Rural Development’ examines the hypothesis that much recent and present-day use of communication media for rural development does not take adequate account of the theoretical work done so far on the function of communication media in reaching rural adult populations and on the nature of the diffusion process. In other words, to ask: Is there a gap between theory and practice in rural development efforts involving communication media? If such a gap does exist, it indicates how those designing and execution of rural development projects could make better use of theory. The way theoreticians and practioners could work more closely in the future in solving their communication problems must be given due emphasis. Chapter 2 of the book, examines a representative group of past rural development projects using
communication media, providing for each, where every possible information on a series of key variables that help analyze these case studies.

Sudesh Misra (2010)\textsuperscript{118} in the book, ‘Development Concerns in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century’ has explored sustainable rural development in India towards the Gandhian framework. Mahatma Gandhi, perhaps the most important thinker and social activist of the century showed India not only the way to win freedom from the British but also to get rid of the tyranny of modern civilization. Gandhi was highly critical of modern civilization, he called it satanic and said “this civilization is such that one has only to be patient and it will be self-destroyed” (M.K.Gandhi in \textit{Hind Sawaraj} p.34). A development model which is unable to remove mass poverty, which fails to bridge the gap between rural and urban areas and between haves and have-nots, and which cannot guaranty even the basic needs (food, clothing, shelter, health, education, security and self-esteem) of the people, can be pursued only to invite chaos-social, economic and moral. Misra has minutely observed the poor standard of rural population living in a vicious circle of poverty and under development. He discussed about the migration issue, where a few migrate to over crowded cities but the cities offer nothing better. Only those who are educated and skilled make migration a success story. The rest are condemned to live in slums and \textit{jhuggi-jhopadis} and to eke out a living from what is known as the informal sector of urban economy. He further examined, no less than 50 per cent of the rural population of India live below the poverty line though the official estimates bring it down to 30 per cent or less. But even 30 per cent means 325 million people. It is more than the total population of all other countries of the world except China.

India Rural Development Report 2012-13 (Oct, 2013)\textsuperscript{119} prepared by Infrastructure Development Finance Company (IDFC Foundation-Chennai) in collaboration with network
partners: Centre for Economic and Social Studies (CESS- Hyderabad), Institute of Rural Management Anand (IRMA-Gujarat), Indira Gandhi Institute of Development Research (IGIDR-Mumbai) along with the contributions from other researchers, experts and civil society organisations working on the ground. It is a lucid compilation of issues pertaining to rural livelihood and sustainability. Rural India is undergoing a sweeping transformation. The narratives vary from rural resurgence and expanding consumption to conflicts, poverty and distress. In this complex and multi-layered context, this report delves into various aspects of rural development. The Report is also unique as it provides a comprehensive current picture of rural India and brings together into a single compilation a review and analysis of the evolving rural economy. Further, implications of rural economy on social relations; contours of regional inequality, social and economic deprivation; inequalities in access to education, healthcare and physical infrastructure; changing nature of livelihoods with commercialisation and small holder farms and growing non-farm opportunities; sustainability of natural resources, so critical to rural livelihoods, and the conflicts over resources; and changing role of the state and local self-governance has been featured. The Report also reviews all major central government rural programmes and schemes and, in particular, provides an in-depth assessment of the flagship rural employment guarantee programme, MGNREGA. It covers debates on topical issues; provides empirical analyses; synthesises literature across a spectrum of issues; presents inspiring stories and innovative models to show what works and what does not.

‘Indian Development: Selected Regional Perspectives’ by Jean Dreze, Amartya Sen (1997) explores India as a nation of great diversity. The commonly used indicators of
'quality of life' (such as life expectancy, infant mortality, and literacy) vary tremendously between the different states, rivaling international contrasts between very low performing countries and very high achieving ones. This volume of essays reflects an attempt to draw lessons from the disparate experiences within India, rather than from contrasts with the experiences of other countries. It supplements Dreze and Sen's India: Economic Development and Social Opportunity, which studies what we can learn from international comparisons of policies, actions, and achievements. The essays challenge exclusively economic judgments of the development process. The first task is to identify the ends of economic and social development in order to have a basis in which to found the means and strategies. The second task is to understand a wider range of means than those related simply to the use or non-use of markets. The first two overview essays study the issues at the national level, focusing on policy debates and district-by-district demographic indicators, respectively. They are followed by detailed case studies of three very different states: Uttar Pradesh, Kerala, and West Bengal. The chapter “Uttar Pradesh: The Burden of Inertia”, contributed by Jean Drèze and Haris Gazdar, gives an insight to the problems of economic and social backwardness in Uttar Pradesh and its causal antecedents. Among these are the disastrous functioning of public services in rural areas, the persistence of widespread illiteracy, and the suppression of women's agency in society. This chapter also talks about the social and political circumstances underlying these diverse failures. The term ‘inertia’ has been significantly used with two aspects, (i) apathy of the state and (ii) failure of civil society to challenge oppressive patterns of caste, class and gender relations. Although the authors focus is on Uttar Pradesh, they argue that the ‘inertia’ explanation also applies to other backward regions of North India.
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