# Sociology 561: Development Theories/Strategies

**Fall 2010 / Tuesday 3:30-6:20 / 311 Davenport Hall**

**Professor Brian Dill**
**31 Computing Applications Building**
**Thursday, 12:30-2:00**
**217.244.2279**
**dill@illinois.edu**

## Course Overview

Our world is increasingly interconnected economically, politically, and culturally, yet it remains characterized by tremendous diversity in the standards of living observed between, among, and within countries. The gap between the global North and global South is particularly stark as evidenced by just a few distressing indicators: 1.4 billion people live on less than $1.25 a day; 1.1 billion people have inadequate access to water; 2.6 billion lack basic sanitation; 24,000 children die each day due to poverty.

This seminar examines some of the major theories, paradigms, perspectives, concepts and policies that, over the past 60 years, have attempted to explain, predict or otherwise effect change in the global South, including modernization and dependency theory, neoliberalism, human development, post-development, and feminist contributions to development. The course also surveys some contemporary perspectives on the discourse and practice of development, such as participatory development, the "good governance" agenda, and the "institutional turn." This is a multidisciplinary social science course, drawing on "mainstream" and "critical" literature from development studies, geography, anthropology, and sociology.

We should note at the outset that development is not static, and that it has long been impelled by both practical and theoretical concerns. It has also been and continues to be shaped by geopolitical interests and social scientific trends that are not immediately tied to development. Bearing this in mind, we shall seek to answer the following key questions this semester: What is development? How have our ideas about development, its causes, and its objectives changed over time? Why, after 60 years of development, are so many people still suffering from poverty, economic decline, ill health, political insecurity, repression, and powerlessness? Where should we focus our development efforts in the future?

## Course Objectives

This course is intended to survey the major debates that have occurred within development studies over the past 60 years. By the end of the semester, students should:

- have a deep and broad interdisciplinary knowledge of development;

- appreciate the range of alternative concepts and measures of development;

- be able to think critically about the ways in which intellectuals engage and effect change in the global South through development discourses;

- have a greater knowledge of the political, economic, social and cultural issues confronting former colonies at independence;

- be able to recognize and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of dominant approaches to development.

## Course Materials

**Eight books** are required for this course. They should be available for purchase at the bookstore(s).

- Abrahamsen, Rita. 2000. *Disciplining Democracy: Development Discourse and Good Governance in Africa*. London: Zed Books.

- Evans, Peter. 1995. *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Ferguson, James. 1994. *The Anti-Politics Machine: Development, Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

- Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Kabeer, Naila. 1994. *Reversed Realities: Gender Hierarchies in Development Thought*. London: Verso.

- Mamdani, Mahmood. 1996. *Citizen and Subject*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Sen, Amartya. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Anchor Books.

- Singer, Peter. 2009. *The Life You Can Save: Acting Now to End World Poverty*. New York: Random House.

There is also a **Compass** component to this course. All of the remaining required readings have been scanned and will be posted on our Compass site.

https://compass.illinois.edu/webct/entryPageIns.dowebct

## Course Format and Requirements

Students are expected to attend all seminar sessions and to complete all of the required readings **prior to class**. Otherwise, it will be difficult to participate actively and meaningfully in the discussions that are a central component of the course. Readings for the course will occasionally be difficult to comprehend and often heavy in quantity. Please plan accordingly and allow sufficient time to complete the readings.

At the beginning of each seminar, I will deliver a short lecture to introduce the topic for the week. My main ambition will be to provide some background to the required readings and to situate them in their appropriate historical context. That being said, students will assume a major responsibility for seminar discussions. Following my lectures, those students responsible for the week's reaction papers will provide a brief introduction to the required readings, identifying what they consider to be the central issues and debates for the session.

## Graded Work

Grades will be based on student performance on the three reaction papers (20% x 3) and one research paper (40%). Students must attend every session and actively participate in the discussions to receive an "A" for the course.

### Reaction Papers

Students are required to complete **three reaction papers** over the course of the semester. In an effort to make sure that everyone is on the same page from the outset, all students will complete a reaction paper for the **week 2** readings. To ensure that two reaction papers are produced for each of the remaining weeks, I will designate responsibility for the subsequent readings. While I cannot promise to make everyone happy, I will do my level best to accommodate student interests and/or preferences when assigning the reaction papers.

The purpose of your reaction paper is to introduce the topic for the week and provide an agenda that will facilitate a coherent and focused discussion. It is **not** to provide the final word on a given topic or to display your encyclopedic knowledge. Some summary of the material may be necessary in order to refresh people's memories and to help orient the discussion. But you should assume that everyone in the seminar has completed the week's readings, and thus your paper and presentation should **not** consist of a long and elaborate overview.

Reaction papers should be mini-essays which help all of us to organize our thoughts and reflections on the key points, issues, and debates. Although you should try to focus the paper around the issues raised in the readings for the week, as the semester progresses you may want to connect, when possible, the week's readings to those covered previously in order to highlight common themes and/or to point out how current readings raise, address, underscore, or challenge questions sparked by earlier reading assignments.

Each reaction paper should be 750-1000 words long (3-4 pages) and sent, via e-mail, to everyone in the course by noon on the Monday before our seminar meets.

### Research Paper

Students are required to write **one research paper** this semester. The paper is your opportunity to explore, in greater detail, one of the topics covered in the seminar. Each paper should be approximately 5,000-6,000 words long (20-24 pages), typed in 12-point font, double-spaced with one-inch margins, and formatted according to the rules of ASA style. Students must submit **hard copies** of their papers either to the professor or to the front office of the Sociology Department (57 Computing Applications Building) by 4:30 P.M. on Tuesday, 14 December. **Electronic copies will not be accepted.**

## Scholastic Conduct

I take the integrity of academic work very seriously, and I expect all students to do the same. Scholastic misconduct is very serious and will be treated accordingly. Individuals who are caught submitting final papers using dishonest means risk receiving a failing grade for the course. Scholastic misconduct is any act that violates the rights of another student with respect to academic work or involves the misrepresentation of a student's own work. For more information, please refer to Part 4 of the University's 2009-2010 Student Code:

http://admin.illinois.edu/policy/code/FullCode_web.pdf

# Course Schedule

### 24 August • Introduction

**week 1**  Welcome to the course! We will devote our first meeting to laying the foundation for our subsequent conversations. We will begin by introducing ourselves to one another, reviewing the syllabus, and discussing the main themes of the course. In an effort to remind ourselves of what is at stake with respect to the success/failure of "development," we will consider a brief article by Thomas Pogge (2005), in which he argues for the moral duty to address world poverty.

***required readings***

Pogge, Thomas. 2005. "World Poverty and Human Rights." *Ethics & International Affairs* 19(1):1-7.

### 31 August • What is Development?

**week 2**  The diverse readings for this week provide a good indication of the murky waters we are about to venture into. Although development studies, at its core, is concerned with poverty and inequality, it does not have a clearly defined, enduring object. Analyses of the macro-level mechanics of development and underdevelopment, which were the basis of development studies during its emergence as an academic discipline approximately four decades ago, have largely been replaced by micro-level studies concerned with the (in)efficiency of development projects. And even a cursory glance at the vast development literature reveals a clear distinction between development as a normative concept, something which refers to the desire to improve the quality of life, and an intentional project, actual efforts to change conditions on the ground and their effects.

Readily acknowledging that development is a normative concept, Dudley Seers (1972:22), a founding father of development studies, takes the position that development nevertheless has a coherent object; i.e., "the realization of the potential of human personality." He challenges the prevalent notion (at the time) that development is merely commensurate with economic growth and argues for a broader explanatory framework, one that stresses the importance of three interdependent indicators: poverty, unemployment and inequality. Moving from measurement to conceptualization, Cowen and Shenton (1995) take a historical view to contend that development, understood as deliberate intervention, was present at the very birth of industrial capitalism to confront the devastation wrought by "progress." Esteva (1991), in contrast, takes a narrower view of the temporality of development, portraying it as a project directed by the United States in an effort to consolidate its emergent hegemony at the end of the Second World War. Where does this leave us? If development is merely an exercise in faith, as Rist (2002) attests, then perhaps we are wise, at the outset of this course, to consider Ferguson's (1994) injunction that we address two key questions: "What is to be done?" and "By whom?"

***required readings***

Cohen, Michael and Robert Shenton. 1995. "The Invention of Development." Pp. 27-43 in Jonathan Crush (ed), *Power of Development.* London and New York: Routledge.

Esteva, Gustavo. 1991. "Development." Pp. 1-23 in Wolfgang Sachs (ed), *The Development Dictionary.* London: Zed Books.

Ferguson, James. 1994. "Epilogue." Pp. 279-288 in *The Anti-Politics Machine: Development, Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Rist, Gilbert. 2002. "Definitions of Development." Pp. 8-24 in *The History of Development: From Western Origins to Global Faith.* London and New York: Zed Books.

Seers, Dudley. 1972. "What are we trying to Measure?" *Journal of Development Studies* 8(3):21-36.

*suggested readings*

Corbridge, Stuart. 2007. "The (im)possibility of development studies." *Economy and Society* 36(2):179-211.

Lund, Christian. 2010. "Approaching development: an opinionated review." *Progress in Development Studies* 10(1):19-34.

Myrdal, Gunnar. 1974. "What is Development?" *Journal of Economic Issues* 8(4):729-736.

Wallerstein, I. 1984. "The Development of the Concept of Development." *Sociological Theory* 2:102-116.


**7 September • Development and the Legacies of Colonialism**

**week 3**   Here we wish to explore the continuities and divergences between colonialism and development. Our aim is to do more than simply foreshadow the argument of post-development critics that we will look at later in the semester; namely, that contemporary development discourse is a "neocolonial" project that reproduces global inequalities and maintains the dominance of the global South by the North. Rather, our ambition here is twofold. First, we want to interrogate the roots of development interventions that have become common-place in our own lifetimes. Cooper's (1997) chapter, for example, explains British and French efforts to use metropolitan funds to develop the production capacities of their African colonies. The emergence of development ideology and practice, we are told, was intended to sustain the empire, not transfer power to Africans. Second, and perhaps more importantly, we want to examine the persistence of colonial forms of power and knowledge into the present. We will read the first half of Mamdani's (1996) remarkable book to interrogate some of the institutional and administrative legacies of colonialism in Africa.

*required readings*

Cooper, Frederick. 1997. "Modernizing Bureaucrats, Backward Africans, and the Development Concept," Pp. 64-92 in Frederick Cooper and Randall Packard (eds), *International Development and the Social Sciences.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mamdani, Mahmood. 1996. *Citizen and Subject.* Princeton: Princeton University Press. (Read pages 1-179).

*suggested readings*

Cooke, Bill. 2003. "A new continuity with colonial administration: participation in development management." *Third World Quarterly* 24(1):47-61.

Havinden, M. and D. Meredith. 1993. *Colonialism and Development: Britain and Its Tropical Colonies 1850-1960.* London: Routledge.

Kothari, Uma. 2005. "From colonial administration to development studies: a post-colonial critique of the history of development studies," Pp. 47-66 in Uma Kothari (ed), *A Radical History of Development Studies: Individuals, Institutions and Ideologies.* London: Zed Books.

Scott, David. 1995. "Colonial Governmentality." *Social Text* 43:191-220.

### 14 September • Modernization Theory

**week 4**   As suggested by Esteva (1991) in one of our readings for week two, "development," as an objective and an intentional practice, emerged following the culmination of the Second World War as various colonies achieved their independence and the Cold War began to take shape. In the two decades that followed, new theories were created to try to explain the likely socio-economic futures of these now-independent countries of the South. A guiding theory in North American academia and policy making was modernization theory, which suggested that all countries would evolve through successive stages of development so long as certain cultural and political conditions were in place. The modernization literature is vast, but we should be able to discern its primary assumptions and ambitions from the three representative pieces by Deutsch (1961), Lerner (1958), and Levy (1965). The attempt by modernization theorists to universalize historically specific values and institutions deriving from Western societies and their experiences was, to be sure, met with withering criticism. Thus, in addition to identifying the characteristic features of modernization theory, our objective this week will be to lay the foundation for the ideological, empirical and methodological critiques we will encounter in the readings for next week.

#### *required readings*

Deutsch, Karl. 1961. "Social Mobilization and Political Development." *The American Political Science Review* 55(3):493-514.

Lerner, Daniel. 1958. *The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East*. New York: The Free Press.

Levy, Marion. 1965. "Patterns (Structures) of Modernization and Political Development." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 358:29-40.

#### *suggested readings*

Bernstein, Henry. 1971. "Modernization Theory and the Sociological Study of Development," *Journal of Development Studies* 7(2):141-60.

Eisenstadt, S. N. 1974. "Studies of Modernization and Sociological Theory." *History and Theory* 13(3):225-252.

Huntington, Samuel. 1971. "The Change to Change: Modernization, Development, and Politics." *Comparative Politics* 3(3):283-322.

Tipps, D. C. 1973. "Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies: A Critical Perspective." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 15(2):199-226.

### 21 September • Dependency Theory

**week 5**   Dependency theorists provided an alternative explanation of the development process by directly challenging the sacred tenets of modernization theory. Their basic argument was that the development of the global North was predicated on the active underdevelopment of the global South. Rather than see independent nation-states as similar entities at different stages of development as suggested by modernizationists, adherents of dependency theory argued that poor and wealthy countries are parts of the same global capitalist system, a system in which the relationship between the "center" and "peripheral" countries was historical, hierarchical, and enduring. The piece by Amin (1972) takes us back to (pre)colonial Africa to account for the emergence

of exploitative relationship of the "periphery" by the "center." Whereas modernization theorists maintained that the North would guide the development of global South through aid, investment, and example, dependency theorists argued that the actions of and ties to the North actually hindered the emergence from poverty of the South. Thus in contrast to a fundamental assumption of modernization theory—i.e., the causes of underdevelopment were internal to the societies of the global South—dependency theory stressed the external causes of the South's lack of development. From this perspective, attributing the South's underdevelopment to lingering traditionalism rather than the advance of global capitalism was viewed as a historical and political mistake. Some in this camp, such as Frank (1969) argued that the South could achieve genuine development only by withdrawing from the world capitalist system and reconstructing the economy and society on a socialist basis. Others, including Cardoso (1972), took a less extreme position by suggesting that dependence and development could occur simultaneously.

*required readings*

Amin, Samir. 1972. "Underdevelopment and dependence in Black Africa: Origins and Contemporary Forms," *Journal of Modern African Studies*. 10(4): 503-524.

Cardoso, Fernando Enrique. 1972. "Dependency and development in Latin America." *New Left Review 74* (July/August):83-95.

Frank, Andre Gunder. 1969. "The development of underdevelopment" *Monthly Review* 18(4):17-31.

*suggested readings*

Chilcote, Ronald H. 1974. "Dependency: A Critical Synthesis of the Literature." *Latin American Perspectives*. 1(1):4-29.

Friedmann, H. and J Wayne. 1977. "Dependency Theory: A Critique." Canadian Journal of Sociology. Vol. 2, No. 4.

Frank, Andre Gunder. 1974. "Dependence is Dead, Long Live Dependence and the Class Struggle: An Answer to Critics." *Latin American Perspectives*. 1(1):87-106.

Smith, Tony. 1979. "The Underdevelopment of Development Literature: The Case of Dependency Theory." *World Politics*. 31(2):247-288.


## 28 September • Neoliberalism

**week 6**   Neoliberalism is an ideology based on the primacy of individualism, market liberalism, entrepreneurship and state contraction. A central assumption of neoliberalism is that open, competitive, unregulated markets represent the optimal mechanism for economic development. Prominent from the late 1970s to the early 1990s, neoliberal ideas represented a major assault on the national developmentalism that we have discussed in previous weeks. Disdain for the state's role in the development process through such strategies as import-substitution industrialization and price controls is captured in Lal's (1983) succinct and oft-cited piece that appeared in an International Monetary Fund (IMF) publication. Neoliberal ideas have had a long gestation period and have been actively promoted/imposed by key, well-placed actors. For this intellectual history and some insight into the role of global governance institutions we turn to Harvey (2005) and Peet (2003).

*required readings*

Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Read pages 1-86.)

Lal, Deepak. 1985. "The misconceptions of 'development economics'." *Finance and Development* 22(2):10-13.

Peet, Richard. 2003. "Globalism and Neoliberalism." Pp. 1-23 in *Unholy Trinity: The IMF, World Bank and WTO*. London and New York: Zed Books.

*suggested readings*

Peck, Jamie and Adam Tickell. 2002. "Neoliberalizing Space." *Antipode* 34(3):380-404.

Fine, Ben. 2009. "Development as Zombieconomics in the Age of Neoliberalism." *Third World Quarterly* 30(5):885-904.

Krueger, Anne O. 1990. "Government Failures in Development." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 4 (3):9-23.

Palley, T. I. 2005. "From Keynesianism to Neoliberalism: Shifting Paradigms in Economics." Pp. 20-29 in A. Saad-Filho and D. Johnston (eds), *Neoliberalism: A Critical Reader.* London: Pluto Press.

## 5 October • Developmental State

**week 7**    Notwithstanding the excessive certitude of neoliberalism's defenders and agents, recent history has shown that open, competitive, unregulated markets may not, in fact, be the optimal mechanism for economic development, particularly for those societies consigned to the periphery of the global economy. Neither Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) in Africa nor "shock therapy" in the former Soviet Union served to raise the standard of living for the majority of those residing in either location. Thus, as we continue our journey with the ever-changing discourse and practice of development we are compelled to confront neoliberal claims directly. The issue is not one of state intervention in the economy. All states intervene in their economies for various reasons. Nor is the issue "how much" a state should intervene. Rather the important question to explore, according to Peter Evans (1995), is "what kind" of state intervention is necessary for development. In our reading for this week, several chapters from *Emdedded Autonomy*, Evans lays out a trenchant attack on the neoliberal contention that the state is an inhibitor rather than a facilitator of economic development. Evans's analysis of the conditions under which three Newly Industrializing Countries (NICs)—i.e., Brazil, India, and Korea—facilitated successful industrial development demonstrates that state bureaucracies can, in fact, provide the right environment for creative entrepreneurial initiatives to thrive.

*required readings*

Evans, Peter. 1995. *Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Read pages 3-127, 227-250.)

*suggested readings*

Amsden, Alice. 1989. *Asia's Next Giant: South Korea and Late Industrialization*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wade, Robert. 1990. *Governing the Market: Economic Theory and the Role of Government in Taiwan's Industrialization*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ó Riain, Seán. 2000. "The flexible developmental state: globalization, information technology and the 'Celtic Tiger'." *Politics and Society* 28(2):157-193.

Woo-Cummings, Meredith (ed.). 1999. *The Developmental State*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

## 12 October • Post-Development

**week 8**  At this point in the semester it should be clear that development studies remains one of the last bastions of modernity in the social sciences. While the theories we have read thus far have clearly differed over the means of attaining the object of development, there has been little discussion of development's content or its appeal. Development, in short, has ostensibly meant improving the quality of life of the world's poorest people so that their wealth, health, longevity and education are commensurate with those residing in the global North. Our reading for this week is a seminal example of a school of thought that has, for two decades, contested the very meaning and desirability of development. Through an empirically rich analysis of the development apparatus in Lesotho, Ferguson (1990) demonstrates the ahistorical and depoliticizing nature of development discourse and practice. His work is emblematic of post-development and post-colonial theorists who argue that certain characteristic "Western" ways of talking about and representing the non-West should be understood as ideological projections rather than as scientific knowledge about people and places elsewhere. To these theorists, the ways of conceiving and representing development that are closely bound to Northern development agencies reveal more about the self-affirming ideologies of the North than insights into the peoples of the rest of the world. In addition, post-development scholars take the position that development has less to do with human improvement and more to do with human control and domination.

### required readings

Ferguson, James. 1994. *The Anti-Politics Machine: Development, Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

### suggested readings

Escobar, Arturo. 1994. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mitchell, Tim. 1991. "America's Egypt: Discourse of the Development Industry." *Middle East Report* 169:18-34+36.

Nederveen Pieterse, Jan. 2000. "After Post-Development." *Third World Quarterly* 21( 2)175-91.

Rahnema, Majid and Victoria Bawtree. 1997. *The Post-Development Reader*. London: Zed Books.

## 19 October • Human Development

**week 9**  This year marks the twentieth anniversary of the Human Development Report (HDR) and offers an opportunity to reappraise its contribution to the stated objective of "human development," namely to enlarge the range of people's choices and to make development more participatory and democratic. As evidenced by the indicators selected for the Human Development Index (HDI), which is contained within the HDR, the most critical choices are those which affect one's ability to lead a long and healthy life, to be educated and to enjoy a decent standard of living. Since the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) first published the HDR in 1990, subsequent reports have emphasized additional choices, such as political freedom, guaranteed

human rights and self-respect. Our readings for this week will allow us both to look back and to contemplate the future of human development. The chapters from Haq (1998), the principal architect and advocate of the concept, are compelling and instructive. They clearly lay out an alternative way to assess progress; i.e., development. The selections from this year's HDR will, ideally, give us an indication of the concept's future.

*required readings*

Haq, Mahbub ul. 1998. "The Human Development Paradigm" and "The Advent of the Human Development Report." Pp. 13-45 in *Reflections on Human Development*. Dehli: Oxford University Press.

United Nations Development Programme. 2010. *Human Development Report 2010: 20 years on: Pushing the frontiers of human development*. New York: UNDP and Oxford University Press. (Readings TBA.)

*suggested readings*

Finemore, Martha. 1997. "Redefining Development at the World Bank," Pp. 203-227 in Frederick Cooper and Randall Packard (eds), *International Development and the Social Sciences*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Jolly, Richard. 2003. "Human Development and Neo-liberalism: Paradigms Compared." Pp. 106-116 in Sakiko Kukuda-Parr and A.K. Shiva Kumar (eds), *Readings in Human Development*, 2nd Edition. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Kelley, Allen C. 1991. "The Human Development Index: 'Handle with Care'." *Population and Development Review* 17(2):315-324.

Streeten, Paul. 2003. "Shifting Fashions in Development Dialogue." Pp. 92-105 in Sakiko Kukuda-Parr and A.K. Shiva Kumar (eds), *Readings in Human Development*, 2nd Edition. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.


## 26 October • Capabilities Approach

**week 10** This week we have the opportunity to read a contemporary text that has already become a must-read classic for anyone interested in development studies. *Development and Freedom*, by Nobel Laureate, Amartya Sen, is a synthesis of his long-standing efforts to shape development economics by focusing on individuals' choices, capabilities, and freedoms rather than income maximization as the key objective of economic development. Sen's (1999) basic argument is that we should evaluate development in terms of its ability to expand people's capabilities to make choices and thereby enable them lead the kinds of lives that they have reason to value. Clearly, this is related to and an extension of the objective of "human development" that was last week's topic of conversation. This is not coincidental, as Sen's previous work provided the conceptual foundation for the human development approach, and he has been a key advocate of the Human Development Index.

*required readings*

Sen, Amartya. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Anchor Books.

*suggested readings*

Alkire, Sabina. 2005. *Valuing Freedoms: Sen's Capability Approach and Poverty Reduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Drèze, Jean and Amartya Sen. 2002. *India: Development and Participation*, second edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, Peter. 2002. "Collective Capabilities, Culture and Amartya Sen's Development as Freedom." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 37(2):54-60.

Fung, Archon and Erik Olin Wright. 2003. "Thinking About Empowered Participatory Governance." Pp. 3-42 in Archon Fung and Erik Olin Wright (eds), *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance.* London: Verso.

## 2 November • Women, Gender, and Development

**week 11**  As a result of more than four decades of feminist scholarship, it is now well recognized that women experience development and social change differently from men. The literature has shown, for example, that when it comes to poverty alleviation, women have fared less well from various development strategies than their male counterparts. Women remain disadvantaged in terms of their access to paid employment, property, credit, inheritance, political power, education, and health care. Although the data on these indicators are incontrovertible, the broad literature that falls under the rubric of "women, gender, and development" embodies distinct schools of thought that are less complementary than they are contradictory. As has been the case with each of the theoretical perspectives we have examined thus far, feminist thinking on development has been deeply embedded in the politics of the time in which it was produced. Our readings for this week are intended to provide us with a broad overview of the three main forms that the interaction between feminism and development have taken: women in development (WID), women and development (WAD), and gender and development (GAD). While a quick glance at the numerous reviews of this literature will suggest the presence of other schools of thought, the three that we will cover in the chapters by Kabeer (1994) and Rathgeber (1990) are arguably the most common and thus provide a good introduction to this area of development thought.

### required readings

Kabeer, Naila. 1994. *Reversed Realities: Gender Hierarchies in Development Thought.* London: Verso. (Read pages 1-68.)

Rathgeber, Eva. 1990. "WID, WAD, GAD: Trends in Research and Practice." *The Journal of Developing Areas* 24:489-502.

### suggested readings

Cornwall, Andrea, Elizabeth Harrison and Ann Whitehead (eds). 2007. *Feminisms in Development: Contradictions, contestations and challenges.* London: Zed Books.

Razavi, S. and Mille. 1995. "From WID to GAD: Conceptual Shifts in the Women and Development Discourse." UN Fourth World Conference on Women: Occasional Paper No.1.

Sen, Gita and Caren Grown. 1987. *Development, Crises and Alternative Visions: Third World Women's Perspectives.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Visvanathan, N., L. Duggan, L. Nisonoff, and N. Wiegersma (eds). 1997. *The Women, Gender, and Development Reader.* London: Zed Books.

### 9 November • Participatory Development

**week 12** The current discourse and practice of development rest on the assumption that participation is an essential component of efforts to foster sustainable livelihoods, promote good governance, and alleviate poverty across the global South. Although currently fashionable, the view that participation is a crucial component of efforts to enable the world's poor to exert greater influence over the decisions and institutions that affect their lives has been defended for decades and thus is well established in the literature. Scholars and practitioners alike have highlighted both the benefits of various forms of participation and the ways that these forms have been shaped by the ever-shifting landscape of development. What has changed in recent years, however, is the extent to which participation has been embraced by both proponents of mainstream and alternative approaches development. Even vigorous academic critiques that emphasized the "tyranny" of participation (Cleaver 2001) or the "dangers of localism" (Mohan and Stokke 2000) have softened as subsequent work has sought to reassert its transformative potential (Hickey and Mohan 2005).

*required readings*

Cleaver, Frances. 2001. "Paradoxes of Participation: Questioning Participatory Approaches to Development." *Journal of International Development* 11:597-612.

Hickey, Sam and Giles Mohan. 2005. "Relocating Participation within a Radical Politics of Development." *Development and Change* 36(2):237-262.

Mohan, Giles and Kristian Stokke. 2000. "Participatory development and empowerment: the dangers of localism." *Third World Quarterly* 21(2):266-280.

*suggested readings*

Dill, Brian. 2009. "The Paradoxes of Community-based Participation in Dar es Salaam." *Development and Change* 40(4):717-743.

Hickey, Sam and Giles Mohan (eds). 2004. *Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation? Exploring New Approaches to Participation*. London: Zed Books.

Kapoor, Ilan. 2002. "The devil's in the theory: a critical assessment of Robert Chambers' work on participatory development." *Third World Quarterly* 23(1):101-117.

Williams, Glyn. 2004. "Evaluating Participatory Development: Tyranny, Power, and (Re)Politicization." *Third World Quarterly* 25(3):557-578.

### 16 November • Good Governance

**week 13** Our reading for this week focuses specifically on the concept of "good governance" and extends the conversation that we had about participatory development in last week's seminar. Governance, as defined by the World Bank (1994:xiv), "is the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources." For the past two decades, "governance," or more precisely "good governance," has played an increasingly important role in development discourse and practice. In the wake of neoliberal reforms prescribed by the World Bank in the 1980s, which largely failed to produce the development gains predicted, donors of various stripes have sought to extend the agenda on development co-operation by insisting on both participation and good governance. Rita Abrahamsen's (2000) outstanding book analyzes the "good governance" agenda of Northern aid agencies in Africa, in particular the language they have used to link

requirements for democratization to those for economic liberalization. She argues that demands for political liberalization—i.e., the creation of superficial democratic institutions—are inappropriate and impractical in the African context, where notions of autonomy and sovereignty have long been little more than illusions. Rather than give domestic constituencies greater power over the decisions that affect their lives, the "good governance" discourse legitimates and maintains international structures and relations of power that are unaccountable and undemocratic.

### required readings

Abrahamsen, Rita. 2000. *Disciplining Democracy: Development Discourse and Good Governance in Africa*. London: Zed Books.

### suggested readings

Andrews, Matt. 2008. "The Good Governance Agenda: Beyond Indicators Without Theory." *Oxford Development Studies*. 36(4):379-407.

Grindle, Merilee S. 2004. "Good Enough Governance: Poverty Reduction and Reform in Developing Countries." *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions* 17(4):525-548.

Weiss, Thomas G. 2000. "Governance, good governance and global governance: conceptual and actual challenges." *Third World Quarterly* 21(5):795-814.

World Bank. 1994. *Governance: The World Bank's Experience*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.


### 30 November • Institutional Turn

**week 14**  This week marks the end of our grappling with the discourse and practice of international development. (Next week we will contemplate ethical arguments for continuing efforts to respond to the scourge of world poverty.) We conclude by exploring readings that introduce a recent turn in the sociology of development, one derived from development economics. The "institutional turn" has arguably become the most important idiom in contemporary development theory. As articulated forcefully by Peter Evans (2004, 2005), this shift is noteworthy insofar as it directs attention to the emergence of institutions that will improve citizens' ability to make choices. The affinity with Sen's capability approach is both obvious and intentional. At this point in the semester, it should be clear that the contemporary concern with institutions has not emerged in a vacuum, but rather builds on the experiences (not to mention the failures) of previous development attempts to make a difference in the lives of others. As evidenced by our previous readings, development scholars and practitioners have struggled to prescribe the right policies for adoption by the governments of the global South. And yet, efforts to graft Northern-inspired economic policies—i.e., structural adjustment in the 1980s—or to induce political liberalization—i.e., good governance in the 1990s—have not always fared well. It is in this context that we come upon the current interest in exploring the interactions between institutions, culture and development.

### required readings

Evans, Peter. 2004. "Development as Institutional Change: The Pitfalls of Monocropping and the Potentials of Deliberation." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 38(4):30-52.

Hyden, Goran. 2008. "Institutions, power and policy outcomes in Africa." Discussion Paper No. 2, Africa Power and Politics Programme (APPP), London.

Portes, Alejandro. 2006. "Institutions and Development: A Conceptual Reanalysis." *Population and Development Review* 32(2):233-262.

*suggested readings*

Dill, Brian. 2010. "Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) and Norms of Participation in Tanzania: Working Against the Grain." *African Studies Review*.

Evans, Peter. 2005. "The Challenges of the 'Institutional Turn': Interdisciplinary Opportunities in Development Theory." Pp. 90-116 in Victor Nee and Richard Swedberg (eds), *The Economic Sociology of Capitalist Institutions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kelsall, Tim. 2008. "Working with the Grain in African Development?" *Development Policy Review* 26(6):627-655.

Lamont, Michèle and Peter Hall (eds). 2009. *Successful Societies: How Institutions and Culture Affect Health*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.


## 7 December • The Way Forward?

**week 15**  In this final meeting of the course, we shift away from development theory in an effort to evaluate what we have learned through a different lens: the lens of ethics. Peter Singer (2009) argues, in *The Life You Can Save*, that our current response to world poverty is both insufficient and ethically indefensible. He suggests that, if we change our views of what is involved in living an ethical life, we can improve the quality of life for others without adversely affecting our own. Now that you have a deeper understanding of the pros/cons and successes/failures of the development apparatus, do you find Singer's arguments not only compelling, but also convincing and, more importantly, feasible?

*required readings*

Singer, Peter. 2009. *The Life You Can Save: Acting Now to End World Poverty*. New York: Random House.

*suggested readings*

Jones, Charles. 1999. *Global Justice: Defending Cosmpolitanism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pogge, Thomas W. 2002. *World Poverty and Human Rights: Cosmopolitan Responsibilities and Reforms*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Sachs, Jeffrey. 2005. *The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Time*. New York: Penguin.

Singer, Peter. 2002. *One World: The Ethics of Globalization*. New Haven: Yale University Press.