

EDITION DW AKADEMIE

#2016

MEDIA DEVELOPMENT

**The Governance and Sustainable Livelihoods
Strands in Media Development**

With financial support from the



Federal Ministry
for Economic Cooperation
and Development

Imprint

PUBLISHER
Deutsche Welle
53110 Bonn,
Germany

RESPONSIBLE
Christian Gramsch

AUTHOR
Linje Manyozo

EDITOR
Helmut Osang

PUBLISHED
September 2016

© DW Akademie

EDITION DW AKADEMIE #2016

MEDIA DEVELOPMENT

The Governance and Sustainable Livelihoods Strands in Media Development

Linje Manyozo

The Governance and Sustainable Livelihoods Strands in Media Development

This paper exams the theory and practice of media development by differentiating two major models: The good governance and the sustainable livelihoods strand. Based on this the author questions how governments, organizations, and civil society today collaboratively rethink and organize media systems to enable them to consolidate good governance and development. His critical analysis shows that a great deal of development and reconstruction assistance is invested in strengthening democratic and independent media systems and institutions, an approach conceptualized as media development. This paper makes the case that the discussion on media development is biased towards Western theory and approaches as it has not examined media development approaches outside the dominant syntaxes of neoliberal governance frameworks.

This paper provides a holistic overview of the field of media development otherwise known as media assistance or media building. Ideally, media development refers to donor-driven, independent or privately-funded efforts that build media or ICT infrastructures, media and communication policies and journalists' capacities in either the north or the south. The aim is to consolidate good governance, free speech, political citizenship and sustainable development. Media development has a long history and theoretical traditions, with roots in enlightenment philosophy and deliberative democracy, and, as will be pointed out in this exposition, has been a key tenet of neoliberal democracies. The discussion seeks to achieve two objectives. Firstly, it presents three theoretical traditions that have defined and shaped the way we understand media development today. These traditions comprise modernization (Lerner 1958, 1971; Rogers, 1962, 1993), information intervention (Price 2002) and the public sphere (Calhoun 1992; Habermas 1962).

Over the years, however, new critical traditions such as communication for development (Gwin Wilkins et al 2014; Manyozo 2012; Scott 2014), post-colonial perspectives, or cultural theory have continued to shape global and local understanding and implementation of media assistance interventions. The paper draws on these three theoretical trajectories in order to propound two dominant strands that have characterized media development practice. These comprise the governance strand and the sustainable livelihoods strand. The central argument revolves around the fact that media development debates have been problematized in ways that emphasize the universalization and globalization of western experiences and approaches in deliberative democracy.

Defining media development

Manyozo (2012) introduces three approaches towards the study of communication for development, and these are: media for development, media development and participatory communication. Whereas media for development and participatory communication involve communication content and processes respectively, media development is more about structure, that is, policy and capacity. Also known as media capacitation, media building or media assistance, me-

dia development refers to organized and strategic efforts at supporting and building the capacity of media institutions, policies, structures and practices as pathways towards consolidating citizenship and good governance, building fragile democracies and enhancing sustainable development. In practice, such media assistance aims to break what Graham (2005) defines as 'knowledge monopolies' and, thereby closing the communication and digital divides between the centers and the peripheries through the provision of universal access to media hardware, software and information. The assumption is that increased access to and participation in the creation, sharing and utilization of information will eventually strengthen the role of the civil society as a space where right holders can actively participate in democracy and hold their duty bearers to account (Manyozo 2012; Scott 2014; Waissford 2011).

Based on this definition, this section explains an ideal and normative theory of media development. It is argued that sustainable financial investment in media capacitation (structures, skills, literacies, policies) will trigger improved quantity and quality of media content, and increased public participation in media production and consumption, which will eventually result in improved good governance and deliberative development. All these efforts are constantly being mediated by critical key factors, namely, politics and international relations, business and economic environment, literacy levels, culture, access to technology and the quality of the knowledge society.

To define media development requires that we bring together various theoretical and empirical conceptualizations and definitions. In the 1970s, Nora Quebral (1988) discussed the *development of mass media* that are part of a distance learning system and that must not be used for propaganda. Likewise, Arnold (2010) provides a functional framework, defining media development as a mechanism for strengthening the fourth estate role of the media to enable the institution to provide checks and balances to the government. For Arnold (2010) as well as Scott (2014), media assistance targets media capacity, enabling legislation and the sustainability and viability of media institutions. There is thus an implicit recognition that media development involves making significant investment in the structure of the media in order to destab-

alize the prevailing inequalities in the political economy of communications. Similarly, Waisbord (2011) and Noske-Turner (2014) highlight the linearity of the dominant model of media assistance, in that investments in media capacitation are expected to yield outputs and outcomes that point to increases in democratic culture within regions and nation states. As if agreeing with the aforementioned, Deane (2008) defines media development as the establishment of a utilitarian media that aims to establish the foundations for transparency and good governance, and provides pluralistic opportunities for various citizen groups to speak and be heard. As such, Arnold and Deane, Waisbord and Noske-Turner all seem to agree on the question of media development as a deliberate process of institutionalizing a free, independent and democratic media system and structure.

In harmonizing all these conceptualizations, media development can be holistically conceived as centering on the deliberate processes of strengthening the role of media in development and governance processes. Important to mention is that its design and implementation are strategically guided and funded by governments, institutions and private funding as well. There are also cases where state governments have designed and implemented own media development projects as a way of consolidating citizenship, democracy and development.

In defining media development, there are two axes of conceptualization that are critical. They are drawn from Mansell's (2011) critique, 'Whose knowledge counts'. The first axis concerns investment, moving in a continuum of external/donor funding to independent/private funding. The second axis involves the continuum of legal framework to outside the legal framework. The following argument focuses on the spectrum of external/donor-driven and independent/private, in which media development operates within accepted legal frameworks.

Theoretical exploration in media development

This section examines the three major theoretical and programmatic trajectories that have shaped extant conceptualizations and the understanding of media development. These three are: (a) modernistic development, (b) information intervention, and, (c) the public sphere. These frameworks have governed the field of media development since its inception. What unites these trajectories is their reliance and emphasis on technological determinism, in which the power of media technology to influence and bring about change is highlighted.

Modernization

This theoretical framework is primarily rooted in Lerner's modernization proposals in which he called for the scaling-up and scaling-out of mass media. The aim was to ensure that the mass media should act as a key pathway towards spreading

the message of civilization and modernity (Lerner 1958, 1971). Alongside Lerner, was the whole media effects tradition that included the scholarship of researchers such as Lazarsfeld, Schramm, Merton, Katz and many others. In this conceptualization, the western model is perceived as the only way towards realistic development. The notion of 'western' requires careful consideration here. 'Western' for Lerner and the modernists implied an American perspective. The concept has undergone significant rethink, and includes neoliberal democratic perspectives from North America, Europe, as well as, even, from the south.

Within the western modernization approaches, the mass media are conceived as "stimuli" that undermine traditional society (Lerner 1958, 1971). There is an assumption of the inevitability of rapid economic growth that should ideally transform the economies of scale in these other worlds to replicate the west. Immediately after the Second World War, European countries embarked on rapid economic and industrial development to rebuild their shattered economies. It was not surprising therefore, that major western scholars and financial institutions would define development solely in economic terms. The major implication was that development meant projecting the American model of society to the world (Escobar 1995). Such theories and approaches would then homogenize the global south into a single category of 'underdeveloped' countries, whose only salvation lay in joining the west in moving along the same continuum of development modernity (Chambers 2005; Escobar 1995). The financial institutions of the World Bank and IMF would immediately take the lead in advising southern countries in how to develop.

Lerner also argued that for modernization to complete achieving sustainable economic growth, the individuals themselves have to be modernized. Western modernization expects traditional societies to abandon their native lifestyles and adopt modern living practices. These were processes that had already taken place in western cultures, when "ordinary men found themselves unbound from their native soil" and moved "from farms to flats and from fields to factories" (Lerner 1958, 47). Transforming individuals to achieve the psychological, geographic and social mobilities requires the concerted effort of transformed educational systems and the mass media. The mass media is expected to bring new aspirations to people. The premise by Lerner is that the spread of mass media helps countries to establish western-like media systems to avoid "going back to an oral system of communication" (Lerner 1971, 871). Such a mass media system must have the capacity to produce, distribute and generate audiences that should consume the information.

On the level of individuals, the media is also considered an innovation to be adopted, to facilitate the transformation of citizens from being traditional into modernity. As such, diffusion becomes a strategy through which such modern media systems and innovation are adopted and shared

through a social system (Rogers 1962, 1993). For international organizations, the idea has been to bypass or overcome 'traditional norms' which modernists hold are characterized by less developed technologies, agrarian economies, low levels of literacy, and in which "communication via word of mouth is more prevalent than by mass media" (Rogers 1962, 61). This is the traditional society that modernists seek to transform into a 'modern social system' marked by developed technology, urban behaviors of its citizens, literate, mobile, industrialized, cosmopolitan social relationships, rationality, and empathy.

For the majority of western media development projects, media actually refers and is exclusive to radio, television, social media, newspapers and ICTs. Though such media development organizations emphasize the undertaking of an information and communication audit in the process of developing media assistance strategies, the general trend has been a preponderance of digitized media projects – those related to radio, television and ICTs. By 2014 for instance, UNESCO's website reports that the organization had implemented 1185 priority media development projects in Africa, Arab regions, Asia Pacific, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean. Out of these projects, none dealt with developing informal and indigenous communication systems. Projects have tended to focus on training of media personnel, building media infrastructure, and capacity strengthening of media structures.

Information intervention

The second major theoretical trajectory is Monroe Price's (2002) notion of information intervention; which seems similar to Frantz Fanon's (1965) concept of sound-wave warfare. Information intervention or sound-wave warfare is associated with the democratization processes that emerged soon after the collapse of the Berlin Wall. Price (2002) introduces and defines information intervention as the deliberate interference with dominant media structures and narratives through the creative employment of strategic media and communications systems and content in order to facilitate the production and sharing of multiple voices as a reliable pathway towards consolidating good governance and democracy. This conceptualization is critical, as Price is not just interested in the establishment of multiple media platforms, but also in how they are used afterwards, especially in forging national memory that holds fragile hegemonies together, and how they contribute to the overall outputs and outcomes of modernizing political systems as well as democratization.

It is, however, important to mention that this concept has a much longer history, especially in the south. During colonial times, the settler economies employed media and communications to maintain hegemony and solicit public support for socio-economic and political endeavors. Simultaneously, information intervention also manifested itself through the practices of underground media operators belonging to po-

litical and minority military groups as they attempted to undermine dominant communication players. Even when the independent African states employed similar strategies on their peoples, the balance of power in international communications still favored rich countries. So to respond to these concerns, UNESCO would in the 1970s, open up the space for discussing critical questions regarding the breaking up of Graham's (2005) knowledge monopolies. This would lead to the establishment of the International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems (UNESCO 1980, 2014). This Commission was requested to examine the implication of political and economic power for the quest for the free and balanced flow of information in the world.

After the study and the accompanying report, UNESCO would identify and propose strategies for 'development of communications' that focused on three aspects: infrastructure, technology and policies (UNESCO 1980, 2014). It is these three aspects that Price's concept of information intervention seeks to address: The assumption here is that increased number of media players increases the multiplicity of democratic voices; and also that the media should be employed strategically to contest the formulation of destructive nationalist discourses and memories. In this case, information becomes a strategy for war, as has been the case with NATO or occupation forces during military conflicts (Price 2002).

Public sphere

The third theoretical trajectory that has shaped media development is the notion of public sphere. In continental Europe, the notions of pure reasoning and public sphere would culminate in the clearer exposition of the Christian model of deliberative democracy. Habermas traces the factors and processes leading to the emergence of the bourgeois public sphere in western societies from around the 18th century (Habermas 1962; Calhoun 1992). As an idea, the public sphere has its intellectual origins in the renaissance philosophy of Immanuel Kant, especially in relation to reason and rationality, two notions that would form the backbone of the Habermasian public sphere. The public sphere was, ideally a political space where people met and held rational-critical dialogues, exercised public reason on matters of public interest. What is important is the interpersonal nature of the dialogue, the immediacy of feedback, the reign of rationality and reason, and the reciprocal relationships and knowledge that participants had about each other within these spaces (Calhoun 1992; Habermas 1962).

The ideal and normative model of the public sphere has received criticism over the years because it apparently overlooks questions of power, inequality, passion and unreason, marginalization and social exclusion (Calhoun 1992). Perhaps in response to such criticism, Habermas (1981a, 1981b) would release two volumes of *The Theory of Communicative Action*, in which he focuses on the practices of using language to share knowledge, formulate identities, strengthen social capital, and

importantly, expand human freedoms. The concern for Habermas was that a 'refeudalization' of the public sphere and a subsequent restitution of knowledge monopolies were underway. The growth of mass media as an industry attracted private and commercial interests, which were only interested in selling both the content and the audiences. In the process, the media lost their public service role as a fourth estate, in which they should have been mediating rationalistic public reason and discussion, but instead, chose to serve the commercial and anti-democratic interests. In a way, one can say that Habermas (1962, 1981a, 1981b) was pointing out two models of a public sphere, the *refeudalized* market model (representing the private and state interests), as is the case in the US broadcasting model; and also the communicative-dialogical model (that ideally represents public interests) as in BBC's public service model.

Strategically designed media development initiatives today attempt to strengthen the public sphere by focusing on establishing and consolidating media models that lie outside the influence of the state, but rather, within the sphere of the civil society. It is assumed that within this sphere, the media can then become independent, free, pluralistic, diverse and a vibrant watchdog of the state, as well as of private interests. It is also within this theoretical framework that community media development is being promoted, with a focus on the institutional, social, cultural, emotional and financial ownership of a media intervention (Lublinski, Wakili and Berner 2014).

At its core, therefore, strategic media development emphasizes pluralism and diversity. The assumption is that, as long as the media are located outside the spheres of the state they will automatically become pluralistic and diverse. Karppinen (2007), however, identifies two different models of diversity. The first is public sphere or policy diversity model, which is similar to the original dialogical model of the public sphere, one that offers diverse media outlets, public interests, content and opinions, but meeting the attributes of communicative action, revolving around democracy, justice and morality (Habermas 1962, 1981a, 1981b). The second kind is market diversity, which is competitive but simultaneously reduces the diversity of political and cultural representation (Karppinen 2007; Calhoun 1992). It therefore is important to take both aspects into consideration: policy diversity and market diversity. Based on these assumptions, media development has been expected to widen social and political access to deliberative democracy. This is achieved through creating room for the production, sharing and utilization of critical voices outside the restrictions and limitations of the market and state bureaucracy.

Two approaches towards media development

Informed by the aforementioned three theoretical trajectories, this chapter presents two strategies towards media development thinking and practice. The first approach is the good

governance strand, which is rooted in western neoliberal democratic political theory and focuses on promoting good governance and democracy. The second approach is the *sustainable livelihoods* strand that promotes community empowerment and micro-development objectives.

(a) The good governance strand

The classical theoretical framework locating this strand can be traced to deliberative democracy theories, utilitarian and libertarian philosophies, modern liberal democratic political theory and more recently, political economy, all of which recognize the separation of the state, the private and civil society institutions and spaces. The assumption is that independent and pluralistic media enable the rational individual to perform communicative action that contributes to further social enlightenment, exercise of justice, law and order, promotion of democratic ideals, but more importantly, to develop the moral consciousness of individuals. This trend of thought emerges from Kant, Marx, Hegel, Weber and others. Political economy as a critical perspective finds itself at the centre of this strand, in which policy makers and scholars attempt to create the 'best' media system that will promote good governance and democracy. The central tenet driving this strand is 'freedom of expression' as articulated in various human rights articles, treaties and policies (Deane 2008). To evaluate whether media development efforts overall are yielding desired results, media development indicators have been developed by various organizations which have sometimes been used to analyze changes in media systems (Schneider 2014; Lublinski, Wakili and Berner 2014).

Due to the largely western origins of funding and technical support, numerous media development initiatives and indicators within the governance strand build on the western concepts of free press and deliberative democracy. As such, the governance strand displays some distinguishing factors from the sustainable livelihoods strand: 1) intervention according to democratization phases, 2) integration in civil society, 3) the concept of sound wave warfare and 4) the usage of media freedom indicators.

Intervention according to democratization processes: The first factor is that media development initiatives are designed and implemented in line with the dominant phases of democratization: These can be described, according Randall (1993), as the origins, the transition and the consolidation phase. It is argued that each of these three phases requires different types of media development interventions.

Integration in civil society: The second distinguishing aspect of this governance strand is that initiatives attempt to establish and strengthen media systems and institutions within the space of civil society as it is considered politically and economically independent. In fact, it is within this civil society space that Habermas would locate his concept of public sphere and

communicative action, away from the influence of both the state and the market. Civil society constitutes that space, that site where communicative action happens, during which independent citizens and institutions contest and challenge hegemony and dominant ideologies.

Sound wave warfare: The third factor has been presented by Frantz Fanon (1965), who discusses the role of rebel radio stations during Algeria's independence war against France. Through its engagement in 'sound-wave warfare', the *Voice of Free Algeria*, like other pirate radio stations across the continent, which in the 1960's were engaged in independence struggles, contributed to the appreciation of the role of information and propaganda in political liberation. Examples of 'sound-wave warfare' include underground publications for oppressed minority groups, pirate radio stations, signal jamming and other unorthodox communication practices that characterize politically problematic occupation, such as NATO's intervention in Eastern Europe, Russia's annexation of Crimea or America's invasion in Iraq. Like Fanon, Price acknowledges that information is an article and a weapon of war.

Media Development Indicators: The fourth aspect is that the design, implementation and evaluation of media development today revolves around media development indicators, which are the tools for measuring the actual characteristics that link free, independent and pluralistic media to good governance and democratic processes. The influential framework for media development indicators was developed by UNESCO (2008, 2014). The five principle categories of indicators, comprise: (1) A system of regulation conducive to freedom of expression, pluralism and diversity of the media; (2) plurality and diversity of media, a level economic playing field and transparency of ownership; (3) media as a platform for democratic discourse; (4) professional capacity building and supporting institutions that underpin freedom of expression, pluralism and diversity; and (5) sufficient infrastructural capacity to support independent and pluralistic media. As argued hitherto, western media development efforts largely aim to employ pluralistic and diverse media as a pathway for consolidating good governance and democracy. Such governance or democracy is described in terms of elections, electoral processes, representatives and civil society. However, the Economic Commission for Africa (2007) acknowledges that in much of the south, traditional systems of governance operate alongside these western models. Because of the "inherent institutional duality" of most southern political cultures, the challenge for political scientists has been to establish pathways for 'incorporating' traditional leadership and governance within 'modern' systems of government (Economic Commission for Africa 2007).

Nevertheless, media development indicators have only tended to cater for the modernized governance systems, leaving out

the traditional systems and their indigenous knowledges. This means that the good governance strand tends to ignore the theory of state formation in the south, which rests heavily on traditional governance systems. The media are defined from the perspective of western literacy, that is, in terms of radio, television, newspapers and internet. There is no reference to indigenous knowledge communication systems, perhaps in fear of "going back to an oral system of communication" (Lerner 1971, 871). The next sections, however, seek to interrogate another model of media development that has attempted to draw upon indigenous knowledge and local ways of knowing and living.

The Media Development Project as a case study in the governance strand

The first example comes from Mozambique. In 1998, the Media Development Project began in Mozambique, as a collaborative initiative of UNESCO-Mozambique and UNDP, aimed at strengthening democracy and governance through development of the media in Mozambique. The country had experienced a violent liberation war with Portugal, and immediately after independence in 1975, was embroiled in a violently destructive civil war until 1992. By the time the war ended, the information and communication infrastructure had broken down or was non-existent in certain cases. The ruling party had controlled all communications. Thus, the media assistance initiative was designed to support processes of decentralization, pluralism and independence of the media and to build the capacity of journalists and editors. It aimed to support the emerging independent print press, support communities to establish and sustain community radio stations, and support the national public broadcaster; to strengthen the role of women in the media, and to provide capacity building in development journalism, especially in HIV/AIDS reporting (Jallof 2005).

In the community radio sector, the Media Development Project focused on five main objectives: emphasizing community ownership of the stations, training and capacity building of communities to ensure technical sustainability, developing a financial partnership strategy, development of local content with the community and participatory evaluation. Other organizations have come into play since this project finished. IREX is implementing a USAID-funded Media Strengthening Program in the same country, the principal aim being to consolidate the independence, capability and quality of community radios to involve regional communities in national development discourses. Organizations such as BBC Media Action, UNESCO, UNDP or DANIDA are also involved in strengthening media institutions to ensure that they play a critical role in cementing democracy and good governance.

(b) The sustainable livelihoods strand

This strand borrows much from livelihoods thinking and the basic needs approach in development theory, in which the focus is on the priority areas of food, housing, clothing and the environment. The notion of sustainable livelihoods is rooted in critical development theory, especially from within the international development community and from scholars as well (Chambers 2005). As a development concept, it focuses on the basic needs of the most vulnerable and poor.

As a strand in media development, it has also been shaped by the work of Rogers on rural sociology and agriculture extension, Quebral's thinking around communication for development, and more importantly, FAO's experiments in agriculture extension and communication the world over (Da Matha 2001). The focus has been to employ media and communications as a strategy for encouraging poor people to participate in rural and agriculture development so they are able to meet their basic needs in life, i.e. achieve livelihood.

Adoption for Rogers (1962, 1993) refers to the period between when an individual hears of an intervention for the first time and the actual time they adopt it – whilst diffusion refers to cumulative adoptions, that is, to the way new knowledge and technology is introduced and accepted in a social system. In these cases (adoption and diffusion), the media are thought of as instruments to facilitate a rapid adoption/diffusion. The principal objective of this particular strand is well captured by a former station manager to an African community radio station, who observed that a local broadcaster that had recently been established with the financial and logistical support from UNESCO was a “development radio” (Manyozo 2012). This radio had empowered villagers, especially women groups involved in income generating activities such as apiculture, by connecting them to both service providers and the market.

For many western development organizations, the focus on sustainable development issues was always a strategic move on their part, especially in the 1960's/1970's, when many countries in the global south attained independence from European powers but ended up as political dictatorships. Any attention paid to governance or democracy issues would have been restricted by national governments and, actually was. Hence, by only focusing on depoliticized ‘development’ issues, these development organizations were not only able to meet their sustainable livelihoods goals, but also to ensure they did not conflict with the newly established political dictatorships. A history of this media development approach is well documented in the exploration of the emergence of the role of the rural radio training institution CIERRO in French-speaking West Africa. In the sustainable livelihoods strand, media development initiatives aim to strengthen citizen access to and participation in local community development initiatives. There are three characterizing factors that define this strand.

First is the promotion of self-management as the highest

level and form of participation. Building on the postcolonial critique of the modernization paradigm by the dependency school of development at the Economic Commission for Latin America, this strand of media development has rejected the continued dependence on donor and government funding as a reliable mechanism for achieving financial sustainability. In fact, Quebral (1988, 80) highlights the need for political independence by suggesting that such media be removed from political propaganda by “housing them in universities.” She goes further to refer to “micromedia” that will “make themselves part of the structure of each local human settlement, that will identify with its inhabitants and steep themselves in its affairs so that they will speak in its idiom, and more important, articulate its interests” (Quebral 1988, 81).

The emergence of the community media movement has demonstrated that the most effective models of media development are not necessarily those that are owned and managed by local communities. The new proposed inclusion of viability and sustainability by DW Akademie in the MDI framework shows a new emphasis on these issues. During the establishment of media projects the communities should establish clear and comprehensive mechanisms for sustaining the initiative financially, which in the end, enables the community to strengthen the two other forms of sustainability – social and institutional sustainability. There are examples of economically viable community media that also serve the needs of the community. In such cases, media development indicators should ideally be examined in relation to how a media project has achieved financial, social, cultural and institutional sustainability. As observed in the proposed viability indicators by DW Akademie, the critical questions to ask comprise: Are there enough local business institutions that are supporting the media in the country? Is the local community supportive of the media project; do they identify with it? Is the prevailing economic condition conducive to media business (Schneider 2014)?

The second aspect of this sustainable livelihoods strand is the centrality of indigenous knowledge communication systems, which are created, modified, used and shared across generations through a series of overt and covert communicative practices and performances. Mundy and Compton (1999) define such communication systems as organically developed ‘elaborate ways’ through which society transmits technical and non-technical information among its members for purposes of informing, educating and entertaining them. Indigenous communications have in-built media and communication systems that are rooted in orality, memory and narrative, such as folk media, village meetings, griot performances, poetry and storytelling, open market places, proverbs or drumbeating. These communication systems often perform positive or negative social functions within an indigenous knowledge system.

The third is the emphasis of media projects on improving social capital, local livelihoods and local development.

Regarding media development indicators that capture the sustainable livelihoods strand, the aim here is to document the cost-effective impact of a media project in reducing or eradicating poverty through providing relevant information, increasing local institutional transparency and accountability, as well as challenging people to actively contribute to development policy formulation, implementation and management (Jallov 2005). Therefore, unlike the good governance perspectives that focus on promoting freedom of expression within western neoliberal concepts of democracy, the sustainable livelihoods strand aims to validate the *participatoriness* and *effectiveness* of *mediated* local development interventions.

One evaluation methodology known as the Most Significant Change (MSC) has been employed as a participatory assessment instrument in evaluating media development projects in East Africa (SIDA and Jallov 2005). The key indicators

upon which MSC is used to evaluate these media projects aim to capture three development narratives, namely, (1) *exposure* (listenership to, usage and ownership of development content), (2) *adoption* (implementing best-bet development practices), and importantly, (3) *active participation* in media and development projects.

The discussion on this sustainable livelihoods strand demonstrates that capturing media development also requires a completely distinct set of indicators when focus is on examining the impact and role of media building on local development and community empowerment. What is also important to understand from the discussion is that whereas the governance strand interventions rely on enabling policy and legislation, the sustainable livelihoods strand can operate even in oppressive political systems.

CIERRO as a case study in the sustainable livelihoods strand

The Inter-African Centre for Rural Broadcasting Studies of Ouagadougou (*Le Centre InterAfricain d'Etudes en Radio Rurale de Ouagadougou*), popularly known as CIERRO, was established in 1974 in Burkina Faso to build management and programming capacity for rural stations. The Centre organized conferences and workshops to mark the emergence of the concept and practice of rural and community radio as an important strategy towards development in Africa. The aim was to decentralize this rural broadcasting model to allow more community access and participation in management and programming. Subsequently, a few rural and community radio stations, and formats such as debate radio or radio forums, were established mostly in West Africa, dealing with health, agriculture, family planning, culture and development topics (Da Matha 2001). Therefore, the Centre played a major role in facilitating the creation of an enabling environment for an inclusive order of knowledge, information, and communication that should not marginalize any social groups and interests. CIERRO's establishment was made possible with initial funding from the German government. Operationally, it relied on various sources of donor funding, which dried up by mid-2000, leading to the eventual closure of the Centre in 2006. In terms of media development, CIERRO provided research and training in rural radio and communication sciences in Africa. It produced training manuals, and awarded certificates and diplomas for short and long-term courses. CIERRO coordinated knowledge management and dissemination in rural radio research and developed innovative methodological approaches to radio communication in a rural environment (Da Matha 2001). The Centre collaborated with various western development and broadcasting organizations, including the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Farm Radio International and the DW Akademie (formerly Deutsche Welle

Radio Training Centre), to organize rural radio capacity building workshops and conferences.

CIERRO's primary objective was the promotion of local rural radio stations that are owned and managed by communities so as to promote development. Central to the Centre's concept of rural radio was community ownership and participation in management and programming, in order to ensure that the station becomes an instrument of liberation and empowerment. Its aim was to enable local people to be active in the design and implementation of development policies. Thus rural radio refers to more than an approach to broadcasting to rural people. It refers to a local station that is spiritually aligned to and belongs to the people. CIERRO's approach to rural and community radio was participatory, inclusive and pro-poor, allowing ordinary people to talk about and listen to community aspirations. CIERRO's model emphasized principles of independence, non-political alignment, non-commerciality, reliance on local staff and self-management by a democratically elected committee (Da Matha 2001; Ilboudo 2003). CIERRO's model of media development continues to be further developed by numerous sustainable livelihoods-oriented organizations worldwide. Alongside CIERRO, organizations such as Farm Radio International, FAO or CTA are still supporting the implementation of media development in accordance with the sustainable livelihoods model.

Media development in Africa

Systematic and strategic media development in Africa probably has its origins in three sources. The first is through newspapers - that were introduced long before the colonial and missionary authorities introduced broadcasting. The second is in rural radio. The third origin can be located within the celebration of indigenous knowledge communications. The following sections therefore, attempt to carry out an exposition of these origins.

The explosion of the ICT sector on the African continent has changed the way media development is conceived and understood. Cell phones are almost everywhere and the availability of internet services via mobile phones is enabling people not to just be on *WhatsApp* but also to join various social media platforms. Even the print media is struggling to keep up with online news platforms, raising doubts as to whether the medium is headed for extinction. There are increasing numbers of remote communities with access to e-banking facilities. Production and accessing audio and visual media has become easier, though it has also bred piracy. ICT centers have popped up all over the continent, and instead of the old cassette of one's favorite music, all one needs to have is a flash disk, blank CD or a mobile phone (with a USB port), and in return for very small payments one will have various songs of their favorite artists uploaded.

Such ICT access and availability is changing media development. Computer-based platforms such as Frontline SMS have enabled rural audiences to interact with farm radio producers. Radio and mobile phones have temporarily merged into a communicative facility for empowering communities. It is becoming increasingly commonplace that local radio stations are converging with mobile phones and internet in order to ensure that local voices become part of global efforts in rethinking development policies. A 2011 study into the 'Implication of ICTs in the Political Economy of Community Radios in Mali, Mozambique and Uganda' (Manyozo, Nassanga, Lopes 2015), established how ICT hardware and software has transformed the work of community media and journalists from largely material efforts to digital labour, and also enabled participatory approaches towards engaging with community groups.

Challenges facing media development in the south

Manyozo (2012) highlighted major challenges facing media development in the global south, namely, (a) the lack of relevant media technology and infrastructure; (b) reliance on donor funding. This discussion adds one more: (c) The increasing public discontent with the state.

Firstly, technology and infrastructure exert a huge influence on the success of media development, where portability and access to repairs are crucial to sustainability of interventions. Lessons from the micro power radio movement show

that portability of equipment and staff familiarity with engineering are the key. These aspects allow media practitioners not only to create and share relevant media content but also to ensure that media development projects meet local needs. Before it developed its mobile micro power station prototype, UNESCO was promoting the basic station model for its media development projects, which emphasized providing cost effective, quality broadcasting equipment: mobility was not seen as important. There have been cases of community groups establishing rural and community stations with western funding but the procured broadcasting equipment would only be repaired with components from the Far East.

Secondly, reliance on donor funding is contributing to a serious rethink on how media development is being designed and implemented. The financial crisis of 2008 precipitated a serious debate about public sector cuts and the investment case. At the same time donors demanded to see the effects of the projects they had supported. This would lead to increased attention paid to generation of evidence-oriented research. As a result two major shifts occurred: (a) Donors moved to a broader media development approach. They invested in media development that was linked to broader program goals in development and good governance. And they expected the provision of technical and financial support to be placed more strategically. (b) Community groups realized donor funding was hard to access as it was limited, so they began to find creative ways of sustaining their media business financially. This was because of the proliferation of the financial inclusion movement in Africa, with increased access to financial capital and banking opportunities. Many community groups acquired business skills and thus began to employ these to strengthen their media development interventions.

Thirdly, there is an increasing discontent with the nature and role of the state, especially in much of the global south. Fanon (1965) rightly prophesied that in fighting for independence, formerly antagonistic groups came together to remove a common enemy, the settler colonialist government. After independence was won or granted, the groups became antagonistically violent, and the only way to ensure peace and security, as well as the survival of the state, was to strengthen dictatorships so as to hold the disparate elements together. Democracy would never have worked because each ethnic and social group felt they deserved to rule over the others.

This was the case in much of the global south. When multiparty politics re-emerged after the fall, the playing field saw the emergence of various political parties and players, especially civil society. Antagonism has crept in, and the weakness of the state has been exposed again, with increasing public displays of anger and dissatisfaction tearing at any lingering sense of nationhood. In this case, the media would ideally be expected to play an active role as an impartial arbiter of citizen voices. Nevertheless, because the state has had to resort to violence to survive, the media has borne the brunt of state heavy-handedness, and as a result, restrictive policies and laws

have been introduced, which have made it harder for the media to operate. In the process, the state departments of communication and public media have remained under total state and political control. It is imperative, therefore, that media development involves transformation of state departments of information as well as state broadcasters into public broadcasters (Lublinski, Wakili and Berner 2014).

Conclusion

The thinking around deliberative democracy and good governance has originally shaped media development. The belief has been that free and independent media are a key institution of deliberative development, transparency and accountability. In a nutshell, this paper has discussed two main points: First, it has provided a linear and modernistic model of media assistance that is rooted in the concepts of modernization, information intervention and public sphere. Second, it has also carved out and discussed two major models of media development that sometimes are in a perpetually tenuous relationship to each other: The good governance (deliberative democracy) model and the sustainable livelihoods blueprint.

Further, the paper has argued that the good governance strand has its roots in enlightenment and utilitarian philosophies and principles especially in relation to freedom of expression as a central tenet in achieving deliberative democracy. In fact, organizations and institutions promoting this model orient their approach on the media development indicators, developed by UNESCO. The processes through which the adoption and adaptation of media development indicators are taking place still raise a lot of questions regarding the notion of local context and stakeholder engagement. On the other hand, the sustainable livelihoods strand provides an opportunity for media projects to be implemented with the aim of promoting national or local development goals. The works of Lerner, Rogers, Quebral, agriculture research centers, and other scholars have demonstrated that, if employed strategically, and if informed by theory and coherent method, the media can change, and even save lives.

In conclusion, it is being argued that the design and implementation of media development within the context of livelihoods thinking has flourished even without good governance conditions, as the state and its partners were solely focused on achieving development of communities – and that the introduction of media projects did not undermine their hegemony. The overarching theme in media development is that strong and independent media systems and institutions offer a platform for ensuring that citizens become active participants in the development of their societies. How this objective is achieved depends on who is funding the intervention, the methodology, capacity of implementers and the quality of the evidence base upon which interventions are built, as well as several other cultural factors.

Bibliography

- Arnold, Ann-Katrin. 2010. *Media Development vs. Communication for Development: Structure vs. Process*. Accessed June 21, 2016. <http://blogs.worldbank.org/publicsphere/media-development-vs-communication-development-structure-vs-process>
- Calhoun, Craig (ed). 1992. *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge. Calhoun. MA: MIT Press.
- Chambers, Robert. 2005. *Ideas for Development*. London and Sterling: Earthscan.
- Da Matha, Jacques. 2001. *CIERRO: A 23-year Contribution to the Development of Rural Radio and Local Rural Radio in Africa*. First International Workshop on Farm Radio Broadcasting in Africa. Rome: FAO. Accessed June 21, 2016. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/003/x6721e/x6721e28.htm>
- Deane, James. 2008. *Media Development or Media for Development? Wrong Question - But What's The Right One*. Accessed June 21, 2016. <http://www.comminit.com/global/content/media-development-or-media-development-wrong-question-what%E2%80%99s-right-one>
- Economic Commission for Africa. 2007. *Harnessing Traditional Governance in Southern Africa*. Lusaka: Economic Commission for Africa. Lusaka: Economic Commission for Africa, Southern Africa Office. Accessed June 21, 2016. http://repository.uneca.org/bitstream/handle/10855/14940/bib.%2056966_I.pdf?sequence=1
- Escobar, A. 1995. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Fanon, Frantz (1965) *A Dying Colonialism*. New York: Grove Press.
- Graham, Phil. 2005. *Political Economy of Communication: A Critique*. Canada Research Chair in Communication and Technology, Waterloo: University of Waterloo. Accessed June 21, 2016. http://www.philgraham.net/MME%20Chapter_Final.pdf
- Gwin Wilkins, Karin, Tufte, Thomas and Obregon, Rafael (ed).2014. *The Handbook of Development Communication and Social Change*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 1962. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, Cambridge: Polity Press.Habermas, Jurgen (1981a). *Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 1: Reason and Rationalization of Society*. Boston Massachusetts: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 1981b. *Theory of Communicative Action, Volume 2: Liveworld and System – A Critique of Functionalist Reason*. Boston Massachusetts: Beacon Press.
- Hallin, Daniel and Mancini, Paolo. 2004. *Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ilboudo, Jean Pierre. 2003. *After 50 years: The role and use of rural radio in Africa*. In Bruce Girard (ed), *The one to Watch: Radio, New ICTs and Interactivity*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization, 132-139.
- Jallov, B. 2005. *Assessing Community Change: Development of a Barefoot Impact Assessment Methodology*. *The Radio Journal: International Studies in Broadcast and Audio Media* 3 (1): 21-34.
- Karppinen, Kari. 2007. *Making a Difference to Media Pluralism: A Critique of the Pluralistic Consensus in Euro-pean Media Policy*. In Bart Cammaerts and Nico Carpentier (eds), *Reclaiming the Media: Communication Rights and Democratic Media Roles*. Bristol: Intellect Books, 9–30.
- Lerner, Daniel. 1958. *The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernising the Middle East*. New York and London: Free Press and Collier-Macmillan.
- Lerner, Daniel. 1971. *Toward a Communication Theory of Modernization: A Set of Considerations*. In Wilbur Schramm and Donald Roberts (eds), *The Process and Effects of Mass Communication Urbana, Illinois and London: University of Illinois, Urbana*, 861-889.
- Lublinski, Jan, Wakili, Merjam and Berner, Petra. 2014. *Introduction: A major challenge for media development*. In *Media Development: In the Service of the Public, Functions and Transformation of Media in Developing Countries*. Bonn: DW Akademie. Accessed July 2, 2016. <http://www.dw.com/popups/pdf/50211247/02-2014-in-the-service-of-the-public-pdf.pdf>
- Manyozo, Linje. 2012. *Media, Communication and Development: Three Approaches*. London and New Delhi: Sage.
- Manyozo, Linje, Nassanga, Goretti, Lopes, Claudia. 2015. *The Implication of ICTs in the Political Economy of Community Radio Broadcasting in Africa: A Comparative Investigation into the Listenership to, Content Production for and Management of Community Radio Broadcasters in Mali, Mozambique (and Uganda)*. Accessed August 8, 2016. http://www.ces.uc.pt/myces/UserFiles/livros/1097_Final_Report_Revised2_LC.pdf

- Mansell, Robin. 2011. *Whose Knowledge Counts? A Political Economy of the Knowledge-Based Society/Economy*. Unpublished presentation given to an IDS Seminar, University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom, 26 January.
- Mundy, Paul and Compton, Lin. 1999. *Indigenous Communication and Indigenous Knowledge*. In Oswald Warren (ed), *The Cultural Dimension of Development: Indigenous Knowledge Systems*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications, 113-123.
- Noske-Turner, Jessica. 2014. *Evaluating the Impacts of Media Assistance: Problems and Principles*. *Global Media Journal* 4 (2): 1-21. Accessed June 21, 2016. <http://www.globalmediajournal.de/de/2015/01/16/evaluating-the-impacts-of-media-assistance-problems-and-principles/>
- Obregon, Rafael and Waisbord, Silvio (ed.). 2012. *The Handbook of Global Health Communication, Development and Social Change*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Price, Monroe. 2002. *Memory, the Media and NATO: Information Intervention in Bosnia-Herzegovina*. In Jan-Werner Müller (ed), *Memory & power in post-war Europe: Studies in the presence of the past*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 137-154.
- Quebral, Nora. 1988. *Development Communication*. Laguna: UPLB College of Agriculture.
- Randall, Vicky. 1993. *The Media and Democratisation in the Third World*. *Third World Quarterly*, 14 (3): 625-646.
- Rogers, Everett. 1962. *Diffusion of Innovations*. New York: Free Press.
- Rogers, Everett. 1993. *Perspectives on Development Communication*. In K. Sadanandan Nair and Shirley White (eds), *Perspectives on Development Communication*, New Delhi, Thousand Oaks and London: Sage, 35-45.
- Scott, Martin. 2014. *Media and Development*. London: ZED Books.
- Schneider, Laura. 2014. *Media Freedom Indices. What They Tell Us – And What They Don't*. Bonn: DW Akademie, Deutsche Welle. Accessed June 21, 2016. <http://www.dw.com/popups/pdf/37157294/01-2014-media-freedom-indices-pdf.pdf>
- SIDA and Birgitte Jallo. 2007. *Community Radio in East Africa: An Impact and Sustainability Assessment of Three Community Radios within EACMP*. Stockholm: SIDA. Accessed June 21, 2016. <http://www.comminit.com/sida/content/community-radio-east-africa-impact-and-sustainability-assessment-three-community-radio-w>
- UNESCO. 1980. *Many Voices One World: Communication and Society, Today and Tomorrow; Towards a New More Just and More Efficient World Information and Communication Order*. London, New York and Paris: Kogan Page and UNESCO.
- UNESCO. 2008. *Media Development Indicators: A Framework for Assessing Media Development*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO. 2014. *World Trends in Freedom of Expression and Media Development*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNDP. 2006. *The Guide to Measuring the Impact of the Right to Information Programmes: Practical Guidance Note*. Oslo: UNDP Democratic Governance Bureau.
- Waisbord, Silvio. 2011. *The Global Promotion of Media Diversity: Revisiting operational models and bureaucratic imperatives*. In Monroe E. Price, Susan Abbott and Libby Morgan (eds), *Measures of Press Freedom and Media Contributions to Development: Evaluating the Evaluators*. New York: Peter Lang, 2011, 321-338.

Linje Manyozo

Linje Manyozo (PhD) is a Senior Lecturer in Communication for Development at RMIT University's School of Media and Communications. He is a development practitioner whose portfolio with international and community development organizations spans health systems strengthening, disease prevention, women and youth empowerment, in which media development has been employed as a strategy to achieve desired outputs and outcomes.



Linje Manyozo ,
Senior Lecturer in Communication and Development,
linje.manyozo@rmit.edu.au

Please contact us for further information

Dr. Jan Lublinski
Head, Research and Evaluation
DW Akademie

T +49.228.429 22 81
jan.lublinski@dw.com

Petra Berner
Head, Strategy and Consulting Services
DW Akademie

T +49.228.429 2981
petra.berner@dw.com

Deutsche Welle
53110 Bonn, Germany

dw-akademie.com
info@dw-akademie.com
facebook.com/DWakademie

-  facebook.com/DWAkademie
-  dw.de/newsletter-registration
-  [@dw_akademie](https://twitter.com/dw_akademie)
-  [#mediadev - dw.com/mediadev](https://dw.com/mediadev)

dw-akademie.com

