

# 1

## Development Communication and Social Change in Historical Context

**Pradip Ninan Thomas**

At any given time, there is a great variety of theoretical and practical approaches in development communications/communications and social change (CSC). Broadly speaking, development communication/communications and social change is about understanding the role played by information, communication, and the media in directed and nondirected social change. It also includes a variety of practical applications based on the mainstreaming of communication as “process” and the leveraging of media technologies in social change. This chapter will specifically deal with development communication/communications for social change from the perspective of communication rights and will include a section on “Voice” making a difference in the context of the “Right to Information” movement in India. In the pedagogy of CSC, we are accustomed to contrasting the “dominant paradigm” and, in particular, its assumptions related to the role of communication in social change along with its preferred methods with that of the participatory school that emerged in the late 1960s, since then becoming global in scope. In its practice, however, it is clear that mixed approaches characterize field applications of CSC and that participation in itself means different things to different people. This has resulted in a variety of participations that can be plotted on the typology that Arnstein created in the late 1960s, ranging from the maximalist to the minimalist.

One of the perennial issues in CSC is whether or not it has an identity that it can call its own and a tradition of theorization that makes it distinctive from other areas in communications. The theorization of CSC has always been dependent on borrowings from other disciplines – from rural sociology that provided the basis for the diffusion model to the radical pedagogy best illustrated by the contributions made by the Brazilian educator Paulo Freire. CSC theorization has also been

shaped by a great variety of “isms” and schools of thought, including Marxism, feminist theory, post-colonial and subaltern theories, identity theory, globalization, social movement theory, and information and communications technology (ICT) for development theories. In recent times, social networking and urban interventions have also contributed to shaping the practice of CSC, although this is yet to be reflected in its theory. While one can argue that these many borrowings and traditions of interdisciplinarity have contributed to the shaping of CSC as a field and to its dynamism, it is also clear that a consequence of these many influences is the existence of a variety of fault lines – between theory and practice, between technology and the social, policy and the implementation of policy, the global and the local, technocratic and managerial approaches versus endogenous, people-centered approaches. In other words, at any given time, the field is characterized by a variety of disjunctures. In spite of the evidence of quantum, what seems to be the case is that the “practical horse” has bolted leaving the “theoretical cart” behind. In other words these literally thousands of initiatives, learnings, and experiences are yet to become foundational material for an explication of theory reflective of, and conversant with, local realities. It would seem that the advent of the “participatory” model stymied further theoretical innovation given that this was interpreted as the “Holy Grail” that would usher in the promised land characterized by communications for all. Key words such as development, participation, social capital, poverty reduction, civil society and empowerment, among others, have an auratic power that disallows any form of questioning. Issue 4–5 of volume 17 of the journal *Development in Practice* is devoted to a deconstruction of such key words and Andrea Cornwall, in an article entitled “Buzzwords and fuzz-words: Deconstructing development discourse,” makes the following observation:

Development’s buzzwords are not only passwords to funding and influence ... The word *development* itself ... has become a ‘modern shibboleth, an unavoidable password’, which comes to be used ‘to convey the idea that tomorrow things will be better, or that more is necessarily better’ ... the very taken-for-granted quality of ‘development’ leaves much of what is actually *done* in its name unquestioned. (Cornwall 2007: 471)

Enclosures are rather unfortunately a characteristic of this rush to invest words with value and this is best illustrated by the fact that the very phrase “communication for social change” was slated for trademarking by a non-profit organization in the USA. What seems to be missing in this situation is any serious theorizing that is grounded in context and that is conversant with local categories.

This chapter will explore critical issues related to the theorizing of communication and social change. In brief, the history of theory in this area is largely made up of two distinct traditions: (1) the dominant paradigm associated with Everett Rogers, Daniel Lerner, and Wilbur Schramm and (2) the participatory/multiplicity model associated with a number of scholars. A recent account of that history is Emile

McAnany's (2012) *Saving the World: A Brief History of Communication for Development and Social Change*. The dominant paradigm and in particular the tradition associated with Rogers – the diffusion of innovations – has been critiqued for its top-down nature although arguably this model remains global. The dominant paradigm is also associated with a strongly “behaviorist” emphasis at the expense of “structures” and this focus on change at the level of the individual remains persistent and paramount. While the participatory model and its emphasis on communication as process does have its merits; in reality there are different traditions of participation, some that are more inclusive than others. Terms such as the role of communications in empowerment, access to communication, and participation as process were articulated by proponents of this model. Rather than deal with the history of theorizing in this area, it will deal with contemporary deficits in the theorizing of CSC and explore three possible avenues for the reinvigoration of CSC theory: (1) the possibilities for understanding conceptual categories such as participation in and through digital interventions such as the Free and Open Source movement and digital labor, (2) attempts to understand CSC theory through the lens provided by communication rights movements (the example of the Right to Information movement in India is given in order to explore validation of local processes of participation and Voice through the mechanism of Public Hearings), and (3) the need for CSC theory to converse with Actor Network Theory linked to a critical political economy of communications toward an understanding of the role played by power/knowledge in the creation and maintenance of networks of power involved in CSC policymaking.

## **The Commodifications of Participation**

An obvious starting place to explore these dislocations is to begin with the multi-accentual nature of concepts such as participation, access, and Voice that is contextually defined and that offers many meanings to many people and many opportunities for practice. Even within civil society interventions related to CSC, these concepts are routinely invoked by different organizations – from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and UNICEF to the World Bank, and organizations such as AMARC, APC, and WACC. Participation is influenced by political economy and by different visions of utopia, of orderings of the world. A critical, political economy inspired approach offers the means to explore communications and social change in terms of its shapings by structures, ideologies, and power flows. The Slovenian social philosopher Slavoj Žižek in his book *First as Tragedy, Then as Farce*, in a critique of capitalism and a call to the “left” to reinvent itself, includes an interesting critique of the embrace of “cultural capitalism” that also offers the possibility for a redemption through consumption. He uses the example of a Starbucks coffee advertisement that sells a “coffee ethic” through linking consumption of

coffee to Fair Trade, ethical investment, and the enjoyment of good “coffee karma”, thereby enhancing our enjoyment of feel-good consumptive practices. As he points out:

The “cultural” surplus is ... spelled out: the price is higher than elsewhere since what you are really buying is the “coffee ethic” which includes care for the environment, social responsibility towards the producers, plus a place where you yourself can participate in communal life ... (Žižek 2009: 53–54)

The upshot of our involvement in such circuits of cultural consumption is that we end up contributing to initiatives that are destined to forever deal with the symptoms of poverty but never with its causes, which include unjust trade practices, poverty and exploitation, the issue of land, and so on. Participation in this utopia is limited precisely because it does not give either the producer or consumer the opportunity to take part in an exercise of freedom. It is very similar to the “slacktivist” cultures that are rife in the era of social networking. This is a culture that encourages people to click and contribute to online polls and issues but that does not enable an engagement with real issues in the world of the here and now. NGOs, for the most part, tend to replicate the logic of neoliberalism and participation therefore tends to become the means for extending the project of neoliberalism through enabling people to participate in a variety of forms of “compassionate capitalism.”

This evisceration of meaning has undoubtedly enabled the worldwide diffusion of the concept of participation. Its status as a weasel word has enabled its mainstreaming, given that it can be invested with meaning in context. More often than not this process of divesting and investing in meanings has led to participation becoming an “empty signifier,” the basis for donor–recipient relationships in the funding of aid and in the writing of reports but not as an essential ethic, skill, and process related to building up capacities in local populations. So, one can argue that participation really has become critical to the reinvention of the dominant paradigm in the context of the twenty-first-century development industry. The argument here is that the field has moved away from the Freirean understanding of participation as praxis, as the means for empowerment and the basis for engagements with reality in order to change it. Instead, participation today is invoked by all sections although rarely as the basis for transformative change. Students from the Centre for Communication and Social Change, UQ, Brisbane, have consistently reported after carrying out fieldwork in countries including Nigeria, Vietnam, and Indonesia that participation remains elusive, a mystery to most people although it exists as a buzzword in the background, invoked by everyone involved in development although practiced by none. While extensive projects find it difficult to mainstream “participation,” it is more likely that participation does work in the context of small-scale projects. This is borne out in a 2012 global survey of participation of community radio stations carried out by

the Aachen-based organization CAMECO. On the nature and levels of participation, the evidence suggests regional differences: there are bound to be community radio stations in every region of the world that exhibit a maximalist approach to participation.

Whereas the ranking of the different areas of participation is similar in all regions, big differences exist in their importance: Latin America tops participation in programming (90%), but is far below average in management and ownership. In Africa, the level of participation in financing (54%) and ownership (49%) is relatively high; participation in ownership is more common in anglophone countries. In Asia, participation in management plays a crucial role (69%). ... The number of radio stations where community members play a greater role in production, presentation or journalism is still rather high: Community members function as local reporters (69%), work as presenters (63%), are responsible for special programmes/time slots (61%), and are musicians (61%), citizen reporters (56%) or editors/producers (39%). The number of radio stations where community members bear a higher responsibility for programme contents, i.e., as editors, producers or presenters, is generally higher in Asia ... than in Africa or Latin America. (Frolich *et al.* 2012: 8–9)

## **The Cooption and Redemption of Participation in a Digital Era**

While these types of assessments of participation do have their limitations, given that they do not generate information on the granular nature of participation or its micropolitics, they have value as a snapshot of participation in the global community radio movement. For CSC theorists, however, one can argue that it is equally profitable to explore participation online, given that it reflects a range of participations – from the corporate control and commodification of participation via myriad versions of “interactivity” to real possibilities for an exploration of alternatives. Henry Jenkins’s “Convergence Culture” that celebrates prosumerism and online freedoms has attracted criticism from media scholars on the left of the academic spectrum including Christian Fuchs, Mark Andrejevic, Graham Murdock, and others. Mark Andrejevic makes the point that interactivity is located within “digital enclosures” and is the perfect means for both the state and private companies for the surveillance of users for security reasons and from a market perspective:

There is a price to be paid for convenience and customization – and we will likely end up paying it not just by sacrificing privacy, but by engaging in the work of being watched: participating in the creation of demographic information to be traded by commercial entities for commercial gain and subcontracted forms of policing and surveillance. (Andrejevic 2007: 98)

In a related piece on the “affective economics” of interactivity, Andrejevic (2011: 616–617) makes the point that at the end of the day audience identification with brands, in spite of the hype of interactivity, are attempts at control and not empowerment. “A context in which control relies increasingly upon expanded opportunities for participation requires a rethinking of the oppositions that place participation per se on the side of democratic empowerment” for there is a need to recognize the “role played by participation in the modulation of affect as a modality of control.” Nicholas Carah (2010) in his book *Pop Brands* shows how mobile phone-based interactivity with bands in the context of music festivals in Australia facilitates branding through “immaterial labour.”

However this very same terrain of the digital has also become the space for innumerable, collaborative projects involving participation. One of the intriguing aspects of information as a commodity is that it cannot, by its very nature, be completely commodified, unlike the vast majority of physical goods. As an immaterial good and service, its status as property remains elusive and is difficult to map onto the existing system of intellectual property. While not denying the fact that information as a commodity and as flows generates massive amounts of global capital, the disruptive potential of the digital continues to unsettle both governments and corporates. The worldwide free and open-source software (FOSS) movement offers compelling evidence of shifts in the production of value. As Daniel Ross (2011: 145) succinctly puts it, “What we find when we are considering FOSS is that it is in fact a highly conflicted entity within the capitalist apparatus of accumulation: simultaneously capable of being commodified, yet acting as reactant of de-commodification: consuming commodified wage labor, yet existing as the product of volunteerism.” This ambivalent nature of information, in particular, its differential valuations at the moment of exchange, reflects as Murdock has suggested, the beginnings of an emerging “gift economy,” and, as such, is indicative of the deep fault lines that run within the core of the contemporary informational mode of production. Projects such as Wikipedia and the worldwide success of FOSS as a movement suggest that the meaning of participation can be redeemed online via cooperative endeavors that involve collaboration, sharing, and volunteerism, which has also been described as a case of “digital gifting.” Murdock, in an essay that argues the case for moral economies supportive of “public cultural commons,” describes digital gifting as follows:

Digital gifting outside the price system operates at three basic levels. Firstly, there is sharing where individuals circulate self-produced or found material using their own website or web space. ... At the next stage up there is co-operation, where individuals contribute to making a shared domain more useful. ... Finally, there is collaborative activity designed to create a new cultural product or resource that can be freely shared. (2011: 25)

I would argue that the study of labor in the context of FOSS and other online projects offers textured possibilities to understand participation in the context of

contemporary social change. We need to, however, locate our understanding within the possibilities of capital given that none of these processes is outside of the system, although they certainly hint at subversions of that system. I would also argue that traditional approaches to understanding participation, such as Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) are dead-ends precisely because innumerable studies have shown the limits of participation. We know what the obstacles are, what the issues are – but we tend to replicate such studies and they confirm what we already know of the limits of participation. To a large extent the mainstreaming of extensive behavioral change communication initiatives has led to the globalization of formulas and to the inevitable contraction of innovation and creativity. The compartmentalization of behavioral change and social change by the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), as per the following description, exemplifies this approach to communication and social change in which a focus on discrete variables enables individuals to be abstracted from the system and collective attributes to be abstracted from individuals. The result is a schizophrenic approach in which behavioral change and social change are unrelated and managed separately.

Behaviour change is commonly defined as a research-based consultative process for addressing knowledge, attitudes and practices that are intrinsically linked to programme goals. Its vision includes providing participants with relevant information and motivation through well-defined strategies, using an audience-appropriate mix of interpersonal, group and mass-media channels and participatory methods. Behaviour change strategies tend to focus on the individual as a locus of change. (UNICEF, 2012)

Social change, on the other hand, is understood as a process of transformation in the way society is organised, within institutions, and in the distribution of power within various social and political institutions. For behaviours to change on a large scale, certain harmful cultural practices, societal norms and structural inequalities have to be taken into consideration. Social change approaches, thus, tend to focus on the community as the unit of change. (UNICEF, 2012)

### **The Contributions of Communication Rights Movements to CSC Theory: The Right to Information Movement in India and Voice**

I also believe that CSC theory, and in particular its conceptual core consisting of concepts such as participation, access, empowerment and voice, can become reinvigorated through new meanings from the study and analysis of communication rights movements, particularly those that have evolved in response to specific deficits at local levels. Let me share one example of indigenous categories and



processes that were a central aspect of an approach to communication and social change. The movement is the Right to Information (RTI) movement in India, which is widely recognized as the most significant movement since the nationalist movement that led to India's independence. This was a movement I had studied in 2010 and which was then published as one of five case studies in the book *Negotiating Communication Rights: Case Studies from India* (Thomas, 2011). The background to this movement is the reality of corruption and graft on a gargantuan scale and its impact on the lives of ordinary Indians. India's welfare economy reaches out into the lives of millions of people. Billions of dollars are spent annually on a range of entitlements – from employment, education, health care, and subsidized food – although only a small proportion of actual funds are actually spent on development. The RTI movement began in a small village in the state of Rajasthan, western India, in the 1990s and ultimately became the basis for a nationwide movement that resulted in numerous legislations at federal and state levels. While this movement is by no means “complete,” is “in process,” and faces multiple obstacles, it has contributed to the revitalization of democracy and the validation of the contributions of ordinary people to the shaping of democratic futures.

The strength of this movement is that it has transformed tried and tested local forms of participation into a nationwide ethic and in that process validated the low-cost and the everyday, cooperative styles and local communicative practices. As opposed to formulaic, top-down participation, movements like the RTI have made participation as a skill, ethic, and process the very basis for people's empowerment. It can be argued that local cultural forms and activities are typically relational and it is this accent on process that facilitates individual buy-in into a movement. Klandermans and Oegema (1987: 519) refer to the processes involved in individual participation in movements:

At the individual level, becoming a participant in a social movement can be conceived as a process with four different steps: becoming part of the mobilization potential, becoming target of mobilization attempts, becoming motivated to participate, and overcoming barriers to participate. The first two steps are necessary conditions for the arousal of motivation. Motivation and barriers interact to bring about participation: the more motivated people are the higher the barriers they can overcome.

### **Public Hearings, Participation, Voice**

The strength of the Right to Information movement in India includes the following. It is an indigenous social movement that was a response to felt needs. It started as a grass-roots movement supported entirely by voluntary, local contributions and it employed familiar pedagogical tools like the Jan Sunwai (public hearing) that was used to strengthen and valorize Voice and offer frameworks for participation. This



movement validated public hearings as a means of participation in the creation of transparency and accountability. The Jan Sunwai is often used by traditional organizations in India, such as guilds and associations of small traders and manufacturers, to make themselves accountable to their publics. “The Jan Sunwai” is, as pointed out in the *Lokniti Newsletter* (November 8, 2005): “an empowering process in that it not only does away with civil society structures that are stacked against the marginalized but also inverts power equations in favor of the marginalized, by making them the center of the discussion. There are no experts and “hence no chance of objectification of the victim” and the “victim represents his case without any technical assistance.” In the words of the Dalit intellectual Gopal Guru (2007): “The *sunwai* is a public hearing but it is different from legal and procedural hearings instituted by the state which by its official, legal, and almost pompous nature, place the victim at an inherent disadvantage. The *sunwai* restores to a person his place in the system by allowing him to represent himself and make himself heard.” Most importantly the Jan Sunwai is a mechanism that affirms Voice and strengthens self-confidence often in contexts where caste and class collude to silence people. In the context of the RTI movement, these public hearings allowed local people to examine both the information and dis-information on local development, the collusions, the silences, the corruption, and the political economy of underdevelopment. In Mohanty’s words (2006: 20): “The term *jan sunwai* is taken literally, and it implies that the power, legitimacy, and sanctity of the forum will emanate from the people, not any judge or panel; and that it is a hearing and not a court or agitational body. The decision of the assembled collective to pose certain sets of questions would determine the priorities of the hearing. It did not pass a verdict or punish the guilty. It is out to shame those government officials, in connivance with suppliers and contractors, who made money illegally from the public works.” Fifteen Jan Sunwais, organized in advance, became critical to the empowerment process. These public hearings were complemented by “*dharnas*” (sit-ins) at the office of the Chief Minister and local government in the face of official inaction on the evidence of corruption. The *dharna* as non-violent civil resistance also became the space for celebrating solidarity. There were instances when the *dharnas* stretched over days in the context of stalemates. As one report states:

The *dharna* ... witnessed an unprecedented upsurge of homespun idealism in the small town of Beawar and the surrounding countryside. Donations in cash and kind poured in daily from ordinary local people, including vegetables and milk from small vendors, sacks of wheat from farmers in surrounding villages, tents, voluntary services of cooking, serving cold water ... and cash donations, even from the poorest. ... Even more significant was the daily assembly of over 500 people in the heat of the tent, listening to speeches ... Active support cut across all class and political barriers. Rich shopkeepers and professionals to daily wage labourers, and the entire political spectrum from the right wing fringe to communist trade unions extended vocal and enthusiastic support. (Shah and Agrawal 2005)

Given the long, drawn-out nature of the *dharnas*, there were numerous focused cultural events – plays, music, devotional singing, question-and-answer sessions – that were used to strengthen solidarity, awareness, and involvement. The intentional use of local culture and popular involvement in the creation of these skits, dramas, and music were critical to the making of this movement.

The use of the Jan Sunwai is an important indigenous means and pedagogical device deployed by this movement to mobilize, radicalize, and give voice to marginalized people who have traditionally been expected to remain silent, even in the face of the most horrendous atrocities committed by the forward castes and by the wealthy. As Jenkins (2007: 60) describes it:

The MKSS's key innovation ... was to develop a novel means by which information found in government records could be shared and collectively verified: the *jan sunwai* (public hearing). A *jan sunwai* is a publically accessible forum, often held in a large open-sided tent pitched on a highly visible spot, at which government records are presented alongside testimony by local people with firsthand knowledge of the development projects that these records purport to document. Key pieces of information from project documents are read aloud. Those with direct knowledge of the specific government projects under investigation are invited to testify on any apparent discrepancies between the official record and their own experiences as labourers on public-works projects or applicants for means-tested antipoverty schemes.

Public hearings played an important role in creating popular understandings of the Right to Know. Shah and Agrawal (2005) have highlighted the participatory nature of the step-by-step process related to a typical Jan Sunwai, summarized as follows:

- Information on suspected corruption in local development projects is generated from extensive research by volunteers organizing the *Jan Sunwai*.
- Official records on amounts sanctioned and actually spent on local development projects are procured from local government offices and analyzed.
- A public hearing is organized independently, not through the official village assembly, in a public place, in the village concerned.
- Extensive publicity is given to the public hearing. All villagers, government officials, elected representatives, and the press are invited.
- The hearings are presided over by a panel of respected individuals from the local community.
- At the start of the *Jan Sunwai* the rules of the meeting are laid out. All, except persons under the influence of alcohol, are entitled to speak. Everybody must speak on the theme and be restrained in their language.
- Identified cases are taken up one by one. Detailed accounts of development expenditures from official records are demystified, paraphrased and read out aloud for the assembly.

- Villagers, particularly laborers, suppliers, and contractors speak out and verify whether they received the money due to them or whether construction took place as claimed. Officials are encouraged to clarify or defend themselves.
- In this way discrepancies are highlighted and officials are asked to explain gaps and shortfalls in accounting.

In the case of the RTI, participation and Voice were both a process and means used to validate life worlds against a system that hitherto flourished with little transparency and no accountability. Voice and participation enabled local people to recognize the value of information as a right that could be used to explore access to other rights linked to employment and food security. In other words, Voice and participation became the means for the affirmation of life. It resulted in ordinary people gaining access to entitlements and thus led to their enjoying a quality of life that the system had hitherto denied them.

### **CSC Theory and the Need to Account for Networks and Structures**

It is clear that CSC theorization has reached an impasse. It is rarely that one comes across a robust theorization that provide a pathway to understand the processes of social change or how to understand the role played by communications in the contestations between dominance, resistance, and the making of sustainable futures. Mohan J. Dutta's (2011) volume *Communication Social Change: Structure, Culture and Agency* offers a refreshingly different basis for the exploration of CSC – one that is rooted in an understanding of the real roles played by international agencies and the politics of CSC in the context of the political economy of aid, food security, health and gender, and the variegated terrains of resistance. The commoditization of behavior change communications has reached epidemic proportions. The accent on symptoms rather than causes has led to the normalization of short-term, project-based CSC initiatives and to a perpetuation of individual-based projects abstracted from context. The obsession with results-oriented projects, outcomes, and numbers has led to a skewed understanding of what communication in social change is all about. We do not seem to have moved on from the bad old days when technology and technique were seen as sufficient inputs to the challenges faced by development. This way of thinking continues to haunt CSC with a renewed energy – with social networking being the latest panacea. Evgeny Morozov in his book *The Net Delusion* deals with this technological determinism, particularly the cyberutopianism and Net-centeredness that are rife today.

If anything, the Iranian Twitter revolution revealed the intense Western longing for a world where informational technology is the liberator rather than the oppressor, a world where technology could be harvested to spread democracy around the globe rather than entrench existing autocracies ... The fervent conviction that given enough good gadgets, connectivity, and foreign funding, dictatorships are doomed, which so powerfully manifested itself during the Iranian protests, reveals the pervasive influence of the Google Doctrine. (Morozov 2011: 5–6)

My own personal point of view is that CSC theory needs to be constantly renewed and that it must intentionally borrow and adapt new theories that allow for new understandings and ways of grasping both old and new realities. While Actor Network Theory has been critiqued for not dealing with structures, I think both ANT and a critical political economy of communications can be used to understand the role played by networks within the new structures of domination. Vincent Mosco, in his classic text *The Political Economy of Communication*, makes the point that, in order to study the media, one needs to study it in context, within the structures and processes that give it meaning and enable its production and reproduction.

Decentering the media means viewing systems of communication as integral to fundamental economic, political, social and cultural processes in society ... the point is that the political economy approach to communication places the subject within a wider social totality. ... Both political economy and communication are mutually constituted out of social and cultural practices. Both refer to processes of exchange which differ but which are also multiply determined by shared social and cultural practices. (Mosco 1996: 71–72)

Mosco's suggestion that the wider social totality simply has to be made sense of equally applies to CSC. It is simply bad theory that highlights behavioral change without dealing with structures; participation without dealing with power; and technology without dealing with the social. One can argue that the dominant paradigm is yet to "pass" and that, rather unfortunately, the participatory model has been coopted within this framework. However, and rather than concluding on a pessimistic note, I strongly believe that there are any number of learnings that one can glean from the "majority" world, and that there are innumerable traditions of practice in these contexts that can throw light on communication and social change theory and practice. The example that I have highlighted of "Voice" in the context of the Right to Information Movement in India reflects a social experience from the periphery that has become the basis for a national movement. Such examples of needs-based rather than imposed solutions, can contribute to knowledge development and can certainly strengthen the theorizing of communication and social change.

## References

- Andrejevic M. (2007). *iSpySurveillance and Power in the Interactive Era*. Kansas: University Press of Kansas.
- Andrejevic, M. (2011). The work that affective economics does. *Cultural Studies*, 25(4–5): 604–620.
- Carah, N. (2010). *Pop Brands: Branding, Popular Music and Young People*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Cornwall, A. (2007). Buzzwords and fuzzwords: Deconstructing development discourse. *Development in Practice*, 17(4–5): 471–484.
- Dutta, J.M. (2011). *Communicating Social Change: Structure, Culture and Agency*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Frolich, J., Daschle, D., Geerts, A., and Jannusch, S. (2012). Survey report: Community participation at local and community radio stations – An exploratory study in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Pacific, [www.cameco.org/english/publications/CAMECO-Practice-Series/](http://www.cameco.org/english/publications/CAMECO-Practice-Series/) (accessed June 8, 2012).
- Guru, G. (2007). Jan Sunwai: A new instrument of democracy in India. *Democracy Asia*, [www.democracy-asia.org/casestudies\\_studies\\_gopal\\_guru.htm](http://www.democracy-asia.org/casestudies_studies_gopal_guru.htm) (accessed February 11, 2008).
- Jenkins, R. (2007). Civil society versus corruption. *Journal of Democracy*, 18(2): 55–68.
- Klandermans, B. and Oegema, D. (1987). Potentials, networks, motivations, and barriers: Steps towards participation in social movements. *American Sociological Review*, 52(4): 519–531.
- McAnany, E. (2012). *Saving the World: A Brief History of Communication for Development and Social Change*. Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield: University of Illinois Press.
- Mohanty, B.K. (2006). The growing role of civil society organisations in contemporary India: A case study of the Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan, Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Kolkatta, (no page numbers).
- Morozov, E. (2011). *The Net Delusion: The Dark Side of Internet Freedom*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Mosco, V. (1996). *The Political Economy of Communication*. London, Thousand Oaks, CA, and New Delhi: Sage.
- Murdock, G. (2011). Political economies as moral economies: Commodities, gifts and public goods. In J. Wasko, H. Sousa, and G. Murdock (eds) *Handbook of Political Economy of Communications*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 13–40.
- Ross, D. (2011). The political economy of free and open source software. PhD Thesis, York University, Toronto.
- Shah, P. and Agrawal, S. (2005). Participatory approaches in public expenditure management, India: Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangatan and the Right to Information Campaign (no page numbers), [www.sasnet.org/documents/Case%20Studies/MKSS%20Case%20Study.pdf](http://www.sasnet.org/documents/Case%20Studies/MKSS%20Case%20Study.pdf) (accessed April 20, 2010).
- Thomas, P.N. (2011). *Negotiating Communication Rights: Case Studies from India*. New Delhi: Sage.
- UNICEF (2012). Communication for Development, [www.unicef.org/cbsc/index\\_42352.html](http://www.unicef.org/cbsc/index_42352.html) (accessed June 8, 2012).
- Žižek, S. (2009). *First as Tragedy, Then as Farce*. London and New York: Verso.