Conclusion: Building Bridges for a Sustainable Future

In Wayanad, farmers are committed to protecting the unique biodiversity and the health of the current and future generations, but their efforts are met with mounting pressures from an increasingly consumerist and materialistic local society that ends up ‘downgrading’ the social status of organic farmers. In almost every conversation I had with the farmers, the issue of ‘ridicule’ they faced from local society was brought up. Equally, the recognition they received from foreign buyers and customers and the interest that their videos have generated among non-organic farmers about their work were greeted with enthusiasm and motivation to work harder and ensure younger generations had a reason to stay in Wayanad and continue farming organically.

The experience of these farmers reflects the complex and integrated nature of sustainable development, where the environmental, social, and economic dimensions are impossible to separate. It is also a reflection of the values that matter to communities and that underlie key concepts in sustainability, including vulnerability, resilience, responsibility towards future generations, and the different ways in which different communities define their problems and solutions (Miller et al. 2014). Understanding these values and the integrated nature of sustainability requires a co-creation of knowledge through collaboration between disciplines and actors to achieve the societal transformations required for the materialisation of sustainable development (Trencher et al. 2013). But until now, even if the three pillars of sustainable development—economic,
environmental, and societal—have been the focus of scientific and policy debate, the extent to which the respective disciplines of economics, sociology, and ecology have also integrated their definitions, approaches, and findings remains debatable (Ciegis et al. 2009; Dimitrov 2010; Gibson 2006). Communication can offer a valuable conceptual and empirical tool for a more integrated understanding of sustainable development, and Servaes and Lie (2013) point to the wealth of sustainable social change work that is being done in various fields, including agriculture, food security, and natural resource management, and which involves communication. Yet, such work is rarely, if at all, framed under the heading of communication studies.

Through its focus on communication and development in the context of food networks, this book has made a step towards demonstrating the importance of relations and communication between key actors in the spheres of production and consumption and in the global/macro and local/micro levels of the food economy. These relations bring to light the different, and often subtle, ways in which the actors’ interdependence can address sustainability and social change challenges. More importantly, the focus on communication and social relations enables a closer focus on people and their unique, traditional, and non-expert knowledge that can prove critical for wider social learning and capacity building. These relations and interdependencies underline the need for transdisciplinary, innovative, and participatory research (Carpiano 2009). In fact, the need for new partnerships is written into the Sustainable Development Goals as an essential path to their implementation (Trott et al. 2018). In this effort, a focus on communication is critical for analysing the links between food, place, and people as essential dimensions to sustainable development (Vandecandelaere et al. 2009). In this book, the integral role of communication in global food networks is seen in at least three areas: trade relations between food producers and small businesses, self-representation in public narratives and discourses, and digital communication between food producers and consumers. From these areas, I would highlight three emerging avenues for further research and innovation: (a) the need for small-scale projects; (b) the role of participatory and non-broadcast communication; and (c) the integration of ideas, actors, and practices from the private sector and the world of business in the field of communication and social change.
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: SMALL, BEAUTIFUL, LOCAL, AND CONNECTED

In 1973 German-born British economist E. F. Schumacher published a book that would popularise critiques to Western neo-classical economics and would challenge the twentieth century’s fixation with the idea that ‘bigger is better’. The book’s title, *Small is Beautiful*, captured the essence of empowerment that comes from small, appropriate technologies that cater for and take into consideration people’s human needs. In contrast, ‘big’ solutions that were tied to big markets and global economic systems would only dehumanise societies.

As this book’s final pages are being written, in the summer of 2020, the world is facing an unprecedented crisis. COVID-19, a novel virus originating in Wuhan, China, is ripping through populations from East to West and from North to South. As the global economy is being hit and the world is bracing itself for a recession, questions around the catastrophic impact of globalisation and theories of de-globalisation are also emerging. Schumacher’s ‘small is beautiful’ idea couldn’t sound more relevant. With the global food supply chain being susceptible to disruptive trade-related measures and restrictions, questions around food security and the resilience of the global food system are also inevitably being asked. Is this pandemic a warning that sustainable food production and consumption is possible only on a local scale? Is this the time for consumers to return to self-sufficiency and confine their purchases to produce that is sourced locally? Considering that millions of people around the world depend on international trade for their livelihoods, it’s hard to imagine a new world order where international food trade takes a back seat. Yet, more than ever, this pandemic brings to the forefront the complex but essential ways in which the local and global can and should co-exist. I feel that E. F. Schumacher’s *Small is Beautiful* is a timely reminder about the need for a people-centred economic system that will remain within people’s control, encouraging human interaction. Does this mean that we somehow need to find ways to ‘reverse’ globalisation? Would that even be possible or desirable? Perhaps what the world needs is to find creative ways for the local and the global to exist in a more balanced, less harmful manner.

One of the core messages in this book concerned the need for more attention to be paid to smaller and localised development projects and initiatives. Sustainable development is a highly contingent concept and process and understanding it requires paying closer attention to the small
and localised experience of the people. But small, beautiful, and local sustainable development does not have to be seen as a limiting approach because the small and the local are also open and connected, and looking for sustainable solutions through small-scale and local projects can also have a global reach. I find that Ezio Manzini’s SLOC (Small, Local, Open, Connected) scenario (2007; 2011; 2015) offers an optimistic approach to achieving a sustainable yet networked and global economy and society. Manzini has also drawn inspiration from Schumacher’s ideology, but in light of the new global reality, he stresses how the ‘small’ that Schumacher referred to can be influential as a node in a global network, while the local can be open to global flows of people, information, and ideas (Manzini 2015: 177–178). Although Manzini’s SLOC scenario was developed as a model for the design of materials for social innovation and sustainability, it encapsulates an all-encompassing framework for understanding global networks and the interactions that constitute the global food system more broadly.

Manzini (2007, 2011) draws on the network society theory to conceptualise the interaction among small, local systems that reconstruct the whole, like nodes in a network. In this network, locality-oriented initiatives remain important as strategies that will enhance the self-sufficiency of the local community. Sustainable solutions should focus on and be found in the small and local places. But for these solutions to work, these small entities and their localities should remain connected to a global network. These interconnections are captured in ‘creative communities’ that include institutions, enterprises, non-profit organisations, and individual citizens that are acting outside of the mainstream economic models and are inventing and enhancing new socio-cultural and economic activities to support the sustainability of local communities. He gives the example of the Ainonghui Farmers’ association in China that has helped small farmers sustain traditional farming and secure higher incomes by connecting with consumers in the distant big cities (Manzini 2011). Although the specific example refers to relations and interactions within the boundaries of the national, it exemplifies a form of social interchange that relies on activities based on local resources and skills that are linked into wider global networks.

Understanding how small and local systems interact and how they can contribute to sustainable solutions requires first an understanding of development on a small and local scale based on the unique experiences of small communities. Understanding the social relations and
communication practices that connect communities can pave the way for identifying mechanisms and methods to connect and spread sustainable behaviours and solutions. The experiences presented in this book offer a glimpse into the possibilities that exist. Through their practices and their resistance to society’s unfavourable norms and rules, the Wayanadan farmers become a source of inspiration that could influence a network’s activities in a way that helps them create a more sustainable future for themselves and other networks. Through their mentality and actions, they exhibit certain characteristics associated with the concept of Manzini’s ‘creative communities’. These are communities that create locality-oriented initiatives, such as strategies to enhance the self-sufficiency of the local community, and try to enhance solutions to everyday life problems without waiting for wider changes in the system, such as the economy. The Wayanadan farmers are an example of a community that is challenging mainstream ways of thinking in their society in order to bring their individual interests and well-being in line with the interest of the environment. Faced with everyday life problems and questions such as the need for natural food, healthy living conditions, and sustainability, they take action in order to provide a solution. Manzini (2007) highlights the importance of support mechanisms, including information exchange and intervention by institutions, civil society organisations, or companies required for the sustainability and long-term existence of such communities, which seems to agree with the needs of communities similar to the farmers in Wayanad. It seems that the challenge is in building a stronger local network that will enable the sustainability of the place. But, for the time being at least, maintaining their connection to the global network is paramount for their growth.

Although the maintenance of small-scale farms may seem contrary to the process of globalisation and the reality of the global food market, it does not have to be. On one hand, society will be better off with productive small-scale farming that will help build strong rural economies in the Global South and allow people to remain with their families (Altieri 2009). This could not be truer for places like Wayanad where the migration of young people to the cities or abroad in search of employment and social recognition remains one of the main challenges. This highlights the importance of creating financial incentives for younger generations and ultimately building a strong rural economy; and these financial incentives are also inextricably tied to export opportunities that provide the principal revenue stream. More importantly, the experience of the Wayanadan
farmers shows that a mesh of connected localities can exist on more than just the economic level. The relationship and philosophy they share with many of their foreign buyers is a testament of the sociability of the economy and the social bonds that connect actors in the global economic system. Under the extraordinary pressures of a global crisis, such social bonds could safeguard societies and economies from disintegration. Hence, if as Manzini (2007) suggests, the small and the local acquires new meaning in the context of the network society and becomes a node in a global network, its potential to influence the global market could come in different forms, such as by spreading an ethical philosophy and environmental stewardship. The virtual interaction that took place between the farmers in Wayanad and the consumers in the UK is another example of how different localities can connect. The impact of such connections is no longer linked to the size/scale of localities alone but to the quantity and quality of the links between them. Replicating these connections should therefore become priority question and requires giving visibility to small, beautiful, and weak cases, relations and interactions that remain hidden and can help develop a more ethical and sustainable global food provision system. Equally paramount is the role of actors from the private sector and civil society for maintaining a creative balance between local and small-scale networks and the global food network. In this case, the communication and the relations that farmers can build with businesses and consumer groups are but one example of how these connections can materialise.

*Small is Beautiful* is an idea that is incarnated in the experiences of the farmers, the small businesses and the consumers that became the focus of this book. Through their practices and beliefs, these actors displayed a desire to be part of a global food economy that remains within their comprehension and creates space for closer relations and human interaction. In this case, the empowering nature of the *Small and Beautiful* is constituted also through the power of ‘weak’ communication. Together, the two ideas call for more attention to human relations for a sustainable future, and at the time of writing these words, as the COVID-19 pandemic unravels, these relations could not be more crucial. The concept of weak communication is an attempt to do just that. It drives our attention to the relational dimension of the economic transactions that connect farmers, businesses, and consumers and that brought to light the closer interrelation of the social, environmental, and economic aspects of sustainability. This interrelation showcases the multidimensional nature of sustainable development that depends on a combination of material assets
with psychological and social resources. It also proves that development can be an ‘irrational’ process (Kleine 2013), such as in the case of the Wayanadan farmers who prioritise a simple life and lower income in return for environmental and biodiversity protection, or the small business owner who spends considerable time talking to and listening to the farmers to understand their needs. Understanding the social relations and communication practices that connect communities will also pave the way for identifying mechanisms and methods to connect and spread sustainable behaviours and solutions, fostering the vision of a multi-local society and a multi-level sustainable development.

**THE POWER OF WEAK COMMUNICATION**

Ezio Manzini’s SLOC scenario draws our attention to a type of sustainable development that is built on interconnections between small and local communities and their creative practices that make up the global system. To this scenario, I propose adding the ‘dialogic’ dimension. I use the term ‘dialogic’ rather than ‘communicative’ to emphasise the informal dialogic communication processes that were the focus of this book. Dialogic communication is mostly considered peripheral in sustainable development projects, but the experience of the Wayanadan farmers, the buyers, and the consumers showed that it is a powerful process of self-discovery that can lead to action for development in multiple ways.

Brazilian educator Paulo Freire has been a leading figure in exemplifying and celebrating the power of dialogic communication through his critical pedagogy method. In this, dialogue between the teacher and the student becomes a source of mutually acquired knowledge as both teacher and student gain a deeper comprehension of their world and the action they can take to transform it. The ‘teacher-student’ relationship articulated in Freire’s approach has, in theory at least, informed the work of participatory development programmes (see Chap. 3), with development agencies and practitioners often assuming the role of the instructor. I advocate that the dialogic process and mutual learning of this philosophy can be extended to everyday life contexts and relations such as the trade relations explored in this book. In his reading of Freire’s work, Singh (2008: 712) explains that the possibility for people to find their voice and critical consciousness (in line with Freire’s *conscientização*) can be expanded to a host of other pedagogic contexts. I propose that it can be extended to other non-pedagogical contexts, such as the market. Dialogic
communication that is embedded in economic transactions has the power to instil a sense of confidence that leads to action. Although interactions are undoubtedly shaped by power relationships, for example, between farmers and buyers, such power relationships can also occur respectfully as both sides grow and benefit in their respective areas of conduct. The concept of weak communication was an attempt to conceptualise the power of dialogic communication in this context. In this book I drew on the theories and insights from the field of communication for development and social change, but further conceptualisation and empirical investigation of the links between informal communication processes and sustainable development is required. We need to develop theoretical tools and identify spaces where such communication can be studied and encouraged so that a deeper and broader perspective can be gained on the ways in which communication can contribute to sustainable development through a type of collective action and movement that is small, local but also connected. Informal and dialogic communication processes in food networks bring together actors in a less formalised way than centralised and organised movements. Moreover, its effectiveness is possible to assess mainly on a small and local scale through local action. Yet, when the right connecting nodes are available, small and local action can have a bigger and more global impact. Social scientists can play a pivotal role not just in giving visibility to such communication processes but also to the nodes that can bring the various small and local actions into a bigger and more global network. Such nodes can be found in the role of the media, educational institutions, businesses, or charities and non-governmental organisations, to name but a few.

A note on the role of communication technologies in supporting informal and dialogic communication processes is essential at this point. On the one hand, the findings from the work presented in this book reinforce existing theories about development not being inherent in technology. The close relations and interpersonal communication that connect farmers with the buyers were made possible through a combination of communication tools, including visits, face-to-face meetings, mobile phones, and the internet. Yet, it was the physical visits and face-to-face encounters that have had the most lasting effect from a development point of view, with technology serving as a facilitator. In this case, the affordance of technology is in fact an affordance of the philosophy and intent of the buyers and the farmers. Along similar lines, the empowering nature of the storytelling experiment was an affordance of the participatory video production
process, which encouraged dialogue among the farmers, reflexivity, and action. On the other hand, and as the farmer-consumer internet-based encounter demonstrated, the role of technology was critical in providing a platform for this interaction.

Understanding the role of communication technologies in sustainable development requires an understanding of the complex communicative channels and information flows in peoples’ lives. Here, the concept of communicative ecologies provides a valuable framework (Slater 2013; Tacchi et al. 2003). Communicative ecologies have been described as ‘processes that involve a mix of media, organized in specific ways, through which people connect with their social networks’ (Tacchi et al. 2003: 17). The concept of communicative ecologies draws attention to the insufficiency of access to technology for development if these technologies do not fit into people’s existing ecologies. Instead, technology should be placed in the context of locally significant communication processes, which includes interpersonal communication. The farmers’ experience with the video experiment is a telling example of the inextricable connection between the use of a specific technology—a mobile phone camera—and the dialogic communication among the farmers. It also shows a different connection between the mobile phone and agricultural development that is materialised through the video making process and the use of the mobile phone as a creative marketing and training tool, as opposed to more common uses of mobile phones, such as the provision of information about market performance and prices. Apart from enabling a more nuanced understanding of ICTs in development, the concept of communicative ecologies offers an analytical framework for a more systematic study of information and communication technology, structures, processes, and practices in sustainable development. Having been designed to take into account relationships and contexts, it lends itself well to the study of ICTs and development in new empirical contexts, such as global food networks, and the development of new theoretical frameworks about the transmission of knowledge in a business context that is not limited to market-related information.
BUSINESS, COMMUNICATION, AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: TOWARDS A NEW PARADIGM

One of the key messages reiterated through this book is the multidimensional nature of sustainable development that entails a multiplicity of strategies and new types of partnerships between the public and private sector (Van Hemelrijck 2013: 29). In the context of the Sustainable Development Goals agenda, the UN is already working together with businesses and multi-national corporations. According to a statement made by UN Secretary-General António Guterres, the private sector is a ‘driving force to push governments to assume their responsibilities’ (UN 2018 in Miklian 2019: 570). Yet, as Chap. 4 demonstrated, discussions on the business-development nexus are fraught with tensions and inconclusive answers. In the field of communication and development, critiques have focused primarily on political economy questions around the role of private corporations as funding mechanisms for development programmes, and the exercise of power of a small number of agencies such as the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, the Open Society Foundation, Johns Hopkins, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and UNICEF (Thomas and van de Fliert 2014: 62). The role of the private sector is mostly seen as liable for reducing development and social change to entrepreneurialism and corporate social responsibility (Enghel 2015; Wilkins and Enghel 2013; Quarry and Ramírez 2009; Thomas and van de Fliert 2014). Discussions are also placed in the context of globalisation, capitalism, and the neoliberal agendas and capitalist values of the funders and private corporations that drive the design of development initiatives at the expense of the beneficiaries (Wilkins and Enghel 2013; in Enghel 2015: 16). Inherent in these critiques is a broader critique of market practices, which according to Escobar (2001) were imposed on development programmes through elite academies, international institutions, and western governments.

Without denying the legitimacy of these critiques, I argue that a blanket approach to business and the private sector risks missing evidence of and opportunities for communication processes in the context of business and trade relations that can contribute to development. For instance, Singh (2008) highlights the valuable role of the markets—situated in every culture and imaginary—in providing affordable communication technologies for development. More crucially, he calls for a view of the market and market exchanges from below and based on rich ethnographic data, evidence, and analysis, such as the anthropological analysis
conducted by Guyer (2004) on the monetary transactions, symbols, and meanings of market exchange in Africa through history (Singh 2008: 719). The analysis of the market exchanges that bring together the Wayanadan farmers with their foreign buyers through the prism of communication for development was my own attempt to provide another viewpoint of the market from below, and to also contribute towards the idea of a new paradigm, where private enterprises gain a more permanent place in development and social change initiatives. The idea of a new paradigm was introduced by Emile McAnany (2012, 2014), based on his analysis of social entrepreneurship as a new business approach to development, where social change originates by local people with innovative ideas and is funded by private enterprises. As Noske-Turner (2015) argues, the term ‘entrepreneur’ is admittedly disconcerting in development circles, as it carries with it a connection with neoliberalism, which in turn contrasts inclusivity and participation. Yet, there is space in this new paradigm for slow, long-term business relations, which might lead to more sustainable social change and development. Development organisations and NGOs could embrace the role of the private sector. In our role as social scientists, we can begin by discovering and bringing more visibility to such opportunities. If, as Sedgwick (2003) suggests, knowledge is performative, this is the way to actively participate in constituting sustainable development and social change.

DEPOLITICISING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: A MESSAGE FROM WAYANAD

Not even an hour goes by without agriculture in our life, or without spending time with the plants we love. This is regardless of the season or weather conditions. So our daily life starts and ends with our farm. Agriculture is part of our spirituality. This farm gives us pleasure, love and goodness. And we are giving the same back to the world. (Extract from a farmer’s written story)

One of the main reasons for writing this book was to contribute to a more holistic understanding of sustainable development or a ‘depoliticisation’ of sustainable development by shifting the attention away from the ‘growth ideology and the obsolete idea that growth must be placed at the core of economic and sustainability policy’ (Gómez-Baggethun 2018: 73). The above quote—part of a story written by a farmer for the storytelling project—is a succinct reflection of the need for such a shift of attention.
The sense of spirituality described in this story summarises the human and social well-being dimension of sustainable development that continues to remain elusive in sustainable development theory and practice. Spirituality was a very palpable quality in Wayanad, articulated through the farmers’ connection to nature; and it co-existed with an entrepreneurial spirit and profound agricultural knowledge and capacity to develop innovative solutions. At the same time, I couldn’t help but notice insecurity and doubt in the farmers’ own skills, as they were contemplating using the ‘modern’ methods used in places like Brazil, for growing pepper on concrete pillars, despite the effectiveness of their methods and the value addition these offered. Throughout the course of this research journey, it became evident that this insecurity was attributed, at least to a certain extent, to the social marginalisation of organic farmers and to the lack of opportunities for them to express their voice and be listened to by their own community and the world more broadly, with the foreign buyers offering a valuable outlet. The empowering nature of voice and listening was discussed in the previous chapters. Here, I want to emphasise the need for further research into the complex relationship between the less visible aspects of sustainable development, such as psychological resources, and how they connect to material and natural resources. Although this connection has been conceptualised through different theoretical frameworks (see Chap. 1), there seems to be a vacuum in empirical research that demonstrates the various ways in which the tangible and the intangible aspects of sustainable development blend. A focus on voice and self-expression as a form of intangible/immaterial development can provide the anchor for more systematic analysis and theorisation. Finally, I want to make a note on the significance of the farmers’ indigenous knowledge for sustainable development. This knowledge concerns not just agriculture methods but a deeper and broader understanding of the spiritual and relational aspects of sustainability and development that the world can learn from. In effect, understanding, depoliticising, and achieving sustainable development will not be possible without bringing the voices and knowledge of these communities to the forefront, and this requires that powerful organisations, influential institutions, and policymakers learn how to listen to this knowledge.

In his inspiring book *Communicating Development with Communities*, Linje Manyozo makes a strong case about the need to listen as a deliberate process, seeking out those with inferior status, and understanding what these voices are all about. He sets out three forms of listening: listening to
evidence, listening to ourselves, and listening as a form of speaking. All three forms require that policymakers, development organisations, and other influential and decision-making bodies step out of their expert role, engage with the empirical reality of communities, engage into a dialogic relationship with them, and make ‘listening’ their form of ‘speaking’ (Manyozo 2017: 129–135). I hope that this book is a step towards this direction.

References

Altieri, M. A. (2009). The ecological impacts of large-scale agrofuel monoculture production systems in the Americas. Bulletin of Science Technology Society, 29(3), 236–244. https://doi.org/10.1177/0270467609333728.

Carpiano, R. M. (2009). Come take a walk with me: The “go-along” interview as a novel method for studying the implications of place for health and well-being. Health & Place, 15(1), 263–272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2008.05.003.

Ciegis, R., Ramanauskiene, J., & Martinkus, B. (2009). The concept of sustainable development and its use for sustainability scenarios. Engineering Economics, 62(2), 28–37.

Dimitrov, D. (2010). The paradox of sustainability definitions, APIRA conference. Available online: http://apira2010.econ.usyd.edu.au/conference_proceedings/APIRA-2010-073-Dimitrov-The-paradox-of-sustainability-definitions.pdf. Accessed 20 Apr 2020.

Enghel, F. (2015). Towards a political economy of communication in development? Nordicom Review: Nordic Research on Media & Communication, 36, 11–24.

Escobar, A. (2001). Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the third world. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gibson, R. B. (2006). Beyond the pillars: Sustainability assessment as a framework for effective integration of social, economic and ecological considerations in significant decision-making. Journal of Environmental Assessment Policy and Management, 8(3), 259–280.

Gómez-Baggethun, E. (2018). Sustainable development. In A. Kothari, A. Salleh, A. Escobar, F. Demaria, & A. Acosta (Eds.), Pluriverse: A post-development dictionary (pp. 71–73). New Delhi: Tulika Books.

Guyer, J. (2004). Marginal gains: Monetary transactions in Atlantic Africa. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Kleine, D. (2013). Technologies of choice? ICTs, development, and the capabilities approach. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Manyozo, L. (2017). *Communicating development with communities*. London: Routledge.

Manzini, E. (2007). Design research for sustainable social innovation. In R. Michel (Ed.), *Design research now*. *Board of International Research in design* (pp. 233–245). Basel: Birkhäuser.

Manzini, E. (2011). *The new way of the future: Small, local, open and connected, social space* (pp. 100–105). Available at https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/rien_research/75.

Manzini, E. (2015). *Design, when everybody designs: An introduction to Design for Social Innovation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.

McAnany, E. G. (2012). *Saving the world: A brief history of communication for development and social change*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

McAnany, E. G. (2014). Economics and communication for development and social change. In K. G. Wilkins, T. Tufte, & R. Obregon (Eds.), *Handbook of development communication and social change* (pp. 242–258). London: Wiley-Blackwell.

Miklian, J. (2019). The role of business in sustainable development and peacebuilding: Observing interaction effects. *Business & Politics, 21*(4), 569–601. https://doi.org/10.1017/bap.2019.28.

Miller, T. R., Wiek, A., Sarewitz, D., Robinson, J., Olsson, L., Kriebel, D., & Loorbach, D. (2014). The future of sustainability science: A solutions-oriented research agenda. *Sustainability Science, 9*(2), 239–246. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-013-0224-6.

Noske-Turner, J. (2015) Left for dust: Innovation and C4D. In *Mobilising media for sustainable outcomes in the Pacific region*. Available at: https://sites.google.com/site/mobilisingmediainthepacific/research-from-the-field/leftfordustinnovationandc4d. Accessed 7 Apr 2020.

Quarry, W., & Ramírez, R. (2009). *Communication for another development: Listening before telling*. New York: Zed Books.

Schumacher, E. F. (1973). *Small is beautiful: A study of economics as if people mattered*. London: Blond and Briggs.

Sedgwick, E. K. (2003). *Touching feeling: Affect, pedagogy, performativity*. Durham/London: Duke University Press.

Servaes, J., & Lie, R. (2013). Sustainable social change and communication. *Communication Research Trends, 32*(4), 1–43.

Singh, J. P. (2008). Paulo Freire: Possibilities for dialogic communication in a market-driven information age. *Information, Communication & Society, 11*(5), 699–726. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691180802124518.

Slater, D. (2013). *New media, development and globalization: Making connections in the global south*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Tacchi, J., Slater, D., & Hearn, G. (2003). *Ethnographic action research handbook*. New Delhi: UNESCO.
Thomas, P. N., & van de Fliert, E. (2014). *Interrogating the theory and practice of communication for social change: The basis for a renewal*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Trencher, G. P., Yarime, M., & Kharrazi, A. (2013). Co-creating sustainability: Cross-sector university collaborations for driving sustainable urban transformations. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 50*(1), 40–55. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.11.047.

Trott, C. D., Weinberg, A. E., & Sample McMeeking, L. B. (2018). Prefiguring sustainability through participatory action research experiences for undergraduates: Reflections and recommendations for student development. *Sustainability, 10*, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.3390/su1.

United Nations Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights (UNHRC). (2018, September 18). *Report of the independent international fact-finding mission on Myanmar*. A/HRC739/64. New York: United Nations.

Van Hemelrijck, A. (2013). Powerful beyond measure? Measuring complex systemic change in collaborative settings. In J. Servaes (Ed.), *Sustainability, participation and culture in communication: Theory and praxis* (pp. 25–58). Bristol: Intellect.

Vandecandelaere, E., Arfini, F., Belletti, G., & Marescotti, A. (2009). *Linking people, places and products*. A guide for promoting quality linked to geographical origin and sustainable geographical indications; FAO: Rome, Italy. Available online: http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/i1760e/i1760e00.pdf. Accessed 19 Apr 2020.

Wilkins, K. G., & Enghel, F. (2013). The privatization of development through global communication industries: Living proof? *Media, Culture and Society, 35*(2), 165–181. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443712468606.