INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF NOVEL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT (IJNRD)
© 2026 IJNRD | Volume 11, Issue 5, May 2026 | ISSN: 2456-4184 | IJNRD.ORG

KNOWLEDGE POVERTY IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: Dimensions, Determinants, and Pathways to Inclusive Knowledge Societies

S. Ramaswamy[1], V. Kaveri[2], Sruthi Mohan[3], S. Gnanasaranya[4], V.Sutha[5] and S.Amutha[6]

[1]Advisor -cum-Adjunct Professor (Economics), GTN Group of Institutions, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India

[2]Head, Department of Management Studies, GTN Arts College (Autonomous), Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India

[3] Chief Administrative Officer, GTN Group of Institutions, Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India

[4] Guest Faculty, Department of Lifelong Learning and Extension, The Gandhigram Rural Institute (DU), Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India

[4] Assistant Professor, School of Management, Hindustan Institute of Technology and Science (DU), Chennai, Tamil Nadu, India

[5] Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce, GTN Arts College (Autonomous), Dindigul, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract

Knowledge poverty—the systematic exclusion from the access, production, and utilisation of information—has emerged as a defining yet under-examined challenge of the 21st century. While international development discourse has historically focused on material deprivation and income-based metrics, the profound asymmetry in the distribution of knowledge resources remains a secondary concern. This article offers a comprehensive, multidisciplinary review of knowledge poverty, situating it as an independent structural phenomenon rather than a mere symptom of financial lack. By examining its conceptual foundations through the lenses of political economy, rural sociology, and development studies, the analysis reveals how knowledge poverty operates with its own distinct dynamics, causes, and social consequences. The study investigates the structural determinants of this exclusion, highlighting its diverse manifestations across geographies, genders, castes, and classes. Drawing on extensive empirical evidence from India and other emerging economies, the article explores the symbiotic relationship between information deficits and critical developmental hurdles, such as food insecurity, health deprivation, and technological marginalisation. It argues that the "digital divide" is only the surface of a deeper epistemic crisis where marginalised communities are not only denied access to information but are also excluded from the very processes of knowledge generation. Furthermore, the research underscores that existing market-led models have failed to bridge these gaps, often exacerbating information asymmetries. Consequently, the article advocates for a fundamental shift in the architecture of public policy. It calls for the "re-centring" of the state's role in democratizing knowledge, ensuring that the production and dissemination of information serve as public goods rather than private commodities. Grounded in three decades of scholarship and government data, this paper presents a compelling case for a new framework of inclusive development—one that recognises knowledge equity as a prerequisite for social justice in the modern global economy.

Keywords: *Epistemic Justice, Structural Exclusion, Knowledge Democratisation, Information Asymmetry, Inclusive Development Architecture*

1.0 Introduction

The dawn of the "knowledge economy" has birthed a profound paradox: while the global volume of information expands at an unprecedented rate, access to that knowledge remains deeply fractured. Hundreds of millions—particularly across South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, and the rural interiors of middle-income nations—remain systematically excluded from the knowledge circuits that dictate economic opportunity, social mobility, and civic dignity. This condition of structural exclusion, defined as knowledge poverty, compels a shift beyond conventional income-based metrics toward a multidimensional understanding of deprivation, as championed by the **UNDP (1990–2023)** and Amartya Sen's "capabilities approach" **(Sen, 1999; Nussbaum, 2011)**. Knowledge poverty is distinct from mere illiteracy; a literate individual remains knowledge-poor if they cannot navigate government entitlements, access agricultural extension services, or participate in digital networks (**Castells, 2010; World Bank, 1998; Stiglitz, 1999; Mansell and Wehn, 1998**). Furthermore, dominant paradigms often marginalise valuable traditional ecological knowledge and community-based technical systems (**Agarwal and Narain, 1989; Shiva, 1988; Warren et al. 1995**). In India, this deprivation is especially stark; despite its status as a global IT superpower, approximately 850 million rural citizens remain disconnected from modern knowledge infrastructure due to

atrophied extension systems and under-resourced public libraries (**GoI, 2007; NSSO, 2018**). While smartphone penetration has increased, the digital divide has actually deepened existing social inequalities (**Kumar and Dreze, 2020; The Hindu, 2021; UNESCO, 2022**). Conceptually, knowledge poverty represents a fundamental deprivation and a capability deficit that restricts the substantive freedoms necessary for individuals to lead lives they value (**Stiglitz, 1999; Sen, 1999**). This information gap results in epistemic exclusion, where marginalised groups are systematically barred from producing or validating knowledge (**de Sousa Santos, 2014**). In the modern era, this is exacerbated by digital knowledge poverty—a lack of essential skills to navigate digital environments (**van Dijk, 2020**)—and instructional poverty, the failure of education to deliver functional literacy (**World Bank, 2019**). Even when material assets are present, resource-knowledge asymmetry can prevent their conversion into positive health or social outcomes (**Strauss and Thomas, 1995**). Furthermore, knowledge poverty manifests as institutional knowledge poverty, where citizens struggle to navigate complex state bureaucracies (**Khera, 2019**), and linguistic exclusion, where vital information remains inaccessible in native tongues (**Pimienta et al. 2009**). It encompasses the erosion of traditional wisdom (**Shiva, 1988**) and health literacy deprivation, which undermines informed medical decision-making (**Nutbeam, 2008**). Vulnerability is heightened by environmental ignorance regarding climate science (**IPCC, 2022**), while cognitive injustice continues to prioritise Western paradigms over diverse indigenous knowledge forms (**Appadurai, 2006**). Political and economic sectors are hampered by a political information deficit concerning legal rights (**Jenkins and Goetz, 1999**) and an agricultural knowledge gap that isolates smallholders (**Chambers, 1983**). Finally, media illiteracy fuels misinformation (**Cinelli et al. 2020**), while gendered knowledge poverty and technological redlining create structural barriers for women and marginalised groups in AI sectors (**Oxfam, 2020; Eubanks, 2018**). These disparities are deepened by a rural-urban knowledge divide (**NSSO, 2018**) and a sustainable development knowledge gap that hinders the achievement of Global Goals (**UNDP, 2020; Heeks and Shekhar, 2019**).

1.1 Conceptual Foundations: Theorising Knowledge Poverty

The Theoretical architecture of knowledge poverty transcends simple definitions of information scarcity, rooting itself in the structural "epistemic inequality" that governs modern society. While traditional economic theory focuses on information asymmetry primarily as a market failure (**Akerlof, 1970; Stiglitz, 2002**), knowledge poverty represents a more profound systemic exclusion where individuals are denied the tools to translate information into human agency. Drawing from Amartya Sen's Capabilities Approach, knowledge is conceptualised not as a commodity, but as a fundamental "conversion factor" that enables individuals to transform available resources into meaningful life outcomes (**Sen, 1999; Robeyns, 2017**). This perspective aligns with the World Development Report (1998), which famously argued that "knowledge, not capital, is the key to sustained economic growth," yet cautioned that the widening "knowledge gap" threatens to permanently marginalise the Global South (**World Bank, 1998**). Furthermore, the conceptualisation of knowledge poverty must account for the social construction of ignorance, or "agnotology," where systemic barriers—intentionally or unintentionally—suppress the traditional and indigenous knowledge systems of marginalised groups (**Proctor and Schiebinger, 2008**). Scholars like **Vandana Shiva (1988)** and **Bina Agarwal (1994)** have demonstrated that when formal Western scientific paradigms become the sole metric of "valid" knowledge, they render the sophisticated ecological and survival wisdom of rural and female populations invisible—a process termed "epistemicide" (**de Sousa Santos, 2014**). Consequently, knowledge poverty is characterised by a dual deprivation: the lack of access to "modern" expert knowledge and the delegitimisation of "local" experiential knowledge. In the contemporary digital era, this foundation is further complicated by the "Network Society" framework, which posits that power is now concentrated in the ability to access and manipulate information flows (**Castells, 2010**). Knowledge poverty, therefore, is not merely a residual effect of income poverty; it is a distinct structural mechanism that reinforces social stratification across generations (**Bourdieu, 1986**). These gaps persist globally due to entrenched structural failures, such as institutional fragmentation, which prevents the formation of integrated knowledge ecosystems, and market failures that incentivise digital platforms to prioritise engagement over information quality, systematically deprioritising the "knowledge-poor" (**Zuboff, 2019**). Additionally, linguistic and cultural barriers ensure that valuable scientific data remains locked behind dominant languages (**Pimienta et al. 2009**), while socio-cultural gatekeeping restricts access based on patriarchal norms (**Vikas et al. 2022**). The historic reliance on failed top-down models in agriculture has further disconnected formal research from the practical needs of smallholders (**Chambers, 1983**). Finally, the emergence of data colonialism has allowed for a concentration of intellectual power that leaves developing nations dependent on culturally mismatched tools (**Couldry and Mejias, 2019**). Addressing these systemic divides requires a radical shift toward recognising knowledge as a justiciable right, ensuring the democratisation of the global intellectual commons (**Appadurai, 2006; Hess and Ostrom, 2007; UNDP, 2020**).

Knowledge as a Public Good and Its Failures: The theoretical treatment of knowledge in mainstream economics is traditionally anchored in the public goods framework pioneered by **Arrow (1962)** and later expanded by **Romer (1990)** through the lens of endogenous growth theory. Arrow's seminal "learning by doing" concept posited that knowledge is inherently non-rival—meaning its consumption by one individual does not deplete its availability for others. This characteristic, coupled with the high costs of excluding non-payers, classifies knowledge as a technical public good, thereby establishing a robust economic justification for state-led investment in its creation and dissemination (**Arrow, 1962**; American Economic Review, 1962). However, this idealised economic view often masks the contentious political economy governing actual distribution. As **Stiglitz (1999)** noted, the production of knowledge is increasingly dictated by rigid intellectual property regimes and market structures that prioritise high-capital actors while marginalising the poor. The World Development Report 1998/99, "Knowledge for Development," served as a critical pivot in this discourse by identifying knowledge asymmetries as a primary driver of global poverty (**World Bank, 1998**). The report differentiated between "knowledge gaps"—the disparity in technical know-how—and "information problems"—the asymmetries in specific transactional data—concluding that both serve as formidable barriers to equitable progress. Providing a more critical nuance, **Mansell and Wehn**

(1998) argued that knowledge systems are inextricably embedded in power dynamics, where the global information infrastructure predominantly serves the interests of the elite. This perspective resonates with **Foucault's (1980)** assertion that knowledge and power are mutually constitutive; the determination of what qualifies as "legitimate" knowledge is fundamentally a political act rather than a neutral scientific one. In the realm of international development, **Chambers (1983)** and **Escobar (1995)** have highlighted how "top-down" expertise systematically devalues the sophisticated local and indigenous knowledge systems of rural populations. This epistemic hierarchy creates a cycle of exclusion where the marginalised are treated as passive recipients of external information rather than active producers of their own developmental reality (**Freire, 1970**). Consequently, the failure of knowledge as a public good is not merely a technical glitch in the market, but a structural outcome of institutional designs that commodify information and prioritise globalised scientific paradigms over localised experiential wisdom (**Ostrom and Hess, 2007**).

Knowledge Poverty: Towards a Working Definition: Building upon these theoretical lineages, we can define knowledge poverty as a condition in which individuals, communities, or societies are deprived of adequate access to, and the internal capacity to meaningfully utilise, the knowledge resources essential for improving material conditions, exercising fundamental rights, managing environmental risks, and participating in democratic governance. Ultimately, it prevents people from leading lives they have reason to value. This definition is characterised by three critical features. First, it is **relational**; rather than being defined by an absolute threshold, knowledge poverty is measured by the widening disparity between the information resources available to the marginalised and those accessible to elite cohorts within a globalised system. Second, it is multidimensional, spanning formal education, technical and scientific data, practical agricultural insights, legal-civic literacy, and ecological wisdom. Third, it is dynamic, as the intensity of deprivation fluctuates in response to rapid technological shifts, institutional reforms, and targeted policy interventions. The microeconomic foundations for this phenomenon are well-documented in the *Journal of Economic Literature*, particularly through the study of information asymmetries and their welfare consequences (**Akerlof, 1970; Stiglitz and Weiss, 1981**). While traditional literature often limits these asymmetries to specific market transactions, they explain how knowledge poverty fundamentally perpetuates material deprivation. For instance, when smallholder farmers are denied access to reliable data regarding market pricing, input quality, meteorological forecasts, or credit transparency, they are forced to make systematically suboptimal economic decisions compared to better-informed actors—even when their initial material assets are identical (**Feder, Just, and Zilberman, 1985**). This informational deficit creates a compounding disadvantage, effectively transforming temporary setbacks into entrenched, intergenerational poverty traps (**Bowles, Durlauf, and Hoff, 2006**). Furthermore, as **Dercon (2002)** suggests, the inability to access "risk-reducing" knowledge leaves the poor disproportionately vulnerable to external shocks, cementing the link between epistemic exclusion and economic stagnation.

Knowledge Poverty and the Capability Approach: Amartya Sen's capability approach provides a comprehensive philosophical framework for conceptualising knowledge poverty as a fundamental deprivation of freedom (**Sen, 1999, 2009**). From this perspective, poverty is not merely a lack of income but the absence of "capabilities"—the effective opportunities an individual has to lead a life they have reason to value (**Sen, 1999**; **Robeyns, 2005**). The capability to access and utilise relevant information functions as a foundational meta-capability or a critical "conversion factor" (**Robeyns, 2010**). Without it, other essential freedoms remain unrealizable: the capability to seek legal redress is nullified without knowledge of one's rights; the capability to maintain bodily health is constrained without access to nutrition and sanitation data; and the capability to generate sustainable livelihoods is limited without an understanding of agricultural innovations or market dynamics (**Sen, 1999**; **Sherafat-Kazemzadeh et al. 2021**). Martha Nussbaum further refines this understanding through her list of "Central Human Capabilities," such as practical reason (forming a conception of the good) and control over one's environment, both of which require significant knowledge endowments (**Nussbaum, 2011**; **Claassen, 2016**). Nussbaum's framework elevates knowledge poverty from a mere instrumental barrier to an intrinsic **injustice**; it diminishes human dignity and the "agency" required to navigate social and political life autonomously (**Nussbaum, 2011**; **Claassen, 2016**). Consequently, addressing knowledge poverty is not simply about improving economic efficiency, but about restoring the agency of marginalised populations, ensuring they can transform their resources into meaningful achievements (**Robeyns, 2005**; **Heckman and Corbin, 2016**).

1.2 Structural Determinants of Knowledge Poverty

The persistence of knowledge poverty is not an accidental byproduct of underdevelopment but is rooted in deep-seated structural determinants that operate at global, national, and local scales. At the global level, the "knowledge divide" is maintained by a restrictive international Intellectual Property Rights **(IPR)** regime, which often prioritises corporate profitability over public access to essential information **(Stiglitz, 1999; Maskus, 2000).** Nationally, the erosion of public infrastructure—such as the atrophy of agricultural extension services, the chronic underfunding of public libraries, and the commercialisation of higher education—creates a vacuum that market-led information services fail to fill for the marginalised **(GoI, 2007; NSSO, 2018; Mazzucato, 2018).** These structural barriers are further compounded by social hierarchies, including caste, class, and gender, which dictate who has the "right to know" and whose knowledge is deemed legitimate **(Bourdieu, 1986; Agarwal and Narain, 1989**). In rural contexts, the centralisation of knowledge production in urban "hubs" leads to a geographic disconnect, where information is often decoupled from the local ecological and social realities it is meant to address **(Chambers, 1983; Pingali, 2012)**. Furthermore, the digital divide serves as a modern structural gatekeeper; while technology holds the potential for democratisation, the lack of affordable connectivity, linguistic relevance, and digital literacy often transforms the internet into a tool for further stratification rather than inclusion **(Mansell and Wehn, 1998; Castells,**

2010; van Dijk, 2020). Ultimately, knowledge poverty is sustained by an "architecture of exclusion" where systemic inequalities in educational quality, media ownership, and technological access intersect to lock the poor into cycles of information deprivation and agency loss **(Freire, 1970; Norris, 2001; UNESCO, 2022).**

Global Knowledge Architecture and Power Asymmetries: The global knowledge architecture is characterised by profound structural asymmetries that reinforce the divide between the Global North and South. Currently, OECD nations account for approximately 90.0 per cent of global research and development (Rand D) expenditure, despite representing less than 20.0 per cent of the world's population (**OECD, 2022**). This financial concentration ensures that the vast majority of peer-reviewed scientific publications are produced within and accessible primarily to researchers in high-income countries. Prohibitively high subscription fees for leading academic journals further isolate universities in developing nations, creating a "paywall" that the burgeoning open-access movement has yet to dismantle (**The Economist, 2014; Suber, 2012**). Furthermore, intellectual property regimes—most notably the WTO's Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (**TRIPS**)—have centralised knowledge ownership within multinational corporations and northern research institutions. As **Shiva (1988)** and **Drahos (2002)** argue, these regimes do not merely restrict access; they actively commodify and appropriate traditional knowledge systems nurtured by indigenous and rural communities over millennia, often without recognition or compensation. This "knowledge enclosure" mirrors the historical enclosure of common lands, leading to the dispossession of intellectual and cultural heritage (**Boyle, 2003**). The **ADB (2021)** has extensively documented how these asymmetries sustain technological dependence, stifling the productive potential of emerging economies. Technology transfers are frequently partial, proprietary, and conditional, designed to preserve the competitive edge of exporting nations rather than foster indigenous innovation. Reports from **UNDP (2020)** and **UNESCO (2021)** corroborate these findings, highlighting structural barriers—such as "brain drain" and the lack of research infrastructure—that prevent developing countries from establishing robust domestic knowledge production capacities (**Altbach, 2015**). Consequently, the global knowledge economy remains a stratified landscape where the Global South is often relegated to being a consumer of information rather than a partner in its creation, a dynamic that **Wade (2002)** describes as "technological cronyism" that hampers long-term equitable development.

Domestic Structural Determinants in India: Within India, knowledge poverty is meticulously structured by intersecting social hierarchies of class, caste, gender, geography, and language. The **(NSSO, 2018)** has documented profound disparities in educational attainment, revealing that Scheduled Castes (SCs) and Scheduled Tribes (STs) continue to lag significantly behind upper-caste groups. These educational deficits translate directly into broader epistemic exclusions, manifested through lower literacy rates, restricted access to digital platforms, and minimal participation in formal knowledge-producing institutions (**Thorat and Newman, 2010; Deshpande, 2011**). The **Government of India's Knowledge Commission Report (2007)**, spearheaded by Sam Pitroda, provided a critical audit of the nation's infrastructure, identifying systemic deficiencies across the entire ecosystem—including primary and higher education, public libraries, research institutions, and agricultural extension services. The Commission emphasised that India's economic trajectory is increasingly bottlenecked by this inadequate infrastructure, necessitating a comprehensive program of reform and public investment to prevent a deepening of social stratification. The Economic and Political Weekly has served as a primary venue for empirical scholarship documenting India's rural-urban knowledge divide (**Dreze and Sen, 2013; Patnaik, 2007; Ramachandran, 2011**). Research consistently demonstrates that rural households—particularly within the "BIMARU" states (Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, and Uttar Pradesh)—suffer from significantly lower access to extension services, print media, and digital information compared to urban counterparts, even when controlling for income levels (**Vaidyanathan, 2010**). This structural gap is exacerbated by the "linguistic divide," where the dominance of English in scientific and technical discourse excludes the majority of the population who operate in vernacular languages (**Mohanty, 2018**). Such entrenched informational deprivation has devastating implications for rural productivity, maternal and child health outcomes, and the quality of democratic participation, effectively creating a "citizenship gap" between the informed urban elite and the knowledge-poor rural masses (**Jeffrey and Doron, 2013; Gupta, 2012**).

Institutional Failures: Knowledge poverty is fundamentally a product of institutional failure, stemming from the systematic under-resourcing and poor design of dissemination mechanisms. Key pillars of the knowledge commons—including agricultural extension systems, public health information services, public libraries, community radio, and adult education programs—have faced significant erosion over recent decades. The Journal of Rural Development **(Swaminathan, 2000; Misra, 2012)** has extensively documented the near-collapse of India's agricultural extension infrastructure following the economic reforms of the 1990s. During this period, fiscal consolidation policies led to a sharp reduction in public investment, leaving a void that private actors have failed to fill equitably (**Babu, Glendenning, Asenso-Okyere, and Govindarajan, 2013**). This institutional retreat is not unique to India; the **(FAO, 2018)** argues that the atrophy of extension services across the developing world was largely driven by structural adjustment conditionalities and a donor-led preference for market-based delivery models. This shift has been a primary catalyst for stagnating productivity and persistent rural deprivation. The **FAO (2018)** estimates that a well-resourced, inclusive extension system could enhance smallholder productivity by 10–25 per cent, offering a potent pathway for poverty reduction (**Anderson and Feder, 2004**). Despite this potential, extension expenditures remain a negligible fraction of agricultural budgets in most developing nations. Furthermore, the commercialisation of information has transformed knowledge from a public good into a "toll good," accessible only to those with the financial means to pay, thereby deepening the divide between resource-rich and resource-poor farmers (**Rivera and Sulaiman, 2009**). Studies in World Development suggest that when public institutions fail to provide "impartial" and "locally relevant" information, marginalised communities become vulnerable to misinformation and exploitation by private input dealers (**Davidson, Ahmad, and Ali, 2001; Birner**

and Anderson, 2007). Ultimately, the revitalisation of these public institutions is essential to dismantle the structural barriers that lock rural populations into cycles of information scarcity and economic stagnation.

1.3 Agricultural and Rural Dimensions of Knowledge Poverty

In rural landscapes, knowledge poverty manifests as a critical "information gap" that severely undermines agricultural productivity, environmental sustainability, and rural livelihoods. The **World Bank (2008)** and the **IFPRI (2012)** have identified this deficit as a primary bottleneck for smallholder farmers in the Global South. As agricultural landscapes face the dual pressures of climate change and market volatility, the need for "climate-smart" and "market-responsive" knowledge has never been greater. However, the systematic decay of public extension services has left millions of farmers reliant on fragmented and often biased information from commercial input dealers (**Feder, Just, and Zilberman, 1985; Glendenning, Babu, and Asenso-Okyere, 2010**). In India, the **NSSO (2018)** data reveal that only a small fraction of farming households have access to formal technical advice, with the majority remaining excluded from modern scientific breakthroughs in seed technology, soil health, and water management (**GoI, 2007; Vaidyanathan, 2010**). This deprivation is not merely about a lack of access to "modern" science; it also involves the systematic marginalisation of Indigenous Technical Knowledge (ITK). Scholars like **Chambers (1983)** and **Shiva (1988)** argue that top-down, "one-size-fits-all" extension models frequently ignore the localised ecological wisdom that rural communities have developed over centuries. This epistemic mismatch leads to the adoption of inappropriate technologies that can degrade local ecosystems and increase financial indebtedness (**Pingali, 2012; Altieri, 2004**). Furthermore, the gendered nature of rural knowledge poverty means that female farmers—who perform a significant portion of agricultural labour—are often the most excluded from training and extension networks due to patriarchal social norms (**Agarwal, 1994; Doss, 2001**). Addressing these dimensions requires a participatory "knowledge-sharing" paradigm that integrates formal scientific research with local experiential knowledge, ensuring that rural development is both technologically advanced and ecologically grounded (**Pretty, 2008; Lwoga, Ngulube, and Stilwell, 2010**).

The Knowledge Needs of Small Farmers: Smallholder agriculture remains the backbone of global food security, sustaining approximately 500 million farm families and producing the majority of food in developing nations (**FAO, 2019**). Despite their central role, small farmers navigate a landscape of profound knowledge challenges, requiring complex, location-specific data on crop selection, soil conservation, integrated pest management, and market fluctuations. In the absence of institutionalised support, these producers must rely on traditional heuristics, informal social networks, or—more precariously—unreliable advice from commercial input dealers whose interests often conflict with sustainable farm management (**Doss, 2015; Bloom et al. 2017**). This reliance on asymmetrical information frequently results in suboptimal resource allocation, reduced yields, and heightened vulnerability to climate-induced shocks (**Birthal et al. 2015**). The **Journal of Rural Studies** has highlighted a widening "epistemic gap" where the information generated by formal research systems diverges significantly from the practical realities of small-scale production (**Chambers and Conway, 1991; Pretty, 1995**). Historically, international research via the **CGIAR** network has prioritised high-yielding varieties and standardised agrochemical packages optimised for irrigated, high-input environments (**Pingali, 2012**). Consequently, the intricate, risk-prone, and rainfed farming systems that characterise the livelihoods of the poor have been marginalised within the formal scientific agenda. This structural mismatch between the supply of "top-down" technological packages and the demand for "bottom-up," ecologically resilient knowledge is a cornerstone of agricultural knowledge poverty (**Altieri, 2002; Vanloqueren and Baret, 2009**). Bridging this divide requires shifting toward Agricultural Innovation Systems **(AIS)** that value co-creation between scientists and farmers, ensuring that knowledge is not merely a commodity transferred, but a capacity built within local contexts (**Klerkx, van Mierlo, and Leeuwis, 2012**).

M. S. Swaminathan and the Knowledge Village Concept: The late agricultural scientist M. S. Swaminathan, a primary architect of India's Green Revolution, dedicated his later career to advocating for an "Evergreen Revolution" fueled by ecological wisdom and information rather than agrochemical intensity (**Swaminathan, 2000; The Hindu, 2023**). His visionary concept of **"Knowledge Villages"**—rural hubs integrating modern Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) with traditional ecological knowledge—was a precursor to contemporary digital development paradigms. Through the M. S. Swaminathan Research Foundation **(MSSRF)**, he pioneered Village Knowledge Centres **(VKCs)** in Tamil Nadu. These centres acted as digital bridges, providing rural populations with internet-enabled access to real-time meteorological data, fluctuating market prices, specialised agricultural advice, and essential government entitlements (**Mahapatra, 2002; Krishnakumar, 2003**). By placing the tools of the "knowledge economy" in the hands of the rural poor, Swaminathan sought to transform passive recipients of aid into active participants in the global information network (**Arunachalam, 2004**). Empirical evaluations of these VKCs have yielded mixed but deeply instructive results regarding the scalability of such interventions. In instances where centres were well-resourced and governed through participatory community models, they significantly enhanced agricultural productivity, improved market bargaining power, and bolstered community resilience against environmental shocks (**Vedavalli, 2005; Senthilkumaran and Nagarajan, 2006**). However, long-term sustainability often proved elusive. Many projects struggled with the high costs of maintaining technical infrastructure and the "content challenge"—specifically, ensuring that information was sufficiently localised, linguistically accessible, and frequently updated to remain relevant to the specific needs of marginal farmers (**Meera, Jhamtani, and Rao, 2004; Saravanan, 2011**). These early experiments underscore that bridging knowledge poverty requires more than just hardware; it demands a robust "infostructure" that supports community ownership and the continuous co-creation of localised knowledge (**Sulaiman et al. 2012**).

Traditional Ecological Knowledge and its Marginalisation: A rigorous analysis of knowledge poverty must confront the systematic devaluation of Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK)—the sophisticated, location-specific insights held by indigenous and rural communities—by dominant institutional frameworks. As **Agarwal and Narain (1989)** demonstrated in their seminal study of Indian water-harvesting systems, centuries of localised expertise in natural resource management have been routinely ignored by government and development agencies that privilege Western scientific paradigms. This institutional blindness creates a "blind spot" in development, where viable local solutions are replaced by high-cost, often inappropriate, external technologies (**Warren, Slikkerveer, and Brokensha, 1995**). **Vandana Shiva (1988, 1993)** provides a radical critique of this displacement, framing the imposition of Green Revolution packages as "epistemic injustice"—the violent erasure of sustainable, diverse knowledge systems in favour of monocultural scientific models. While critics highlight the undeniable productivity gains of the Green Revolution (**Pinstrup-Andersen and Hazell, 1985**), Shiva's argument regarding the intrinsic value of cognitive diversity has gained significant traction in contemporary discourse on "epistemologies of the South" (**de Sousa Santos, 2014**). International frameworks, such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (**CBD**), its Nagoya Protocol, and the FAO's International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources, now formally recognise the rights of indigenous communities to their traditional crop varieties and associated wisdom. Despite these legal milestones, **UNDP (2020)** and **UNEP (2021)** reports confirm that implementation remains fragmented. Traditional knowledge continues to be undermined by global intellectual property regimes that facilitate the commodification of indigenous biological resources—a phenomenon often termed "biopiracy"—without providing equitable compensation or recognition to the original knowledge holders (**Robinson, 2010; Dutfield, 2004**). Effectively addressing knowledge poverty, therefore, requires a "knowledge pluralism" approach that treats TEK not as a relic of the past, but as a vital, evolving resource for modern climate adaptation and biodiversity conservation (**Berkes, 2012; Nakashima et al. 2012**).

Rural Sociology and the Social Dimensions of Knowledge Poverty: Rural sociology provides critical insights into the social mechanics of knowledge poverty, emphasising that access to information is rarely neutral but is instead deeply embedded in localised hierarchies of power. Research in the *Journal of Rural Studies* and *Rural Sociology* has extensively documented how knowledge inequalities within communities frequently mirror broader stratifications of caste, class, and gender (**Gupta, 1998; Mosse, 2005**). In the Indian context, access to vital agricultural extension, credit information, and market networks has historically been monopolised by upper-caste male landowners. This systematic exclusion leaves Dalit, Adivasi, and women farmers deprived of the "epistemic resources" essential for their economic survival and social mobility (**Thorat and Newman, 2010; Rao, 2017**). Consequently, knowledge poverty is not merely a lack of information but a manifestation of "social closure," where dominant groups control the flow of intellectual capital to maintain their socio-economic status (**Bourdieu, 1986; Murphy, 1988**). The concept of "knowledgeable agents"—influential community members who act as knowledge brokers—further illustrates how information flows are mediated by social power (**Long and Long, 1992**). While these brokers can facilitate the diffusion of innovations, they often function as strategic gatekeepers, filtering and selectively sharing information to reinforce their own authority and economic advantage (**Lewis and Lewis, 2012**). This "gatekeeping" often renders external development interventions ineffective for the most marginalised, as the intended information is diluted or diverted before reaching the bottom of the social pyramid (**Jerven, 2013**). Therefore, a central challenge for development practitioners is the design of "disintermediated" or democratized dissemination systems—such as peer-to-peer learning networks and community-led digital platforms—that bypass traditional power structures to ensure equitable knowledge access (**Glendenning and Ficarelli, 2012; Wood, 2003**).

1.4 Gendered Dimensions of Knowledge Poverty

Knowledge poverty is a deeply gendered phenomenon, rooted in patriarchal structures that systematically restrict women's access to, and control over, information and technology. Across the Global South, the "gender knowledge gap" manifests in significantly lower rates of female literacy, secondary education, and digital fluency compared to their male counterparts (**Huyer, 2006; UNESCO, 2022**). These disparities are not merely incidental but are maintained through social norms that prioritise male education and mobility while confining women to domestic spheres or low-value labour. In rural agrarian economies, where women provide up to 50% of the labour force, they are frequently bypassed by agricultural extension services that are traditionally designed for and by men (**Agarwal, 1994; FAO, 2011; Doss, 2001**). This exclusion leaves female farmers with less access to technical information regarding modern seed varieties, climate adaptation strategies, and market pricing, directly undermining their productivity and economic autonomy (**Quisumbing and Pandolfelli, 2010**). Furthermore, the "digital gender divide" serves as a contemporary gatekeeper, as women are less likely to own smartphones or have the "meaningful access" required to navigate online government services or financial platforms (**ITU, 2021; GSMA, 2023**). This technological marginalisation is compounded by the devaluation of women's indigenous knowledge—particularly in seed preservation, medicinal plants, and household nutrition—which is often dismissed as "informal" or non-scientific by mainstream development agencies (**Shiva, 1988; Howard, 2003**). Scholars like **Nussbaum (2011)** and **Kabeer (1999)** argue that this epistemic deprivation is a fundamental barrier to "agency," as the lack of legal and civic knowledge prevents women from claiming their rights to land, health, and political participation. Consequently, dismantling knowledge poverty requires a "gender-transformative" policy framework that not only improves access to information but also challenges the underlying power relations that dictate who is allowed to know and who is allowed to lead (**Meinzen-Dick et al. 2011; Cornwall and Rivas, 2015**).

Women as the Most Knowledge-Deprived Group: Women in developing nations are disproportionately burdened by knowledge poverty, a condition that persists despite their foundational roles in food production, ecological stewardship, and household

health. Systematic exclusion from information networks—compounded by lower literacy and educational attainment rates—severely hampers their efficacy across these critical domains (**UNDP, 2020**). In India, while the gender literacy gap is narrowing, these statistics often mask deeper "knowledge participation" barriers; social norms frequently restrict even literate women from engaging with public libraries, digital hubs, or community training programs (**Jeffrey and Doron, 2013; Mazumdar, 2014**). Agricultural knowledge serves as a particularly stark example of this disparity. While women perform approximately 60–80% of food production labour in many developing contexts, they receive less than 10% of dedicated extension services (**FAO, 2011**). This "knowledge service gap" (**Mehra and Rojas, 2008**) forces female farmers to make high-stakes production and management decisions without the technical scaffolding available to their male counterparts, directly compromising national food security and local economic resilience. The productivity costs of this epistemic marginalisation are documented extensively in the *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* and *Sociology*. Empirical research across Sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia suggests that bridging the gender knowledge and input gap could elevate female agricultural yields by 20–30%, providing a massive boost to poverty reduction efforts (**Quisumbing, 1995; Doss, 2018; O'Sullivan et al. 2014**). Beyond agriculture, the lack of "civic knowledge" often prevents women from asserting legal rights or accessing health entitlements, reinforcing cycles of intergenerational deprivation (**Kabeer, 2005**). Addressing these inequities is therefore not only a moral imperative of social justice but a pragmatic requirement for economic efficiency. To close this gap, policymakers must transition toward "gender-responsive" knowledge systems that account for women's time constraints, mobility limitations, and linguistic preferences, ensuring that information acts as a catalyst for genuine empowerment (**Quisumbing and Pandolfelli, 2010; Meinzen-Dick et al. 2011**).

Women's Health Knowledge and Reproductive Rights: The gendered knowledge gap extends far beyond the agricultural sector to encompass health, reproductive rights, and civic agency. Nutritional knowledge poverty—specifically the lack of information regarding micronutrient supplementation, breastfeeding, and age-appropriate complementary feeding—remains a primary driver of persistent child malnutrition in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa (**Black et al. 2013**). While institutional frameworks like the **WHO/UNICEF** infant feeding guidelines and India's Integrated Child Development Services **(ICDS)** represent vital responses to these deficits, their implementation often suffers from systemic inadequacies in reach and quality (**Varshney, 2018; Khera, 2019**). This informational deprivation is not merely a lack of awareness but a structural failure to provide marginalised women with the actionable health literacy required to optimise household well-being (**Nutbeam, 2000**). Similarly, access to information regarding reproductive health and contraception is a fundamental pillar of female empowerment. Research published in the *World Bank Economic Review* demonstrates that enhancing women's knowledge of family planning and maternal healthcare significantly reduces mortality rates while bolstering economic autonomy (**Schultz, 2002; Cleland et al. 2006**). Conversely, reproductive knowledge poverty is directly correlated with higher fertility rates, adverse maternal outcomes, and diminished labour force participation—factors that consolidate intergenerational poverty traps (**Canning and Schultz, 2012**). Furthermore, as **Kabeer (2005)** argues, the ability to make informed choices about one's body is the ultimate expression of agency. When women are denied access to legal entitlements and health information, they are effectively excluded from the "knowledge commons" of modern healthcare, leading to a profound "capability deprivation" that impacts the entire developmental trajectory of a nation (**Sen, 1999; Starbird et al. 2016**).

1.5 Knowledge Poverty, Health, and Environmental Vulnerability

Knowledge poverty acts as a fundamental determinant of health and environmental outcomes, creating a "vulnerability trap" for the marginalised. In the domain of public health, the lack of access to accurate, timely, and actionable information regarding disease prevention, sanitation, and nutrition significantly elevates morbidity and mortality rates across the Global South (**Nutbeam, 2000; WHO, 2013**). This deprivation is particularly visible in the management of infectious diseases and the growing burden of non-communicable illnesses, where health literacy serves as a critical conversion factor for medical interventions (**Kickbusch et al. 2013**). Furthermore, environmental vulnerability is inextricably linked to epistemic exclusion. As climate change accelerates, rural and coastal communities—such as those in India's Sundarbans or the drylands of Sub-Saharan Africa—often lack access to granular meteorological data and "climate-smart" adaptation strategies necessary to manage escalating risks (**IPCC, 2022; Adger et al. 2003**). The relationship between knowledge and vulnerability is bidirectional; while a lack of scientific data hampers formal adaptation, the systematic devaluation of Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) undermines local resilience. When indigenous management systems for water harvesting or seed diversity are delegitimised by top-down policy frameworks, communities lose the very tools that have historically allowed them to navigate environmental shocks (**Berkes, 2012; Nakashima et al. 2012**). Reports from **UNDP (2020)** and **UNEP (2021)** emphasise that "knowledge-led" disaster risk reduction is essential for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Without a democratic "knowledge architecture" that integrates local wisdom with modern scientific forecasting, the poor remain disproportionately exposed to health crises and environmental catastrophes, cementing the link between informational deprivation and existential risk (**Wisner et al. 2004; Beck, 1992**).

Health Knowledge Poverty: The link between knowledge poverty and health deprivation is both direct and pervasive, forming what is often termed the "knowledge gradient" in public health. Households lacking fundamental insights into disease transmission, preventive sanitation, and nutrition face a significantly elevated risk of morbidity and mortality, independent of their income or material assets (**Strauss and Thomas, 1995; Bloom, Canning and Sevilla, 2004**). In India, this deprivation manifests as a multi-dimensional barrier to well-being; reports in *India Today* have highlighted how persistent misconceptions regarding HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis management, and vaccine efficacy continue to undermine public health interventions. While the World Health Organisation (WHO)

and the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare have launched extensive behaviour-change communication programs, their impact remains geographically and socially uneven, with rural and marginalised populations frequently receiving lower-quality or linguistically inaccessible information compared to their urban counterparts (**Viswanath et al. 2012; Ramani et al. 2013**). The COVID-19 pandemic exposed these epistemic vulnerabilities with unprecedented brutality. As documented by the *Economic Times*, *The Hindu*, and *The Indian Express*, a "shadow pandemic" of misinformation—accelerated by social media—delayed vaccine uptake and promoted scientifically unverified remedies, directly influencing mortality rates. Paradoxically, the rapid expansion of smartphone connectivity, which was heralded as a tool for information democratisation, instead became a primary vehicle for the "infodemic" (**Mint, 2021; Mascarenhas, 2021**). This highlights a critical limitation: connectivity alone cannot resolve knowledge poverty without the concurrent development of critical information literacy (**Cinelli et al. 2020**). Effective health outcomes, therefore, require a shift from mere information dissemination to building "health literacy" capabilities, ensuring that individuals can critically evaluate and act upon the information they receive (**Nutbeam, 2008; Kickbusch, 2001**).

Environmental Knowledge and Climate Vulnerability: Climate change has emerged as the most consequential driver of knowledge poverty in the twenty-first century. Smallholder farmers, pastoralists, and forest-dependent communities in developing nations are on the front lines of this crisis, facing altered rainfall patterns, extreme weather events, and shifting growing seasons that render traditional heuristics insufficient (**Singh et al. 2017**). Adapting to these volatile conditions requires access to climate science, early warning systems, and technical advice on resilient farming—resources that remain severely deficient for the most vulnerable (**Raub et al. 2024**). The IPCC Sixth Assessment Report and UNEP emphasise that climate impacts are distributed not only by geography but by knowledge access; communities with robust climate services demonstrate significantly higher adaptive capacity than those trapped in knowledge poverty, even under identical climatic stress (**IPCC, 2022; UNEP, 2022**). This "knowledge-climate nexus" suggests that investing in information infrastructure—such as the district-level forecasts provided by Skymet in India—is a prerequisite for resilience (**Singh et al. 2017**). Furthermore, *Down to Earth* has highlighted the critical role of Traditional Ecological Knowledge **(TEK)** in climate adaptation, noting that indigenous observations of weather and ecosystems are invaluable, yet increasingly at risk of being lost as communities are displaced (**Pandey and Sengupta, Sangomla 2020, 2022; Vinyeta and Lynn, 2013**). The most promising frontier in climate research is the synthesis of TEK with formal science, allowing for situation-specific models that are both technologically advanced and culturally grounded (**Vinyeta and Lynn, 2013; Karki et al. 2011**). By fostering a dialogue between indigenous wisdom and modern meteorology, policy-makers can create inclusive adaptation plans that mitigate the "vicious cycle" of climate-induced poverty and mental distress (**Raub et al. 2024; UN DESA, 2017**).

1.6 The Digital Divide as Contemporary Knowledge Poverty

In the contemporary era, the digital divide has evolved from a simple disparity in hardware ownership into a sophisticated "tripartite" model of knowledge poverty, encompassing inequities in physical access, digital skills, and the capacity to convert information into tangible life outcomes (**Farooqi et al. 2022; van Dijk, 2020**). While the "first-level" divide—physical connectivity—continues to affect 2.7 billion people globally, recent scholarship emphasises that even when access is nominally achieved, a "second-level" divide persists through significant gaps in digital literacy and motivation (**First Monday, 2024; van Dijk, 2020**). This is further complicated by the "third-level" divide, where marginalised groups are systematically less able to translate online engagement into social or economic advantages, thereby reinforcing existing structural injustices (**van Dijk, 2020; Farooqi et al. 2022**). In India, this divide is particularly stark, as the pandemic revealed "life and death" inequalities in access to digital health, finance, and education across disparate states (**Arora and Sapre, 2025**). The emergence of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has introduced a new frontier of epistemic inequality, potentially exacerbating the digital divide through algorithmic bias and "AI readiness" gaps (**Mokoena and Seeletse, 2026; Melina, 2024**). While AI offers immense potential for personalised learning, its benefits are currently concentrated in resource-rich regions, leaving the Global South to navigate linguistically and culturally mismatched tools (**Mokoena and Seeletse, 2026; Melina, 2024**). Furthermore, gender remains a persistent barrier; girls often report higher levels of "computer anxiety" due to socialised norms, despite frequently outperforming boys in technical assessments (**MDPI, 2025**). As the United Nations underscores, narrowing this divide is no longer just a technological goal but a core Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) essential for human development and poverty reduction (**Arora and Sapre, 2025; UNDP, 2025**). Without targeted interventions—such as gender-equal literacy programs and inclusive AI frameworks—the digital era threatens to deepen the "development divide," locking knowledge-poor populations out of the circuits of the global economy (**Arora and Sapre, 2025; Mokoena and Seeletse, 2026**).

The Promise and Reality of Digital Inclusion: The proliferation of digital technologies—encompassing smartphones, high-speed internet, social media, and digital payment ecosystems—has sparked significant optimism regarding the democratisation of knowledge for historically marginalised populations. In India, the Digital India initiative (2015) sought to catalyse this transformation, aiming to build a "knowledge economy" through universal connectivity. This vision was accelerated by the "Jio revolution" starting in 2016, which onboarded hundreds of millions of new users via low-cost mobile data. However, as critical scholarship underscores, mere connectivity does not equate to meaningful knowledge access. The *Economic and Political Weekly* (2020) and the *World Bank Research Observer* (2019) have challenged "digital optimism," arguing that without deliberate pro-poor design and governance, these technologies tend to amplify existing social stratifications rather than dissolve them (**Toyama, 2015; Warschauer, 2004**). Several structural mechanisms explain this persistent inequality. First, the most economically and scientifically valuable online content remains dominated by English and other global languages, creating a linguistic barrier for India's diverse, multilingual population (**Pimienta et**

al. 2009). Second, digital literacy—the cognitive ability to navigate, critically evaluate, and synthesise online data—remains a "luxury" distributed along established lines of educational and socioeconomic privilege (**van Deursen and van Dijk, 2014**). Perhaps most critically, the underlying business models of global digital platforms, characterised by **Zuboff (2019)** as "surveillance capitalism," prioritise data extraction and attention capture over information quality. These platforms are incentivised to serve users with high purchasing power to attract advertisers, systematically deprioritising the information needs of the poor. Consequently, the algorithmic architecture of the modern web often creates a misalignment between the profit motives of tech giants and the developmental requirements of the knowledge-poor, necessitating a shift toward non-market, public-interest digital infrastructures (**Mazzucato, 2018; Gurstein, 2011**).

India's Digital Divide: Evidence and Dimensions: Despite the exponential surge in mobile internet penetration, India's digital landscape is characterised by a persistent and profound divide. The NSSO's **Household Social Consumption Survey (2018)** highlighted a stark urban-rural disparity, noting that only 4.4 per cent of rural households possessed internet access compared to 23.4 per cent in urban centres—a ratio exceeding five to one. While subsequent data from the National Family Health Survey (NFHS-5) and the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI) indicate significant improvements in nominal connectivity—fueled by 4G expansion and the "Jio effect" on data pricing—these figures often mask the reality of effective digital inclusion (**TRAI, 2023**). Connectivity metrics systematically overstate empowerment; many rural users remain restricted to basic smartphones for passive entertainment and social media, lacking the "meaningful access" or digital literacy required to leverage the internet for economic advancement, healthcare, or government entitlements (**Prasad, 2021; Kaba and Sylla, 2020**). Detailed analyses in *Mint* and the *Financial Express* further illuminate the "digital gender gap," where women's access to and mastery of digital tools lag significantly behind men's across nearly all Indian states. This disparity is most acute in the "BIMARU" belt, including Bihar, Rajasthan, and Uttar Pradesh. A **2020 Oxfam India study** revealed a jarring imbalance, with women constituting only 31.0 per cent of internet users compared to 69.0 per cent for men (**Oxfam, 2020**). Crucially, this gap is not merely a byproduct of income inequality; it is rooted in entrenched patriarchal norms that govern female mobility, restrict device ownership, and stigmatise women's independent digital participation (**Vikas et al. 2022; GSMA, 2023**). As **Zhu (2021)** argues, without addressing these socio-cultural "gatekeepers," technological expansion alone will continue to bypass the most knowledge-poor segments of the population, reinforcing a lopsided development trajectory.

e-Governance and Knowledge Poverty: The systematic transition to digital service delivery—commonly termed e-governance—has introduced complex new dimensions to knowledge poverty. Public services, welfare entitlements, and social protections that were historically accessed through physical administrative offices are increasingly mediated by digital platforms. These systems demand not only consistent internet connectivity and high levels of digital literacy but also often require successful biometric identification. While this digital shift has, in specific instances, streamlined service delivery and mitigated leakage, it has simultaneously erected formidable barriers for the most marginalised. For these populations, digital exclusion is no longer merely an informational deficit; it is a structural exclusion from basic social protection and survival resources (**Masiero, 2016; Madon, 2009**). The Hindu Business Line and the Economic Times have extensively chronicled the logistical and humanitarian failures of e-governance in rural India. These reports highlight frequent biometric authentication failures, the exclusion of legitimate beneficiaries from the Public Distribution System (PDS) due to technical glitches, and the inherent inaccessibility of digital grievance redressal mechanisms for those without smartphones or connectivity (**GoI, 2019**). These journalistic accounts align with rigorous academic inquiries published in the Economic and Political Weekly and the World Bank Research Observer, which demonstrate how the digitalisation of welfare can inadvertently deepen knowledge-related marginalisation (**Dreze, 2020; Khera, 2019**). When "technical efficiency" is prioritised over user capability, the resulting "digital friction" disproportionately penalises the elderly, the disabled, and the rural poor, effectively transforming a tool for inclusion into a mechanism of bureaucratic opacity (**Chaudhuri, 2019; Drèze and Sen, 2013**).

1.7 Policy Responses and an Alternative Architecture

Existing policy responses to knowledge poverty have largely oscillated between market-led digital optimism and fragmented, top-down bureaucratic interventions. However, the persistence of deep informational asymmetries suggests that the current "information-delivery" model is fundamentally broken. To dismantle knowledge poverty, a radical shift toward an Alternative Knowledge Architecture is required—one that recenters the state's role in democratising the production and dissemination of knowledge as a core public good (**Mazzucato, 2018; Stiglitz, 1999**). This new framework must transition from passive "connectivity" to active "capability building," ensuring that marginalised populations possess the critical literacy to evaluate, adapt, and apply information to their specific contexts (**Sen, 1999; Warschauer, 2004**). Central to this architecture is the revitalisation of public institutions—such as agricultural extension services, public libraries, and community media—transforming them into participatory "knowledge commons" where local experiential wisdom is integrated with formal scientific data (**Hess and Ostrom, 2007; Swaminathan, 2000**). Furthermore, policy must address the structural barriers of the digital era by implementing "gender-transformative" digital literacy programs and enforcing transparency in algorithmic governance to prevent the automation of social exclusion (**Zuboff, 2019; Eubanks, 2018**). International cooperation is also essential to reform restrictive intellectual property regimes (TRIPS) that currently prioritise corporate profit over the human right to research and information (**Shiva, 1988; Drahos and Braithwaite, 2002**). In India, reports from the National Knowledge Commission **(2007)** and empirical studies in the *Economic and Political Weekly* underscore that a "one-size-fits-all" digital approach often ignores the linguistic and geographic realities of the rural poor (**GoI, 2007; Dreze and Sen, 2013**). Ultimately, an effective policy architecture must foster "epistemic justice," recognising that the democratisation of knowledge is not merely a technical prerequisite for economic

growth, but a foundational requirement for social justice and genuine democratic participation in the 21st century (**de Sousa Santos, 2014; Appadurai, 2006**).

Existing Policy Frameworks: Critique and Assessment: Existing policy responses to knowledge poverty are scattered across disparate domains, including education, agricultural extension, health communication, ICT, and science and technology policy. Each sector operates within its own institutional silo, utilising distinct funding streams and evaluation metrics with minimal cross-domain coordination. This fragmentation constitutes a significant governance failure, preventing the synergistic investments necessary to foster a holistic knowledge ecosystem. Education policy has served as the primary instrument for addressing these deficits, bolstered by substantial international support. In India, the Right to Education Act **(2009)** marked a historic commitment to universal elementary schooling, significantly boosting enrollment figures. However, as the Annual Status of Education Reports **(ASER)** consistently demonstrate, increased enrollment has not equated to functional knowledge; a staggering majority of primary school graduates still lack foundational literacy and numeracy (**ASER, 2022**). This "learning poverty"—a term coined by the World Bank and UNESCO—represents the most fundamental layer of knowledge poverty, as it cripples an individual's lifelong capacity to acquire, process, and utilise any subsequent information (**World Bank, 2019; UNESCO, 2022**). In the agricultural sector, extension policy has oscillated between public provision and market-led models over the last thirty years without achieving sustained success. The Training and Visit (TandV) system, aggressively promoted by the World Bank in the 1980s, was eventually discarded after being critiqued as an overly top-down, supply-driven model that remained disconnected from the lived realities of farmers (**Anderson, Feder, and Ganguly, 2006**). Subsequent attempts to introduce privatised extension, peer-to-peer networks, and ICT-enabled advisory services have shown localised promise but have consistently failed to scale effectively (**Saravanan, 2015; World Development Report, 2008**). Furthermore, as **Birner and Anderson (2007)** argue, the shift toward market-based models often neglects the "public good" nature of agricultural information, leaving resource-poor farmers dependent on commercial interests. Consequently, the lack of a coherent, integrated policy framework ensures that information remains a luxury rather than a democratized tool for development (**Rivera and Sulaiman, 2009; Swanson, 2008**).

Towards a Knowledge Rights Framework: An emerging body of scholarship posits that effectively addressing knowledge poverty requires more than just optimised programming; it demands a fundamental shift toward a Knowledge Rights Framework. Just as the rights to food, health, and education have become justiciable in international law and various national constitutions, the **right to knowledge**—encompassing the right to access information, participate in knowledge generation, and have existing expertise protected—must be legally operationalised (**Shiva, 1988; UNDP, 2020**). This perspective aligns with the "right to research" championed by **Appadurai (2006)**, which views the ability to gain and evaluate information as a prerequisite for modern citizenship and agency (**Sen, 1999**). In the Indian context, the Right to Information (RTI) Act **(2005)** serves as a vital, albeit partial, recognition of this principle. By granting citizens legal access to state-held data, RTI has empowered rural communities and journalists to audit government performance and expose corruption, effectively transforming "transparency" into a tool for cognitive empowerment (**Jenkins and Goetz, 1999; Baviskar, 2010**). However, the right to transparency is only one facet of a broader knowledge agenda. A comprehensive framework must also secure the right to access the global scientific commons through open-access mandates and ensure that knowledge produced via public funding remains a public good rather than a proprietary asset (**Hess and Ostrom, 2007; Suber, 2012**). Furthermore, it must protect Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) from biopiracy while guaranteeing meaningful participation in the governance of knowledge-producing institutions (**de Sousa Santos, 2014; Robinson, 2010**). The Global South's historic calls for a New International Information Order **(NWICO)**, though largely stifled in the late 20th century, are finding renewed urgency in contemporary debates regarding digital sovereignty, data justice, and the governance of Artificial Intelligence (**Pickard, 2015; Milan and Treré, 2019**). Ultimately, establishing a justiciable right to knowledge is essential to prevent a new era of "data colonialism" and to ensure that the benefits of the information age are distributed equitably across all societies (**Couldry and Mejias, 2019; Zuboff, 2019**).

Reimagining Agricultural Knowledge Systems: Overcoming knowledge poverty in the agricultural domain requires a fundamental reimagining of how information is generated, validated, and disseminated. The dominant paradigm of the past half-century—where knowledge is produced in formal research institutions and transmitted to "passive" farmers through linear extension systems—has comprehensively failed to serve the majority of smallholder producers **(Chambers, 1983; Pretty, 1995; World Development Report, 2008)**. In response, an alternative framework is emerging, characterised by Participatory Action Research (PAR), Agricultural Innovation Systems (AIS), and Integrated Knowledge Systems. These approaches share a core commitment to treating farmers as active knowledge agents rather than passive recipients, building upon local expertise rather than replacing it, and ensuring that information is responsive to the diverse needs of marginalised groups, including women and those in risk-prone environments **(de Boon et al. 2022)**. Practical expressions of this paradigm—such as the M. S. Swaminathan Research Foundation's (MSSRF) Village Knowledge Centres, IDRC's participatory projects, and the FAO's Farmer Field School methodology—demonstrate significant potential for enhancing productivity and economic resilience **(Ouma et al. 2024)**. Recent evidence indicates that shifting toward an innovation platform approach can increase the uptake of sustainable practices, such as the System of Rice Intensification (SRI), by 30.0–80.0 per cent, leading to substantial returns on investment for smallholder farmers **(Ouma et al. 2024)**. Furthermore, governing these innovation processes sustainably requires a comprehensive understanding of normative and power dynamics across societal scales, ensuring that technological transitions are ecologically and socially equitable **(de Boon et al. 2022)**. Ultimately, replacing top-down silos with systemic, multidisciplinary learning coalitions can bridge the "cognitive gap" between academic research and local farm management, fostering a more inclusive knowledge economy **(Gutiérrez Cano et al. 2023)**.

Digital Public Goods and Knowledge Commons: The evolution of digital public goods (DPGs)—encompassing open-source software, open data, open standards, and freely accessible content—represents a potent mechanism for the democratisation of knowledge. The Digital Public Goods Alliance, supported by the UNDP, has catalogued hundreds of DPGs that address critical development gaps in agriculture, health, and education (**UNDP, 2021**). India's experience with Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI), including the Unified Payments Interface (UPI) and the Open Network for Digital Commerce (ONDC), has demonstrated that strategically designed public platforms can be transformative for historically excluded populations. However, to ensure these tools do not inadvertently entrench digital divides, they must be governed as a "knowledge commons"—a concept pioneered by **Ostrom (1990)** and **Bollier (2014)**. This framework proposes that knowledge resources should be collectively managed and shared, offering a third way between the enclosures of private intellectual property and the rigidities of state-controlled information (**Hess and Ostrom, 2007**). Knowledge commons range from global collaborative efforts like Wikipedia to localised community seed banks and open-source agricultural software. These institutions prove that shared intellectual resources can be managed effectively through cooperative governance without relying solely on market incentives. As **Benkler (2006)** argues, "commons-based peer production" allows for the creation of high-value information that is more resilient and adaptable to local needs than proprietary alternatives. Furthermore, the integration of DPGs with traditional knowledge repositories can protect indigenous wisdom from biopiracy while making it available for sustainable development (**Shiva, 2001**). For DPGs to truly bridge knowledge poverty, they must be supported by a robust "infostructure" that prioritises interoperability, local linguistic relevance, and community-led governance, ensuring that the digital age fosters an inclusive intellectual commons rather than a new era of data concentration (**Mazzucato, 2018; Digital Public Goods Alliance, 2023**).

Strategies for Removing Knowledge Poverty: Eradicating knowledge poverty requires a paradigm shift from viewing information as a mere commodity to treating it as a fundamental justiciable right. Effective strategies for its removal must address the specific structural failures that sustain informational deprivation across various sectors and global contexts. The systematic removal of knowledge poverty necessitates a multidimensional approach that integrates institutional reform, technological democratisation, and community-led empowerment. Eradicating Learning Poverty through Foundational Literacy: The deepest layer of knowledge poverty—learning poverty—occurs when the schooling system fails to provide basic literacy and numeracy skills despite high enrollment rates. Strategies for its removal include the "Teaching at the Right Level" (TaRL) model, which prioritises foundational skills over rigid, age-based grade-level curricula. Policy frameworks must shift their primary focus from physical school infrastructure to measurable learning outcomes, utilising rigorous monitoring tools like the Annual Status of Education Report **(ASER)** to identify and bridge gaps early (**World Bank, 2019**). Bridging the Digital Divide via Digital Public Infrastructure: Digital knowledge poverty is characterised not merely by a lack of connectivity, but by a deficit in the capacity to leverage technology for economic and social mobility. Countries can eradicate this by investing in Digital Public Infrastructure (DPI)—open-source, interoperable platforms for payments (such as UPI), identification systems, and data exchange. This inclusive architecture ensures that even the most marginalised populations can access digital finance and government entitlements without being locked into proprietary, high-cost, or exclusionary ecosystems (**UNDP, 2021**). Overcoming Health Knowledge Poverty through Literacy: Health deprivation is frequently rooted in a lack of "health literacy"—the cognitive and social ability to process and act upon medical information (**Nutbeam, 2008**). Strategies for eradication include the deployment of Community Health Workers (such as ASHAs in India), who serve as vital cultural and linguistic translators of medical science. Furthermore, digital health platforms must be redesigned with "low-literacy" interfaces, incorporating voice-based or iconographic tools to ensure that marginalised groups are not excluded from the ongoing digital health revolution (**van de Vijver et al. 2023**). Eradicating knowledge poverty globally requires a "Knowledge Rights Framework" that moves beyond top-down information delivery to active capability building. Reclaiming the Knowledge Commons: One of the most effective global strategies is the resistance to the "enclosure" of information. By fostering a Knowledge Commons, nations can ensure that scientific research, textbooks, and datasets are treated as shared public resources (**Kranich, 2006**). This includes mandating open-access for publicly funded research and reforming restrictive Intellectual Property (IP) regimes that prioritise corporate profits over the human right to life-saving knowledge, such as pharmaceuticals (**Finger and Bank, 2004**). Participatory and Integrated Knowledge Systems: In the agricultural and environmental sectors, knowledge poverty is often a result of ignoring local wisdom. Global eradication strategies must adopt Participatory Action Research (PAR), where formal scientists work as partners with farmers. Integrating Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) with modern climate science creates more resilient adaptation strategies for smallholders in developing countries (**Klimczuk et al. 2024**). This ensures that knowledge generation is responsive to local linguistic and ecological contexts rather than being a "one-size-fits-all" scientific dictate. Strategic Leadership and Resource Allocation: Sustainable eradication requires a shift in governance. Strategic leadership must align resource allocation with the specific goal of "knowledge infrastructure"—libraries, agricultural kiosks, and local-language content repositories. Evidence suggests that even in resource-constrained settings, accountability mechanisms and transparent management can significantly enhance the efficacy of poverty elimination programs (**Singh and Chudasama, 2020**).

1.8 Conclusion

This article has demonstrated that knowledge poverty is a pervasive, structurally determined form of deprivation that serves as a central impediment to development and social justice. Spanning agricultural, health, environmental, and digital domains, knowledge poverty is not merely a byproduct of income scarcity but an independent phenomenon capable of entrenching material deprivation across generations (**World Bank, 2019**). Existing policy responses—often fragmented, supply-driven, and politically insensitive—have

largely failed. The "education-first" model overlooks knowledge systems outside formal schooling; market-based extension services bypass the most marginalised; and "digital-first" strategies overestimate the power of connectivity while ignoring the necessity of digital literacy and inclusive design (**Toyama, 2015; Warschauer, 2004**). An effective response requires a fundamental shift toward recognising knowledge access as a justiciable right, supported by rigorous monitoring of a Knowledge Poverty Index comparable to the Multidimensional Poverty Index (**Alkire and Jahan, 2018**). This necessitates sustained public investment in "infostructure"—libraries, community health workers, and localised digital content—alongside democratic reforms that give the marginalised a voice in knowledge governance. Furthermore, intellectual property regimes must be reformed to protect the public's right to research and safeguard traditional ecological wisdom (**Shiva, 1988; Drahos and Braithwaite, 2002**). The research agenda is both rich and urgent. We must move toward systematic measurement of epistemic gaps, analyse the political economy of institutional atrophy, and document successful empowerment initiatives that scale participatory methodologies (**Chambers, 1983; Pretty, 1995**). In an era of climate disruption and technological acceleration, the capacity to access and generate knowledge is the ultimate determinant of survival. Allowing this divide to widen is a civilizational failure; addressing it with ambition is the only pathway to truly sustainable and equitable development.

References

[1] ADB. (2021). Key indicators for Asia and the Pacific 2021: Special supplement—Advancing digital economic development. Asian Development Bank.

[2] Adger, W. N., Huq, S., Brown, K., Conway, D., and Hulme, M. (2003). Adaptation to climate change in the developing world. Progress in Development Studies, 3(3), 179–195.

[3] Agarwal, A., and Narain, S. (1989). Towards green villages: A strategy for environmentally sound and participatory rural development. Centre for Science and Environment.

[4] Agarwal, B. (1994). A Field of One's Own: Gender and Land Rights in South Asia. Cambridge University Press.

[5] Akerlof, G. A. (1970). The Market for "Lemons": Quality Uncertainty and the Market Mechanism. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 84(3), 488–500.

[6] Alkire, S., and Jahan, S. (2018). The New Global Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI): Periodic Data Updates and Analysis. Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative (OPHI).

[7] Altbach, P. G. (2015). Knowledge and Education as Global Public Goods. In Global Perspectives on Higher Education. Sense Publishers.

[8] Altieri, M. A. (2002). Agroecology: The science of natural resource management for poor farmers in marginal environments. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment, 93(1-3), 1–24.

[9] Altieri, M. A. (2004). Agroecology: The Science of Sustainable Agriculture. CRC Press.

[10] Anderson, J. R., and Feder, G. (2004). Agricultural Extension: Good Intentions and Hard Realities. The World Bank Research Observer, 19(1), 41–60.

[11] Anderson, J. R., Feder, G., and Ganguly, S. (2006). The Rise and Fall of the Training and Visit System of Agricultural Extension. The World Bank Research Observer, 21(1), 147–166.

[12] Appadurai, A. (2006). The Right to Research. Globalisation, Societies and Education, 4(2), 167–177. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767720600752596

[13] Arora, R., and Sapre, N. (2025). Rural–Urban Digital Divide: Evidence from Indian States. International Journal of Finance and Economics. https://doi.org/10.1002/ijfe.3113 Cited by: 0

[14] Arrow, K. J. (1962). The economic implications of learning by doing. Review of Economic Studies, 29(3), 155–173. American Economic Review, 52(5), 1023–1046.

[15] Arunachalam, S. (2004). Information and communication technologies and poverty alleviation. Current Science, 87(7), 960–966.

[16] ASER Centre. (2022). Annual status of education report (Rural) 2022. Pratham Education Foundation.

[17] Babu, S. C., Glendenning, C. J., Asenso-Okyere, K., and Govindarajan, S. K. (2013). Farmers' Information Needs and Search Behaviours: Case Study in Tamil Nadu, India. IFPRI Discussion Paper 01270.

[18] Baviskar, A. (2010). Winning the right to information in India: Is knowledge power? Economic and Political Weekly, 45(31), 45–52.

[19] Beck, U. (1992). Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity. Sage.

[20] Benkler, Y. (2006). The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom. Yale University Press.

[21] Berkes, F. (2012). Sacred Ecology (3rd ed.). Routledge.

[22] Birner, R., and Anderson, J. R. (2007). How to Make Agricultural Extension Demand-Driven? The Case of India's Agricultural Extension Reforms. International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI).

[23] Birthal, P. S., Kumar, S., Negi, D. S., and Roy, D. (2015). The impacts of information on returns from farming: Evidence from a nationally representative farm survey in India. Agricultural Economics, 46(2), 242–261.

[24] Black, R. E., Victora, C. G., Walker, S. P., Bhutta, Z. A., Christian, P., De Onis, M., ... and Maternal and Child Nutrition Study Group. (2013). Maternal and child undernutrition and overweight in low- and middle-income countries. The Lancet, 382(9890), 427-451.

[25] Bloom, D. E., Canning, D., and Sevilla, J. (2004). The effect of health on economic growth: A production function approach. World Development, 32(1), 1–13.

[26] Bollier, D. (2014). Think Like a Commoner: A Short Introduction to the Life of the Commons. New Society Publishers.

[27] Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. Greenwood.

[28] Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. Greenwood.

[29] Bowles, S., Durlauf, S. N., and Hoff, K. (Eds.). (2006). Poverty Traps. Princeton University Press.

[30] Boyle, J. (2003). The Second Enclosure Movement and the Construction of the Public Domain. Law and Contemporary Problems, 66(1/2), 33–74.

[31] Canning, D., and Schultz, T. P. (2012). The economic consequences of reproductive health and family planning. The Lancet, 380(9837), 165-171.
[32] Castells, M. (2010). The Rise of the Network Society (2nd ed.). Wiley-Blackwell.
[33] Chambers, R. (1983). Rural Development: Putting the Last First. Longman.
[34] Chambers, R., and Conway, G. (1991). Sustainable rural livelihoods: Practical concepts for the 21st century (IDS Discussion Paper No. 296). Institute of Development Studies.
[35] Chaudhuri, B. (2019). The Digital Transition: e-Governance in India. Oxford University Press.
[36] Cinelli, M., Morales, G., Galeazzi, A., Quattrociocchi, W., and Starnini, M. (2020). The COVID-19 social media infodemic. Scientific Reports, 10(1), 16598. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-73510-5
[37] Claassen, R. (2016). An agency-based capability theory of justice. European Journal of Philosophy, 25(4), 1279–1304. https://doi.org/10.1111/ejop.12195 Cited by: 107
[38] Cleland, J., Bernstein, S., Ezeh, A., Faundes, A., Glasier, A., and Innis, J. (2006). Family planning: the unfinished agenda. The Lancet, 368(9549), 1810-1827.
[39] Cornwall, A., and Rivas, A. M. (2015). From 'gender equality' and 'women's empowerment' to global justice: Reclaiming a transformative agenda for gender and development. Third World Quarterly, 36(2), 396–415.
[40] Couldry, N., and Mejias, U. A. (2019). The Costs of Connection: How Data is Colonising Human Life and Appropriating it for Capitalism. Stanford University Press.
[41] Davidson, A. P., Ahmad, M., and Ali, T. (2001). Dilemmas of Agricultural Extension in Pakistan: Food for Thought. Agricultural Research and Extension Network (AgREN), Network Paper No. 116.
[42] De Boon, A., Sandström, C., and Rose, D. C. (2022). Governing agricultural innovation: A comprehensive framework to underpin sustainable transitions. Journal of Rural Studies, 89, 407–422. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2021.07.019 Cited by: 127
[43] De Sousa Santos, B. (2014). Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide. Paradigm Publishers.
[44] De Sousa Santos, B. (2014). Epistemologies of the South: Justice Against Epistemicide. Paradigm Publishers.
[45] Dercon, S. (2002). Income Risk, Coping Strategies, and Safety Nets. The World Bank Research Observer, 17(2), 141–166.
[46] Deshpande, A. (2011). The Grammar of Caste: Economic Discrimination in Contemporary India. Oxford University Press.
[47] Digital Public Goods Alliance. (2023). Annual Report: Accelerating the SDGs with Digital Public Goods. DPGA.
[48] Doss, C. (2018). Women and Agricultural Productivity: Reframing the Issues. Development Policy Review, 36(1), 35–50. American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 100(2), 312–323.
[49] Doss, C. R. (2001). Designing Agricultural Technology for African Women Farmers: Lessons from 25 Years of Experience. World Development, 29(12), 2075-2092.
[50] Drahos, P., and Braithwaite, J. (2002). Information Feudalism: Who Owns the Knowledge Economy? Earthscan.
[51] Dreze, J. (2020). Dissent on Aadhaar: Big data meets big brother. Economic and Political Weekly, 55(18), 44–52.
[52] Dreze, J., and Sen, A. (2013). An uncertain glory: India and its contradictions. Allen Lane / Princeton University Press.
[53] Dutfield, G. (2004). Intellectual Property Rights and the Life Science Industries: A Twentieth-Century History. Ashgate.
[54] Economic Times. (2021, May 12). COVID misinformation cost lives: How India's infodemic made the pandemic worse. The Economic Times. https://economictimes.indiatimes.com
[55] Escobar, A. (1995). Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World. Princeton University Press.
[56] Eubanks, V. (2018). Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor. St. Martin's Press.
[57] FAO. (2011). The State of Food and Agriculture 2010–11: Women in agriculture — closing the gender gap for development. Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations.
[58] FAO. (2018). Agricultural extension and advisory services: A review of investment and returns. Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations.
[59] FAO. (2019). The state of food and agriculture 2019: Moving forward on food loss and waste reduction. Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations.
[60] Farooqi, A., Khalid, U., and Khan, A. M. (2022). Understanding the Digital Divide in the Contemporary Digital World. Global Political Review, 7(4), 7–14. https://doi.org/10.31703/gpr.2022(vii-iv).02 Cited by: 17
[61] Feder, G., Just, R. E., and Zilberman, D. (1985). Adoption of Agricultural Innovations in Developing Countries: A Survey. Economic Development and Cultural Change, 33(2), 255–298.
[62] Finger, M. J., and Bank, W. (2004). Poor People`s Knowledge: Helping Poor People to Earn from Their Knowledge. World Bank Publications.
[63] Foucault, M. (1980). Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977. Pantheon.
[64] Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the Oppressed. Herder and Herder.
[65] Glendening, C. J., and Ficarelli, P. P. (2012). The relevance of content in ICT initiatives in Indian agriculture. Development in Practice, 22(8), 1160–1170.
[66] Glendenning, C. J., Babu, S., and Asenso-Okyere, K. (2010). Review of Agricultural Extension in India: Are Farmers' Information Needs Being Met? IFPRI Discussion Paper 00937.
[67] Government of India. (2007). Report of the National Knowledge Commission. National Knowledge Commission, GoI
[68] Government of India. (2019). Report of the High-Level Committee on Socio-Economic, Health and Educational Status of Tribal Communities of India. Ministry of Tribal Affairs.
[69] GSMA. (2023). The Mobile Gender Gap Report 2023. GSMA Association.
[70] Gupta, A. (2012). Red Tape: Bureaucracy, Structural Violence, and Poverty in India. Duke University Press.
[71] Gupta, A. K. (1998). Rewarding and documenting grassroots innovations and traditional knowledge. Economic and Political Weekly, 33(9), 443–452.
[72] Gurstein, M. B. (2011). What is community informatics (and why does it matter)?. Journal of Community Informatics, 7(3).
[73] Gutiérrez Cano, L. F., Zartha Sossa, J. W., Orozco Mendoza, G. L., Suárez Guzmán, L. M., Agudelo Tapasco, D. A., and Quintero Saavedra, J. I. (2023). Agricultural innovation system: analysis from the subsystems of Rand D, training, extension, and sustainability. Frontiers in Sustainable Food Systems, 7. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsufs.2023.1176366 Cited by: 39

[74] Heckman, J. J., and Corbin, C. O. (2016). Capabilities and skills. Journal of Human Development and Capabilities, 17(3), 342–359. https://doi.org/10.1080/19452829.2016.1200541 Cited by: 196
[75] Hess, C., and Ostrom, E. (Eds.). (2007). Understanding Knowledge as a Commons: From Theory to Practice. MIT Press.
[76] Hindu Business Line. (2021, November 22). Aadhaar authentication failures continue to exclude rural beneficiaries from food entitlements. The Hindu Business Line. https://www.thehindubusinessline.com
[77] How do you envision these strategies being applied specifically to the "Silver Economy" and the unique informational needs of an ageing population?
[78] Howard, P. L. (Ed.). (2003). Women and Plants: Gender Relations in Biodiversity Management and Conservation. Zed Books.
[79] Huyer, S. (2006). Gender, Science and Technology. In the UNESCO World Science Report. UNESCO Publishing.
[80] India Today. (2021, August 15). The knowledge divide: Why millions of Indians remain excluded from the information age. India Today, 46(33), 28–35. https://www.indiatoday.in
[81] IPCC. (2022). Climate change 2022: Impacts, adaptation and vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge University Press.
[82] ITU. (2021). Digital Trends in South Asia 2021: Information and Communication Technology Trends and Developments in the South Asia Region. International Telecommunication Union.
[83] Jeffrey, R., and Doron, A. (2013). The Great Indian Phone Book: How the Cheap Cell Phone Changes Business, Politics, and Daily Life. Harvard University Press.
[84] Jenkins, R., and Goetz, A. M. (1999). Accounts and accountability: Theoretical implications of the right-to-information movement in India. Third World Quarterly, 20(3), 603–622.
[85] Jerven, M. (2013). Poor Numbers: How We Are Misled by African Development Statistics and What to Do about It. Cornell University Press.
[86] Kaba, A., and Sylla, A. (2020). Factors Facilitating or Inhibiting the Use of ICT by Small-scale Farmers. International Journal of ICT Research in Africa and the Middle East, 9(2), 1-17.
[87] Kabeer, N. (1999). Resources, agency, achievements: Reflections on the measurement of women's empowerment. Development and Change, 30(3), 435–464.
[88] Kabeer, N. (2005). Gender equality and women's empowerment: A critical analysis of the third millennium development goal 1. Gender and Development, 13(1), 13-24.
[89] Karki, M., et al. (2011). Integrating Indigenous and Local Knowledge into Adaptation Policies and Practices. CABI.
[90] Khera, R. (2019). Dissent on Aadhaar: Big data meets big brother. Economic and Political Weekly, 54(18), 44–52.
[91] Kickbusch, I. (2001). Health literacy: Addressing the health and education divide. Health Promotion International, 16(3), 289–297.
[92] Kickbusch, I., Pelikan, J. M., Apfel, F., and Tsouros, A. D. (Eds.). (2013). Health Literacy: The Solid Facts. World Health Organisation Regional Office for Europe.
[93] Klerkx, L., van Mierlo, B., and Leeuwis, C. (2012). Evolution of systems approaches to agricultural innovation: Concepts, analysis and interventions. In Farming Systems Research into the 21st Century: The New Paradigm (pp. 457–483). Springer.
[94] Klimczuk, A., Jasso, G., Evans, M. D. R., and Kelley, J. (2024). Editorial: On poverty and its eradication. Frontiers in Sociology, 9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2024.1487220
[95] Kranich, N. (2006). Countering Enclosure: Reclaiming the Knowledge Commons. Understanding Knowledge as a Commons, 85-122. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/6980.003.0007
[96] Krishnakumar, A. (2003, January 17). A Knowledge Revolution for Rural India: The Story of Village Information Kiosks. Frontline, 20(2), 62–67.
[97] Kumar, V. (2020). The digital divide deepens: Evidence from Rural India. Economic and Political Weekly, 55(35), 7–10.
[98] Lewis, D., and Lewis, D. (2012). Non-Governmental Organisations, Management and Development. Routledge.
[99] Long, N., and Long, A. (Eds.). (1992). Battlefields of knowledge: The interlocking of theory and practice in social research and development. Routledge.
[100] Lwoga, E. T., Ngulube, P., and Stilwell, C. (2010). Managing Indigenous Knowledge for Sustainable Agricultural Development in Developing Countries: A Critical Review in the Sub-Saharan African Context. International Journal of Information Management, 30(3), 226-234.
[101] Madon, S. (2009). e-Governance for Development: A Focus on Rural India. Palgrave Macmillan.
[102] Mahapatra, R. (2002, October 15). Village knowledge centres: Bridging the digital divide in Tamil Nadu. Down to Earth, 11(9), 38–44.
[103] Mansell, R., and Wehn, U. (Eds.). (1998). Knowledge societies: Information technology for sustainable development. Oxford University Press for the United Nations.
[104] Masiero, S. (2016). The digital revolution of public services: From PDS to e-PDS in the state of Kerala. Economic and Political Weekly, 51(24), 78–83.
[105] Maskus, K. E. (2000). Intellectual Property Rights in the Global Economy. Institute for International Economics.
[106] Mazumdar, I. (2014). Women and Globalisation: The Case of India. Pearson Education India.
[107] Mazzucato, M. (2018). The Value of Everything: Making and Taking in the Global Economy. Allen Lane.
[108] Meera, S. N., Jhamtani, A., and Rao, D. U. M. (2004). Information and communication technology in agricultural development: A comparative analysis of three projects from India. Agricultural Research and Extension Network (AgREN), Network Paper No. 135.
[109] Mehra, R., and Rojas, M. H. (2008). A significant shift: Women, food security and agriculture in a global marketplace. International Centre for Research on Women.
[110] Meinzen-Dick, R., Quisumbing, A., Behrman, J., Biermayr-Jenzano, P., Wilde, V., Noordeloos, M., ... and Beintema, N. (2011). Gender: A Comparison of Innovations in Agricultural Dissemination. IFPRI Monograph.
[111] Milan, S., and Treré, E. (2019). Big Data from the South(s): Beyond Data Universalism. Television and New Media, 20(4), 319–335. https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476419837739
[112] Mint. (2021, April 20). The misinformation pandemic: How fake news about COVID-19 shaped behaviour in rural India. *Mint*. https://www.livemint.com
[113] Misra, V. N. (2012). Agricultural extension in India: The need for systemic reform. Journal of Rural Development, 31(4), 399–418.
[114] Mohanty, A. K. (2018). The Multilingual Reality: Living with Languages. Multilingual Matters.

[115] Mokoena, S., and Seeletse, S. (2026). AI and the digital divide in education. Frontiers in Computer Science. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomp.2026.1759027 Cited by: 0
[116] Mosse, D. (2005). Cultivating development: An ethnography of aid policy and practice. Pluto Press.
[117] Murphy, R. (1988). Social Closure: The Theory of Monopolisation and Exclusion. Oxford University Press.
[118] Nakashima, D. J., Galloway McLean, K., Thulstrup, H. D., Ramos Castillo, A., and Rubis, J. T. (2012). Weathering Uncertainty: Traditional Knowledge for Climate Change Assessment and Adaptation. UNESCO and UNU.
[119] Narayanan, R., and Dhorajiwala, S. (2019). Aadhaar and the Right to Food: A Study on Biometric Authentication in the PDS. State of India's Livelihood (SOIL) Report. Sage.
[120] Norris, P. (2001). Digital Divide: Civic Engagement, Information Poverty, and the Internet Worldwide. Cambridge University Press.
[121] NSSO. (2018). Household social consumption: Education in India, 2017–18. National Statistical Office, Government of India.
[122] Nussbaum, M. (2011). Creating capabilities: The human development approach. Harvard University Press.
[123] Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach. Belknap Press.
[124] Nutbeam, D. (2000). Health literacy as a public health goal: a challenge for contemporary health education and communication strategies into the 21st century. Health Promotion International, 15(3), 259-267.
[125] Nutbeam, D. (2008). The evolving concept of health literacy. Social Science and Medicine, 67(12), 2072–
[126] Nutbeam, D. (2008). The evolving concept of health literacy. Social Science and Medicine, 67(12), 2072–2078.
[127] OECD. (2022). Main science and technology indicators 2022. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
[128] Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action. Cambridge University Press.
[129] Ostrom, E., and Hess, C. (2007). Understanding Knowledge as a Commons: From Theory to Practice. MIT Press.
[130] O'Sullivan, M., Rao, A., Banerjee, R., Gulati, K., and Vakis, R. (2014). Levelling the Field: Improving Opportunities for Women Farmers in Africa. World Bank Group.
[131] Ouma, M. A., Ouma, L. O., Ombati, J. M., and Onyango, C. A. (2024). A cost-benefit analysis of the adoption of the system of rice intensification: Evidence from smallholder rice farmers within an innovation platform in the Oluch irrigation scheme, Kenya. PLOS ONE, 19(1), e0290759. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal. pone.0290759 Cited by: 3
[132] Oxfam India. (2020). India Inequality Report 2020: On Women's Backs. Oxfam.
[133] Pandey, K., and Sengupta, R. (2020, September 15). Climate knowledge gaps: Why traditional ecological knowledge must be mainstreamed. Down to Earth, 29(9), 22–29.
[134] Patnaik, U. (2007). The republic of hunger and other essays. Three Essays Collective.
[135] Pickard, V. (2015). The Battle Over the NWICO: Examining the Historical Roots of the Digital Divide. The International Journal of Communication, 9, 2516–2535.
[136] Pimienta, D., Prado, D., and Blanco, Á. (2009). Twelve years of measuring linguistic diversity on the Internet. UNESCO.
[137] Pingali, P. L. (2012). Green Revolution: Impacts, limits, and the path ahead. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS), 109(31), 12302-12308.
[138] Pinstrup-Andersen, P., and Hazell, P. B. R. (1985). The impact of the Green Revolution and prospects for the future. Food Reviews International, 1(1), 1–25.
[139] Prasad, R. V. (2021). Digital Divide in India: A Review of Issues, Challenges and Policy Framework. Journal of Management and Public Policy, 12(2), 14-26.
[140] Pretty, J. (2008). Agricultural Sustainability: Concepts, Principles and Evidence. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 363(1491), 447-465.
[141] Pretty, J. N. (1995). Regenerating agriculture: Policies and practice for sustainability and self-reliance. Earthscan.
[142] Proctor, R. N., and Schiebinger, L. (2008). Agnotology: The Making and Unmaking of Ignorance. Stanford University Press.
[143] Quisumbing, A. R. (1995). Gender differences in agricultural productivity: A survey of empirical evidence. FCND Discussion Paper No. 5. International Food Policy Research Institute. American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 77(5), 1246–1254.
[144] Quisumbing, A. R., and Pandolfelli, L. (2010). Promising approaches to address the needs of poor female farmers: Resources, constraints, and interventions. World Development, 38(4), 581-592.
[145] Ramachandran, V. K. (2011). The state of India's rural economy. Economic and Political Weekly, 46(30), 11–18.
[146] Ramani, S. V., Sadreghazi, S., and Duysters, G. (2012). On the diffusion of boP innovations: The case of anti-malarial drugs in India. World Development, 40(12), 2537–2547.
[147] Rao, N. (2017). "Good Women Do Not Inherit Land": Politics of Land and Gender in India. Social Science Press.
[148] Raub, K. B., Laufer, J., Flynn, S. E., Daniels, S., and Sivalingam, T. (2024). Harnessing climate services to support community resilience planning: Lessons learned from a community-engaged approach to assessing NOAA's National Water Model. Frontiers in Climate, 6. https://doi.org/10.3389/fclim.2024.1291165 Cited by: 5
[149] Rivera, W. M., and Sulaiman, V. R. (2009). Extension Policy: Analysis and Contextual Adaptation. The Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension, 15(3), 267–281.
[150] Robeyns, I. (2005). The capability approach: A theoretical survey. Journal of Human Development, 6(1), 93–117. https://doi.org/10.1080/146498805200034266 Cited by: 5457
[151] Robeyns, I. (2010). The capability approach. The Philosophers' Magazine, (50), 92–93. https://doi.org/10.5840/tpm20105073 Cited by: 1217
[152] Robeyns, I. (2017). Wellbeing, Freedom and Social Justice: The Capability Approach Re-examined. Open Book Publishers.
[153] Robinson, D. F. (2010). Confronting Biopiracy: Challenges, Cases and International Debates. Earthscan.
[154] Romer, P. M. (1990). Endogenous Technological Change. Journal of Political Economy, 98(5), S71-S102.
[155] Sangomla, A. (2022, June 30). Losing ground: Traditional farmers and the climate knowledge crisis. Down to Earth, 31(3), 18–25.
[156] Saravanan, R. (2015). Agricultural extension in India: Decline, revival and the digital frontier. Journal of Rural Development, 34(1), 1–24.
[157] Saravanan, R. (Ed.). (2011). ICTs for Agricultural Extension: Global Experiments, Innovations and Experiences. New India Publishing Agency.
[158] Schultz, T. P. (2002). Why governments should invest more to educate girls. World Development, 30(2), 207–225. World Bank Economic Review, 16(1), 79–102.
[159] Sen, A. (1999). Development as Freedom. Oxford University Press.
[160] Sen, A. (2009). The idea of justice. Allen Lane / Harvard University Press.

[161] Senthilkumaran, S., and Nagarajan, B. S. (2006). Village Knowledge Centres: Lessons from Tamil Nadu. Economic and Political Weekly, 41(52), 5398–5404.
[162] Sharma, S. (2021, March 8). India's Digital Gender Gap: Women remain marginalised in the mobile internet revolution. The Financial Express. https://www.financialexpress.com
[163] Sherafat-Kazemzadeh, R., Gaumer, G., Hariharan, D., Sombrio, A., and Nandakumar, A. (2021). Between a rock and a hard place: How poverty and lack of agency affect HIV risk behaviours among married women in 25 African countries: A cross-sectional study. Journal of Global Health, 11, Article 04059. https://doi.org/10.7189/jogh.11.04059 Cited by: 22
[164] Shiva, V. (1988). Staying alive: Women, ecology and development. Zed Books.
[165] Shiva, V. (1993). Monocultures of the mind: Perspectives on biodiversity and biotechnology. Zed Books.
[166] Shiva, V. (2001). Protect or Plunder? Understanding Intellectual Property Rights. Zed Books.
[167] Singh, C., Daron, J., Bazaz, A., Ziervogel, G., Spear, D., Krishnaswamy, J., Zaroug, M., and Kituyi, E. (2017). The utility of weather and climate information for adaptation decision-making: Current uses and prospects in Africa and India. Climate and Development, 10(5), 389–405. https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2017.1318744 Cited by: 336
[168] Singh, P. K., and Chudasama, H. (2020). Evaluating poverty alleviation strategies in a developing country. PLOS ONE, 15(e0227176). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal. pone.0227176
[169] Sinha, D. (2019). ICDS at the Crossroads: Nutrition, Knowledge and the Limits of Supply-Side Interventions. Economic and Political Weekly, 54(28), 10–13.
[170] Starbird, E., Norton, M., and Marcus, I. (2016). Investing in family planning: key to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals. Global Health: Science and Practice, 4(2), 191-210.
[171] Stiglitz, J. E. (1999). Knowledge as a Global Public Good. In I. Kaul, I. Grunberg, and M. A. Stern (Eds.), Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st Century. Oxford University Press.
[172] Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). Information and the Change in the Paradigm in Economics. American Economic Review, 92(3), 460–501.
[173] Stiglitz, J. E., and Weiss, A. (1981). Credit Rationing in Markets with Imperfect Information. The American Economic Review, 71(3), 393–410.
[174] Strauss, J., and Thomas, D. (1995). Health, nutrition, and economic development. Journal of Economic Literature, 36(2), 766–817.
[175] Suber, P. (2012). Open Access. MIT Press.
[176] Sulaiman, V. R., Hall, A., Kalaivani, N. J., Dorai, K., and Reddy, T. S. V. (2012). Necessary, but not sufficient: Critiquing the role of information and communication technology in agricultural development. Agricultural Systems, 108, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agsy.2011.12.002
[177] Swaminathan, M. S. (2000). An evergreen revolution. Biologist, 47(2), 85–89. Journal of Rural Development, 19(3), 303–320.
[178] Swanson, B. E. (2008). Global Review of Good Agricultural Extension and Advisory Service Practices. Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO).
[179] The Economist. (2014, May 10). Towards open science: Research is increasingly available to all. The Economist, 411(8886), 68–70.
[180] The Hindu. (2021, March 15). The digital India paradox: Connectivity without empowerment. The Hindu. https://www.thehindu.com
[181] The Hindu. (2023, October 3). Remembering M. S. Swaminathan: The man who wanted to put knowledge in the hands of farmers. The Hindu. https://www.thehindu.com
[182] Mascarenhas, A. (2021, June 7). Vaccine hesitancy in rural India: How misinformation is slowing the COVID-19 immunisation drive. *The Indian Express*. https://indianexpress.com
[183] The Times of India. (2020, November 10). India's learning poverty crisis: Millions of children who can't read or count. The Times of India. https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com
[184] Thorat, S., and Newman, K. S. (Eds.). (2010). Blocked by Caste: Economic Discrimination in Modern India. Oxford University Press.
[185] Toyama, K. (2015). Geek Heresy: Rescuing Social Change from the Cult of Technology. PublicAffairs.
[186] TRAI. (2023). The Indian Telecom Services Performance Indicators. Telecom Regulatory Authority of India.
[187] UN DESA. (2017). Climate Change and Social Inequality (Working Paper No. 152). United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
[188] UNDP. (1990). Human development report 1990: Concept and measurement of human development. United Nations Development Programme.
[189] UNDP. (2020). Human development report 2020: The next frontier — human development and the Anthropocene. United Nations Development Programme.
[190] UNDP. (2021). Digital Public Goods: Accelerating the Sustainable Development Goals. United Nations Development Programme.
[191] UNEP. (2021). Making peace with nature: A scientific blueprint to tackle the climate, biodiversity and pollution emergencies. United Nations Environment Programme.
[192] UNEP. (2022). Adaptation Gap Report 2022: Too Little, Too Slow – Climate Adaptation Failure Puts World at Risk. United Nations Environment Programme.
[193] UNESCO. (2021). World Social Science Report 2021: Addressing inequalities in research systems. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation.
[194] UNESCO. (2022). Global Education Monitoring Report 2022: Gender Report, Deepening the Debate on Those Left Behind. UNESCO Publishing.
[195] UNESCO. (2022). Global Education Monitoring Report: Inclusion and Education. UNESCO.
[196] Vaidyanathan, A. (2010). Agricultural Growth in India: Role of Technology, Incentives, and Institutions. Oxford University Press.
[197] Van de Vijver, S., Tensen, P., Asiki, G., Requena-Méndez, A., Heidenrijk, M., Stronks, K., Cobelens, F., Bont, J., and Agyemang, C. (2023). Digital health for all: How digital health could reduce inequality and increase universal health coverage. DIGITAL HEALTH, 9. https://doi.org/10.1177/20552076231185434
[198] Van Deursen, A. J., and van Dijk, J. A. (2014). The digital divide shifts to differences in usage. New Media and Society, 16(3), 507–526.
[199] Van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2020). The Digital Divide. Polity Press. Cited by: 3254
[200] Vanloqueren, G., and Baret, P. V. (2009). How agricultural research systems shape a technological regime that develops genetic engineering but locks out agroecology. Research Policy, 38(6), 971–983.
[201] Varshney, V. (2018, March 31). Malnutrition in India: A knowledge failure as much as a resource failure. Down to Earth, 26(24), 28–35.

[202] Vedavalli, L. (2005). Village knowledge centres: Sustainability challenges and policy implications. Journal of Rural Development, 24(3), 345–362.
[203] Vedini, K. H. (2007). Village Knowledge Centres: A case study of MSSRF. National Institute of Agricultural Extension Management (MANAGE).
[204] Vikas, S. V., et al. (2022). Gender and the Digital Divide in India: A Socio-Technical Perspective. Information Technology for Development, 28(4), 712-735.
[205] Vinyeta, K., and Lynn, K. (2013). Exploring the role of traditional ecological knowledge in climate change initiatives. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. https://doi.org/10.2737/pnw-gtr-879 Cited by: 136
[206] Viswanath, K., Nagler, R. H., Bigman-Galimore, C. A., McCauley, M. P., Jung, M., and Ramanadhan, S. (2012). The communications revolution and health inequalities in the 21st century: Implications for cancer control. CA: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians, 62(6), 401–417. https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21161
[207] Wade, R. H. (2002). Bridging the Digital Divide: New Route to Development or New Form of Dependency? Global Governance, 8(4), 443–466.
[208] Warren, D. M., Slikkerveer, L. J., and Brokensha, D. (Eds.). (1995). The Cultural Dimension of Development: Indigenous Knowledge Systems. Intermediate Technology Publications.
[209] Warschauer, M. (2004). Technology and Social Inclusion: Rethinking the Digital Divide. MIT Press.
[210] WHO. (2013). The Economics of the Social Determinants of Health and Health Inequalities: A Resource Book. World Health Organisation.
[211] Wisner, B., Blaikie, P., Cannon, T., and Davis, I. (2004). At Risk: Natural Hazards, People's Vulnerability and Disasters (2nd ed.). Routledge.
[212] Wood, G. (2003). Staying secure, staying poor: The "Faustian Bargain." World Development, 31(3), 455–471.
[213] World Bank Economic Review. (2019). Does digital connectivity reduce poverty? Evidence from rural India. World Bank Economic Review, 33(1), 197–223.
[214] World Bank. (1998). World development report 1998/99: Knowledge for development. Oxford University Press for the World Bank.
[215] World Bank. (2008). World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development. The World Bank.
[216] World Bank. (2010). Agricultural Innovation Systems: An Investment Sourcebook. The World Bank.
[217] World Bank. (2019). Ending Learning Poverty: What Will It Take? World Bank Group.
[218] World Bank. (2019). World Development Report 2019: The Changing Nature of Work. The World Bank.
[219] World Development. (2017). Information, Agricultural Decisions and Market Outcomes in Developing Countries: A Meta-Analysis. World Development, 95, 252–267.
[220] World Development. (2019). Participatory agricultural research and knowledge poverty: Evidence from South Asia. World Development, 124, 104656.
[221] World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO). (2021). World Intellectual Property Report: The Changing Face of Innovation. WIPO.
[222] Zhu, Y. (2021). Digital Divide and Social Inequality: A Study of the Impact of Digital Technology on Social Stratification. Springer Nature.
[223] Zimmerman, F. J., and Carter, M. R. (2003). Asset Smoothing, Consumption Smoothing and the Reproduction of Inequality under Risk and Subsistence Constraints. Journal of Development Economics, 71(1), 233–260.
[224] Zuboff, S. (2019). The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power. PublicAffairs.