



Working together
www.rcis.ro

Revista de Cercetare si Interventie Sociala

ISSN: 1583-3410 (print), ISSN: 1584-5397 (electronic)

DYNAMISM OF CULTURE, POVERTY AND DEVELOPMENT: INDIA AND BANGLADESH EXPERIENCE

M. Rezaul ISLAM, Rajantheran MUNIANDY, Silllalee S. KANDASAMY

Revista de cercetare și intervenție socială, 2020, vol. 68, pp. 145-162

<https://doi.org/10.33788/rcis.68.10>

Published by:
Expert Projects Publishing House



On behalf of:
„Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University,
Department of Sociology and Social Work
and
HoltIS Association

REVISTA DE CERCETARE SI INTERVENTIE SOCIALA
is indexed by Clarivate Analytics (Social Sciences Citation Index),
SCOPUS and CROSSREF

Dynamism of Culture, Poverty and Development: India and Bangladesh Experience

M. Rezaul ISLAM¹, Rajantheran MUNIANDY²,
Silllalee S. KANDASAMY³

Abstract

This paper looks at the dynamism of culture, poverty and development between two countries: India and Bangladesh. There is evidence that poverty is related with culture and this synergy is related with development and vice-versa. This evidence is much more unified within these two countries. A Qualitative Interpretative Meta-Synthesis (QIMS) was conducted to analyze the current literature on the dynamism of culture, poverty and development. Results showed that culture, poverty and development are interning each other, and this interning is a factual in India and Bangladesh. The paper clearly shows that due to the cultural backwardness in India and Bangladesh, many people could not come out from the poverty line. As a result, the achievement of the development indicators in both countries is still slow. This paper argues that culture in all its multiple forms is essential to address the poverty as well as development. The findings of the paper would be important guideline to the development practitioners, NGO workers and development policy makers.

Keywords: poverty, social class, social development, social exclusion, local culture, human development.

¹ Institute of Social Welfare & Research, University of Dhaka, BANGLADESH. E-mail: rezauldu@gmail.com

² University of Malaya, Department of Indian Studies, Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences, Kuala Lumpur, MALAYSIA. E-mail: rajanmun@um.edu.my

³ University of Tunku Abdul Rahman, Department of Modern Languages, Faculty of Creative Industries, Kajang, MALAYSIA. E-mail: silllalee@utar.edu.my

Introduction

Culture, poverty and development are three buzzwords in social sciences and humanities. Culture is a broad concept that associates many aspects including poverty and development. Though the concept 'culture' means different things to different people and country as it is so contextual, but it is widely accepted that it is part of people's self-conception and self-perception and is related to nationality, ethnicity, religion, social class, generation, locality or any kind of social group. On the other hand, *poverty* is about not having enough money to meet basic needs including food, clothing and shelter. Social scientists defined poverty as persistent hunger or starvation, inadequate or absent education and health care, and are usually estranged from mainstream. Development is a broad concept that includes social, economic, political and human development in the society. These three concepts have wide explanation, but rarely explained with its interlinking and interdependency manner in the global as well as Asian literature. The literature in India and Bangladesh is very low. Within this limitation, this paper looks at the dynamism of culture, poverty and development between these two countries. This paper argues that poverty is related with culture and this synergy is related with development and vice-versa.

We can see that there are some similarities of both countries on the socioeconomic development indicators (*Table 1*). On the other hand, there are some differences such as total population, density of population, geographical location and size, religion, language, etc. In some indicators, Bangladesh is doing better such as public health, GDP growth etc. than India.

Table 1: Socioeconomic indicators of India and Bangladesh in 2017

Socioeconomic indicators	India	Bangladesh
Population, total (millions)	1,339.18	164.67
Population growth (annual %)	1.1	1.0
Surface area (sq. km) (thousands)	3,287.3	147.6
Population density (people per sq. km of land area)	450.4	1,265.0
Poverty headcount ratio at national poverty lines (% of population)	21.9 (2010)	24.3
Poverty headcount ratio at \$1.90 a day (2011 PPP) (% of population)	21.2 (2010)	14.8
GNI per capita, PPP (current international \$)	6,980	4040
Income share held by lowest 20%	8.3 (2010)	8.6
Life expectancy at birth, total (years)	69	72
Fertility rate, total (births per woman)	2.3	2.1

Adolescent fertility rate (births per 1,000 women ages 15-19)	25	84
Contraceptive prevalence, any methods (% of women ages 15-49)	54	62
Births attended by skilled health staff (% of total)	86	50
Mortality rate, under-5 (per 1,000 live births)	39	32
Prevalence of underweight, weight for age (% of children under 5)	35.7	32.6
Immunization, measles (% of children ages 12-23 months)	88	94
Primary completion rate, total (% of relevant age group)	96	119
School enrolment in primary (% gross)	114.5	111.1
School enrolment, secondary (% gross)	76	67
School enrolment, primary and secondary (gross), gender parity index (GPI)	1	1
Prevalence of HIV, total (% of population ages 15-49)	0.2	0.1
Forest area (sq. km) (thousands)	708.6	14.3
Terrestrial and marine protected areas (% of total territorial area)	3.5	4.9
Annual freshwater withdrawals, total (% of internal resources)	44.8	34.2 (2010)
Urban population growth (annual %)	2.4	3.2
GDP (current US\$) (billions)	2600.82	249.72
GDP growth (annual %)	6.7	7.3
Exports of goods and services (% of GDP)	19	15
Imports of goods and services (% of GDP)	22	20
Gross capital formation (% of GDP)	31	31

Source: Based on World Bank (2019).

This paper has three main sections: conceptual and operational definitions of culture, poverty and development, secondly- justify with current literatures how these three concepts are interning each other, and thirdly- validates with a number of examples how this interning is factual in India and Bangladesh. It is noted that the traditional livelihoods related to cultural forms and local practices are very common in India and Bangladesh whose skills and knowledge may be passed on from generation to generation. Here, culture is precisely the medium through which individuals express their ability to fulfil themselves and is therefore an integral part of development. There are two forms of cultural perspectives that are interrelated

with poverty as well as development. Due to the backwardness of culture, people in these two countries are poor and they are far behind on the most of the development indicators. Another perspective is that globalization is reinforcing on culture, poverty and development (Islam *et al.*, 2019). In both countries, globalization, with its ever-increasing social and economic interdependencies, provides opportunities for development, while also presenting enormous challenges to local communities, livelihoods, and identities. These global challenges such as endemic poverty, financial crisis, rapid urbanization, and environmental degradation have rendered people all the more vulnerable to change and to the impacts of natural disasters, and have led to the progressive loss of local cultures. Within this line, this paper argues that culture, in all its multiple forms, is essential to address these global challenges towards to promote economic growth, human development, and environmental knowledge and to bring stability in these two countries. In this perspective, a vision of development embracing culture is an essential part of the enlargement of choice and to endorse human dignity and well-being, and enhancement of freedom.

Conceptual framework

Culture

The concept 'culture' encompasses so many components that it is extremely difficult to define. Possibly, Kroeber and Kluckhohn are the first authors who attempted to define this concept in 1952. They compiled a list of 164 different definitions of culture. Apte (1994) argued that despite a century of efforts to define culture but till 1990s no agreement was reached among the anthropologists due to its diverse meanings. Matthew Arnolds' *Culture and Anarchy* (Arnold, 2018) referred culture as special intellectual or artistic endeavors or products, what today we might call 'high culture' as opposed to 'popular culture' or 'folk culture'. Edward Tylor (Taylor, 1870) referred culture to a quality possessed by all people in all social groups, who nevertheless could be arrayed on a development (evolutionary) continuum from 'savagery' through 'barbarism' to 'civilization'. Here, culture is a complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society. There are some words which are very popular concepts in culture such as mass culture, cultural heritage, cultural identity, popular culture, cultural diversity, etc. The theoretical lack of definition of culture also led to it being excluded from the development policies. There are many readings and different approaches to the notion of culture, and the problem is what is included and what is excluded from it (Marana, 2010). Culture is not a static set of values and practices: it is constantly recreated as people question, adapt and redefine their values and practices when faced with changes and the interchange of ideas. This statement brings culture as a significant aspect for development. Finally, we should emphasise that this

work considers cultural diversity to be a natural event inherent to human beings (Marana, 2010). The following definitions of culture will give more elaboration of its meanings and nature:

‘Culture ... is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society. Culture... is that complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, law, customs, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by [a human] as a member of society’ (Taylor, 1871)

‘Culture consists of patterns, explicit and implicit, of and for behaviour acquired and transmitted by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiment in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values; culture systems may, on the one hand, be considered as products of action, on the other, as conditional elements of future action’ (Kroeber & Kluckhohn 1952).

Economists tend to narrowly define culture as “those customary beliefs and values that ethnic, religious, and social groups transmit fairly unchanged from generation to generation” (Guiso, Sapienza and Zingales, 2006).

“A culture consists of habits that are shared by members of a society, whether a primitive tribe or an advanced nation. It is the product of learning, not of heredity. “The cultures of the world are systems of collective habits. The differences observable among them are the cumulative product of mass learning under diverse geographic and social conditions” (Murdock, 2006).

‘[Culture] is the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from another.’ It is the set of attitudes, values, beliefs, and behaviors shared by a group of people, but different for each individual, communicated from one generation to the next’ (Matsumoto, 1996).

‘Culture is a fuzzy set of basic assumptions and values, orientations to life, beliefs, policies, procedures and behavioural conventions that are shared by a group of people, and that influence (but do not determine) each member’s behaviour and his/her interpretations of the ‘meaning’ of other people’s behaviour’(Spencer-Oatey 2008).

The above definitions provide different dimensions of culture. Different authors mention different feature of culture, but the common components are that cultures are the totality of our beliefs, attitude, values and norms, and it is the part of our life. Culture is the identity of every human being (Islam *et al.*, 2019). Woolcock (2014) recently reviewed the sociological literature on culture and development, and highlights how scholarship has evolved to consider culture as shaping a repertoire or ‘tool kit’ of habits, skills, and styles from which people construct ‘strategies of action. The most interesting and important is that culture is learned, not inherited. However, it derives from one’s social environment, not from one’s genes. This is again mostly interesting that human nature in one hand and individual’s personality

on the other have significant impacts on culture. According to Hall (1997), culture refers to the shared meanings of a community of individuals. It is a tool by which those persons collectively “make sense of things” and it stands as a “repository of values and meanings” (Hall 1997). It is inherently dynamic (Hall, 1997; Douglas, 2004; Sen 2004) and ever changing product. It is one experience, one identity and it has uniqueness and collective identities for large numbers of individuals who are actually quite diverse (Said, 2003; Islam *et al.*, 2019a).

Poverty

The meaning of poverty has been defined in many ways over the years due to its practical application and local context. This is true that the concept ‘poverty’ has been massively explained in the lens of economics. Later the meaning of poverty has been extended to consider social, political and cultural contexts. Now, poverty is not restricted to one dimension, e.g. income, but it manifests itself in all domains of life, such as housing, education, and health (Deleek *et al.* 1992). The United Nations (UN, 1995) has defined poverty as a condition characterized by severe deprivation of basic human needs, including food, safe drinking water, sanitation facilities, health, shelter, education and information. It depends not only on income but also on access to services. It is measured in terms of income or consumption, is below a particular standard (ILO, 1995), yet there is no international consensus on guidelines for measuring poverty. Typically, it is measured with respect to families and not the individual, and is adjusted for the number of persons in a family. Economists often seek to identify the families whose economic position (defined as command over resources) falls below some minimally acceptance level.

There are some other concepts used as types of poverty e.g., extreme poverty, absolute poverty, relative poverty, and quality of life (Islam *et al.*, 2019b). All of these make this definition complex. The international standard of extreme poverty is set to the possession of less than 1\$ a day. Absolute poverty measures poverty in relation to the amount of money necessary to meet basic needs such as food, clothing, and shelter. The concept of absolute poverty is not concerned with broader quality of life issues or with the overall level of inequality in society (Islam *et al.*, 2019b). The concept therefore fails to recognise that individuals have important social and cultural needs. This, and similar criticisms, led to the development of the concept of relative poverty. Relative poverty defines poverty in relation to the economic status of other members of the society: people are poor if they fall below prevailing standards of living in a given societal context. An important criticism of both concepts is that they are largely concerned with income and consumption.

Social scientists’ understanding of poverty is critical of the economical idea of free choice models where individuals control their own destiny and are thus the cause of their own poverty. Sociologists generally study the reasons for poverty, such as the roles of culture, power, social structure and other factors largely out

of the control of the individual. Accordingly, the multidimensional nature of poverty, in particular social aspects such as housing poor, health poor or time poor, needs to be understood in order to create more effective programs for poverty alleviation. Sociological theories of poverty are based on the idea that individuals are influenced by the physical and cultural context in which they live, and it gives importance to gender and household structure. However, poverty is also social, political and cultural. Moreover, it is considered to undermine human rights - economic (the right to work and have an adequate income), social (access to health care and education), political (freedom of thought, expression and association) and cultural (the right to maintain one's cultural identity and be involved in a community's cultural life).

Development

Development is again a wide and multidimensional concept. It has different meanings and scope in different discipline and there is no consensus on its universal meaning and definition. In general, development means the growth of an individual, society, a nation, or entire world in terms of both economic and non economic activities. According to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2019), development is the act or process of growing or causing something to grow or become larger or more advanced, the act or process of creating something over a period of time. The concept 'development' is contested both theoretically and politically, and is inherently both complex and ambiguous. However, the definition of 'development' has been controversial and unstable over time. Development is the process of enlarging people's choices (Sen, 1999). Development consists of the removal of various types of a freedom that leave people with little opportunity of exercising their reasoned agency. It can be seen as a process of expanding the real freedoms that people enjoy the expansion of the 'capabilities' of persons to lead the kind of lives they value - and have reason to value (Dreze & Sen, 1999).

Indeed, one of the simplest definitions of 'development' is probably Chambers' (2004) notion of 'good change', although this raises all sorts of questions about what is 'good' and what sort of 'change' matters (as Chambers acknowledges), about the role of values, and whether 'bad change' is also viewed as a form of development. The dimensions of development are extremely diverse, including economic, social, political, legal and institutional structures, technology in various forms (including the physical or natural sciences, engineering and communications), the environment, religion, the arts and culture. In this conceptualization, development relates to a wide view of diverse socioeconomic changes. The process does not relate to any particular set of objectives and so is not necessarily prescriptive. Equally, it does not base its analysis on any expectations. The concept 'developed' comes as more organised and structured way directly to the achievement of poverty reduction and of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Sustainable Development

Goals (SDGs). A common theme within most definitions is that ‘development’ encompasses ‘change’ in a variety of aspects of the human condition.

Methodology

Research approach and method

This study presented findings through a qualitative exploration. A Qualitative Interpretative Meta-Synthesis (QIMS) (Aguirre & Bolton, 2013; Islam, 2016; Islam & Khan, 2018; Ruiz & Praetorius, 2016; Chowdhury, Wahab & Islam, 2018; Reza, Subramaniam & Islam, 2018; Islam, Wahab, Burmstar & Chowdhury, 2019) was conducted to analyze the current literature on the dynamism if culture, poverty and development.

Research design

QIMS is a phenomenological and qualitative traditional approach that immersed the relationship between culture, poverty and development. This QIMS design is followed the studies of Islam and Hossain (2014), Islam and Mungai (2016), Ruiz and Praetorius (2016), Islam (2016); Chowdhury, Wahab & Islam (2018); Reza, Subramaniam & Islam (2018); and Islam *et al.*, (2019a).

Table 2: List of publications from Web of Science (2009-2018)

Year	Number of publications (global)			Number of publications in India			Number of publications in Bangladesh		
	Culture & Poverty	Culture & development	Culture, poverty & development	Culture & Poverty	Culture & development	Culture, poverty & development	Culture & Poverty	Culture & development	Culture, poverty & development
2009	5	250	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2010	8	247	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
2011	15	245	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
2012	8	292	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2013	4	290	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
2014	5	280	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
2015	7	336	1	1	1	-	-	-	-

2016	6	380	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
2017	9	343	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
2018	7	274	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source: Web of Science (2019)

Table 3: List of publications from Scopus (2009-2018)

Year	Number of publications (global)			Number of publications in India			Number of publications in Bangladesh		
	Culture & Poverty	Culture & development	Culture, poverty & development	Culture & Poverty	Culture & development	Culture, poverty & development	Culture & Poverty	Culture & development	Culture, poverty & development
2009	4	214	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2010	14	222	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
2011	8	229	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
2012	7	281	1	-	1	-	-	1	-
2013	5	274	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
2014	10	286	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
2015	7	298	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
2016	5	281	1	-	1	-	-	1	-
2017	6	278	-	-	2	-	-	-	-
2018	9	269	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source: Scopus (2019).

Criteria

Studies were qualified for inclusion if these studies have the characteristics such as i) had the keywords culture, poverty and development, ii) contained a qualitative research design, iii) published in English, and iv) published in journals listed in either Thomson Reuters or Scopus. All other studies were disqualified for this study. This study used two search engines such as Web of Science and Scopus by using four keywords such as culture and poverty, culture and development, culture, poverty and development in global, India and Bangladesh (2009 to 2018) published literature such as journal article, books, book chapters, conference papers, etc. based on ‘title’ from both of these sources on the selected keywords (Tables 2 and 3). The Web of Science recorded highest number of publications in global literature on culture and development but it is very few on culture and

poverty, and notably low on culture poverty and development. The similar trend was also found from the Scopus as well. The numbers of publications on those three keywords are very few in both India and Bangladesh. A significant number of these are cited in the reference section. No publication was found on culture, poverty and development.

Data analysis: Theme extraction and synthesis

We tried to conserve the integrity of the selected publications for data analysis so that the originality of each publication is maintained. We also used the synonyms of the words in order to avoid the plagiarism of those publications, but in many cases we kept the similar words/concepts which carry significant meanings. We identified the common factors as themes, collected across studies, and pooled to form a synergistic understanding from distinct categories. We maintained the accuracy, and reliability and validity throughout the process of theme extraction.

Results and discussion

The literature makes confusion about the conceptual definitions of culture, poverty and developments. This was much more difficult to bring such three concepts together as we did not get a single paper in both Web of Science and Scopus in India and Bangladesh. We found that the term 'culture' has meant different things to different scholars and part of our challenge is to assess those meanings against what we know about poverty and development. We also realise that these three concepts are cross-cutting issue. Lewis' (1959, 1969) notion of the culture of poverty is that this culture emerged when groups that were socially and economically marginalised from a capitalist society developed patterns of behaviour to deal with their low status. This statement is fully true in both Bangladesh and India. More recently, the scholars have found that neighbourhood poverty can have cultural consequences for both individuals and neighbourhoods as a whole once in place, the culture of poverty was self-perpetuating, so that people were unlikely to change their behaviour even if the structural circumstances that led to it changed. This is a common feature among the rural communities in both countries. As a result, they were likely to develop an oppositional culture, a set of attitudes and beliefs fundamentally at odds with those of mainstream society. One in which subscribing to mainstream beliefs – such as participating in the formal economy or attaining success through the standard educational pathways – was considered disloyal to the fictive kin group. While groups were internally strengthened through the formation of this collective culture, their members' individual prospects for occupational success were, ironically, weakened. This statement is true in both countries as we could not come out from the colonial habits and practices. Sen and others (in Lamont and Small, 2010) have argued that

whether people are doing well in light of what they are capable of doing depends not merely on their given society but also on their interests and predilections. For example, most would agree that in both countries reducing illiteracy can be conceived as an objective, not subjective goal in practical terms. But when we are consider well-being, we are concerned not that every person has a college education, but that those who wish for one are able to attain it. Poverty is a by-product of cultural backwardness which is true in India and Bangladesh. There are many studies which showed that the slow development trend in Bangladesh and India are related with the cultural backwardness.

There is clear evidence about the positive relationship between culture and development. Many authors such as Marana (2010), Schwartz (1992), Avruch (1998) and Cace *et al.* (2011) mention that development should think into the cultural processes. Here, culture is taken as a fundamental dimension of the development process. Sustainable development can only be ensured by integrating cultural factors into the strategies to achieve it (Marana, 2010). On the other hand, culture and development are two words which have not always gone together, or been worked upon within the same context in the world. This is no such literature in India and Bangladesh that can justify this argument. Now culture and development has been thought as complementary word for each other. In recent years however, we come across new elements, instruments and ideas which place increasing emphasis on this pair of concepts. Having said this, despite all this work carried out in the area of culture and development, civil society, cultural organisations and the NGOs, amongst others in both countries, have all identified the need to examine further role of culture in development processes. It is observed that these organizations already developed the theoretical level and in its practical application through development activities and projects over time. It is also observed that these organizations developed the development tools considering the cultural context through the application of the theory and the mainstreaming of culture in development practice. John Hawkes –in his publication ‘The Fourth Pillar of Sustainability’– defended, often without any impact or support in the public policies, that culture should be the 4th pillar of sustainability (Marana, 2010).

We can see that education as a main component of development has been composed clearly. Education and the acquisition of knowledge and skills are desirable development objectives we are making a statement that holds true across different regions of the world that applies to all contemporary civilizations. It is argued that societies will differ in the ways and the extent to which they have internalized some of these values in their policies, their traditions and their institutions. Acceptance of the desirability of gender equality, for instance, does not mean that inequalities and injustices based on gender—deeply entrenched in all our cultures, to a greater or lesser extent. India and Bangladesh are two countries where this argument is evidenced in many studies. But few would disagree that gender disparities are out of step with modernity and that their presence retards human progress. Here, culture, poverty and development issue is very clear.

Development is not only about reducing poverty and expanding opportunities against the background of rising incomes. It is also in a very fundamental way about adopting a set of values that are compatible with humanity's moral development. Rather poor people become more aggressive due to poverty and unemployment. Here poverty issue has been considered to some extent as a product of the lack of cultural awareness among the poor people in both countries. This new issue has been added in the development process that the development issue has now focused comparatively new way where the components of culture, poverty and development have been changed massively due to cultural awareness among the poor people.

Cultural diversity can itself become a tool for development. Cultural diversity is as a source of exchange, innovation, and creativity. In development circles, recent scholars have argued that we should place greater importance on local knowledge, including the understandings and practices of indigenous and other marginalised groups (Scott 1999; Islam, 2014, Islam, 2019). But on the other hand, Banfield & Banfield (1958) expressly argued that cultural traditions in many parts of the world undermined the possibility of political and economic development. The idea is that cultural diversity undermines progress because it undermines common values is based on the faulty assumption that political and economic progress of the collective depends primarily on consensus, rather than conflict; on the presence of shared norms, values and beliefs. This is very common in India where cultural diversity is peak. Even, it is also true in Bangladesh particularly among the indigenous and ethnic community. Certainly, some agreement on core notions such as respect for life, fairness and economic opportunity are important, but they are also hardly points of difference. Many of the most important advances in civil rights, workers rights and economic development in developed nations have come as a result of conflict; of the efforts of society as a whole to deal directly and openly with differences over the right course of history. But the newer thinking within the culture, poverty and development, this cultural divert can be a strong weapon to fight against cultural aggression where the westernization versus indigenization fight is peak. This kind of conflict can be minimized through cultural harmonization.

There is another explanation that development, as overcoming poverty, must be a broad and holistic concept which must incorporate the concept of cultural development. In turn, one must remember the large potential of the work on cultural wealth as it provides a vision of wealth to communities which are always seen as 'poor' from the international cooperation perspective, which normally has a more classic concept of poverty (uncovered basic needs). Cooperation must also always take into account the cultural approach to society's problems, as stated by Gonzalo Carámbula (in Marana, 2010), which indicates that it is not only the cultural cooperation projects which should take culture into account, but that every social or technological development action must also consider the specific cultural aspects. The role of cultural management in conflicts is not

however taken into account, as indicated by Carámbula. Islam (2017a) recently examined nongovernmental organizations (NGOs') development frameworks for development of the smiths' communities how these fit with the local context of Bangladesh. This study provides clear evidence that NGOs in Bangladesh are practicing global development frameworks which do not fit with the local context. The study showed a number of gaps and challenges that are related with the local cultures such as low level of socio-economic and cultural conditions, unknown and unfamiliar development tools, lack of consultation with the local people, lack of space and development ownership in the development process. Each of challenges inhibits the smiths' access and involvement in the development activities. In another study, Islam (2014) examined that the local community people have limited space in the development processes due to the lack of indigenization of the development tools and frameworks into their own culture and practices. In most of the cases, the local poor people want to understand the development tools into their own language, culture and habits. Islam and Morgan (2012) and Islam (2017b) further argued that the local people could not participate into the development process until these are not designed in their own language and culture that they understand and own those. This evidence is also true in India.

There is a growing appreciation that culture and development are interdependent processes (Badgerow, 2014) though culture was a topic of limited concern to economists confronted with poverty reduction (Sen 2004). Kuran (2004) argues that cultures serve aesthetic, psychological, and social needs and also influences economic performance. Conversely, poverty reduction interventions are not confined to material impacts, but also influence socio-cultural relationships (Alkire 2004). For example, the causes of poverty in India partly rely on social structures and relations. This creates a discrimination that generates an 'artificial' poverty: between castes and genders, between religions and tribes. Likewise, in many cases the situation of women and their bottom-low participation in the economy of India worsens the situation. Their restricted access to education in rural areas also makes any kind of family planning and educative campaign on child diseases or education quasi ineffective. On the other hand, due to the lack of poverty, unemployment, income insecurity and low health facilities, many people in the hard-to-reach communities do not accept family planning methods which are directly initiated for population control and development in Bangladesh. It is from this perspective that Sen (2004) has called for a more profound evaluation of the cultural dimension of poverty reduction, noting the role of value formation in identifying economic 'ends' and 'acceptable instruments to achieve those ends'. The World Bank (2016) recently recognised that the economists have recognized that decision-making is not always rational and consistent. A growing body of research in the field of behavioural economics has highlighted the importance of context and culture in shaping decision-making. The Bank states that from this vantage point, development progress depends on changing not only incentives (what *homo economicus* responds to) but also mindsets. On the other hand, the 'outcome'

characteristic of marginalization addresses relationships of inequality (Kanbur 2007). Lamont, Beljean and Clair (2014) argued that social processes produce social inequality. Small, Harding, and Lamont (2010) argued that sociologist, demographer and even economist have begun asking question about the role of culture in many aspects of poverty even explicitly explaining the behaviour of the low income population in reference to cultural factors poverty. Charles (2008) argued that culture has been incorporated into sociological studies of class, racial/ethnic, and gender inequality. Inequality, particular gender inequality in both India and Bangladesh is closed tied with cultural issues.

The World Bank (2002) understands culture in its broad meaning: the social structures, norms, values and practices that underpin social identities and behaviours, creative activities, and cultivation of imagination. Culture is relevant to development in terms of both ends and means: it affects what is of value in a society, through the intrinsic value accorded to cultural activities and through the influence of cultural processes on the values attached to the various aspects of well-being and features of a society (including the relative weight given the well-being of different individuals or groups); and it influences how individuals, communities, informal and formal institutions respond to developmental changes and that influence the opportunities they face. This has been evidenced that the country's overall development depends on how this country practice this broad meaning. We can see that India and Bangladesh has similarity in this coherence. None of the country could use this broad meaning of culture. Both countries' social structures, norms and values, and cultivation of cultural imagination are trapped with many social taboos, cultural malpractices, social ignorance and many more cultural restrictions.

The World Bank further detailed that the conception of what it is to be poor is recognized to be a function of societal norms, and to involve multiple dimensions of well-being. There are some global norms, derived from a combination of objective and ethical considerations-for example, the food requirements for minimum healthy living or the right of all children to a basic education. This is true that this cultural practice has been started in India and Bangladesh, but the coverage is very limited. Still a huge people do not start to think this aspect. This is important that both countries have started to think about and many of these aspects have been included in the development process due to the craving and execution of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It is found that the position of Bangladesh in this regard is better than India. Bangladesh has overcome many cultural and societal barriers toward to improve women empowerment, child health, sanitation, reproductive health, family planning, and poverty alleviation. In many aspects of this development discourse, the minimum level of expenditure is needed to avoid poverty; other factors, such as how much insecurity is intolerable for decent living, and determinants of social exclusion or subjective feelings of humiliation or powerlessness. In many cases in India and also in some cases in Bangladesh, different subgroups within one society or culture often disagree to

accept some development interventions. This raises a complex question of how to pay attention to the values that form part of cultures that have embedded inequities.

Conclusions

The main limitation of this study was the lack of justification on the interlinking relationships between culture, poverty and development due to the shortages of published studies. We found in some studies that culture has a direct link with development and vice versa in both countries. On the other hand, due to cultural lag, people could not go for development. Most of the studies proved that poverty is a big threat towards development as both countries are facing poverty threat greatly where nearly 40% of the people are poor. Badgerow (2014) conducted a study on incorporating a cultural perspective in poverty reduction. She affirmed the importance of incorporating a cultural perspective into development. She concluded that, in order to achieve this, intensive participation of community members is essential throughout an intervention. Community members must have the opportunity to articulate their own conceptualization of poverty and from there formulate a desirable path to achieving their unique aspirations. In Bangladesh, Sir Fazle Hasan Abed, Director and Founder of the BRAC Foundation (Abed, 2013) argued that culture becomes absolutely essential in terms of designing programs that work. What he wanted to say is that if the programme is not culturally appropriate then it doesn't work and many of the programmes are not culturally appropriate tend not to work.

It is noted that the traditional livelihoods related to cultural forms and local practices whose skills and knowledge may be passed on from generation to generation. Here, culture is precisely the medium through which individuals express their ability to fulfil themselves and is therefore an integral part of development. From the above discussion, we can see that there are two forms of cultural perspectives that are interrelated with poverty as well as development. The traditional form is that due to the backwardness of culture, people in these two countries are poor and far from development. Another perspective is that globalization is reinforcing on culture, poverty and development. In both countries, globalization, with its ever-increasing social and economic interdependencies provides opportunities for development, while also bring enormous challenges to local communities, livelihoods, and identities. These global challenges such as endemic poverty, financial crisis, rapid urbanization, and environmental degradation have rendered people vulnerable as well as led to the progressive loss of local cultures. This paper argues that culture in all its multiple forms is essential to address these global challenges, through its role in economic growth, in human development, as a storehouse of environmental knowledge, and as a symbolic force to bring stability and meaning to communities in these two countries. In this perspective, a vision of development embracing culture as an essential part

of the enlargement of choice provides for human dignity and well-being, and an enhancement of freedom.

To sum up of the above discussion, we can come three concluding remarks: (1) First, culture has a direct link with development where it is clear that cultural development is a condition for development. It is proved that if a country can overcome social prejudice and cultural backwardness any country can develop. In this aspect, both countries are facing such problem tremendously; (2) Secondly, the literature cannot clearly prove that poverty is related with culture or vice versa. Rather some studies show that cultural diversity make slows of the development. A very few comments are found in the literature that culture has direct link with poverty; (3) Thirdly, poverty makes slow of the development process where a huge portion of people particularly in the rural and ethnic communities are poor and struggling for development.

References

- Aguirre, R. T., & Bolton, K. M. (2013). Why do they do it? A qualitative interpretive meta-synthesis of crisis volunteers' motivations. *Social Work Research*, 37(4), 327-338. DOI: 10.1093/swr/svt035
- Apte, M. (1994) Language in sociocultural context. In: R.E. Asher (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Vol.4 (pp. 2000-2010). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Arnold, M. (2018). Culture and anarchy. *Musaicum*.
- Banfield, E. C. and L. F. Banfield (1958). *The moral basis of a backward society*. Research Center in Economic Development and Cultural Change, University of Chicago.
- Cace, S., Arpinte, D., Cace, C., Cojocaru, S. (2011). The social economy. An integrating approach. *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences*, 33E, 49-66.
- Chambers, R., & Pettit, J. (2004). Shifting power to make a difference. In L. Groves & R. Hinton (eds.), *Inclusive aid: Changing power and relationships in international development*, pp. 137-162.
- Charles, M. (2008). Culture and Inequality: Identity, Ideology, and Difference in "Postascriptive Society". *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 619(1), 41-58. DOI: 10.1177/0002716208319824
- Chowdhury, S. R., Wahab, H. A., & Islam, M. R. (2018). The role of faith-based NGOs in social development: Invisible empowerment. *International Social Work*. doi: 10.1177/0020872818767260
- Corbridge, S. (1998). 'Beneath the pavement only soil': The poverty of post-development. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 34(6), 138-148. DOI: 10.1080/00220389808422549
- Cowen, M. P., & Shenton, R. W. (1998). Agrarian doctrines of development: Part I. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 25(2), 49-76. DOI: 10.1080/03066159808438666
- Deleecq, H., & Van den Bosch, K. (1992). Poverty and adequacy of social security in Europe: a comparative analysis. *Journal of European Social Policy*, 2(2), 107-120. DOI: 10.1177/095892879200200203
- De Janvry, A., & Kanbur, R. (Eds.). (2006). *Poverty, Inequality and Development: Essays in Honor of Erik Thorbecke* (Vol. 1). Springer Science & Business Media.

- Douglas, M. (2004). Traditional culture - Let's hear no more about it. In: V. Rao and M. Walton (eds), *Culture and public action*, pp. 85-109.
- Guiso, L., Sapienza, P., & Zingales, L. (2006). Does culture affect economic outcomes?. *Journal of Economic perspectives*, 20(2), 23-48. DOI: 10.1257/jep.20.2.23
- Dreze, J., & Sen, A. (1999). *India: Economic development and social opportunity*. OUP Catalogue.
- Hall, J. M. (2002). *Hellenicity: between ethnicity and culture*. University of Chicago Press.
- Islam, M. R. (2014). Improving development ownership among the vulnerable people: Challenges of NGOs' community empowerment projects in Bangladesh. *Asian Social Work and Policy Review*, 8(3), 193-209. DOI: 10.1111/aswp.12035
- Islam, M. R. (2016). Hunger reduction in China: an analysis of contextual factors. *Asian Social Work and Policy Review*. 10(3), 295-310. DOI: 10.1111/aswp.12098
- Islam, M. R. (2017a). NGO community empowerment projects in Bangladesh: How do these fit the local context. *Local Economy*. 32(7), 763-777.
- Islam, M. R. (2017b). Non-governmental organizations and community development in Bangladesh. *International Social Work*. 60(2), 479-493. DOI: 10.1177/0020872815574133
- Islam, M. R. (2016). *NGOs, Social Capital and Community Empowerment in Bangladesh*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Islam, M. R., & Khan, N. A. (2018). Threats, vulnerability, resilience, and displacement among the climate change and natural disaster-affected people in South East Asia: An overview. *Journal of the Asia Pacific Economy*. 23(2), 297-323. DOI: 10.1080/13547860.2018.1442153
- Islam, M. R., & Mungai, N. W. (2016). Forced evictions in Bangladesh: a human rights issue. *International Social Work*. 59(4), 494-507. DOI: 10.1177/0020872815580046
- Islam, M. R., Wahab, H. A., Burmester, C. F., & Chowdhury, S. R. (2019). 'Cultural Globalization: A critical analysis of Identity Crises in the developing economies' in N. Faghih (ed.), *Globalization in Developing Economies*, Netherlands: Springer.
- Kroeber, A. L., & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). *Culture: A critical review of concepts and definitions*. *Papers. Peabody Museum of Archaeology & Ethnology*, Harvard University.
- Lamont, M., Beljean, S., & Clair, M. (2014). What is missing? Cultural processes and causal pathways to inequality. *Socio-Economic Review*, 12(3), 573-608.
- Lamont, M. & Small, M. L. (2010). *Cultural diversity and anti-poverty policy*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Marana, M. (2010), Culture and Development. Evolution and prospects. In UNESCO Etxea, 2010 UNESCO Center of the Basque Country Pº Urbitarte 12, local 2, Bilbao, Spain retrieved September 12. www.unescoetxea.org
- Matsumoto, D. (2006). Culture and nonverbal behavior. *Handbook of nonverbal communication*, 219-235.
- Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2019). Poverty. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/poverty#targetText=Definition%20of%20poverty,a%20%3A%20debility%20due%20to%20malnutrition>
- Murdock, G. P. (1959). *Africa its peoples and their culture history*. McGraw Hill.

- Reza, M. M., Subramaniam, T., & Islam, M. R. (2019). Economic and social well-being of Asian labour migrants: A literature review. *Social Indicators Research*. 141(3), 1245-1264. DOI: 10.1007/s11205-018-1876-5
- Ruiz, E., & Praetorius, R. T. (2016). Deciphering the lived experience of Latinos with diabetes and depression: A qualitative interpretive meta-synthesis. *Social work in public health*, 31(2), 70-82. DOI: 10.1080/19371918.2015.1087912
- Sen, A. (1999). (1999). *Development as Freedom*, Oxford University Press.
- Sen, A. (2004). How does culture matter. In: In: V. Rao and M. Walton (eds), *Culture and public action*, 38-50.
- Small, M. L., Harding, D. J., & Lamont, M. (2010). Reconsidering culture and poverty. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 629(1), 6-27. DOI: 10.1177/0002716210362077
- Spencer-Oatey, H. (Ed.). (2008). *Culturally Speaking Second Edition: Culture, Communication and Politeness Theory*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Tylor, S. E. B. (1871). *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art and Custom*. 2 Volumes. London: J. Murray.
- Woolcock, M. (2014). *Culture, Politics, and Development*. SSRN Scholarly Paper. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network.
- World Bank (2016). Yes, culture matters for economic development. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2016/03/28/yes-culture-matters-for-economic-development>.
- World Bank (2019). World Bank open data. <https://data.worldbank.org/>