Communication for
Social and Behaviour Change
Learning Module Series

Studies on Development
History, Theories & Concepts

MODULE 1

unicef | for every child

Coordinators and leading contributors:

Paolo Mefalopulos is currently UNICEF Representative, Chile. He was the Chief of Communication for Development (C4D) at UNICEF India Country Office from June 2009 to March 2014. His expertise is in participatory communication research and planning. While working for FAO, Paolo was part of a team that developed an innovative methodology known as PRCA – Participatory Rural Communication Appraisal. He also taught at the University of Texas at Austin, where he obtained his Ph.D. in international communication. He authored several articles and books on communication for development. His most recent works, published by the World Bank are: *Development Communication Sourcebook: broadening the boundaries of communication* and *Participatory Communication: A practical guide.*

Mario Mosquera-Vasquez currently works as Regional Advisor, Communication for Development (Social Change); UNICEF's Europe and Central Asia Regional Office (ECARO). He worked as Chief C4D. India from Sept 2014 Mar 2019. He has over 20 years of experience working on a variety of health promotion, health communication, community mobilization interventions and research projects, primarily in Latin America and Asia. His doctorate in public health is from the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK. He worked as a visiting research scholar at Ohio University, USA, and consulted with European universities such as the University of Heidelberg, Germany, and the Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, UK, in a Latin American Research Center. He has published research articles in international journals and authored in various books chapters.

Dr. Silvio Waisbord is a Professor in the School of Media and Public Affairs at George Washington University. He holds a Ph.D. in sociology from the University of California, San Diego. His most recent book (co-edited with Rafael Obregon) is *Handbook of Global Health Communication* (Wiley). He is editor-in-chief of the International Journal of Press/Politics. Dr. Waisbord has lectured and worked in more than 30 countries, has written or edited 8 books, and published more than 100 journal articles, book chapters, and newspaper columns. He has worked in communication for social change, particularly in program design and implementation, as well as capacity strengthening and training.

Chike Anyaegbunam is a Professor at School of Journalism and Telecommunications, College of Communication and Information in the University of Kentucky. He is the Director, Dissemination and Implementation Sciences Consortium (DISC). He earned a doctorate degree in journalism and mass communication from the University of Iowa. His areas of expertise are: participatory communication and people empowerment, public relations and integrated strategic communication, social marketing, international development and rural health communication. He has published extensively in peer review journals.

Developed 2013; Updated 2019.

Studies on Development
History, Theories & Concepts

MODULE 1

MODULE 1

Studies on development:
History, theories and concepts

The module is designed to provide students with an overview of the history and evolution of development studies. In this module, students will learn about main theories, analytical premises and critiques. Emphasis will be given to understanding the influence of theoretical models on development policies and programmes. Particular attention is paid on the impact of theories and practice in India.

Key competencies

After this module, students should be able to demonstrate the following competencies:

- Knowledge of basic theories and models in development
- Critical analysis of key theories and models
- Develop coherent arguments about the strengths and limitations of theories and models
- Ability to explain theories and models and understand practical implications

Unit 1   Early theories and models of development

Unit 2   Contemporary theories of development

Unit 3   Human rights-based approach to development

Unit 4   Approaches to development in India

Unit 5   Communication for development: Theories, models and debates

MODULE 1
UNIT 1

Early theories and models of development

General introduction

This unit critically examines the emergence of development theories and issues since the late 1940s, following the expansion of the Marshall Plan to parts of the world beyond Europe. The unit emphasises the dominance of economic growth, trickle-down theory, technology transfer and modernisation as development goals. It also discusses the early critique of this dominant paradigm formulated by the dependency theory and the emergence of alternative development thinking.

What are conventionally seen as development theories refers to debates and a body of literature that emerged in the post-war era in response to new international challenges, particularly the process of decolonisation around the world and the massive differences between the 'developed' West and the 'underdeveloped' rest of the world.

Development as both a notion and a project, however, was not born half a century ago. It is a much older concept, historically grounded in the evolution of European colonialism. Indeed, the idea of development as a project of human improvement and management of social change was intrinsic to colonialism. European powers were convinced that their global expansion was not simply the imposition of power upon other people, but a mission for human betterment through the dissemination of specific political, economic, social and cultural orders. Obviously, this position meant the devaluation of the complexity, richness and knowledge of people worldwide. 'Development' was premised on the conviction that there was one sure, 'European' path to human progress and happiness. Colonial understanding of development left a deep imprint on notions of development. It laid the ground for teleological arguments that view development as a path, as a sequence that, sooner or later, would reach humankind. Also, it promoted the notion that 'development' was identified with a certain interpretation of the European experience – modernisation, science, democracy, capitalism, etc.

This view articulated theories and models of development that dominated the international debates in the post-war period. Two questions drove the debate over 'development': How do we explain remarkable differences in the political, economic, and social orders around the world? What should be done to mitigate, if not overcome, such differences?

Under the influence of the modernisation paradigm, the taxonomy originally used to understand global differences implicitly set up the interpretative parameters. As demonstrated by government documents and a wealth of academic studies, the world was divided into 'developed'/'modern' and 'underdeveloped'/ 'non-modern' countries. This categorisation was ethnocentric, premised on normative assumptions about desirable social orders, and established a ladder from one to another extreme. Modernisation proposed the idea of a necessary, forward-moving, linear process by which countries increasingly develop features associated with modernity – industrial economy, democratic politics, legal-bureaucratic administration. These features were found in the 'lead' cases of the West – the powers that had triumphed in the Second World War and supposedly incarnated the successful culmination of the Western experience. And so, modernisation became the yardstick to measure social and human development around the world—the normative horizon that should be considered as the point of arrival for global humankind. No doubt, the modernisation paradigm represented the Western, post-war unbound optimism that envisioned a bright future filled with industrialism and prosperity, increased productivity and consumption, liberal democracy, and the reduction of socio-economic differences. At the height of the Cold War, modernisation was proposed as the panacea to improve lives in Latin America, Asia and Africa and deal with poverty, illiteracy, poor health and other social ills—it offered the solution for the rest of the world to 'catch up' with the West. Undoubtedly, in the context of Cold War politics, modernisation was submitted to be a viable alternative to the communist model for countries to transition into modernity and development. The modernisation paradigm offered a 'developmentalist' vision that placed capitalist economic development at the centre of social change as the desirable and only path to human progress.

The modernisation paradigm was challenged by 'dependency' theories. These theories drew from economic structuralism and Marxist positions that criticised the terms of economic development under capitalism and its consequences for world economies. The main criticism was the modernisation's analysis which ignored that the 'development' of the West was the flip side of the 'underdeveloped' South. How Europe developed could not be understood aside from the historical development of colonialism and imperialism. Because the rest of the world had developed in ways that were 'dependent' on European designs and policies, the former colonies were left with a legacy of poverty and exploitation. The global division of labour produced by colonial policies was largely responsible for different levels of economic, political and social development. The disparities were the outcome of a historical process by which the West became industrialised and achieved economic growth and political democracy.

The 'world-systems' analysis built on the dependency model by arguing that an integrated analysis is necessary to understand how global dynamics driven by European expansionism shaped social systems worldwide. Also, it emphasised the need to understand economic relations between countries in the 'core' and the 'periphery' to analyse politics, society and culture. Because the world was dominated by the one single logic – the expansion of European capitalism – it was necessary to understand how this unifying dynamic determined the evolution of different parts of the world system.

Although this critique of the modernisation paradigm questioned its narrow analysis that established a model of change in economic stages as well as its normative premises, it offered alternative notions of development that demanded a sort of different economic policies (such as import-substitution industrialisation) and social redistributionism. It challenged modernisation's myopic interpretation of international history, and the assumption that the model of industrial capitalism and political democracy, represented by the United States, could be necessarily achieved if the rest of the world emulated the West.

Questions for discussion

- What is development?
- What is modernisation? What are the critiques of the modernisation paradigm?
- What are the differences and similarities among development theories?
- How are theories embedded in specific historical contexts?

Reading list

Required readings

Cardoso, F. H. and E. Faletto. 1979. Dependency and Development in Latin America. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Frank, Andre Gunder. 1966. Latin America: Underdevelopment or Revolution, chapter 1.

Escobar, Arturo.1995. Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World, chapter 1. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Green Revolution: Curse or blessing. http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/pubs/pubs/ib/ib11.pdf

McMichael, Philip, Editor. Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective, chapter 2. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Rostow, W. W. 1962. The Stages of Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chapter 2. http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=5740393

Streeten, Paul. 1977. The Distinctive Features of a Basic Needs Approach to Development. http://www.palgravejournals.com/development/collections/pdf/human_development/paul_streeten.pdf

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1976. The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century. New York: Academic Press, pp. 229-233. http://media.pfeiffer.edu/lridener/courses/WORLDSYS.HTML

Supplementary readings

Seers, Dudley. 1969. The Meaning of Development. International Development Review 11(4): 3-4.

Stewart, F. and Streeten, P. 1976. New Strategies for Development: Poverty, Income Distribution, and Growth. Oxford Economic Papers, New Series 28 (3): 381-405.

Case study

Intelligence consultancy Nambia. Iran's White Revolution: A Critique Modernisation Theory. November 14, 2012 http://intelliconn.wordpress.com/2012/11/14/irans-white-revolution-a-critique-of-modernisation-theory/

Learning activities

The learning activities should be aimed at developing the following competencies:

- Identify key concepts and arguments in theories and models about development

- Analyse similarities and differences between modernisation and critical theories

- Discuss the applicability of classic arguments to contemporary contexts by analysing specific factors/processes/trends that informed early development thinking

Lectures, small group discussions, debates and presentations

1. Group work to produce glossary of key theoretical concepts (between 10 and 20 concepts).

2. Group work to produce diagnosis of a global development challenge (selected by students) based on one theory and a short critique based on a different model.

3. Students are asked to discuss the contemporary relevance of classic concepts and arguments, and provide examples of policies/programs that are embedded in classic models.

4. Based on news articles/short academic research, discuss how a contemporary development challenge in India could be analysed by two classic theories/models presented in the readings

Unit assessment/evaluation methods

- In-class exercises

- Case study/scenario analysis and challenge

- Assignments: Oral and written presentations

- Written assignment
  http://en.wekipedia.org/wiki/modernisation (this link provides case studies of US/Europe/Asia/Eurasia

MODULE 1
UNIT 2

Contemporary theories of development

General introduction

This unit covers contemporary development theories, including globalisation, gender, environment, sustainable development, participatory development and human development. The unit also discusses the emergence of governance and accountability as major issues in the development arena.

In the past few decades, a range of theories has questioned the overall 'development' framework and project developed by the West during the post-war years. The challenge to modernisation was deemed necessary for both analytical and normative reasons. Analytically, the categories developed in the 1950s do not apply to a world that was significantly different than the international order that emerged after the Second World War. Globalisation or the affirmation of market-based economy around the world changed basic economic, political and social dynamics. It intensified interconnectivity through the consolidation of financial industrial, political and cultural networks. The reality of an interconnected world could not be comprehended with categories that corresponded to a different time.

Also, it was necessary to revisit the normative assumption of modernisation. Its economistic and universalistic premises that identify social change with a narrow perspective of desirable futures and pathways to transformation were deemed problematic and patronising. The vision of one path to development as outlined by the West was challenged by perspectives that underscore the importance of cultural pluralism, participation and choice as central to the improvement of the human condition. At the same time, alternative models questioned the normative premises of a model of Western modernity that champions an order built on social exploitation, the plundering of natural resources, discrimination and violence. No project of social change can ignore the multiplicity of the human experience or deny the importance of local knowledge and sovereignty in the process by which communities outline goals and take action. If self-determination is put at the centre of human development, then, it is necessary to revisit the premises of modernisation.

While acknowledging that the critique of 'developmentalism' is wide-ranging, this module focuses on theories that have raised two critical issues that are absent in the modernisation paradigm: alternative definitions of human development and participation as central to development.

One line of thinking is identified with the work of Amaryta Sen who has argued that development should aim to unleash the capacity of individuals to realise their potential. Development should not be simply associated with economic indicators or changes in economic standing. Prosperity does not necessarily mean freedom. Development as freedom demands strengthening individual ability to have political rights, economic facilities, opportunities, transparency and protection. Poor people lack opportunities and choices, not just economic means. So, development policies should aim at improving individuals' chances at various freedoms. Central to Sen's model is that development requires individuals helping themselves. Rather than focusing on conventional indicators such as GDP or employment as proxy for development, the analysis should assess whether individuals are responsible and capable of making choices. Human capital is more important than economic capital. Therefore, ways to improve human capital, such as education and training, are critical. Inclucating good, 'ethical' behaviour among individuals is the main goal of social transformation.

The other critical innovation in development studies was the rise of participatory theories. These approaches questioned developmentalism insofar as it offered a view of expert-led, top-down, externally-imposed change. Instead, it proposed a notion of development as participation – citizens' active engagement in public affairs to express opinions, conduct dialogue, and identify needs and actions. The modernisation paradigm completely ignored the need to involve citizens as true protagonists of development, and favoured models based on knowledge accumulated by experts and leaders. Development as participation demands maximising opportunities for people to express their voices and deploy their knowledge and skills. Decentralisation, local knowledge, empowerment and human rights are critical notions that need to be prioritised by development actions.

Among several authors identified with the participatory approach, Robert Chambers stands out as someone who pioneered participatory methodologies such as Participatory Rural Appraisal that are widely used in development programmes. Chambers' approach is embedded in ideas originally developed by Brazilian educator Paulo Freire – the notion that participation is raising consciousness about social conditions and identifying causes and solutions. Chambers' work is situated at the crossroads of innovative approaches developed either independently or collectively in various regions of the world.

The increased acceptability of participatory theories reflects significant changes in the political economy of many countries. Economic and political reforms including decentralisation and significant advances toward liberal democracy have definitely raised expectations about community/local participation. Many countries have institutionalised participatory mechanisms to promote citizens' engagement in government, elections, referenda, budgets, debates and decisions. Evidence remains mixed about the impact of myriad initiatives on reverting top-down forms of policy-making and political participation.

Questions for discussion

- What definitions of development are proposed by Sen and Chambers?
- How do they compare to other approaches to development?
- What are the practical applications of the theories presented?
- What are the strengths and limitations of these theories?
- What programmes are grounded in the principles discussed in this module?

Reading list

Required readings

Chambers, Robert. 1997. Rural Development: Putting the Last First. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Chambers, Robert. 1997. Whose Reality Counts? Putting the First Last. London: Intermediate Technology Publication.

Osmani, S. 2008. Participatory governance: An overview of issues and evidence. Retrieved from http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/UN/UNPAN028359.pdf

Sen, Amartya. 1983. Development: Which Way Now? The Economic Journal 93, 372: 745-762.

Sen, Amartya. 1999. Development as Freedom. New York: Knopf.

United Nations Development Programme. The Human Development Reports (HDR). Retrieved from http://hdr.undp.org/en/humandev/

World Bank. Accountability in Governance. http://siteresources.worldbank.org/PUBLICSECTORANDGOVERNANCE/Resources/AccountabilityGovernance.pdf

Supplementary readings

Cornwall, A. and Gaventa, J. 2001. From users and choosers to makers and shapers: repositioning participation in social policy. IDS working paper no. 127, Retrieved from http://www.pnet.ids.ac.uk/dbtwwpd/exec/dbtwpcgi.exe?QB0=AND&QF0=NO@RRNO&QI0=3935&MR=15&TN=a2&DF=f1cro&RF=f1cro&DL=0&RL=0&NP=3&MF=eldismsg.ini&AC=QBE_QUERY&BU=http%3A//www.pnet.ids.ac.uk/database.htm

Andrews, Matthew, and Anwar Shah. 2003. Citizen-centered governance: A new approach to public sector reform. Washington, DC: The World Bank. Retrieved from http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/206961/CitizenCenteredGovernanceANew.pdf

Case studies

Projects that use innovative gender-responsive approaches to address gender inequalities http://go.worldbank.org/ECX6CB6JR0

Rose, Kalima. (1992). Where Women are Leaders: The SEWA Movement in India. pp. 15-35, 118-155, 263-275. http://www.sewa.org/index.asp

Accountability in India. Case studies at http://www.worldbank.org/socialaccountability_sourcebook/Regional%20database/india.htm

Learning activities

The learning activities should be aimed at developing the following competencies:

- Explain key concepts and arguments in contemporary theories and models.
- Critical analysis of alternatives to developmentalism.
- Demonstrate the practical implications of alternative models of development.
- Identify conceptual innovations in contemporary theories.
- Collaborative learning and reflexivity.
- Argumentation skills.

Lectures, small group discussions and presentations

1. Ask students in small groups to present summaries of theories and their practical implications.

2. Conduct debate between two development positions/theories about a topic to be selected by students in consultation with instructor. Each group should prepare a short presentation that explains how the problem is defined, analyze and addressed by one theory discussed in class and readings.

3. Group work to identify the theoretical premises and discuss the achievements of participatory programmes.

4. Produce situation assessment of a hypothetical problem premised on either Sen's ideas or participatory model of development. Identify key questions and issues to be studied as well as suitable methodologies to conduct studies.

Unit assessment/evaluation methods

- In-class exercises
- Case study analysis
- Assignments: Oral and written presentations

MODULE 1
UNIT 3

Human rights-based approach
to development

General introduction

This unit focuses on the principles and elements of human rights and discusses their applications in development programming. It offers an overview on the history of rights-based approaches, key concepts and arguments, and main innovations and contributions to development theory and practice.

The 'rights-based' approach to development has been central to development programs and debates for the past decades. Although this notion remains a matter of continuous discussion, it foregrounds ideas of participation and empowerment as both mechanisms and objectives of development. Whilst mindful of the fact that human-rights based approach can be manipulated and endorsed only rhetorically, various agencies and observers have made persuasive arguments for why it needs to be at the centre of development initiatives. Certainly, underscoring the importance of rights as central to human life is not truly novel. Long traditions in both Western and Eastern thought have stressed the importance of individual and collective rights. Rights to self-determination, cultural sovereignty, individual safety, expression, privacy and others have long been seen as central to human development. From anti-colonial struggles to debates about the New International Economic Order, various movements have emphasised the importance of rights. Consequently, rights-based approaches should not be narrowly seen as embedded only in Western, modern traditions, but instead, as universal values grounded in various cultural, social and religious traditions.

If rights are not new, then, what makes them an important and recent innovation in development? The difference lies in the relatively recent adoption of rights-based approaches and discourse by several government and international agencies as part of the efforts to overcome the limitations of past approaches focused on social and economic development. During the 1990s, United Nations agencies and other aid actors introduced important changes that put rights at the centre. The significance of rights is part of decade-long movements to expand and redefine the notions of development established during the Cold War. Defining poverty as a human-rights violation and articulation of the notion that access to health, food, and housing as human rights are no small achievements if we consider past, narrow understandings of human development.

Arguments for the centrality of rights can be classified as follows: normative, pragmatic and ethical. The normative argument is that rights direct attention to the need to place specific values at the centre of development and make politics critical for social change. It conceives citizens, not as 'beneficiaries' of other people's actions, but rather, as owners and demanders of rights vis-à-vis states and other forms of power. On the basis of rights, citizens hold actors and themselves accountable for ensuring that they are observed. Rights are not simply given by benevolent actors, but are rather demanded by mobilised citizens.

Pragmatically, rights-based approaches provide benchmarks to assess progress, achievements and make demands. Rights are the basis for making government, agencies and other actors accountable – for measuring whether they fulfil their obligations and meet international and national commitments. Related to this issue is the question of 'international rights' as necessary and important frameworks to make demands on national actors, particularly if the latter disregard or purposefully ignore them. Here the impact of globalisation is evident and unquestionably positive, for it has expanded the framework and the language of rights in ways that empower citizens to make demands and monitor their governments' performance according to supra-national legislation and principles. As rights-bearing, global subjects, citizens may require democratic governments to meet their duties as members of international communities and signatories of global agreements.

The third dimension of rights-based approaches refers to the ethical obligations implicit in development. It brings up questions about the duties and responsibilities vis-à-vis fellow human beings. It signals the commitment to an ethical vision of equality and power. It means that development entails a political process by which citizens demand, achieve and enforce rights.

Although it places question in a global scenario of international treaties and common aspirations, a rights-based approach directs attention to the significance of local contexts: histories of rights-based struggles, definitions of rights, socio-cultural foundations of rights, modes of petition and mobilisations, and achievements and failures.

Important questions still lack obvious answers: What if citizens are unable to access institutions to enforce their rights? How are international rights monitored? What global and local actions are successful to promote, institutionalise and monitor rights? How are development agencies and governments held accountable if they fail to put rights at the centre? Who has the power to hold them accountable? Are there certain rights that should be prioritised? How do we reconcile common global rights with cultural diversity and self-determination? How successful are local communities in the enforcement of global rights? What if some rights (such as rights to shelter, healthcare, education and safe water) lack sufficient legal teeth to be duly enforced?

Questions for discussion

- Where are the conceptual/theoretical foundations of rights-based approaches?

- How are rights defined?

- What are the links between rights and development?

- What are the different approaches to rights?

- How are rights-based approaches applied in programmes?

- What programmes show examples of citizens as right-bearers?

Reading list

Required readings

Ackerman, John M. 2005. Human rights and social accountability. World Bank. Retrieved from http://go.worldbank.org/BQ7PNUX450

Kirkemann B, Jakob und Tomas Martin. 2007. Applying a Rights-based Approach. An Inspirational Guide for Civil Society. Danish Institute for Human Rights. Retrieved from www.humanrights.dk/.../applying a rights-based approach.pdf

Celestine Nyamu-Musembi and Andrea Cornwall. 2004. What is the "rights-based approach" all about? Perspectives from international development agencies http://www.ids.ac.uk/files/Wp234.pdf

Servaes, Jan, Editor. 2008. Communication for Development and Social Change, chapter 2. New Delhi: SAGE.

RESOURCES LIST - Human rights-based approach. 2009. Retrieved from www.acfid.asn.au/what-we-do/docs_what.../HR%20resources.pdf

Case studies

Carol Miller and Marilyn Thomson. Case Studies on Rights-based Approaches to Gender and Diversity. Gender And Development Network.2005. http://www.gadnetwork. org.uk/storage/gadn-publications/Case%20Studies%20on%20Rights- based%20 Approaches%20to%20Gender%20and%20Diversity.pdf

Commitments to water and sanitation must come with real commitments to human rights. The Right to Water and Sanitation. June 6th, 2012. http://www.righttowater.info/ commitments-to-water-and-sanitation-must-come-with-real-commitments-to-human-rights/

UNFPA at Work. Six Human Rights Case Studies. Harvard School of Public Health. Program on International Health and Human Rights. http://www.unfpa.org/webdav/site/ global/shared/documents/publications/2008/6human_rights_cases.pdf

Alstone P and Robinson M (Ed) (2011). Human Rights and Development. Towards a Mutual Reinforcement,. Oxford University Press http://www.realizingrights.org/pdf/ Human_Rights_and_Development.pdf

Learning activities

The learning activities should be aimed at developing the following competencies:

- Explain key concepts and arguments of rights-based approaches
- Critical analysis of arguments for certain rights
- Demonstrate the practical implications of rights-based approaches for development programmes
- Collaborative learning and reflexivity
- Argumentation skills

Lectures, small group discussions and presentations

1. Group discussions of rights-based programmes, their principles, actions, challenges, and achievements. Analyse the role of local, national, and global actors in the promotion and enforcement of rights

2. Compare two programmes aimed at strengthening different sets of rights to analyse strategies and impact. What are the commonalities and differences among programmes to promote/institutionalise/enforce difference set of rights (e.g. gender, education, voting, clean air rights)?

3. Students analyse the ethical, philosophical and political principles underlying a specific case of rights-based programme, and demonstrate how they are translated into practice

4. Prepare summaries of arguments for specific rights (e.g. cultural sovereignty, freedom of expression) that bring together local and international traditions

Unit assessment/evaluation methods

- In-class exercises
- Case study analysis
- Assignments: Oral and written presentations

MODULE 1
UNIT 4

Approaches to development in India

General introduction

Human development grew out of global discussions on the link between economic growth and development during the second half of the 20th Century. By the early 1960s, there were increasingly loud calls to 'dethrone' GDP. Economic growth had emerged as both a leading objective and indicator of national progress in many countries[1] , even though GDP was never intended to be used as a measure of wellbeing.[2] In the 1970s and 80s, developmental debates considered using alternative focuses to go beyond GDP, including putting greater emphasis on employment; redistribution with growth and including whether people's basic needs were met.

However, according to a report issued in 2010 by the country's Institute for Human Development (IHD), despite these positive economic developments and a concomitant expansion in several social services, India is still among the countries with some of the lowest indicators of human development. India's levels of malnutrition, illiteracy and poverty, as well as income inequalities and regional disparities are still unacceptably high (IHD, 2010).

Human development is influenced by the complex reality of a large population living below the poverty line and a few living in luxury. In 2010, India was ranked as a 'Medium Human Development' nation because of its global Human Development Index (HDI) value of 0.519, which falls short of the world average of 0.624. India's low ranking in global HDI is partly due to the rise of inequality in the country, which is much higher (32 per cent) than in the world as a whole (22 per cent) (UNDP, 2010). An analysis of the impact of inequalities at a disaggregated level reveals that inequalities are highest in the education dimension, which is in consonance with the findings of the HDR 2010.

According to the 2018 Human Development Report, India's HDI registered impressive gains in the last decade as the nation's index increased by 23 per cent to 0.640 between 2010 and 2018. However, the country still ranks a low 130 among 187 countries. Additionally, when India's HDI value is adjusted to account for inequalities, the value drops by 26.8 per cent to 0.468. This indicates that India has a long way to go in terms of social inclusion.

---

[1]Kennedy, Robert. (1968). Address to the University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas on March 18, 1968. wwwinformationclearinghouse.info/article27718.htm
[2]Kuznets, Simon. "National Income, 1929–1932." U.S. Congress, Senate Doc. No. 124–73, at 7 (1934)

The India Human Development Report 2011

The India, Human Development Report, 2011 'Towards Social Inclusion' released by the Institute of Applied Manpower Research, Planning Commission, Government of India also corroborates the results of the UNDP Human Development Report. Based on Professor Amartya Sen's ideas of social justice, the Indian report addresses three critical issues:

I. Whether India has experienced inclusive growth in the true sense.

II. Whether different social groups like the scheduled castes, scheduled tribes and Muslims get excluded from the development process.

III. How flagship programmes/schemes of the government are dealing with some of these concerns.

The Government of India has been concerned about rising inequalities and uneven distribution of the benefits of growth. Accordingly, the thrust of the 12th Five Year Plan (2012-2017) was on faster, more sustainable, and inclusive growth. Additionally, in 2015, the Planning Commission was replaced by the National Institution for Transforming India, or NITI Aayog which put out a three-year Action Plan (2017-2020). One of the main focus areas of this action plan is building a more inclusive society especially for women, children, and religious and class minorities.[3]

While the current rate of progress of a number of indicators is not sufficient to meet many of these targets, the government's commitment to 'inclusive growth' presents a unique opportunity to improve the lives of all Indian children. In the past, the application of the human rights-based approach in India has favourably influenced the development of policies and programming, which prioritise the needs of the poor, marginalised and vulnerable groups. Human rights-based strategies have been used successfully in programmes to enable marginalised and vulnerable children gain access to primary education and to reclaim their right to food (Banerjee, 2005).

Role of agriculture in human development in India

More than half of the country's workforce is employed in the agriculture sector. The rural areas are still home to some 72 per cent of India's 1.3 billion people, a large number of whom are poor. Most of the rural poor depend on rain-fed agriculture and fragile forests for their livelihoods (World Bank, 2011). As a part of its MDGs, the Government of India places high priority on reducing poverty by raising agricultural productivity. However, various challenges need to be overcome before this is achieved. Vulnerability of rural farm households is often linked to lack of access to land and water, which largely determines much of the success of Indian farms. Large farms with good irrigation can be quite prosperous; unfortunately, they are also quite rare. Only 57 per cent of rural households own any land, and a majority of farms are less than one hectare.

---

[3]http://niti.gov.in/writereaddata/files/coop/IndiaActionPlan.pdf

Regional and social inequalities and traditional hierarchies such as caste, present structural obstacles to India's right to food and food security efforts aimed at the marginalised. Thus, according to Sharma & Kumar, (2011), ensuring sustainability and economic viability of smallholders and improving their competitiveness in production and marketing by facilitating better access to improved technology, inputs, credit and markets should be accorded priority for higher and inclusive agricultural growth.

Other areas such as health and education have also contributed significantly to the improvement of the human development in India. These topics will be covered in later modules.

Local governance in India

There is no doubt that the Indian constitutional amendment made in 1992 provided a conducive environment for participatory democracy at the local level. On paper it had opened a new set of spaces for people's engagement to ensure equity in resource allocation and good governance; at the same time there seemed to be important limitations on how much participation (in the way it is currently understood and practiced) can actually be delivered, and how much it can contribute towards framing local policy.

What global literature, combined with learnings from India, tell us about participation in local governance is that decentralised planning is challenging since it is time consuming, and more often than not, the planning machinery is weak and the evidence/database is poor. Development administration is not geared to/not willing to undertake the task of micro-planning in most of the states and therefore, participatory, transparent and accountable governance does not come easy. Micro planning processes may throw up unpalatable issues which may not be acceptable to the authorities or which they may not have the will or intent to address. The government may also lack finances/budget or staff to address the needs. The government may also lack transparency and a culture of citizen engagement to assure downward accountability.

More evidence is needed to determine whether or not decentralisation can promote both efficient service delivery and local empowerment simultaneously. According to Francis and James, 2003: "decentralised structures of administration that only act as a more effective tool for centralising power; regional and district committees in which government officials make decisions while the local representatives sit silent; village councils where local people participate but have no resources to allocate." In the Indian context, decentralisation has been actioned with great fervour but without adequate capacity building.

Concentration of power in local political elites develops into forms of local tyranny, allowing little say to communities in local decision-making since structures of local accountability are not in place in many developing countries (Bardhan, 2002). Unless social exclusion and inequality are addressed, the viability of representative and participatory democracy, in a comprehensive way, is uncertain (Hadenius, 2003).

In India, decentralised bodies are also political in nature as they are affiliated to some party or the other. Hence, they are not very far away from ensuring the vested interests of the leaders that they serve at the higher level, within the party structure.

Lack of access to vital public information has a disempowering effect on people particularly on poor, vulnerable and marginalised groups (like tribal, women and children) and places limitations on the realisation of basic human rights entitlements like realising the right to food, the right to health or the right to education (Banerjee, 2005). However, even if people have the information about their rights/entitlements to participate and they are aware of the existing mechanisms to take part in local decision making, their capacity to influence changes in the system depends on their place in the social structure and their ability to negotiate and articulate their needs and aspirations.

How can C4D contribute to local governance to improve participation, inclusion and accountability?

A large body of work conducted by the World Bank indicates that at the process level, communication can contribute to improving governance by influencing opinions, attitudes and behaviour of leaders and policy makers (political will), mid-level bureaucrats (organisational will), and citizens (public will) towards supporting governance reform objectives. According to the World Bank, citizens are motivated by the possibility of holding the government accountable. Communication with the government becomes a two-way flow, generating further demands and more reliable information. The hypothesis is that the virtuous circle is completed as government practices become more open and responsive to citizens (World Bank, 2006).

Thus, communication can contribute to improving the performance of government programmes by providing citizens with direct information on the performance of the government and equipping them with the information required to hold government to account. Communication can also build social capital by encouraging networks and social movements around particular issues (Communication for Governance and Accountability Programme, The World Bank, 2007).

C4D at the national Level

In the last few years, the Government of India has implemented several communication-driven initiatives, such as Swachh Bharat Mission, Ayushman Bharat, Skill India, Poshan Abhiyan, Khelo India, Beti Bachao Beti Padhao Yojana, Digital India, Accessible India (Sugamya Bharat Abhiyan), Make in India to name a few. For example, in March 2018, the Government of India launched its Poshan Abhiyaan campaign which aims to improve the nutritional status of children under six years, adolescent girls, and pregnant and lactating women. A major initiative under the Poshan Abhiyaan was the Poshan Maah. In September of 2018, twenty-six types of communication and mobilisation activities were conducted by 12 Ministries/ Departments. Communication activities were undertaken by Anganwadi workers, ANMs, ASHAs, teachers and Swachagrahis to spread Poshan messages to families. Emphasis was placed on mainstreaming home visits as well as group and interpersonal counselling sessions on important themes.

Additionally, to communicate messages effectively, a variety of innovative approaches were used such as demonstration of cooking healthy and nutritious dishes, engagement through nutrition games, distribution of seeds to start kitchen gardens and street plays/ nukkad nataks.[4]

While the focus of Poshan Abhiyaan was on traditional media, the government's Beti Bachao, Beti Padhao (BBBP) scheme also focused on digital and social media. Launched on 22 January 2015 by Prime Minister Narendra Modi, it aims to address the issue of the declining Child Sex Ratio (CSR). The key elements of the scheme include nation-wide awareness campaigns, advocacy campaigns and multi-sectoral action.

The hashtag #SelfieWithDaughter was promoted on social media in June 2015. It started when Sunil Jaglan, the sarpanch of Bibipur village in Jind, Haryana, took a selfie with his daughter Nandini and posted it on Facebook. The hashtag garnered worldwide fame. Prime Minister Modi in his "Mann Ki Baat" lauded the sarpanch. People from across India and the world shared selfies they took with their daughters.

A YouTube channel on BBBP was launched with videos on the issue of declining child sex ratio. Many states launched various activities under the BBBP campaign banner. For example, on 12th August 2015, Gomati District Administration, with the help of Udaipur Municipal Council and Health & Family Welfare Department, dedicated Rabindra Udayaan, a park articulated in 2010 in the eastern bank of Amar Sagar (a major Lake at Udaipur town), for girls in a bid to intensify the BBBP campaign as a part of the 69th Independence Day celebration.

Mansa district in Punjab has launched an initiative to inspire its girls to be educated. Under its "Udaan – Sapneya Di Duniya De Rubaru (Udaan- Live your Dream For One Day)" scheme, the Mansa administration invites proposals from girls belonging to classes VI-XII. These girls have the opportunity to spend one day with a professional they aspire to be — doctor, police official, engineer, IAS and PPS officers.

Questions for discussion

- How has India's approach to development changed over the years?
- How does communication play a role in India's new vision for development?

---

[4]https://icds-wcd.nic.in/nnm/NNM-Web-Contents/LEFT-MENU/Review-Meetings/RM_10-10-2018/Rashtriya-Poshan-Maah-A-Communiqu%C3%A9.pdf

Reading list

Required reading

Akerkar, Supriya. 2005. Rights, Development and Democracy: A Perspective from India. In P. Gready and J. Ensor, Reinventing Development: Translating Rights-based Approaches from Theory to Practice. Zed Books.

Desai, Sonalde, Amaresh Dubey, B.L. Joshi, Mitali Sen, Abusaleh Shariff and Reeve Vanneman. 2010. Human Development in India: Challenges for a Society in Transition. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

IHD. 2010. Human Development in India: Emerging Issues and Policy Perspectives. Retrieved from www.ihdindia.org/pdf/World-Bank-Consultation-Report.pdf

Johnson, C. 2003. Decentralisation in India: Poverty, Politics and Panchayati Raj, ODI Working Papers, No. 199, Overseas Development Institute, London.

Nirmal, C. J. 2002. Human Rights in India: Historical, Social, and Political Perspectives. Oxford University Press.

Case study

Craissati, D., D. Banerjee, U. King, L., Lansdown, G. and Smith, A., Eds. 2007. A Human Rights-Based Approach to Education for All. UNICEF/UNESCO. http://unesdoc. unesco. org/images/0015/001548/154861e.pdf

Learning activities

- Lectures
- Small group discussions and presentations
- Field trip to interact with a marginalised group/farmers/PRI representatives

Unit assessment/evaluation methods

- In-class exercises
- Case study analyses
- Assignments: Oral and written presentations

MODULE 1
UNIT 5

Communication for development:
Theories, models and debates

General introduction

This unit presents the chronological evolution and comparison of conceptualisations of communication and their applications within various paradigms of development. It clarifies the understanding and uses of the most influential communication theories, strategies, and techniques in development. The linkages among theories, how problems are identified and analysed as well as the choice of practical interventions are explicated. Special attention is paid to the implications of the use of C4D for governance and accountability programmes.

The evolution of theories and models in communication for development (also called communication for social change, development communication or social and behavioural change communication) shows its close proximity to debates about development in general. One cannot understand debates, concepts and programmes without considering what communication scholars and practitioners have reflected and participated in broad discussions about models of human development.

A dominant paradigm emerged during the 1950s, and was elaborated by US-based communication and sociology scholars. It mirrored the modernist premises of early models that assumed that development was a matter of cultural change and that education/information would eventually provide the right set of values and knowledge to spearhead social, economic and political change. For this model, the problem of underdevelopment was grounded on the persistence of traditional attitudes and knowledge that were contrary to the necessary 'modern' culture underpinning modern, democratic capitalism. It advanced the idea that communication, particularly the new forms of mass media, could act as vessels for spreading modern values and information. Communication was conceived as a linear, unidirectional process with clear roles assigned to senders and receivers. The focus of this paradigm was on the individual and his/her attitudes and behaviours. These premises underlie various models widely used in C4D such as social marketing, social learning, theories of reasoned (individual) action and many others.

This paradigm has been criticised by various theories. One set of criticisms was directed at its ahistorical, apolitical understanding of the media which ignored that the media is not simply an 'agent of development', but is a political, economic and social institution with specific interests and dynamics. Rather than functioning as actors for change, the media perpetuates inequalities, commercialism, and even in some cases, anti-social values that are contrary to human development. Consequently, it is impossible to think about human development as long as prevalent media/communication structures are tilted in favour of the present order. Communication and development demand changes in access, ownership, funding, and management of the media, so that they can serve social and general purposes.

Another set of criticisms drew attention to the informational and individualistic premises of the dominant paradigm and accused it of ignoring the social and collective nature of development and change. Development entails participatory processes by which citizens challenge power structures and demand changes. It is not simply a question of equipping people with the 'right' information to make better choices, but rather engaging with them in a dialogue, and facilitating empowerment at the individual and community level. Communication should not be identified with transmission of information. Rather, it is about dialogue, raising consciousness and collective action. From community meetings to local media, a variety of spaces provide opportunities for communicative actions directed at social change development. Communication must therefore be understood as a process of social mobilisation by which communities identify problems, select courses of action, and implement strategies to foster change.

One interesting point of discussion is whether a reconciliation or convergence among different theories and approaches is plausible. Behaviour science, for example, is a participatory approach that combines theories from social psychology, consumer marketing and behavioural economics.[5] Insights from participatory models have been incorporated by development and communication programmes. From India's SEWA to South Africa's Soul City[6] , from Tostan[7] in West Africa to 'healthy community' programmes worldwide, myriad initiatives have adopted participatory insights to engage citizens and improve social conditions. It is not obvious, however, whether epistemological differences and programmatic divergences between information and participatory theories and models can be completely bridged. The use of entertainment education approaches is a fertile area of research and practice, for example, to investigate possible ways in which insights from different traditions can be integrated. Likewise, it is important to consider whether persuasion and participatory models can be woven into a common vision that underscores the importance of voice and empowerment.

---

[5]This will be elaborated on in Module 2
[6]https://www.soulcity.org.za/
[7]https://www.tostan.org/

Questions for discussion

- What principles/arguments found in theories of development inform theories of communication for development?

- What are the practical implications of various theories? How do arguments translate into concrete programmes and actions?

- What have been the main changes in the evolution of research and practice in C4D?

Reading list

Required readings

Gumucio Dagron, Alfonso & Tufte, Thomas, Editors. 2006. Communication for Social Change Anthology: Historical and Contemporary Readings. Communication for Social Change Consortium, New Jersey, USA.

Freire, Paulo. 1970. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Herder & Herder.

Mefalopulos, Paolo. 2008. Development Communication Sourcebook: Broadening the Boundaries of Communication. Module 2. World Bank, Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/2008/01/9658930/developmentcommunication-sourcebook-broadening-boundaries-communication

Melkote, Srinivas and H. Leslie Steeves. 2001. Communication for Development in the Third World, 2nd edition, SAGE. Chapter 2.

Rogers, Everett M. 1976. Communication and Development: The Passing of the Dominant Paradigm. Communication Research 3 (2): 213-40.

Waisbord, Silvio. 2000. Family Tree of Theories, Methodologies, and Strategies. Rockefeller Foundation. Retrieved from www.communicationforsocialchange.org/pdf/familytree.pdf

Srampickal, Jacob, and Aram, I. Arul, Editors. 2007. Understanding Development Communication. Media House, New Delhi.

White, S.A. 1994. 'The Concept of Participation: Transforming Rhetoric to Reality' in White, S.A. et al Participatory Communication: Working for Change and Development. New Delhi, India: SAGE.

Hausenblas, H. A., Carron, A. V., & Mack, D. E. (1997). Application of the theories of reasoned action and planned behavior to exercise behavior: A meta-analysis. Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 19(1), 36-51.

Supplementary readings

Lerner, Daniel. 1958. The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernising the Middle East. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Schramm, Wilbur. 1964. Mass Media and National Development. Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press.

Case studies

World Bank. Communication for Governance and Accountability Programme. http://go.worldbank.org/6NKWHXJTF0

Obregon, Rafael and Silvio Waisbord. 2010. The Complexity of Social Mobilisation in Health Communication: Top-Down and Bottom-Up Experiences in Polio Eradication, Journal of Health Communication.

Williamson, H.A. 1991. The Fogo Process: Development Support Communications in Canada and the Developing World, in Casmir, F.L., Editor, Communication in Development. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation. pp. 270-287.

Learning activities

The learning activities should be aimed at developing the following competencies:

- Explain key concepts and arguments in C4D.
- Demonstrate the practical implications of communication theories.
- Develop critical analysis of theoretical arguments.
- Develop collaborative learning and reflexivity.
- Hone argumentation skills.

Lectures, small group discussions and presentations

1. Discuss everyday actions/trends/phenomena that illustrate the models of communication presented (e.g. advertising, political campaigns, demonstrations, peer education, interpersonal communication).

2. Analyse how different models think/define about actors, channels/platforms, messages, and effects.

3. Group discussion about specific programmatic cases. Select one example of "informational/diffusionist" and one example of "participatory" approaches to analyse how theoretical arguments and concepts influence design and execution of programmes. Discuss how the issue at stake could have been addressed differently if alternative communication approaches had been used.

Unit assessment/evaluation methods

- In-class exercises
- Case study analysis
- Assignments: Oral and written presentations
- Individual and group presentations
- Written tests

NOTES: ....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

....

NOTES: ....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....

NOTES: ....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....

Key contributors:

1. Abhijit Bora, Professor & Head of Department, Tezpur University
2. Abid Husain, Assistant Professor Jamia Millia Islamia
3. Alka Gadgil (Dr.), Head & Faculty, Xavier Institute of Communication, Mumbai, Maharashtra
4. Alka Malhotra, Communication for Development Specialist, UNICEF Delhi
5. Anant Kumar (Dr.), Associate Professor, Xavier Institute of Social Sciences (XISS), Ranchi
6. Anjali Capila (Dr.), Associate Professor, Dept. of Development Communication & Extension, Lady Irwin College, Delhi
7. Aparna Khanna, Associate Professor, Lady Irwin College, Delhi University
8. Arbind Sinha (Dr.), Advisor, MICA - Centre for Development Management and Communication, Mudra Institute of Communication Ahmedabad (MICA)
9. Archna Kumar, Associate Professor, Development Communication and Extension, Lady Irwin College, Delhi University
10. Arupa Shukla, Communication for Development Specialist, UNICEF Delhi
11. David Mould (Dr.), Professor Emeritus, Media Arts & Studies, Ohio University
12. Diwakar Shukla, Director, Jagran School of Journalism and Communication, Bhopal
13. Elnur Aliyev, Communication for Development Specialist, UNICEF Delhi
14. I Arul Aram (Dr.), Associate Professor, Department of Media Sciences, Anna University (AU), Chennai, Tamil Nadu
15. Ila Patel (Dr.), Professor, Social Science, Institute of Rural Management, Anand, Gujarat
16. Joya Chakraborthy, Senior Assistant Professor, Tezpur University
17. Kanchan K. Malik (Dr.), Associate Professor in Communication, University of Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh
18. Kulveen Trehan, Senior Faculty, University School of Mass Communication, Indraprastha University
19. M. H. Ansari (Dr.), Professor & Head of Department, Rural Management, Xavier Institute of Social Services (XISS), Ranchi
20. Manjaree Pant, Communication for Development Specialist, UNICEF Rajasthan
21. Manukonda Rabrindranath, Dean Faculty of Communication and Media studies, Head of Journalism and Mass Communication, Indira Gandhi National Tribal University, Madhya Pradesh
22. Narendranath Chowdary, Consultant, Monitoring & Evaluation, UNICEF Delhi
23. Neela Saldanha, Director, Center for Social and Behaviour Change, Ashoka University
24. Neelam Yadava (Dr.), Assistant Professor, Mudra Institute of Communication Ahmadabad, Gujarat
25. Purnima Mehrotra, Center for Social and Behaviour Change, Ashoka University
26. R Lavanya (Dr.), Assistant Professor, Department of Media Sciences, Anna University (AU), Chennai, Tamil Nadu
27. Rachana Sharma, Communication for Development Specialist, UNICEF Delhi
28. Raj Shree Verma (Dr.), Associate Professor, Rural Management, XISS
29. Rashmi Jain, Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work, Jamia Millia Islamia
30. Rudrajit Das, Communication for Development Specialist, UNICEF Delhi
31. S. Arulchelvan (Dr.), Assistant Professor, Department of Media Sciences, Anna University (AU), Chennai, Tamil Nadu
32. S. Devaraj (Dr.), Research Assistant, Dept. of Extension Education, Gandhigram Rural Institute, Tamil Nadu
33. Salman Khan, Research Associate, School of Social Work, Jamia Millia Islamia
34. Sanjay Singh, Communication for Development Specialist, UNICEF Madhya Pradesh
35. Sant Kumar (Dr.), Associate Professor, Rural Management, Xavier Institute of Social Services (XISS), Ranchi
36. Santosh Kumar Patra (Dr.), Assistant Professor, Media Studies, Mudra Institute of Communication, Ahmadabad
37. Seema Kumar, Communication for Development Specialist, UNICEF Andhra Pradesh & Karnataka
38. Shivani Saraf, Center for Social and Behaviour Change, Ashoka University
39. Siddartha Shrestha, Chief, Communication for Development, UNICEF Delhi
40. S.K. Gopal (Dr.), Programme Coordinator, Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Gandhigram Rural Institute, Tamil Nadu
41. Sunitha Don, Assistant Professor, Department of Media Sciences, Anna University (AU), Chennai, Tamil Nadu
42. Tisha Srivastav, Assistant Professor, Film and Media Studies, Ashoka University
43. U.T. Rao (Dr.), Professor, General Management, Mudra Institute of Communication, Ahmadabad, Gujarat
44. Uma Maheshwari P., Assistant Professor, Department of Media Sciences, Anna University (AU), Chennai, Tamil Nadu
45. Vaiju Naravane, Professor, Journalism and Media Studies, Ashoka University
46. Vasuki Belavadi, Associate Professor in Communication, University of Hyderabad
47. Vinod Pavarala (Dr.), Professor in Communication, UNESCO Chair on Community Media, University of Hyderabad

unicef | for every child