



Communication in development cooperation

Future Brief - Part 3

Production practices in humanitarian communication

This is the third and final Future Brief in the trilogy about humanitarian communication. Here we discuss the role of production processes in humanitarian communication and highlight how not only representations but also productions of international solidarity can become more ethical, inclusive, and equitable. We propose three modes of shifting the power in content production: on the level of INGOs and their partner organisations (the institutional mode); on the level of (the work of) creative agencies, artists, and professionals who are close to the projects that are represented (the creative mode); and, finally, on the level of civil society organisations, community activists and ordinary citizens activists who are part of the projects (the civic mode).



Photo by Wonderlane.com

The production side of humanitarian communication

- [Production-centered approaches to humanitarian communication](#)
- [Localization of aid: are NGOs walking the talk?](#)
- [How development organizations can tell stories more ethically](#)

The production of communications about international cooperation and humanitarian assistance has received relatively little attention from professionals, critics, and academics alike. While the challenges of humanitarian representations and audiences have led to quite a significant body of research, the topic of production has largely been out of sight. This while (the persistence of) problematic representations can be, at least partially, explained by unbalanced production processes and practices, where Western perspectives (still) prevail as a result of crews whose privileges determine the choices made when writing articles, interviewing participants, and shooting footage.

This third Future Brief, therefore, departs from one of the key findings in the previous one. In the second Future Brief, we argued that it is key to actively include the people who the story is about in order to produce more ethical, inclusive, and equitable communication. This practice was referred to as participatory storytelling or co-creation and explained as a mode of producing communication where all people involved in a project get a say, stake, and role in how their stories are told. Involving and engaging people can, however, be done in various ways, and it is therefore important that INGOs 'maximise' the participatory efforts and have it run parallel to a shift in the power relation between INGOs and the people represented. Parallel to this, participatory storytelling can and should be aligned with a general 'relocation' of production processes and practices in international cooperation and humanitarian assistance. Over the past decade, the sector has elaborately discussed

ideas of localisation [1], that is, the need 'that local, national and regional actors should be at the heart of humanitarian responses'. [2] In this Future Brief, we aim to highlight that this applies to production practices in humanitarian communication as well.

Traditionally, most communication professionals in the sector work at 'head offices' based in the so-called global North, where they create stories about places and people in the so-called global South. Participatory storytelling advocates a shift in this production process from North to South, parallel to the more general aim of shifting the power in international cooperation. In this Future Brief, we want to outline three (mutually beneficial) modes of shifting the power in humanitarian communication: the institutional, the creative, and the civic mode. These three modes should not be understood as definitive or separate categories. They are mentioned here as a way of giving structure to a range of different ideas and fundamental choices to be made across institutional, creative, and civic forces.



Photo by RF Studio

Media and participation

In his book *Media and Participation* (2009), Nico Carpentier offers an instructive distinction between 'minimalist' and 'maximalist' notions of participation in media production. [3] This distinction amounts to the fact that many perceived forms of participation in practice do not adequately redistribute power between media professionals and citizens. As such, Carpentier argues that we cannot be content with any form of participation that does not structurally improve the position of ordinary citizens, minority groups, and democratic movements.

A notorious example of 'minimalist' participation can be found in social media, where many can indeed speak out, while at the same time, social media platforms (through algorithms and moderation) hold the power to strictly regulate whose voices are muted or amplified. As these platforms also accumulate vast amounts of personal data and capital, the power balance tips to their advantage, despite their seemingly participatory character.

As social media are just one example of how participation does not in and of itself change power imbalances, INGOs should be aware of the different levels on which participation can be implemented, from the early set-up of campaigns to the production and distribution of content.

The institutional approach to co-creation: within and between organisations

- ▣ [OECD's guide on successful partnerships](#)
- ▣ [Visualizers of solidarity](#)
- [Example of institutional co-creation: DTS/CNV's 'Working together, Jobs for Young People'](#)

The institutional approach refers to various forms of co-creation in which media campaigns and other representations are produced in collaborations between different departments within an organisation, or together with partnering organisations. In its easiest (but quite far-reaching) form, this would entail a loosening of the ties between the 'head office' and communication department and an alignment of communication activities with the 'country offices' (evidently, this refers to the broader aim to altogether reconsider the distinction between 'head' and 'country' offices). In short, this would mean that communication professionals are not based at the head offices of international NGOs, but that communication professionals work at all the different offices of an organisation. This would also mean that (the role of) communication would be more clearly embedded within the work that INGOs do.

Of course, this can also be expanded beyond one's own organisation. To begin with, and on a micro-scale, the act of giving credit to partner organisations that have worked on a project should be a given. All too often, partner organisations are sidelined in communications of INGOs. While INGOs often pride themselves in working with 'local communities' or 'partner organisations', their efforts are often not represented on screen. While giving credit is a first step, which can be taken without involving partners in the process of drafting or shooting content, the best option would be to co-create campaigns. In this set-up, partner organisations are invited to represent their efforts and

stakes in different projects – and ideally, they take the initiative and lead the way themselves.

A good example of this can be found in CNV International, a Dutch federation of trade unions, which has an 'international' department that functions as an independent NGO for global justice. CNV works closely with partner unions across the world, an approach that shows in their communications, in which all participating trade unions are credited and represented on an equal basis. In addition, media are used to further the aims of the organisation, such as an app that allows workers to monitor working conditions, where subsequently the data generated is used for lobbying and advocacy. In another instance, the organisation joined forces with UDTs, a Senegalese trade union, and two Senegalese influencers to launch a campaign for better youth employment. [4]




Photo by Brett Sayles

The creative approach to co-creation: involving locally-based creatives

- ④ [The cultural turn in international development](#)
- ④ [How the cultural and creative industries can power human development](#)
- ④ [Example of creative co-creation: The Lam Sisterhood](#)

The example of CNV, where the power of influencers from the country where the project takes place is used, highlights a second mode of shifting the power in the production of 'communication for development'. Here the strategy is to reach out to locally-based creative journalists, artists, filmmakers, and other media professionals, rather than to rely on a fixed team of (international) communication professionals from within the organisation. This strategy detaches the production process from possible institutional complexities (such as internal politics and concerns about practicalities or formalities) and allows for using the skills, expertise, and creativity that are not available with the (partner) organisation(s). Just as is the case with more general tendencies to localise international cooperation, the practice of working together with locally-based creative professionals is both more accurate and just.

While working with locally-based professionals sounds (and is) promising, it might, at least at first, be easier said than done. It can be hard to navigate a creative industries landscape that is new to your organisation and to outsource work to parties that you are not yet familiar with. However, it can and should be done, and you could start with a partial shift, where local crew members are added to teams that have done the job before. Building a network and familiarising yourself with the different agencies and professionals that are around take time – and time should be taken.

The creative approach to co-creation holds significant

additional benefits. Most importantly, creatives who work (most) proximate to the represented places, communities, and projects are generally better able to embed the campaign within the wider context.

They usually speak the language of those who will be within the storytelling frame, both in a literal sense and regarding the political, economic, social, and cultural dynamics. In addition, a campaign produced 'in close proximity' to the project often more easily resonates with the participants of the story and across audiences from that community, region, or country.

An interesting point in the case is The LAM Sisterhood, a Nairobi-based storytelling collective that produces stories for the people that they are about, even if the production is commissioned by an external party, such as an INGO. [5] This means that The LAM Sisterhood always centralises the stakes of the subjects of the communication and always involves them from planning the production to reflecting on the final edit.



Photo by Ahmed Akacha

The civic approach to co-creation: involving the people the story is about

- ④ [Putting the people in the pictures first](#)
- ④ [Example of civic co-creation: Youth Voices for Change](#)
- ④ [Example of civic co-creation: Voices for Just Climate Action](#)

Like partner organizations who are often not given credit, grassroots actions are regularly sidelined in representations of international cooperation and humanitarian assistance. Indeed, as noted in a report from the 'Shifting the Power' project in the UK, 'community contribution as first responders in emergencies, [are] not normally recognized, acknowledged, quantified, documented and shared in the wider international disaster response discourse.' [6] This can be changed by directly and actively involving the people who are working for change in the production process, and having them represent themselves.

This already begins with the basic act of asking consent for recording and publishing someone's story, which in essence can be understood as involving people in the production process. This should be done at all times and in a comprehensive way. However, ideally, people tell, create, and circulate their own stories, and they are often skilled and media-savvy to do so. In fact, civil society organisations, community activists, and ordinary citizens usually have great skills in media production. A great example can be found in the Youth Voices for Change campaign by the Down to Zero Alliance, where a group of young activists from around the world took care of the 'photography shoots, to blogs, social media campaigns and videos.' [7] More generally, a tendency to be welcomed is the sharing of content produced by activists and citizen journalists by NGOs. An example of an NGO that is actively doing this is Hivos. In the case of Voices for Climate Justice, for example, an alliance 'brings together global and local voices by connecting a

diverse range of civil society organizations representing women, youth, indigenous people, urban poor, digital activists and more’.

As the civic approach to co-creation engages civil society organisations, community activists, and ordinary citizens, it is most far-reaching and should be most sought-after in terms of shifting the power in the production of humanitarian communication. However, it could be experienced as challenging, at least at first, as INGOs have to rely on people who are not necessarily institutionally anchored or professionally trained in content production. At the same time, people in vulnerable situations might not always be in a position to be involved in the production process. Yet, as this approach is the one that allows for most agency and power to people, it is the route to follow in the quest for ethical, inclusive, and equitable communication.

Consent and power

The process of getting consent for the depiction of individuals has been on the agenda at INGOs for quite some time already. A range of concerns have sparked this interest, particularly about the position of children (and who is allowed to consent on their behalf) and the linguistic and cultural barriers that, to the persons who are about to be represented, can make unclear what they actually consent to. However, in discussions about content one fundamental element receives surprisingly little attention: the role of power. When representations are about international cooperation or humanitarian aid, a significant part of the participants are in such a position of vulnerability and dependency that they might consent based on their vulnerability or dependency.

Particularly when confronted with a media professional representing an official institution, the role of power should not be neglected. Therefore, the sector would do well to shift the baseline from a relatively formal understanding of informed consent (in which consent is a matter of abstract rules and signatures alone) to a more ethical understanding of consent.

In the latter, potential vulnerabilities and dependencies on the side of the participant are actively considered. As a result, INGOs can thoroughly assess the power relations inherent in the consent procedure, maximize the participants’ authority and agency in the decision-making process, and minimize the pressures involved. It means investing time in building a relationship with the people who might be filmed, interviewed, or photographed, and discussing the options regarding if and how someone would like to participate in the production. This means, by default, that the consent process should be started well ahead of the intended content collection and production phase.

One way to partially mitigate power imbalances is to involve INGO staff in the consent procedure who is already familiar, trusted, and accessible to the participants; someone they know and have regularly interacted with already. In this process a rejection is a viable option – as it indicates a thorough consent procedure. Also, the full range of possibilities regarding the disclosure of a person’s identity on screen or in writing is something to be considered, ranging from elaborate attention to someone’s background and identity (as a way of giving credit and fully representing someone’s personal motivation) to full anonymization (for reasons of safety or privacy, or other personal considerations).

Opportunities and concerns regarding equipment, training, and platforms

- ④ [Whose photo? Whose voice? Who listens?](#)
- ④ [International programme for the development of communication](#)
- ④ [Participation and media production: critical reflections on content creation](#)

The already mentioned Down to Zero Alliance worked together with a group of youth leaders to ‘strengthen their communication and advocacy skills while connecting them through a digital communications platform.’ [8] This highlights the fact that some modes of participatory storytelling require additional support in terms of skills, equipment, and infrastructure. In these cases, the strengthening of civil society organisations, community organisations, and ordinary citizens in these regards can be regarded as an end in itself. Indeed, as noted in our second Future Brief, access to the means of media production must be considered a human right, as it allows people to participate in societal debate and to speak out and be heard.

This brings us to the ‘amplification’ of people’s voices in and through humanitarian communication, where INGOs increasingly emphasize how they provide a platform for people to be seen and heard. It can be productive to (at least partially) look at the communication channels of INGOs as platforms: that is to say, as places where civil society organisations can take the stage. Yet, if this is done, one general misunderstanding about platforms is to be noted. Whether talking about social media platforms or other notions of platformisation, the notion of the platform tends to be misunderstood as a neutral facilitator of social action. The use of the word ‘platform’ (provided for others to use) usually implies that the space provided is a neutral stage, for others to take. This is, however, never the case: any kind of platform is built and curated, and functions as an actively mediating

institution or machine. [9] NGOs should be aware that any kind of support, amplification, or platform-like function is just as much a social act as a top-down produced campaign is.

An example of this can be found in the research of Tiffany Fairey's study of participatory photography projects by INGOs. In these projects, citizen journalism is encouraged, and the results are circulated widely – but not without the INGOs being active at crucial moments of the decision-making process. As such, she highlights that these projects can just as well be understood as sides for negotiation, where different expectations, preferences, and dependencies collide. Indeed, she states that 'it is rare that participants retain full editorial and curatorial control' in these projects, and she therefore 'calls for practitioners (...) to be transparent and reflexive about these negotiated processes.' [10] Whether indeed by means of training, supplying equipment, or providing a platform, INGOs should just as well reflect on how their co-creative projects are configured by power relations.

Fairey particularly notes one concern as central, and that is the editorial control that INGOs hold on to because 'projects have to compete in an image market which demands the selection of compelling images in order for the images to gain an audience.' [11] Indeed, the role of audiences, in this case, audiences from the global North, is key to understanding the main concerns INGOs can have about the different modes of shifting the power in production practices in communication: will the target audience understand and appreciate the results?

In some sense, it could be argued that communication professionals based in Dutch and other European 'head offices' are in the best position to produce content that resonates with their target audience, because of their knowledge of (Western) audiences, (media) cultures and (philanthropic) market mechanisms. However, while this might be true from a fundraising point of view, this does not do justice to the more structural aim to have non-Western voices heard – and heard properly. As discussed

in the second Future Brief, the fundraising argument often hampers the goal of ethical, inclusive, and equitable representation. Indeed, to centralise the (expectations of) Western audiences would once again marginalise the position of the subjects of representation.

Indeed, as emphasized in the example of The LAM Sisterhood, it is the people within the frame that the communication is ultimately made for – their perspective should remain central at all times. Alternatively, therefore, communication professionals from the global North can employ their knowledge about Western audiences to create interest in, harness support for, and promote self-representation. In addition, they might guide Western audiences through stories that are 'new', 'different', or 'unexpected' to them.

As such, rather than conforming to Western audiences (whose preferences may be at odds with the results of participatory storytelling), communication professionals should play a role in changing the expectations to a pattern that allows for better representation. Communication professionals can be considered experts in understanding what Western audiences require to create a more balanced and just narrative. Where intercultural communication always involves an effort to 'translate' between contexts, languages, and expectations, this role means a shift in the burden of translation. Where in traditional humanitarian communication this burden mainly lies with the subjects of the communication (whose stories were told to fit donor expectations), in this new set-up it would lie with the communication professionals in the global North (who garner support for a broad variety of self-representations).

Conclusions

The different modes of shifting the power in the production of humanitarian communication encompass a loose set of ideas and ideals that can help to balance out the work of content production in humanitarian communication. Contemporary production practices are often not very balanced yet, mainly because such content is not produced by or in cooperation with the people whom it is actually about.

The common practice of working with communication professionals based at 'head offices' of INGOs in the global North results in representations that are mostly produced from an outsider's perspective. Along the lines of institutions, creativity, and civil society, different strategies can be used and combined to get an insider perspective. Concrete steps that can be taken include working on co-productions with partner organisations, building a network of media professionals and creative agencies in the same region where projects take place, and the act of handing over control to locally-based civil society organisations, community activists, and ordinary citizens. These steps require time but even more so a commitment to working together on an equal basis.

In addition, there is work to be done in changing (audience) expectations and (power) relations, to ensure that participatory storytelling can enhance (the production of) ethical, inclusive, and equitable communication.

Colophon

This Future Brief on communication in international cooperation is a product of the Partos Innovation Hub in collaboration with the Expertise Centre Humanitarian Communication (HuCom). Partos is the membership organisation for Dutch-based organisations working in international cooperation. The Partos Innovation Hub offers professionals in the field of international cooperation the space to learn and innovate with each other to be better able to navigate the future and accelerate structural change within themselves, their organisations, and in international cooperation. HuCom is a non-profit organisation committed to better communication about international cooperation. They consider ethical, inclusive, and equitable communication as essential to creating a more just world and offer feedback and tools for INGOs in the Netherlands and abroad to become aware of and contribute to this.

Authors

Wouter Oomen, Senior Lecturer in Media Studies at Utrecht University and Co-Director of the Expertise Centre Humanitarian Communication.

Emiel Martens, Assistant Professor in Media Studies at the University of Amsterdam, Senior Researcher in Arts and Culture Studies at Erasmus University Rotterdam, and Co-Director of the Expertise Centre Humanitarian Communication.

Contributors

Various members of the Community of Practice Inclusive Communication, started in April 2022 by Partos in collaboration with the Expertise Centre Humanitarian Communication.

References

- [1] Ben Emmens and Maxine Clayton, "Localization of Aid: Are NGOs Walking the Talk?", *Shifting the Power Project*, 2017.
- [2] KUNO, "Local Leadership."
- [3] Nico Carpentier, *Media and Participation: A Site of Ideological-Democratic Struggle*, 2011.
- [4] CNV International, "Youth voices - Influencer Ninou talks with young people about how to find a job", YouTube.com, 2022.
- [5] LAM Sisterhood, "About Us."
- [6] Ben Emmens and Maxine Clayton, "Localization of Aid: Are NGOs Walking the Talk?", *Shifting the Power Project*, 2017.
- [7] Down to Zero Alliance, "Voice for Change: Final Report 2020-2021", Down to Zero Alliance, 2021.
- [8] Down to Zero Alliance, "Voice for Change: Final Report 2020-2021", Down to Zero Alliance, 2021.
- [9] Tarleton Gillespie, "The Politics of 'Platforms'", *New Media & Society* 12.3 (2010): 347-364.
- [10] Tiffany Fairey, "Whose Photo? Whose Voice? Who Listens? 'Giving,' Silencing and Listening to Voice in Participatory Visual Projects", *Visual Studies* 33.2 (2018): 111-126.
- [11] Tiffany Fairey, "Whose photo? Whose voice? Who listens? 'Giving,' Silencing and Listening to Voice in Participatory Visual Projects", *Visual Studies* 33.2 (2018): 111-126.



Photo by Mikael Blomkvist

© March 2024

Copyright: All rights reserved for those who want to pursue a better world for all. We hope that this publication will be reproduced and shared as widely as possible, in any form or by any means. While doing so, we would appreciate it if you mention *Future Brief on Communication in development cooperation - Part 2*, published by [Partos](#) and the [Expertise Centre Humanitarian Communication](#).



EXPERTISE CENTRE
**HUMANITARIAN
COMMUNICATION**