

Dilla University
College of Social Sciences and Humanities
Department of Sociology

Sociology of Development (SOCI 2091)

By: Getachew Teferi (PhD)

Objectives

- This course aims three things:
 - to impart the fundamental ideas and concepts of development to students;
 - to inform students about relevant implications of development policies for one's own country and the need for utilizing existing theoretical perspectives to examine and assess this polices as well;
 - students will also be introduced to contemporary debates in development.
- **Outcomes**
 - By the end of this course students will be able:
 - To analyse some of the conceptual and theoretical issues around development;
 - To critically examine existing development policies in Ethiopia and asses the advantages and disadvantages of its implementation;
 - To understand the nature of development and how it impacts oneconomies, cultures, political structures and the environment around the world; and,
 - To understand the relationship between development and democracy.

Chapter One

Conceptualizing and Measuring Development

Why are some countries poorer than others, and what can be done to raise the standard of living for everyone? At the close of World War II, scholars and policy makers alike became intently focused on answering these questions. Finding the answers, they believed, would help prevent future wars and stop the spread of communism—an ideology that was thought particularly attractive to the poorest of the world’s citizens. Identifying the determinants of national development also made good economic sense: The United States’ postwar technological and industrial dominance could generate larger profits only if US companies could access a growing international consumer market. As a result, the field of “development” was born.

From the beginning, development evolved along two paths. On the first path, scholars aimed to generate theoretical understandings of social change, especially at the national level. Development became a new and central sub-field across most social science disciplines, as well as an integral part of many schools of public policy. On the second path, politicians and citizens residing outside the ivory tower began new initiatives to promote positive social change through action, especially by rebuilding war-torn Europe and reducing human misery in developing nations. Several big players operating along this second path—intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) (such as the United Nations, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund) and massive international non-governmental development organizations (INGOs) (such as World Vision, Oxfam, and CARE)—were founded during this same postwar period. Development thus evolved with a distinctly dual character: It is both something that academics study and something that practitioners do.

Because the term *development* may mean different things to different people, it is important that we have some working definition or core perspective on its meaning. Without such a perspective and some agreed measurement criteria, we would be unable to determine which country was actually developing and which was not.

1.1 Development Defined

In general terms, “development” means an “event constituting a new stage in a changing situation” or the process of change *per se*. If not qualified, “development” is implicitly intended

as something positive or desirable. When referring to a society or to a socio-economic system, “development” usually means improvement, either in the general situation of the system, or in some of its constituent elements. Development may occur due to some deliberate action carried out by single agents or by some authority pre-ordered to achieve improvement, to favourable circumstances in both.

Development is also seen as a transformational vision of entire countries, where transformation is sought across the four dimensions of polity, economy, social relations, and public administration. More specifically, ideally developed societies would have political systems that represent the aggregate preferences of citizens, economic systems that grow through enhanced productivity, social relations that fairly extend rights and opportunities to all individuals, and public organizations that function according to meritocratic standards and professional norms.

Although development has been a constant concern of governments, policy-makers, economists and other social scientists – and has touched the lives of more people than ever before – there has been little agreement on what constitutes development, how it is best measured and how it is best achieved. One reason for this lack of agreement is that dissatisfaction with the pace and character of economic and social change has instilled a desire to redefine the aims and measures of development.

Development can be defined as the process of economic and social transformation that is based on complex cultural and environmental factors and their interactions.

Traditional Economic Measures

In strictly economic terms, *development* has traditionally meant achieving sustained rates of growth of **income per capita** to enable a nation to expand its output at a rate faster than the growth rate of its population. Levels and rates of growth of “real” per capita **gross national income (GNI)** (monetary growth of GNI per capita minus the rate of inflation) are then used to measure the overall economic well-being of a population—how much of real goods and services is available to the average citizen for consumption and investment.

With few exceptions, such as in development policy circles in the 1970s, development was until recently nearly always seen as an economic phenomenon in which rapid gains in overall and per capita GNI growth would either “trickle down” to the masses in the form of jobs and other

economic opportunities or create the necessary conditions for the wider distribution of the economic and social benefits of growth. Problems of poverty, discrimination, unemployment, and income distribution were of secondary importance to “getting the growth job done.” Indeed, the emphasis is often on increased output, measured by **gross domestic product (GDP)**.

The New Economic View of Development

The experience of the 1950s and 1960s, when many developing nations did reach their economic growth targets but the levels of living of the masses of people remained for the most part unchanged, signalled that something was very wrong with this narrow definition of development. An increasing number of economists and policy-makers clamoured for more direct attacks on widespread absolute poverty, increasingly inequitable income distributions, and rising unemployment. In short, during the 1970s, economic development came to be redefined in terms of the reduction or elimination of poverty, inequality, and unemployment within the context of a growing economy.

Dudley Seers posed the basic question about the meaning of development succinctly when he asserted:

The questions to ask about a country’s development are therefore: What has been happening to poverty? What has been happening to unemployment? What has been happening to inequality? If all three of these have declined from high levels, then beyond doubt this has been a period of development for the country concerned. If one or two of these central problems have been growing worse, especially if all three have, it would be strange to call the result “development” even if per capita income doubled.

1.2 Core Values of Development

Is it possible, then, to define or broadly conceptualize what we mean when we talk about development as the sustained elevation of an entire society and social system toward a “better” or “more humane” life? What constitutes the good life is a question as old as philosophy, one that must be periodically re-evaluated and answered afresh in the changing environment of world society. The appropriate answer for developing nations today is not necessarily the same as it would have been in previous decades. But at least three basic components or core values serve as a conceptual basis and practical guideline for understanding the inner meaning of development.

These core values— **sustenance, self-esteem, and freedom**—represent common goals sought by all individuals and societies. They relate to fundamental human needs that find their expression in almost all societies and cultures at all times. Let us therefore examine each in turn.

Sustenance: The Ability to Meet Basic Needs - All people have certain basic needs without which life would be impossible. These life-sustaining basic human needs include food, shelter, health, and protection. When any of these is absent or in critically short supply, a condition of “absolute underdevelopment” exists. A basic function of all economic activity, therefore, is to provide as many people as possible with the means of overcoming the helplessness and misery arising from a lack of food, shelter, health, and protection. To this extent, we may claim that economic development is a necessary condition for the improvement in the quality of life that is development. Without sustained and continuous economic progress at the individual as well as the societal level, the realization of the human potential would not be possible. One clearly has to “have enough in order to be more.” Rising per capita incomes, the elimination of absolute poverty, greater employment opportunities, and lessening income inequalities therefore constitute the *necessary* but not the *sufficient* conditions for development.

Self-Esteem: To Be a Person - A second universal component of the good life is self-esteem—a sense of worth and self-respect, of not being used as a tool by others for their own ends. All peoples and societies seek some basic form of self-esteem, although they may call it authenticity, identity, dignity, respect, honor, or recognition. The nature and form of this self-esteem may vary from society to society and from culture to culture. However, with the proliferation of the “modernizing values” of developed nations, many societies in developing countries that have had a profound sense of their own worth suffer from serious cultural confusion when they come in contact with economically and technologically advanced societies. This is because national prosperity has become an almost universal measure of worth. Due to the significance attached to material values in developed nations, worthiness and esteem are nowadays increasingly conferred only on countries that possess economic wealth and technological power—those that have “developed.” As Denis Goulet put it, “Development is legitimized as a goal because it is an important, perhaps even an indispensable, way of gaining esteem.”

Freedom from Servitude: To Be Able to Choose - A third and final universal value that we suggest should constitute the meaning of development is the concept of human freedom.

Freedom here is to be understood in the sense of emancipation from alienating material conditions of life and from social servitude to nature, other people, misery, oppressive institutions, and dogmatic beliefs, especially that poverty is predestination. Freedom involves an expanded range of choices for societies and their members together with a minimization of external constraints in the pursuit of some social goal we call development. Wealth can enable people to gain greater control over nature and the physical environment (e.g., through the production of food, clothing, and shelter) than they would have if they remained poor. It also gives them the freedom to choose greater leisure, to have more goods and services, or to deny the importance of these material wants and choose to live a life of spiritual contemplation. The concept of human freedom also encompasses various components of political freedom, including personal security, the rule of law, freedom of expression, political participation, and equality of opportunity. Although attempts to rank countries with freedom indexes have proved highly controversial, studies do reveal that some countries that have achieved high economic growth rates or high incomes, such as China, Malaysia, Saudi Arabia, and Singapore, have not achieved as much on human freedom criteria.

The Three Objectives of Development

We may conclude that development is both a physical reality and a state of mind in which society has, through some combination of social, economic, and institutional processes, secured the means for obtaining a better life. Whatever the specific components of this better life, development in all societies must have at least the following three objectives:

1. *To increase the availability and widen the distribution of basic life-sustaining goods* such as food, shelter, health, and protection
2. *To raise levels of living*, including, in addition to higher incomes, the provision of more jobs, better education, and greater attention to cultural and human values, all of which will serve not only to enhance material wellbeing but also to generate greater individual and national self-esteem.
3. *To expand the range of economic and social choices* available to individuals and nations by freeing them from servitude and dependence not only in relation to other people and nation-states but also to the forces of ignorance and human misery.

1.3 Dimensions of Development

For practical purposes, in particular for policy making and development management, the focus of the agents aiming at development is almost always on selected parts of the system or on specific features. A summary (non-exhaustive) list of possible qualifications comprises:

- **Economic development:** it is just when improvement of the way endowments and goods and services are used within (or by) the system to generate new goods and services in order to provide additional consumption and/or investment possibilities to the members of the system.

It has traditionally been seen as the first form of development. It has often been strictly associated with the concept of economic growth, in turn defined as an increase in the *per capita* income of the economic system. Indeed, growth defined in this way can be seen more as the result of an economic development process, i.e. the transformation of the structure of an economic system, rather than as a development process *per se*.

Countless economists provided insights and proposed models to explain how economic systems develop (or should develop) to generate growth. Just to mention some milestones:

- it is worth mentioning the contributions of Shumpeter (1911), who suggested that economic systems evolve through subsequent disequilibria due to agents which introduce innovations, more than “developing” according to a pre-determined path.
 - Solow (1956) with his “*Long Run Growth Model*” highlights that, increasing the capital per unit of labour (a shift in the capital/labour ratio) increases labour productivity and generates growth.
- **Human development:** people-centered development, where the focus is put on the improvement of the various dimensions affecting the well-being of individuals and their relationships with the society (health, education, entitlements, capabilities, empowerment etc.)

It is just a step towards a multi-dimensional concept of development, where knowledge is not only fundamental to economic growth but an end *per se*, as it generates empowerment, self-reliance and a general improvement in community and social relationships. Nowadays the concept of development encompasses a set of elements comprised in more than one of the above-mentioned qualifications.

UNDP, for instance, provides an aggregate concept of human development on the basis of three criteria: (i) “Long and healthy life”, (ii) “knowledge” and (iii) “A decent standard of living”, respectively measured by life expectancy at birth, mean years and expected years of schooling and gross national income per capita at purchasing parity. The associated Human Development Index (HDI) is then adjusted on the basis of (iv) the inequality in the distribution of the specific features within countries, assuming that the unequal distribution of wealth is an undesirable feature of the development processes.

- **Sustainable development:** development which considers the long term perspectives of the socio-economic system, to ensure that improvements occurring in the short term will not be detrimental to the future status or development potential of the system, i.e. development will be “sustainable” on environmental, social, financial and other grounds.

The concept of “sustainable development” was first introduced by Brundtland (1987), who defines development as “sustainable” if it “*meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs*”.

Sustainable development implies minimizing the use of exhaustible resources, or at least, ensuring that revenues obtained from them are used to create a constant flow of income across generations, and making an appropriate use of renewable resources. This applies to energy (oil and oil products in particular) but also to fish stock, wildlife, forests, water, land and air. Land degradation, due to soil erosion and salinization, persistent water and air pollution, depletion of fish stock and deforestation are all examples of consequences of non-sustainable activities.

The concept of sustainability has also been extended beyond environmental concerns, to include social sustainability, i.e. long term acceptance and ownership of development changes by the citizens, their organizations and associations (civil society), and financial and economic sustainability.

Social development: is a process that results in the transformation of social structures to improve the capacity of a society in order to fulfill its objectives. It refers to a paradigmatic change within the social and economic structure. Social development attempts to explain the qualitative changes in the structure and framework of society, that help the society to better realize its aims and objectives. When development takes place in progressive way featuring in

greater levels of efficiency, quality, productivity, complexity, comprehension, creativity, mastery, enjoyment and accomplishment and brings qualitative changes in human existence, it can be termed as social development.

The UN document claimed a social development aims at bringing about a more equitable distribution of income and wealth for promoting social justice, alleviating poverty, maximizing productivity, employment and expanding and improving facilities for education, health nutrition, housing and social welfare for the disadvantaged individuals, groups and communities. These become the very indicators of social development. Thus it can be noted that society centric development can be designated as social development. This implies that development processes need to benefit people, enrich their way of interaction in groups and societies, and make the norms that facilitate such interaction conducive. Social development thus implies the change in social institutions. Progress toward an inclusive society with the process of normative and institutional changes and changes in the interactional pattern among individuals can be depicted as a good example of social development. To quote James Midgley “Planned change designated to promote the wellbeing of the population as a whole in conjunction with a dynamic process of economic development can be termed as social development.”

1.4 Characteristics of Development

The following are the important characteristics of development.

1. Development is a continuous process

The process of development continues from the moment of inception of the society. The society always marches forward. Sometimes the process of development is faster and under some situations it slows down. However, it witnesses no complete halting point. It is ongoing in nature.

2. Development follows a pattern

Development occurs in an orderly manner and follows a certain sequence. Thus, primitive, medieval and modern are the different phases of development of the society. The society cannot skip one stage to reach at the other in the process of development. The pattern is always maintained.

3. Development has a direction

It runs as corollary from the above said feature that the process of development follows a definite direction. The direction is always forward and never backward. August Comte's "Law of Three Stages", Herbert Spencer's proposition that the society moves from a simple to the complex one, Ferdinand Tonnies's idea that the society transits from community to association, Emile Durkheim's proposition that the society makes a shift from mechanical to organic solidarity and Karl Marx's idea that the society progresses from a class to a class less society amply justify the directionality involved in the process of development. It also impresses that in the process of development, the society progresses towards maturity.

4. Development can be evolutionary or revolutionary in nature

Development when occurs in a slow and gradual manner it is said to be evolutionary in character. Evolutionary development takes its natural course, time and is not very spectacular in nature. In the long run the impacts of development become visible. On the other hand, revolutionary development refers to the abrupt and rapid change in the society. Revolutionary development is triggered by some factors like education, migration in large scale, introduction of policies etc. Revolutionary development is marked in a quick span and is vividly visible in nature. For example, transition of a society from pre modern to modern is evolutionary development, but transition of a society from monarchy to democracy due to some revolution is revolutionary in nature.

5. Development is multi-dimensional

The conventional notion of development always insisted upon the uni-dimensionality of the concept of development focusing on economic growth. However, later on it was felt economic growth is a parameter of development, but not the sole or whole of it. At this moment the social scientists and development practitioners felt that development has to be multidimensional touching various aspects of the society. So that it can become better yielding in nature. It should not confine itself to the economic dimension, but should have its political, cultural and social dimensions too. Its political dimension is expressed through the process of democratization, distributive justice; increased consciousness for human rights, equity, liberty etc. The cultural dimensions of development is manifested through the growth of secular culture, increased consumerism etc. The social dimensions of development include increased participation of

people in societal affairs, development of self-reliance, better human development and environmental sustainability, etc.

6. Development is universal, but not uniform

Development is a common process witnessed by every society however primitive or modern it is. Every society witnesses the process of development in some form or the other. Time and space cannot arrest it. Right from the beginning of the society development process is initiated. The rich and the poor societies, the most developed and the most under developed societies too experience it. In some societies it is faster while in some societies it is slow. In some societies the yields of development are more remarkable than other societies. So, the process is universal, but the outcome is not uniform.

7. Development insists upon adaptability

Development as process is driven by human needs. Human needs change with the changing time and situations. The process of development demands the existing institutions to change and adapt to the upcoming demands to fulfill the emerging needs of the individuals. For example: with the process of industrialization there was increased migration which required the institution of joint family to disintegrate structurally.

8. Development stands for dynamism

Development necessarily entails change. It brings changes in the status quo of a society. No development process can be imagined without bringing subsequent changes. Thus, the concept of development is against the notion of static.

9. Development is irreversible

Development as a process is always forward looking and has no look back. There may be temporary stalemates but once a society is into the process of development, it will never revert back to its original state. So development is always progressive.

10. Development is diffusive

Development never remains concentrated in the place of its origin. It has a natural tendency to spread beyond its place of origin. The best example of it is that when a new technology is innovated, very soon, it spreads to other areas beyond the place of its origin.

11. Development always has positive yields

The outcomes of development are always positive. It is for the betterment of the society. Development thus is progressive. But sometimes when development outcomes are used by human beings in a negative way its consequences become disastrous. For e.g. Development of technology necessarily improves human quality of life. But when men indiscriminately use it for destructive purpose the outcomes become sorrowful.

12. Development has got its qualitative and quantitative connotations

Development as a process can be judged through the qualitative improvement human conditions of living. For example, when there is a reduction of house hold drudgery for the women we find a qualitative change in their living conditions and term it as development of women. Similarly, when there is a quantum lift or there is an increase in number of some institution, then also we feel the impact of development. For example, the increase in the number of educational institutions is also described as development. Thus the qualitative aspects of development are felt while the quantitative aspects of development are observed.

Measurement of Development

i. Gross Domestic Product

Gross domestic product (GDP) is the standard measure of the value of final goods and services produced by a country during a period. It counts all the output generated within the borders of a country. GDP is composed of goods and services produced for sale in the market and also includes some non-market production, such as defence or education services provided by the government. While GDP is the single most important indicator to capture these economic activities, it is not a good measure of societies' well-being and only a limited measure of people's material living standards. The sections and indicators that follow better address this and other related issues and this is one of the primary purposes of this publication.

Countries calculate GDP in their own currencies. In order to compare across countries these estimates have to be converted into a common currency. Often the conversion is made using current exchange rates but these can give a misleading comparison of the true volumes of final goods and services in GDP. A better approach is to use purchasing power parities (PPPs). PPPs are currency converters that control for differences in the price levels of products between

countries and so allow an international comparison of the volumes of GDP and of the size of economies.

GDP is defined by the following **formula**: $\text{GDP} = \text{Consumption} + \text{Investment} + \text{Government Spending} + \text{Net Exports}$.

ii. Gross National Product

The **GNP (Gross National Product)** measures the market value of all goods and services produced in a certain period by national bodies, independently of where this production takes place. It is an estimate of total value of all the final products and services turned out in a given period by the means of production owned by a country's residents. GNP measures the output of a country's residents regardless of the location of the actual underlying economic activity.

Income from overseas investments by a country's residents counts in GNP, and foreign investment within a country's borders does not. This is in contrast to GDP which measures economic output and income based on the location rather than nationality.

GNP and GDP can have different values, and a large difference between a country's GNP and GDP can suggest a great deal of integration into the global economy.

The formula to calculate the components of GNP is $Y = C + I + G + X + Z$.

That stands for $\text{GNP} = \text{Consumption} + \text{Investment} + \text{Government} + X$ (net exports) + Z (net income earned by domestic residents from overseas investments minus net income earned by foreign residents from domestic investments).

iii. Human Development Index

The underlying principle of the HDI, considered path-breaking in 1990, was elegantly simple: National development should be measured not only by income per capita, as had long been the practice, but also by health and education achievements.

The Human Development Index (HDI) is a composite index focusing on three basic dimensions of human development: the ability to lead a long and healthy life, measured by life expectancy at birth; the ability to acquire knowledge, measured by mean years of schooling and expected years

of schooling; and the ability to achieve a decent standard of living, measured by gross national income per capita.

For each dimension, the value of the index is computed on a scale of 0–1 where 0 corresponds to the minimum, and 1 to the maximum assigned value for the corresponding indicator. The overall HDI is then determined as the arithmetic average of the three indices.

Human development classification

HDI classifications are based on HDI fixed cut-off points, which are derived from the quartiles of distributions of the component indicators. The cut-off points are HDI of less than 0.550 for low human development, 0.550–0.699 for medium human development, 0.700–0.799 for high human development and 0.800 or greater for very high human development.

Chapter Two

Characteristics of Developing Countries

The most striking feature of the global economy is its extreme contrasts. Output per worker in the United States is about 10 times higher than it is in India and more than 50 times higher than in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Real income per capita is \$48,430 in the United States, \$2,930 in India, and \$280 in the DRC.

We then consider ten important features that developing countries tend to have in common, on average, in comparison with the developed world. In each case, we also discover that behind these averages are very substantial differences in all of these dimensions among developing countries that are important to appreciate and take into account in development policy. These areas are the following:

- 2.1 Lower levels of living and productivity
- 2.2 Lower levels of human capital
- 2.3 Higher levels of inequality and absolute poverty
- 2.4 Higher population growth rates
- 2.5 Greater social fractionalization
- 2.6 Larger rural populations but rapid rural-to-urban migration
- 2.7 Lower levels of industrialization
- 2.8 Adverse geography
- 2.9 Underdeveloped financial and other markets
- 2.10 Lingering colonial impacts such as poor institutions and often external dependence.

The mix and severity of these challenges largely set the development constraints and policy priorities of a developing nation.

2.1 Lower Levels of Living and Productivity

As was noted at the outset of the chapter, there is a vast gulf in productivity between advanced economies such as the United States and developing nations, including India and the Democratic Republic of Congo but also a wide range among these and other developing countries.

At very low income levels, in fact, a vicious circle may set in, whereby low income leads to low investment in education and health as well as plant and equipment and infrastructure, which in turn leads to low productivity and economic stagnation. This is known as a poverty trap or what Nobel laureate Gunnar Myrdal called “circular and cumulative causation.” However, it is important to stress that there are ways to escape from low income. Further, the low-income countries are themselves a very diverse group with greatly differing development challenges.

One common mis-perception is that low incomes result from a country’s being too small to be self-sufficient or too large to overcome economic inertia. However, there is no necessary correlation between country size in population or area and economic development (in part because each has different advantages and disadvantages that can offset each other).

2.2 Lower Levels of Human Capital

Human capital—health, education, and skills—is vital to economic growth and human development. Compared with developed countries, much of the developing world has lagged in its average levels of nutrition, health (as measured, for example, by life expectancy or undernourishment), and education (measured by literacy).

2.3 Higher Levels of Inequality and Absolute Poverty

Globally, the poorest 20% of people receive just 1.5% of world income. The lowest 20% now roughly corresponds to the approximately 1.4 billion people living in extreme poverty on less than \$1.25 per day at purchasing power parity.

But the enormous gap in per capita incomes between rich and poor nations is not the only manifestation of the huge global economic disparities. To appreciate the breadth and depth of deprivation in developing countries, it is also necessary to look at the gap between rich and poor *within* individual developing countries. Very high levels of inequality—extremes in the relative incomes of higher- and lower-income citizens—are found in many middle income countries, partly because Latin American countries historically tend to be both middle-income and highly unequal. Several African countries, including Sierra Leone, Lesotho, and South Africa, also have among the highest levels of inequality in the world. Inequality is particularly high in many resource-rich developing countries, notably in the Middle East and sub-Saharan Africa. Indeed, in many of these cases, inequality is substantially higher than in most developed countries (where inequality has in many cases been rising).

2.4 Higher Population Growth Rates

Global population has sky-rocketed since the beginning of the industrial era, from just under 1 billion in 1800 to 1.65 billion in 1900 and to over 6 billion by 2000. Rapid population growth began in Europe and other now developed countries. But in recent decades, most population growth has been centered in the developing world. Compared with the developed countries, which often have birth rates near or even below replacement (zero population growth) levels, the low-income developing countries have very high birth rates. More than five-sixths of all the people in the world now live in developing countries.

A major implication of high birth rates is that the active labor force has to support proportionally almost twice as many children as it does in richer countries.

2.5 Greater Social Fractionalization

Low-income countries often have ethnic, linguistic, and other forms of social divisions, sometimes known as **fractionalization**. This is sometimes associated with civil strife and even violent conflict, which can lead developing societies to divert considerable energies to working for political accommodations if not national consolidation. It is one of a variety of governance challenges many developing nations face. There is some evidence that many of the factors associated with poor economic growth performance in sub-Saharan Africa, such as low schooling, political instability, underdeveloped financial systems, and insufficient infrastructure, can be statistically explained by high ethnic fragmentation.

The greater the ethnic, linguistic, and religious diversity of a country, the more likely it is that there will be internal strife and political instability. Ethnic and religious diversity need not necessarily lead to inequality, turmoil, or instability, and unqualified statements about its impact cannot be made.

2.6 Larger Rural Populations but Rapid Rural-to-Urban Migration

One of the hallmarks of economic development is a shift from agriculture to manufacturing and services. In developing countries, a much higher share of the population lives in rural areas. Although modernizing in many regions, rural areas are poorer and tend to suffer from missing markets, limited information, and social stratification. A massive population shift is also under

way as hundreds of millions of people are moving from rural to urban areas, fuelling rapid urbanization, with its own attendant problems.

2.7 Lower Levels of Industrialization and Manufactured Exports

Industrialization is associated with high productivity and incomes and has been a hallmark of modernization and national economic power. It is no accident that most developing-country governments have made industrialization a high national priority, with a number of prominent success stories in Asia.

In developed countries, agriculture represents a very small share of employment and output about 1% in the United States and United Kingdom—although productivity is not disproportionately low. And the share of employment in industry in these two countries, for example, is actually smaller now than in some developing countries, particularly among women, as developed countries switch to the service sector. An often suggested but controversial “pattern of development” is that the share of employment in industry begins to slowly decline (and the service sector continues to expand) after developed-country status is reached.

There is wide variation in activity by sector around the developing world. However, in most African and Asian countries, agriculture still provides a substantial share of employment, in some cases even a majority.

Along with lower industrialization, developing nations have tended to have a higher dependence on primary exports. Most developing countries have diversified away from agricultural and mineral exports to some degree.

2.8 Adverse Geography

Many analysts argue that geography must play some role in problems of agriculture, public health, and comparative underdevelopment more generally. Landlocked economies, common in Africa, often have lower incomes than coastal economies. Developing countries are primarily tropical or subtropical, and this has meant that they suffer more from tropical pests and parasites, endemic diseases such as malaria, water resource constraints, and extremes of heat. A great concern going forward is that global warming is projected to have its greatest negative impact on Africa and South Asia.

2.9 Underdeveloped Markets

Imperfect markets and incomplete information are far more prevalent in developing countries, with the result that domestic markets, notably but not only financial markets, have worked less efficiently. In many developing countries, legal and institutional foundations for markets are extremely weak.

Some aspects of market underdevelopment are that they often lack:

- 1) a legal system that enforces contracts and validates property rights;
- 2) a stable and trustworthy currency;
- 3) an **infrastructure** of roads and utilities that results in low transport and communication costs so as to facilitate interregional trade;
- 4) a well-developed and efficiently regulated system of banking and insurance, with broad access and with formal credit markets that select projects and allocate loanable funds on the basis of relative economic profitability and enforce rules of repayment;
- 5) substantial market information for consumers and producers about prices, quantities, and qualities of products and resources as well as the creditworthiness of potential borrowers; and,
- 6) social norms that facilitate successful long-term business relationships.

These six factors, along with the existence of economies of scale in major sectors of the economy, thin markets for many products due to limited demand and few sellers, widespread externalities (costs or benefits that accrue to companies or individuals not doing the producing or consuming) in production and consumption, and poorly regulated common property resources (e.g., fisheries, grazing lands, water holes) mean that markets are often highly imperfect. Moreover, information is limited and costly to obtain, thereby often causing goods, finances, and resources to be misallocated. And we have come to understand that small externalities can interact in ways that add up to very large distortions in an economy and present the real possibility of an underdevelopment trap. The extent to which these **imperfect markets** and **incomplete information** systems justify a more active role for government (which is also subject to similar problems of incomplete and imperfect information) is an issue that we will be

dealing with in later chapters. But their existence remains a common characteristic of many developing nations and an important contributing factor to their state of underdevelopment.

2.10 Lingerinɡ Colonial Impacts and Unequal International Relations

Colonial Legacy:

Most developing countries were once colonies of Europe or otherwise dominated by European or other foreign powers, and institutions created during the colonial period often had pernicious effects on development that in many cases have persisted to the present day. Despite important variations that proved consequential, colonial era institutions often favored extractors of wealth rather than creators of wealth, harming development then and now.

Both domestically and internationally, developing countries have more often lacked institutions and formal organizations of the type that have benefited the developed world: Domestically, on average, property rights have been less secure, constraints on elites have been weak, and a smaller segment of society has been able to gain access to and take advantage of economic opportunities. Problems with governance and public administration, as well as poorly performing markets, often stem from poor institutions.

Colonial history matters not only or even primarily because of stolen resources but also because the colonial powers determined whether the legal and other institutions in their colonies would encourage investments by (and in) the broad population or would instead facilitate exploitation of human and other resources for the benefit of the colonizing elite and create or reinforce extreme inequality. Development-facilitating or development inhibiting institutions tend to have a very long life span.

In a related point of great importance, European colonization often created or reinforced differing degrees of inequality, often correlated with ethnicity, which have also proved remarkably stable over the centuries. In some respects, postcolonial elites in many developing countries largely took over the exploitative role formerly played by the colonial powers. High inequality sometimes emerged as a result of slavery in regions where comparative advantage in crops such as sugarcane could be profitably produced on slave plantations. It also emerged where a large, settled indigenous population could be coerced into labor. This history had long-term consequences, particularly in Latin America. Where inequality was extreme, the result has been

less movement toward democratic institutions, less investment in public goods, and less widespread investment in human capital (education, skills, and health). These are among the ways in which extreme inequality is harmful to development and so is also an important long-term determinant of comparative development.

External Dependence:

Relatedly, developing countries have also been less well organized and influential in international relations, with sometimes adverse consequences for development.

More generally, developing nations have weaker bargaining positions than developed nations in international economic relations. Developing nations often also voice great concern over various forms of cultural dependence, from news and entertainment to business practices, lifestyles, and social values. The potential importance of these concerns should not be underestimated, either in their direct effects on development in its broader meanings or indirect impacts on the speed or character of national development.

Chapter Three

Theoretical Perspectives in Sociology of Development

3.1 The Modernization Theory

In the years following the Second World War, modernization was generally accepted by social scientists, planners and politicians, both in the West and in the Third World. Although there were wide differences of opinion within this 'school', several themes and assumptions were shared by most of its adherents. The unit of analysis was usually the nation-state, and the nations of the Third World were placed on an evolutionary scale, at the apex of which were 'modern' Western societies. These provided a development pattern which, if followed in the Third World, would allow the 'developing' societies to catch up with the West, which was prepared to assist its (implicitly junior) partners by actively diffusing the ingredients necessary for development, especially 'modern' values, technology, expertise and capital. Within the Third World, the most active agents in the process of modernization were considered to be Western-educated elites, whose appointed task was to wean their people away from tradition and haul them, not without a degree of firmness, into the twentieth century.

In fact, some similarities were found among the proponents. First, they are all Eurocentric. They arise from within a body of thought firmly located in European experience, and they have been largely developed and applied by intellectuals, planners and politicians who have been socialized into this tradition. Secondly, like other notions of development, they embody a 'before' and an 'after', often with an implicit or explicit intermediate category. Modernization theorists tended to perceive the Third World from an evolutionary position of presumed advantage and superiority: 'they'—the backward or transitional societies—were on their way to becoming more like 'us'.

Theorists of the 1950s and 1960s viewed the process of development as a series of successive stages of economic growth through which all countries must pass. It was primarily an economic theory of development in which the right quantity and mixture of saving, investment, and foreign aid were all that was necessary to enable developing nations to proceed along an economic growth path that had historically been followed by the more developed countries. Development thus became synonymous with rapid, aggregate economic growth.

In the modernization theory there were two poles/societies:

The Traditional society

- were pre-capitalist
- Technologically constrained
- Traditional values and beliefs
- Stagnant and unchanging

What were the reasons for “backwardness”?

The problem was related to something inherent to the traditional societies. So there was nothing about global system, the colonial past, etc. Therefore, KEEP CALM, and remember, it is Your Fault!

The Modern society

- The West are the paragons of modernity
- Technological prowess
- Rapid economic growth
- Modern way of life
- Capitalism and democracy

So, what to do to bring about the desired development?

- Emulate the First World: follow in their steps (it's easy!)
 - Humankind can solve it all
 - Break from the fetters of tradition
- Evolve through stages of development
- Significant support from the First World
- Major role for national governments in eliciting the transformation

According to the modernization theory, modern societies are more productive, children are better educated, and the needy receive more welfare.

The basic assumptions of the theory are as follows:

- a) Modernization is a systematic process. The attribute of modernity forms a consistent whole, thus appearing in a cluster rather than in isolation;

- b) Modernization is a transformative process; in order for a society to move into modernity its traditional structures and values must be totally replaced by a set of modern values;
- c) Modernization is an imminent process due to its systematic and transformative nature, which builds change into the social system.

Modernization is a homogenizing process, in this sense, we can say that modernization produces tendencies toward convergence among societies, i.e. “as time goes on, they and we will increasingly resemble one another because the patterns of modernization are such that the more highly modernized societies become, the more they resemble one another”. Modernization is a Europeanization or Americanization process; in the modernization literature, there is an attitude of complacency toward Western Europe and the United States.

Modernization is a progressive process which in the long run is not only inevitable but desirable.

Finally, modernization is a lengthy process. It is an evolutionary change, not a revolutionary one. It will take generations or even centuries to complete, and its profound impact will be felt only through time. All these assumptions are derived from European and American evolutionary theory.

Modernization theory, on the other hand, was popular in the 1950s, but was under heavy attack at the end of the 60s. Criticisms of the theory include the following: First, development is not necessarily unidirectional. This is an example of the ethnocentricity of Rostow’s perspective. Second, the modernization perspective only shows one possible model of development. The favored example is the development pattern in the United States. Nevertheless, in contrast with this circumstance, we can see that there have been development advances in other nations, such as Taiwan and South Korea; and we must admit that their current development levels have been achieved by strong authoritarian regimes.

A second set of critiques of the modernization theory regards the need to eliminate traditional values. Third World countries do not have a homogeneous set of traditional values; their value systems are highly heterogeneous. A second aspect for criticism here is the fact that traditional and modern values are not necessarily always mutually exclusive: China, for example, despite advances in economic development continues to operate on traditional values and this appears to be the same situation in Japan. Moreover, it is not possible to say that traditional values are

always dichotomous from modern status, for example, loyalty to the Emperor can be transformed to loyalty to the firm.

3.2 The Dependency Theory

The international-dependence revolution was more radical and more political. It viewed underdevelopment in terms of international and domestic power relationships, institutional and structural economic rigidities, and the resulting proliferation of dual economies and dual societies both within and among the nations of the world.

Just as 'bourgeois' theories of development were, at least in part, a response to the decolonization process—a political development that led to the application of standard sociological approaches to 'new' nations—so, too, was underdevelopment theory. But it was more than that. Dependency theory, a key element of underdevelopment theory, arose from a growing disillusionment with *economic* strategies for development, especially as they had been applied in Latin America. This rejection was also accompanied by the realization, not confined to Latin America, that classical Marxist analyses were not appropriate in the context of the Third World.

Development and underdevelopment are seen as opposite sides of the same process: development in one region occurs only at the expense of underdevelopment in another. Indeed, developed and

underdeveloped societies participate in the same world system, which originated in capitalist expansion and colonialism. The system's parts are asymmetrically linked in a pattern of international trade which is characterized by 'unequal exchange'.

According to this view, underdevelopment must be explained by reference to the structural position of Third World societies in the global economy and not, as in modernization theory, by the backwardness of their peoples or traditions, the lack of an educated elite, or by the absence of values considered to be conducive to (capitalist) development.

The plight of the Third World, which has arisen from participation in the world system, can be relieved only by the severance of such exploitative links. Underdeveloped societies must first become socialist and then 'go it alone', or develop alternative links with other genuine (and currently non-existing) socialist societies. This is the route they must follow to autonomous

development, rather than vainly attempt to replicate the (alleged) history of capitalist development in the West.

Discontentment with the modernization theory in the 1950s precipitated new strands of thinking which resulted in the dependency theory. The theory came as a critical reaction to the conventional approaches to economic development that emerged in the aftermath of World War II. Andre Gunder Frank (1967), in his analysis of the post-colonial state, has argued that classical development theories such as modernity are misleading in that they fail to articulate the true relationship between the developed world and the poor regions of the world. For Frank, modernity distorts the truth about the motive of the developed countries on their former colonies.

It attributes the existence and continuance of **underdevelopment** primarily to the historical evolution of a highly unequal international capitalist system of rich country–poor country relationships. Whether because rich nations are intentionally exploitative or unintentionally neglectful, the coexistence of rich and poor nations in an international system dominated by such unequal power relationships between the **center** (the developed countries) and the **periphery** (the developing countries) renders attempts by poor nations to be self-reliant and independent difficult and sometimes even impossible.

3.3 Lewis Theory of Development

Basic Model One of the best-known early theoretical models of development that focused on the **structural transformation** of a primarily subsistence economy was that formulated by Nobel laureate W. Arthur Lewis in the mid- 1950s. The **Lewis two-sector model** became the general theory of the development process in surplus-labor developing nations during most of the 1960s and early 1970s, and it is sometimes still applied, particularly to study the recent growth experience in China and labor markets in other developing countries.

Lewis two-sector model: A theory of development in which surplus labor from the traditional agricultural sector is transferred to the modern industrial sector, the growth of which absorbs the surplus labor, promotes industrialization, and stimulates sustained development.

In the Lewis model, the underdeveloped economy consists of two sectors: a traditional, overpopulated rural subsistence sector characterized by zero marginal labor productivity—a

situation that permits Lewis to classify this as **surplus labor** in the sense that it can be withdrawn from the traditional agricultural sector without any loss of output—and a high-productivity modern urban industrial sector into which labor from the subsistence sector is gradually transferred. The primary focus of the model is on both the process of labor transfer and the growth of output and employment in the modern sector. Both labor transfer and modern-sector employment growth are brought about by output expansion in that sector. The speed with which this expansion occurs is determined by the rate of industrial investment and capital accumulation in the modern sector. Such investment is made possible by the excess of modern-sector profits over wages on the assumption that capitalists reinvest all their profits. Finally, Lewis assumed that the level of wages in the urban industrial sector was constant, determined as a given premium over a fixed average subsistence level of wages in the traditional agricultural sector.

This process of modern-sector **self-sustaining growth** and employment expansion is assumed to continue until all surplus rural labor is absorbed in the new industrial sector. Thereafter, additional workers can be withdrawn from the agricultural sector only at a higher cost of lost food production because the declining labor-to-land ratio means that the marginal product of rural labor is no longer zero. This is known as the “Lewis turning point.”

Criticisms of the Lewis Model: Although the Lewis two-sector development model is simple and roughly reflects the historical experience of economic growth in the West, some of its key assumptions do not fit the institutional and economic realities of most contemporary developing countries.

First, the model implicitly assumes that the rate of labor transfer and employment creation in the modern sector is proportional to the rate of modern-sector capital accumulation. The faster the rate of capital accumulation, the higher the growth rate of the modern sector and the faster the rate of new job creation. But what if capitalist profits are reinvested in more sophisticated laborsaving capital equipment rather than just duplicating the existing capital, as is implicitly assumed in the Lewis model?

The second questionable assumption of the Lewis model is the notion that surplus labor exists in rural areas while there is full employment in the urban areas. Most contemporary research

indicates that there is little surplus labor in rural locations. True, there are both seasonal and geographic exceptions to this rule.

The third dubious assumption is the notion of a competitive modern sector labor market that guarantees the continued existence of constant real urban wages up to the point where the supply of rural surplus labor is exhausted.

3.4 The Neoclassical

Throughout much of the 1980s and 1990s, a fourth approach prevailed. This neoclassical (sometimes called neoliberal) counterrevolution in economic thought emphasized the beneficial role of free markets, open economies, and the privatization of inefficient public enterprises. Failure to develop, according to this theory, is not due to exploitive external and internal forces as expounded by dependence theorists. Rather, it is primarily the result of too much government intervention and regulation of the economy.

The central argument of the neoclassical counterrevolution is that underdevelopment results from poor resource allocation due to incorrect pricing policies and too much state intervention by overly active developing-nation governments. The neoliberals argue that by permitting competitive **free markets** to flourish, privatizing state-owned enterprises, promoting free trade and export expansion, welcoming investors from developed countries, and eliminating the plethora of government regulations and price distortions in factor, product, and financial markets, both economic efficiency and economic growth will be stimulated.

The neoclassical counterrevolution can be divided into three component approaches: the free-market approach, the public-choice (or “new political economy”) approach, and the “market-friendly” approach. **Free-market analysis** argues that markets alone are efficient—product markets provide the best signals for investments in new activities; labor markets respond to these new industries in appropriate ways; producers know best what to produce and how to produce it efficiently; and product and factor prices reflect accurate scarcity values of goods and resources now and in the future. Competition is effective, if not perfect; technology is freely available and nearly costless to absorb; information is also perfect and nearly costless to obtain. Under these circumstances, any government intervention in the economy is by definition distortionary and counter-productive. Free-market development economists have tended to assume that

developing-world markets are efficient and that whatever imperfections exist are of little consequence.

Public-choice theory, also known as the **new political economy approach**, goes even further to argue that governments can do (virtually) nothing right. This is because public-choice theory assumes that politicians, bureaucrats, citizens, and states act solely from a self-interested perspective, using their power and the authority of government for their own selfish ends. Citizens use political influence to obtain special benefits (called “rents”) from government policies (e.g., import licenses or rationed foreign exchange) that restrict access to important resources. Politicians use government resources to consolidate and maintain positions of power and authority. Bureaucrats and public officials use their positions to extract bribes from rent-seeking citizens and to operate protected businesses on the side. Finally, states use their power to confiscate private property from individuals. The net result is not only a misallocation of resources but also a general reduction in individual freedoms. The conclusion, therefore, is that minimal government is the best government.

The **market-friendly approach** is a variant on the neoclassical counter-revolution associated principally with the 1990s writings of the World Bank and its economists, many of whom were more in the free-market and public-choice camps during the 1980s. This approach recognizes that there are many imperfections in developing-country product and factor markets and that governments do have a key role to play in facilitating the operation of markets through “nonselective” (market-friendly) interventions—for example, by investing in physical and social infrastructure, health care facilities, and educational institutions and by providing a suitable climate for private enterprise. The market-friendly approach also differs from the free-market and public-choice schools of thought by accepting the notion that **market failures** are more widespread in developing countries in areas such as investment coordination and environmental outcomes. Moreover, phenomena such as missing and incomplete information, externalities in skill creation and learning, and economies of scale in production are also endemic to markets in developing countries.

Chapter Four

Culture and Development

4.1 What is Culture?

Culture is a term that should connote different things to different individuals. Culture may now be said to be the whole complex of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterize a society or social group. It includes not only arts and letters, but also modes of life, the fundamental rights of the human being, value systems, traditions and beliefs.

Andah (1982:4-5) presented a more embracing definition:

Culture embraces all the material and nonmaterial expressions of a people as well as the processes with which the expressions are communicated. It has to do with all the social, ethical, intellectual, scientific, artistic, and technological expressions and processes of a people usually ethically and/or nationally or supra-nationally related, and usually living in a geographically contiguous area; what they pass on to their successors and how these are passed on.

Culture could therefore depict glaring similarities between people within the same territorial space that fosters a feeling of oneness that they would wish to preserve for future generations.

In summary, culture is a network of traits that could be learned, based on interaction or derived from history. Whatever culture is, it definitely regulates our lives by unconsciously shaping our attitudes, values, goals, behaviour or personality. From all indication, man is definitely nothing without culture. Little wonder that "...the pride of any society lies in its culture since no society in the world could be considered great without reference to its tradition and culture."

Culture is:

- A source of identity, innovation and creativity;
- A set of distinctive spiritual and material, intellectual and emotional features of a society or a social group.

- A complex web of meanings, relationships, beliefs, and values that frames people's relationship to the world.
- Acquired through the process of cultivation and improvement of the individual, especially by means of education.
- An evolving dynamic force relevant to all societies, local or global.
- Influenced by and in turn influences world-views and expressive forms.
- Located in a time and a place. While culture in the abstract is a set of mental constructs, it is rooted in a place at a moment in history and is always local.
- A renewable resource if it is carefully nurtured for it to grow and flower. When neglected, it is easily lost or destroyed.

4.2 Culture as a vehicle for economic development

- Culture is a powerful global economic engine generating jobs and income with a value of US\$1.3 trillion in 2005.
- Culturally embedded livelihood practices help retain local knowledge and generate employment while enabling local economic development. These may vary from building crafts to agriculture and natural resource management.
- Cultural goods and services often need low capital investment by building on materials and skills available within the community. The successes of micro-credit enterprises that benefit women have been especially valuable.

4.3 Culture is a Vehicle for Social Cohesion and Stability

- Mutual appreciation of diversity among cultures creates positive and constructive engagement. Dialogue promotes mutual understanding, knowledge, reconciliation, and peace, which are essential for social stability.
- Symbolic force of cultural heritage: Culture is a well-spring of hope, enabling a deep sense of belonging
- Social cohesion through cultural tourism: Cultural heritage not only generates income, but also builds social cohesion, mobilizing communities around its care and management. Cultural festivals enhance dialogue.

- Safeguarding distinctive cultural forms and the processes of their production contributes to strengthening the social capital of a community and creates a sense of stewardship and trust in public institutions.

4.4 Culture is a Vehicle for Environmental Protection

Values and beliefs shape the relationship of a people to their natural environment and the ways they manage and impact it. Cultural values, local knowledge, and traditional practices of environmental management can be valuable resources towards achieving ecological sustainability.

- Cultural and ecological diversity: Biological and cultural diversity are intricately connected to a wide range of interactions between humans and nature, that are interdependent and mutually reinforcing.
- Traditional systems of environmental management: Accumulated traditional knowledge and the community practices of environmental management are fundamental to sustainability and essential for the survival of the place and people. Development approaches and programs have often failed to recognize that societies categorized as ‘underdeveloped’ have in fact been living sustainably for generations in a specific locale.
- Cities and cultural landscapes: In an urbanizing world, management of natural and built heritage need to embrace their interrelationships by involving local communities in conservation initiatives.
- Ecological challenges: A variety of current environmental challenges such as depleting water sources, shrinking forest covers, and disappearing species, rooted in a disregard for the environment, may be addressed by positive practices embedded in local cultures that value a balance between natural and human worlds.

4.5 Culture is a Vehicle for Resilient Communities

- Innovation and creativity: Culture builds resiliency by reinforcing the abilities of people to be innovative and creative especially in the adversity of disasters and conflicts.
- Local building materials and technologies: Schools, health centres, and housing built with local materials, knowledge and technologies are climatically effective, of lower cost, and use labour from the community. They engender identity, acceptance, and ownership, rather than structures imported from outside the region.

- Culture and globalization: Communities empowered to define their identities and assert local values are better able to engage with the forces of globalization to ‘indigenize’ them on their terms and benefit from them.
- Agents of development: Heightened awareness of values and assets, enables people to become authors of their own development.

A vision of development embracing culture as an essential part of the enlargement of choice, provides for human dignity and well-being, and an enhancement of freedom.

Promoting development appropriate to a people, place, and their culture empowers them to shape their futures and the means to attain them. Development projects that impose visions from the outside impair the capacity of people to contribute to the well-being of their communities.

Nurtures spiritual and intellectual wealth towards eradicating poverty: Poverty is not only a lack of economic resources but also a lack of rights, influence, status, and dignity. Altering perceptions of insecurity and of status enables the poor to rise out of poverty as does recognizing innovation and creativity.

Seeks local solutions to global agendas: Cultural approaches help to make development strategies relevant at the local level. Development responsive to place and culture empowers communities to engage with globalization on their own terms.

Culture-led development also includes a range of non-monetized benefits, such as greater social inclusiveness and rootedness, resilience, innovation, creativity and entrepreneurship for individuals and communities, and the use of local resources, skills, and knowledge. Respecting and supporting cultural expressions contribute to strengthening the social capital of a community and fosters trust in public institutions. Cultural factors also influence lifestyles, individual behaviour, consumption patterns, values related to environmental stewardship, and our interaction with the natural environment. Local and indigenous knowledge systems and environmental management practices provide valuable insight and tools for tackling ecological challenges, preventing biodiversity loss, reducing land degradation, and mitigating the effects of climate change.

The integration of culture into sustainable development strategies and policies advances a human-centered and inclusive approach to development, in addition to serving as a powerful

socio-economic resource. Culture is transversal and cross-cutting concern and, as such, affects all the dimensions of development.

We are in a world where we are born free yet find it so difficult to express that which is the soul of our existence- that which categorizes us as belonging to a certain race, colour or language unit. When we talk about liberation what immediately comes to mind are the economic, social and political aspects of the term. Little regard is placed on cultural liberation. Yet culture has daily played an invisible role in determining our customs, values, morals and growth in the society. If we truly aspire freedom from the shackles of underdevelopment, there is also an urgent need to break away from the confines of western cultural systems evident in our dressing, language, music, artwork, attitude to innovations and search for that which made us proud to be.

4.6 Cultural Industries

Whereas the dominant industries of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries depended on materials and factories, science and technology, the industries of the twenty-first century will depend increasingly on the generation of knowledge through creativity and innovation matched with rigorous systems of control.

The growth of cultural industries is accounted for by rapid techno-economic change in production, distribution and marketing and it is complemented by the emergence of an intergovernmental framework and a regime of copyright regulation, liberalization under WTO-GATT, and UNESCO's protection of cultural diversity.

The functions required for a line of activity to be sustainable are not necessarily all commercial. Some functions, which enable a sector of activity to be structured, developed and enduring, must be supported by the community. Communities are generally willing to play this role because culture and cultural goods and services are perceived as indispensable to the society's well-being and embody significant positive societal externalities.

The economic effects and impact of culture take several forms:

- high economic added value of activities associated with the sectors of cultural activity;
- an engine of and resource for local development;
- improvement of the country's international position and competitiveness;

- positive impact of culture on the creativity of individuals;
- improvement of people's capacity to adapt to social and economic changes;
- promotion of the revitalization and rebirth of towns and communities;
- endogenous development without relocation;
- job-creating activities;
- potential exports for developing countries;
- diversification of the economy;
- development of small enterprises in the sector;
- potential source of income for the most disadvantaged sectors;
- activities not easily relocated, the raw material being local

Culture is an important resource that gives rise to income-generating activities for the people of poor countries, especially in regions that have few other resources and few comparative advantages. Persons active in the cultural sector must therefore have cutting-edge expertise in order to devise and apply effective development strategies so as to structure these sectors of activity by ensuring that all functions are in place to make the line of activity sustainable. As with any other sector of activity, strategies and public policies must be implemented in order to develop the sector. Unfortunately, as developing countries, whose institutional capacity is low, often do not meet the requirements for achieving these goals, support from development partners is vital if governance in this sector is to be improved.

Genuine development solutions to development challenges can only be real solutions if the cultural dimension of the challenge identified and the cultural consequences of the solution envisaged are previously well clarified.

Chapter Five

New Trends and Debates in Sociology of Development

5.1 Democratization and Development

Is democracy inherently a good thing? And do democratic institutions facilitate economic development? It appears reasonable to answer the first question affirmatively: democracy is a good thing because it facilitates free human choice and it furthers the good of political participation. But the answer to the latter question is an empirical one, and there is debate within the development field about the effects of electoral democracy on the development process. Some argue, for example, that the experiences of Korea, Taiwan, or Indonesia show that a strong authoritarian state is better able to engineer a successful process of economic development than an electoral democracy such as India (because of its ability to discipline fractious demand groups).

Development and democracy have been strongly correlated in the contemporary world. Today, even after the prolonged democratization wave that started in the 1970s and accelerated in the 1990s, the distribution of democracies remains highly skewed by level of per capita income. Whereas 94% of the countries with a per capita income above \$10,000 (in constant \$ of 1996) held free and competitive elections in 1999, only 18% with a per capita income below \$2,000 did so.

Democracy is a good thing, both intrinsically and instrumentally. **Intrinsically**, it is a necessary component of the ability of individuals to live freely and autonomously. As Sen and many others have argued, the democratic process does have intrinsic value on its own right, and it should be expected to arrive at policy decisions in a way that is inclusive, participatory, broadly representative of different societal interests, transparent, and accountable. In particular, following the Sen tradition, the importance of participation in one's development through open and nondiscriminatory democratic processes is fundamental.

Instrumentally, it is an institutional guarantee that the policies and laws created by a government will have a reasonable fit with the fundamental interests of the people. Thus democracy is a central determinant of the quality of life, and a central element in the ability of

men and women to live freely and autonomously as human beings. This is no less so in poor and developing countries than it is in the North and the West.

We can see that economic development “of the right kind” involves several dimensions:

- growth in the productive capacity of society: growth in productivity of labor, agriculture, and capital (leading to growth in per capita incomes and per capita assets);
- development that leads to significant and continuing improvement in the quality of life for the poor and the near-poor (that is, the majority of the population in most developing societies);
- development that serves to broaden the distribution of economic assets and incomes;
- development that leads to improvement in conditions of health and safety in the workplace;
- development that leads to improvement in “quality of life” issues for all: improved access to health care, clean water, education;
- development that leads to sustainable environmental change and resource use;
- development that leads to improvement in gender equity over time.

A democracy is a polity in which collective decisions (laws, policies, procedures) are the expression, direct or indirect, of the preferences and choices of the collection of equal citizens of the polity.

There has been an extended debate about democracy and development, and the relations between democratization and economic growth. Do the institutions of electoral democracy facilitate or impede development?

Some have maintained that democratic regimes are in general less capable of managing effecting economic development than authoritarian regimes. The central premise of this reasoning stems from the observation that development requires change, and that change affects some voters adversely. So governments dependent on electoral support in the next election will typically tend to avoid choices that impose hardship on significant numbers of voters.

Others have argued that democratic regimes are positively associated with economic development, and especially with more egalitarian modes of development. Finally, there is a

body of thought which holds that democracy is neither positive nor negative with respect to economic development.

There is also a debate on whether 'real' democracy can only be said to be achieved in those political regimes that foster development, economic equality and social justice. But as many analysts have noted, there is nothing inherent in the nature of a democratic system that should automatically lead to certain outcomes. Such a maximalist understanding of democracy may in fact risk overburdening the concept, and it places unrealistic expectations and/or demands on what democratic regimes should achieve by sheer virtue of being democracies.

During the 1960s and the 1970s, an argument that gained considerable prominence in mainstream academic and policy circles was that democracy was more likely to emerge in countries with high(er) levels of socio-economic development. Building on Lipset's seminal analysis (1959), which stresses at one point that economic wealth is 'an initial condition for democracy' (p. 62), many analysts and scholars interpreted this correlation as implying that development was a precondition for democracy. This modernization approach to democratization understood the emergence of democracy as a consequence of the transformation of class structure, the emergence of a bourgeoisie, economic development, increasing urbanization, the prior development of democratic values, and other cultural and religious factors.

Thus, according to this reading, the emergence of democracy is endogenous to the process of economic and social development—there is a simple, linear progression toward modernization that ultimately culminates in democratization. In other words, once a nondemocratic regime acquires a certain level, or 'threshold,' of economic development and social maturation, it will inevitably become a democracy. According to the modernization approach, then, the appearance of democracy should be seen as the crowning achievement of a long process of modernization, or as a luxury that affluent countries can (finally) afford.

However, the advent of the so-called Third Wave of democratization that swept across much of the developing world beginning in the 1980s challenged this concept of 'prerequisites' for democracy. Many of the movements towards formal democracy since then have taken place in countries where such transformation would not have been expected based on low levels of economic development and other socio-economic indicators. In addition, many authoritarian regimes were able to survive even after reaching a considerably high level of development, so

pg. 38

that there does not seem to be a natural progression from authoritarianism to democracy after reaching some kind of developmental ‘threshold’.

In recent times, in general, a broad international consensus has emerged that holds that economic development *per se* is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for the emergence of democracy. On the other hand, beyond this general agreement about the fact that there are practically no (structural) preconditions to the emergence of democracy, the nature of the relationship between democracy and development remains a very hotly contested issue.

‘Democracy first’ argument: do all good things go together?

The core of the argument that democracy helps promote development (more than the other way around) rests on some of the key institutional features of democratic systems – namely its accountability mechanisms and checks and balances provisions. These features play an essential role in limiting the abuse of executive and state power more broadly, and through elections and other processes, they also provide a predictable (in terms of rules, not outcome), transparent, periodic, and reliable system of rewards and punishments. According to Sen (1999), for example, it is these institutional characteristics of a (functioning) democracy that explain why famines have never occurred in democratic systems. In a comparative analysis of policy reform in Central Europe after the transition to democracy in 1989, David Stark and László Bruszt also find that ‘executives that are held accountable by other state institutions and held in check by organized societal actors ... [produce] ... more effective ... [developmental] policies’.

On the other hand, the wave of ‘democratic optimism’ that accompanied this momentous transformation toward democracy in a vast number of developing countries – what Francis Fukuyama (1992) enthusiastically described as ‘the end of history’ – may itself have placed unusually high expectations about what these newly emerging democratic systems could and should accomplish. Turning many of the more traditional assumptions embedded in modernization theory on its head, a new orthodoxy emerged within the international community (especially among donors) beginning in the 1990s that held that democracy is not an outcome or consequence of development, but rather a necessary ingredient to bring about development.

This is the thinking underpinning much of the ‘good governance’ agenda promoted by the international community (especially multilateral and bilateral donors). This donor agenda is

fundamentally concerned about the rules and practices according to which governments are chosen and state power and authority are exercised (Kjaer, 2004). Although democracy as such is not always explicitly spelled out as an element of internationally-supported good governance efforts, there is a clear normative commitment to democratic politics embodied in the good governance agenda. Among other things, good governance emphasizes the importance of transparency and (both horizontal and vertical) accountability, and it also calls for broadly inclusive and participatory decision-making processes as an essential condition to the effective promotion of development.

‘Development first’ argument: do the ends justify the means?

It is in fact this natural tendency of a democratic system to fragment, diffuse, and divide power among many different stakeholders at many different levels, both within the state and among societal actors (Dahl 1971), thereby making decision-making processes more time-consuming, that has led many other analysts in academic and policy circles alike to argue that, in the developing world, authoritarian regimes may be better suited than democratic ones to promote economic development. As Halperin et al. have noted, ‘the appeal of the authoritarian-led approach has ... at least something to do with its expediency, in comparison to the messy and time-consuming procedures typical of democracy’. The core of this argument is that development requires a strong, centralized, highly autonomous government, especially when poor countries need to play ‘catch-up’, and that democratic politics are simply too messy and unpredictable to provide such a structure.

Much of the empirical evidence sustaining the thesis that authoritarian regimes are in general more effective than democratic ones in promoting rapid development comes from the so-called East Asian Tigers (Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore), where the state in each case oversaw and led a process of rapid economic growth and radical socio-economic transformation from the 1960s to the 1990s. More recently, China and Vietnam have also been used as important showcases in favour of this argument.

5.2 Globalization and Development

Globalization has become a commonly used word world-wide. It is no longer a new concept or phenomenon in the academic and business world as social scientists, journalists, business

analysts, management theorists, writers and commentators generally have at various times used and will continue to use the word in particular contexts for declared and undeclared purposes.

Globalization has opened up new and extensive opportunities for worldwide development. However, this is not “progressing evenly” as some countries are becoming integrated into the global economy more rapidly than others with the evidence of fast growth and reduced poverty.

Development, though a multi-dimensional concept has to do with a rate of change in a particular direction “change in technology, social, economic and political aspect of life resulting in happy human life’. It is related closely to the concept of globalization. Development as a concept has attracted many definitions and interpretations among scholars and writers; nonetheless, it addresses the process of transforming a society positively. It is therefore pertinent to view “globalization and development as the two broad concepts for transformation. The question that may be asked should then be which of the two concepts leads practically to the other? - Or are they complementary concepts for whatever progress in any society?

These questions are premised on the increasing debate among scholars who view globalization as having the capacity for increased opportunities for growth and development. The above assertion is informed by the fact that globalization may not be that imperative particularly in the 21st century if some international economies (societies) are not developed. In other words, development may not be visible (particularly in Africa) if as argued, the principle or notion of globalisation is not embraced. Which one comes first is another area of the process of transformation that is still contestable.

Globalization means different things to different people and thus it has been used in several ways in the literature. It is a process of integrating not only the economy of nations but also their culture, technology and governance. Generally, it may be referred to as:

the widening, deepening and speeding up of world-wide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary social life, from the cultural to the criminal, the financial to the Spiritual.

The whole idea of globalization therefore revolves around other new realities and terminologies as Information Technology, Deregulation, Trade liberalization, Economic competition or free enterprises and an emergent political structure/system that is people oriented, etc.

More explicitly, perhaps, “it refers to a process of increasing economic openness, growing economic interdependence and deepening economic integration between countries of the world. It is associated not only a phenomenal spread and volume of cross-border economic transactions, but also with an organization of economic activities which straddles national boundaries. In other words, it refers to the increasing integration of economies particularly through trade and financial flows around the world.

The breakdown of boundaries as barriers to economic exploitation that globalization represents means that every country of this world, rich/developed or poor/developing would have access to every other country. That is, the developing nations would have access to the markets of the developed countries, unrestricted: and vice-versa. “It will be a borderless world”. This again, has raised so many questions and increasing debate on the subject of the power of the state and the continuous relevance of the principles of sovereignty, independence and the understanding of international relations.

While some perceive globalization as a process of increasing integration into the world economy as positive (salvation), others see it as negative (damnation) in terms of unequal pattern of development.

Chapter Six

Development Planning and Aid

6.1 Development Planning

In early years of development following World War II and decolonization, a perception of the state as a benevolent supporter of development held sway, at least implicitly, but the record of corruption, poor governance, and state capture by vested interests in so many developing countries has made this view untenable. More recently, a negative view of government has predominated, but it too has been based more on theory than fact and has failed to explain the important and constructive role that the state has played in many successful development experiences, particularly in East Asia. Now a middle ground has emerged, recognizing both the strengths and the weaknesses of the public and private roles, providing a more empirically grounded analysis of what goes wrong with governance in development and the conditions under which these flaws can be rectified, and incorporating an appreciation of the role of civil society.

In the initial decades after the Second World War and decolonization, the pursuit of economic development was reflected in the almost universal acceptance of development planning as the surest and most direct route to economic progress. Until the 1980s, few people in the developing world would have questioned the advisability or desirability of formulating and implementing a national development plan. Planning had become a way of life in government ministries, and every five years or so, the latest development plan was paraded out with great fanfare.

National planning was widely believed to offer the essential and perhaps the only institutional and organizational mechanism for overcoming the major obstacles to development and for ensuring a sustained high rate of economic growth. To catch up with their former rulers, poor nations were persuaded that they required a comprehensive national plan. The planning record, unfortunately, did not live up to its advance billing. But a comprehensive development policy framework can play an important role in accelerating growth, reducing poverty, and reaching human development goals.

The Nature of Development Planning

Economic planning may be described as a deliberate governmental attempt to coordinate economic decision making over the long run and to influence, direct, and in some cases even

control the level and growth of a nation's principal economic variables (income, consumption, employment, investment, saving, exports, imports, etc.) to achieve a predetermined set of development objectives. An **economic plan** is simply a specific set of quantitative economic targets to be reached in a given period of time, with a stated strategy for achieving those targets. Economic plans may be comprehensive or partial.

A **comprehensive plan** sets its targets to cover all major aspects of the national economy.

A **partial plan** covers only a part of the national economy—industry, agriculture, the public sector, the foreign sector, and so forth.

Finally, the **planning process** itself can be described as an exercise in which a government first chooses social objectives, then sets various targets, and finally organizes a framework for implementing, coordinating, and monitoring a development plan.

The Rationale for Development Planning

The early widespread acceptance of planning as a development tool rested on a number of fundamental economic and institutional arguments. Of these we can single out four as the most often put forward.

- i. **Market Failure:** Markets in developing economies are permeated by imperfections of structure and operation. Commodity and factor markets are often badly organized, and the existence of distorted prices often means that producers and consumers are responding to economic signals and incentives that are a poor reflection of the real cost to society of these goods, services, and resources. It is therefore argued that governments have an important role to play in integrating markets and modifying prices. Moreover, the failure of the market to price factors of production correctly is further assumed to lead to gross disparities between social and private valuations of alternative investment projects. In the absence of governmental interference, therefore, the market is said to lead to a misallocation of present and future resources or, at least, to an allocation that may not be in the best long-run social interests. This **market failure** argument is perhaps the most often quoted reason for the expanded role of government in less developed countries.

Thus, *Market failure* is a phenomenon that results from the existence of market imperfections (e.g., monopoly power, lack of factor mobility, significant externalities, lack of knowledge) that weaken the functioning of a market economy.

- ii. ***Resource Mobilization and Allocation:*** This argument stresses that developing economies cannot afford to waste their very limited financial and skilled human resources on unproductive ventures. Investment projects must be chosen not solely on the basis of partial productivity analysis dictated by individual industrial capital-output ratios but also in the context of an overall development program that takes account of external economies, indirect repercussions, and long-term objectives. Skilled workers must be employed where their contribution will be most widely felt. Economic planning is assumed to help by recognizing the existence of particular constraints and by choosing and coordinating investment projects so as to channel these scarce factors into their most productive outlets. In contrast, it is argued, competitive markets will tend to generate less investment and to direct that investment into areas of low social priority (e.g., consumption goods for the rich).
- iii. ***Attitudinal or Psychological Impact:*** It is often assumed that a detailed statement of national economic and social objectives in the form of a specific development plan can have an important attitudinal or psychological impact on a diverse and often fragmented population. It may succeed in rallying the people behind the government in a national campaign to eliminate poverty, ignorance, and disease or to boost national prowess. By mobilizing popular support and cutting across class, caste, racial, religious, or tribal factions with the plea to all citizens to work together toward building the nation, it is argued that an enlightened central government, through its economic plan, can best provide the needed incentives to overcome the inhibiting and often divisive forces of sectionalism and traditionalism in a common quest for widespread material and social progress.
- iv. ***Foreign Aid:*** The formulation of detailed development plans has often been a necessary condition for the receipt of bilateral and multilateral foreign aid. With a shopping list of projects, governments are better equipped to solicit foreign assistance and persuade donors that their money will be used as an essential ingredient in a well-conceived and internally consistent plan of action.

The results of development planning have been generally disappointing. The widespread rejection of comprehensive development planning based on poor performance has had a number of practical outcomes, the most important of which is the adoption in a majority of developing countries of a more market-oriented economic system.

What went wrong? Why has the early euphoria about planning gradually been transformed into disillusionment and dejection? We can identify two interrelated sets of answers, one dealing with the gap between the theoretical economic benefits and the practical results of development planning and the other associated with more fundamental defects in the planning process, especially as it relates to administrative capacities, political will, and plan implementation.

6.2 The Politics of Foreign Aid

Most Aid was first officially extended for development purposes during and after the Cold War. Fifty years since the first official development assistance (ODA) programs were instituted, the question of the effectiveness of foreign aid remains an unresolved issue. Foreign aid has long been a major topic of interest, both between governments and in academic studies. During the last five to ten years, aid has been the subject of heated debate. This debate has not only dealt with isolated features of aid, but has touched on the fundamental justification for aid. The debate has been triggered by a combination of events and changes in the post-war world economy. First, the security motives for aid have largely disappeared with the ending of the Cold War. Second, as a result of the changes in Russia and Eastern Europe, the competition for available aid resources has increased. Third, donor countries in Western Europe have faced economic difficulties, forcing them to concentrate their economic policies on combating budget deficits. The public sector has been the chief victim in this process of budget balancing. As part of the public sector, aid has had to face the same adjustment demands as the rest of the sector. Fourth, trailing economic growth in donor countries has sparked vigorous economic policy debate. There has been a much stronger emphasis on market forces, rather than state- led growth.

Official aid is often criticized for not have contributed to economic growth and poverty reduction. Foreign aid is always presented as altruistic endeavor on the part of industrial countries, the motivation is to help the Third World nations in Africa, Asia and Latin America achieve progress and development similar to that of the North. However, the impact of foreign aid in the last half century is not impressive. If foreign aid was extended to arrest famine,

disease, malnutrition, pandemics, and societal disorder, its goal has not been met and its impact is meaningless.

Development aid is a phenomenon of the post-war period. As such, it has grown considerably and given rise to a number of institutions, bilateral as well as multilateral, solely employed in delivering aid to poor and developing countries. Aid has traditionally been seen as something temporary, something that can only complement existing national resources and efforts. After almost forty years in existence, aid has become something permanent. Furthermore, in some countries, aid has become a considerable force in the national economy, making those countries more or less completely dependent on it.

Despite the popular belief that aid is primarily motivated to assist the poor, substantial evidence points to political, strategic, and welfare interests of donor countries as the driving force behind aid programs. The beginnings of aid can be traced to three processes unfolding during the 1940s. The first was the launching of the United Nations. Amidst the human, physical and economic devastation of warfare, a window opened briefly on the opportunity to safeguard peace through international collaboration among the Allies. The world's first aid agency (1943) was the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA), set up to address the human ravages of conflict in Europe. By 1946, the new International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) was extending its first loans in the same continent. Thus was the multilateral aid system born.

Secondly, even as the window began to swing closed with the Soviet Union's first Security Council vetoes in 1946, foreign bilateral aid began to be impelled by growing cold war rivalry. In 1948, General George Marshall's Plan began to funnel US\$13 billion of assistance from America to Europe over four years - the equivalent of \$90 billion today - with rapid and palpable results. Thirdly, the 1940s saw the beginning of the independence movement among the former colonies. Aside from vastly expanding the arena of ideological rivalry, independence encouraged new bilateral donors to build aid programs as a continuation of their colonial obligations in the 1950s.

Generally, realization of development and prosperity need decades of hard work. But unfortunately, in today's developing countries especially in Africa most of the rulers and the

ruled alike see development as the result only of foreign aid and donor hand-outs, rather than people's own efforts.

Freedom of sovereign political decision should not be compromised for any charity in the name of foreign aid. Foreign aid can only be valuable, if the recipient country benefits from it in the reduction and elimination of poverty, inequality and unemployment through promotion of work-culture.

Aid should not be considered as a principal factor for development; rather it should only be regarded as a necessary compliment to the domestic efforts nurtured by culture of self-reliance and hard work, because aid cannot be depended upon indefinitely. Besides, governments of Africa must be allowed to enjoy what international political economic theorists call 'the policy space' to determine their own trade policies, and to set their development priorities. Aid can help, but it should be concentrated on countries with good macroeconomic policy and governments genuinely committed to improving public services and infrastructure, and stamping out corruption.

Many development economists agree that the effectiveness of America's European Recovery Plan (Marshall Plan), by and large, was due to limited political conditions that required the recipient nations only to cooperate against communist expansion and the way that amount of money was spent. A quick survey of the Marshall Plan for instance, shows that; of the \$13 billion allotted, \$3.4 billion had been spent on imports of raw materials and semi-manufactured products; \$3.2 billion on food, and fertilizers; \$1.9 billion on machines, vehicles, and equipments; and \$1.6 billion on fuel.

Moreover, the strategy followed in allocation of aid received by west Europeans, under the Marshall Plan, makes certain that Europeans were given not only aid, but also, their freedom of choice in determining their priorities in allocation of a given aid. As a result, they were able to identify their exact shortcomings and used that aid to fund appropriately the projects intended to alleviate their real problems. But this is not case in Africa; the donors dictate the terms and conditions of the aid where it ultimately brings less result or no result.

Why aid is criticized?

Aid has often come with a price of its own for the developing nations:

- i. aid is often wasted on conditions that the recipient must use overpriced goods and services from donor countries;
- ii. most aid does not actually go to the poorest who would need it the most;
- iii. aid amounts are dwarfed by rich country protectionism that denies market access for poor country products, while rich nations use aid as a lever to open poor country markets to their products; and
- iv. large projects or massive grand strategies often fail to help the vulnerable; money can often be embezzled away.

Case studies conducted in some parts of Africa reflect a disappointing story. With the notable exception of Botswana, the preceding chapters chronicle a history in which there have been more failures than successes. However, the case studies also demonstrate that aid to Africa has some notable achievements to its credit. Alongside many disappointments, aid has financed many development projects and programs which achieved very high internal rates of return, including schools, clinics, health posts, bridges, roads, manpower training program, etc. In Ghana, for example, the Ghana Rural Water Project (GRWP), set up in 1985 to provide potable water and sanitation facilities, has been credited with “the drilling of 202 wet boreholes, training of 200 local hand-pump maintenance volunteers, construction of 60 VIP latrines, improved cleanliness of communities due to intensive hygiene and sanitation education”. Some of the spin-offs from this project have included the fact that “women now have increased options with respect to the use of their time as they have a choice between working longer on their farms, going for literacy classes, or engaging in some other income-generating activity”.

What makes aid more effective?

- i. ***The Macroeconomic Environment:*** A first factor that helps explain the success of aid is the extent to which it is designed and implemented in the context of macroeconomic stability. It is now well established that the absence of stability results in sub-optimal use of resources, as economic agents are more likely to prefer short-term speculation and consumption to long-term productive investment. The case studies suggest that when aid has been provided during an economic crisis, as has been the case in much of the region over the last two decades, it has been less likely to reach objectives that rely on a positive response from economic agents. For

example, agricultural projects are less likely to result in farmers investing in productivity-enhancing technologies when the latter live under the greater uncertainty of economic crisis.

When economic and fiscal crisis is particularly intense, some of the basic functions of recipient governments are critically undermined. Regular economic planning and budgeting become more and more haphazard, replaced by crisis management and ad hoc solutions to the most pressing emergencies. Governments stop collecting economic statistics or monitoring economic activity, coming to focus all their energy on their own survival. When this happens, governments become incapable of properly planning, designing, and implementing aid projects and the quality of aid further deteriorates.

- ii. ***Management Capacity of Recipients:*** Perhaps the most important determinant of aid effectiveness is the recipient's capacity to manage aid and integrate it in to its own coherent development management process. Aid programs are more likely to be successful when the recipient government has the capacity to identify and articulate its own priorities and programs, and the ability to implement, monitor, and evaluate the resulting programs in the context of its own planning and budgeting. For this to be possible, a well functioning institutional machinery has to exist. The country must have state organizations with the will and capacity to set policy priorities, negotiate with donors, and determine when to accept or reject donor proposals. In addition to maintaining a stable macroeconomic context, government organizations must at least have personnel at the top of the state apparatus with skills, professional norms and experience, as well as the motivation to perform well.
- iii. ***Aid Relationship:*** Aid is very much a joint undertaking between a donor and a recipient government. It has become fashionable in aid circles to refer to the notion of "partnership" to describe the relationship, and to capture the idea that two actors have joined hands to accomplish something of mutual benefit. This project adopted the view that there is indeed a causal link between the aid relationship and aid effectiveness. If there is unequalness of this relationship it probably contributes to misunderstanding, resentment, and quite often conflict between the partners.

Lack of government management capacity for development purposes has conditioned the relationship donors have forged with recipient governments. Several examples from the case studies illustrate the point, that over time, the asymmetry in capacities between government and donor has led to the domination of donors in the design, implementation, and monitoring of aid activities, combined with a tendency of governments to reveal their real preferences only indirectly and passively. The desire to promote short-term success in the face of low governmental capacities has led donors to play roles which ideally should be left to recipients. The failure to emphasize the building of government management capacities has constituted a self-fulfilling prophecy, as we argued in the last section, but it has had some short-term advantages.

- iv. ***Sustainability of Aid:*** There is a direct relationship between the lack of capacity to manage aid, the nature of the aid relationship, and the long-term sustainability of aid. In the previous two sections we argued that most African countries have often failed to manage aid effectively. This failure has increasingly shaped the current relationship between donor and recipient, in which donors tend to dominate policy and agenda-setting while African governments play a largely passive and peripheral role. One of several implications of this dynamic has been a resulting lack of local ownership of aid activities, and a tendency to view aid performance as a donor responsibility, particularly once the economic and fiscal crises become significant.

Despite agreements to ensure continuity of projects when donors depart, there is a common need to maintain external funding after projects should technically have been phased out. In fact, the failure of governments to meet recurrent cost obligations constitutes a very important and worsening constraint on aid effectiveness in Africa. A key lesson from the case studies is that ownership is a precondition for the sustainability of a program. Unless aid is fully integrated into a recipient's national development program, problems of this nature will recur. The fact that integration has helped Botswana avoid these problems further underlines the inevitability of change to current aid practices.

- v. ***Improve aid coordination:*** The current duplication of and wastage in aid projects needs to be stopped. Aid coordination ought to be made a priority, particularly by

recipient governments. Project and donor proliferation over-stretches the management capacity of recipients and leads to wasted resources. Recognizing the central role of government and its budgetary and planning processes is one mechanism to limit the duplication and waste. Another would be greater specialization by donors, who should be encouraged to focus on a smaller number of countries, and on a smaller number of activities.

Chapter Seven

Cross-cutting Issues of Development

There are different factors that could affect the development endeavors of most societies. It implies that the existence of such factors should be taken into account to be effect on our way to development. Thus, it is cognizant of this fact that we are going to discuss few of the cross-cutting issues one should consider in the attempt to realize development.

7.1 Population and Development

The central issue of our time may well turn out to be how the world addresses the problem of ever-expanding human numbers. —*James Grant, former director general, UNICEF*

In 2009, the world's population was estimated to be 6.8 billion people. Projections by the United Nations placed the figure at more than 9.2 billion by the year 2050 (another widely cited projection is higher, at 9.5 billion). The overwhelming majority of that population will inhabit the developing world. What will be the economic and social implications for development if such projections are realized? Is this scenario inevitable, or will it depend on the success or failure of development efforts? Finally, even more significant, is rapid population growth per se as serious a problem as many people believe, or is it a manifestation of more fundamental problems of underdevelopment and the unequal utilization of global resources between rich and poor nations, as others argue?

Every year, more than 75 million people are being added to the world's population. Almost all of this net population increase—97%—is in developing countries. Increases of such magnitude are unprecedented. But the problem of population growth is not simply a problem of numbers. It is a problem of human welfare and of development.

Rapid population growth can have serious consequences for the well-being of all of humanity. If development entails the improvement in people's levels of living—their incomes, health, education, and general well-being—and if it also encompasses their capabilities, self-esteem, respect, dignity, and freedom to choose, then the really important question about population growth is this: How does the contemporary population situation in many developing countries contribute to or detract from their chances of realizing the goals of development, not

only for the current generation but also for future generations? Conversely, how does development affect population growth?

Population Growth: Past, Present and Future

When people first started to cultivate food through agriculture some 12,000 years ago, the estimated world population was no more than 5 million. Two thousand years ago, world population had grown to nearly 250 million, less than a fifth of the population of China today. From year 1 on our calendar to the beginning of the Industrial Revolution around 1750, it tripled to 728 million people, less than three-quarters of the total number living in India today. During the next 200 years (1750–1950), an additional 1.7 billion people were added to the planet's numbers. But in just four decades thereafter (1950–1990), the earth's human population more than doubled again, bringing the total figure to around 5.3 billion. The world entered the twenty-first century with over 6 billion people. It was shown how rapidly total population grew after 1950 in comparison with the two centuries before that. It vividly portrays the magnitude of population growth, most of which has been in developing countries, both as a percentage of the total and in terms of absolute numbers. Finally, it provides projections to 2050, when world population is expected to reach 9.2 billion.

It was observed that before 1650, it took nearly 36,000 years, or about 1,400 generations, for the world population to double. Today it would take about 58 years, or two generations, for world population to double at current growth rates. Moreover, whereas it took 1,750 years to add 480 million people to the world's population between year 1 and the onset of the Industrial Revolution, this same number of people is today being added in less than seven years.

The reason for the sudden change in overall population trends is that for almost all of recorded history, the rate of population change, whether up or down, had been strongly influenced by the combined effects of famine, disease, malnutrition, plague, and war—conditions that resulted in high and fluctuating death rates. In the twentieth century, such conditions came increasingly under technological and economic control. As a result, human mortality (the death rate) is now lower than at any other point in human existence. It is this decline in mortality resulting from rapid technological advances in modern medicine and the spread of modern sanitation measures throughout the world, particularly within the past half century, that has resulted in the unprecedented increases in world population growth, especially in developing countries. Inshort,

population growth today is primarily the result of a rapid transition from a long historical era characterized by high birth and death rates to one in which death rates have fallen sharply but birth rates, especially in developing countries, have fallen more slowly from their historically high levels.

Age Structure and Dependency Burdens

Population is relatively youthful in the developing world. Children under the age of 15 constitute more than 30% of the total population of developing countries but just 17% of developed nations. In fact, at least 10 developing nations have over 44% of their population under the age of 15; as of 2009, 43% of Ethiopia's population, 45% of Nigeria's, and 38% of Pakistan's was under 15; for both India and Mexico, the comparable figure is 32%.

In countries with such an age structure, the **youth dependency ratio**—the proportion of youths (under age 15) to economically active adults (ages 15 to 64)—is very high. Thus the workforce in developing countries must support almost twice as many children as it does in the wealthier countries. In North America, the workforce age group (15 to 64) amounts to about 68% of the total population. This workforce has to support only about 20% of the population as youthful dependents.

The main problems in more developed countries relate more to their low population growth and old-age dependents (over age 65). By contrast, in sub-Saharan Africa, the economically active workforce makes up about 54% of the total population (just 3% of the population is over age 65). In general, the more rapid the population growth rate, the greater the proportion of dependent children in the total population and the more difficult it is for people who are working to support those who are not. This phenomenon of youth dependency also leads to an important concept, the **hidden momentum of population growth**.

Perhaps the least understood aspect of population growth is its tendency to continue even after birth rates have declined substantially. Population growth has a built-in tendency to continue, a powerful momentum that, like a speeding automobile when the brakes are applied, tends to keep going for some time before coming to a stop. In the case of population growth, this momentum can persist for decades after birth rates drop.

There are two basic reasons for this. First, high birth rates cannot be altered substantially overnight. The social, economic, and institutional forces that have influenced fertility rates over the course of centuries do not simply evaporate at the urging of national leaders. We know from the experience of European nations that such reductions in birth rates can take many decades. Consequently, even if developing countries assign top priority to the limitation of population growth, it will still take many years to lower national fertility to desired levels.

The second and less obvious reason for the hidden momentum of population growth relates to the age structure of many developing countries' populations. In the context of the developing countries, when the young generation reaches adulthood, the number of potential parents will inevitably be much larger than at present. It follows that even if these new parents have only enough children to replace themselves (two per couple, as compared with their parents, whomay have had four or more children), the fact that the total number of couples having two children is much greater than the number of couples who previously had more children means that the total population will still increase substantially before leveling off.

The demand for children in developing countries

The economic theory of fertility assumes that the household demand for children is determined by family preferences for a certain number of surviving (usually male) children (i.e., in regions of high mortality, parents may produce more children than they actually desire in the expectation that some will not survive), by the price or "opportunity cost" of rearing these children, and by levels of family income. Children in poor societies are seen partly as economic investment goods in that there is an expected return in the form of both child labor and the provision of financial support for parents in old age. However, in many developing countries, there is a strong intrinsic psychological and cultural determinant of family size, so the first two or three children should be viewed as "consumer" goods for which demand may not be very responsive to relative price changes.

Mechanisms to reduce fertility rate

The effect of social and economic progress in lowering fertility in developing countries will be the greatest when the majority of the population and especially the very poor share in its benefits.

Specifically, birth rates among the very poor are likely to fall where the following socio-economic changes come to pass:

1. An increase in the education of women and a consequent change in their role and status;
2. An increase in female non-agricultural wage employment opportunities, which raises the price or cost of their traditional child-rearing activities;
3. A rise in family income levels through the increased direct employment and earnings of a husband and wife or through the redistribution of income and assets from rich to poor;
4. A reduction in infant mortality through expanded public health programs and better nutritional status for both mother and child and better medical care;
5. The development of old-age and other social security systems outside the extended family network to lessen the economic dependence of parents, especially women, on their offspring;
6. Expanded schooling opportunities so that parents can better substitute child “quality” for large numbers of children

In short, expanded efforts to make jobs, education, and health more broadly available to poverty groups in general and women in particular will not only contribute to their economic and psychic well-being (i.e., to their development) but also contribute substantially to their motivation for smaller families (i.e., their freedom to choose), which is vital to reducing population growth rates.

The consequences of high fertility

Population growth is believed to retard the prospects for a better life for the already born by reducing savings rates at the household and national levels. It also severely draws down limited government revenues simply to provide the most rudimentary economic, health, and social services to the additional people. This in turn further reduces the prospects for any improvement in the levels of living of the existing generation and helps transmit poverty to future generations of low-income families.

According to the latest empirical research, the potential negative consequences of population growth for economic development can be divided into seven categories: its impact on economic

growth, poverty and inequality, education, health, food, the environment, and international migration.

1. **Economic Growth.** Evidence shows that although it is not the culprit behind economic stagnation, rapid population growth lowers per capita income growth in most developing countries, especially those that are already poor, dependent on agriculture, and experiencing pressures on land and natural resources.
2. **Poverty and Inequality.** Even though aggregate statistical correlations between measures of poverty and population growth at the national level are often inconclusive, at the household level the evidence is strong and compelling. The negative consequences of rapid population growth fall most heavily on the poor because they are the ones who are made landless, suffer first from cuts in government health and education programs, and bear the brunt of environmental damage. Poor women once again bear the greatest burden of government austerity programs, and another vicious circle ensues. To the extent that large families perpetuate poverty, they also exacerbate inequality.
3. **Education.** Although the data are sometimes ambiguous on this point, it is generally agreed that large family size and low incomes restrict the opportunities of parents to educate all their children. At the national level, rapid population growth causes educational expenditures to be spread more thinly, lowering quality for the sake of quantity. This in turn feeds back on economic growth because the stock of human capital is reduced by rapid population growth.
4. **Health.** High fertility harms the health of mothers and children. It increases the health risks of pregnancy, and closely spaced births have been shown to reduce birth weight and increase child mortality rates.
5. **Food.** Feeding the world's population is made more difficult by rapid population growth—a large fraction of developing country food requirements are the result of population increases. New technologies of production must be introduced more rapidly, as the best lands have already been cultivated. International food relief programs become more widespread.

6. **Environment.** Rapid population growth contributes to environmental degradation in the form of forest encroachment, deforestation, fuelwood depletion, soil erosion, declining fish and animal stocks, inadequate and unsafe water, air pollution, and urban congestion.
7. **International Migration.** Many observers consider the increase in international migration, both legal and illegal, to be one of the major consequences of developing countries' population growth. Though many factors spur migration, an excess of job seekers (caused by rapid population growth) over job opportunities is surely one of them. However, unlike the first six consequences listed here, some of the economic and social costs of international migration fall on recipient countries, increasingly in the developed world. It is not surprising, therefore, that this issue has recently taken on political importance in North America and Europe.

7.2 Environment and Development

The old notion of “development versus environment” has given way to a new view in which . . . better environmental stewardship is essential to sustain development.

—*World Bank, World Bank Atlas, 1997*

The livelihood of more than half of the economically active population in the developing world directly depends in whole or part on the environment through agriculture, as well as animal husbandry, hunting, fishing, forestry, and foraging. This alone underscores the importance of the seventh Millennium Development Goal: to “ensure environmental sustainability.” Environmental quality affects, and is affected by, economic development.

We now also understand that the interaction between poverty and environmental degradation can lead to a self-perpetuating process in which, as a result of ignorance or economic necessity, communities may inadvertently destroy or exhaust the resources on which they depend for survival. Rising pressures on environmental resources in developing countries can have severe consequences for self-sufficiency, income distribution, and future growth potential.

Environmental degradation can also detract from the pace of economic development by imposing high costs on developing countries through health-related expenses and the reduced productivity of resources. The poorest 20% of the poor in both rural and urban areas will experience the consequences of environmental ills most acutely. Severe environmental degradation, due

topopulation pressures on marginal land, has led to falling farm productivity and per capita food production. Since the cultivation of marginal land is largely the domain of lower-income groups, the losses are suffered by those who can least afford them. Similarly, the inaccessibility of sanitation and clean water mainly affects the poor and is believed to be responsible for a preponderance of infectious disease worldwide. Because the solutions to these and many other environmental problems involve enhancing the productivity of resources and improving living conditions among the poor, achieving environmentally sustainable growth is synonymous with our definition of economic development.

There is increasing concern that the destruction of the world's remaining forests, which are concentrated in a number of highly indebted developing countries in Africa as well as such countries as Indonesia, Brazil, Peru, and the Philippines, will greatly contribute to climate change caused by **global warming** through the greenhouse effect. At the same time, developing countries, particularly those in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia, are predicted by climate models to suffer most from future global warming and **climate change**. Yet to date, most of the greenhouse gases causing the problem were emitted in developed countries, creating what may be termed *environmental dependence*: Developing nations will be reliant on the developed world to take immediate steps to reduce emissions, as well as to develop new technologies that will enable further reductions and successful adaptation to the already inevitable warming and resulting climate change. However, developing countries, most prominently China at this stage, will also have to reduce emissions well below current forecasts, or any reductions in the developed world will only delay the possibly catastrophic consequences.

Much of the concern over environmental issues stems from the perception that we may reach a limit to the number of people whose needs can be met by the earth's finite resources. We may or may not reach this point, given the potential for new technological discoveries, but it is clear that continuing on our present path of accelerating environmental degradation would severely compromise the ability of present and future generations to meet their needs. A slowing of population growth rates would help ease the intensification of many environmental problems. However, the rate and timing of fertility declines, and thus the eventual size of world population, will largely depend on the commitment of governments to creating economic and institutional conditions that are conducive to limiting fertility.

Poverty and the Environment

The poor are usually the main victims of environmental degradation. The poor suffer more from environmental decay because they must often live on degraded lands that are less expensive because the rich avoid them. Moreover, people living in poverty have less political clout to reduce pollution where they live. And living in less productive polluted lands gives the poor less opportunity to work their way out of poverty. But in some cases they are also its agents, typically as a result of the constraints of their poverty. Too often, again, high fertility is blamed for problems that are attributable to poverty itself.

Though it is clear that environmental destruction and high fertility go hand in hand, they are both direct outgrowths of a third factor, absolute poverty. For environmental policies to succeed in developing countries, they must first address the issues of landlessness, poverty, and lack of access to institutional resources. Insecure land tenure rights, lack of credit and inputs, and absence of information often prevent the poor from making resource-augmenting investments that would help preserve the environmental assets from which they derive their livelihood. Hence preventing environmental degradation includes as a key component the provision of institutional support to the poor, rather than fighting an inevitable process of decay.

If, in fact, it is possible to reduce environmental destruction by increasing the incomes of the poor, is it then possible to achieve growth without further damage to the environment? Evidence indicates that the very poor cause considerable environmental destruction as a direct result of their poverty. It follows that increasing the economic status of the poorest group would provide an environmental windfall. However, as the income and consumption levels of everyone else in the economy also rise, there is likely to be a net increase in environmental destruction. Meeting increasing consumption demand while keeping environmental degradation at a minimum will be no small task.

Environmental challenges in developing countries caused by poverty include health hazards created by lack of access to clean water and sanitation, indoor air pollution from biomass stoves, and deforestation and severe soil degradation— all most common where households lack economic alternatives to unsustainable patterns of living. The principal health and productivity consequences of environmental damage include water pollution and scarcity, air pollution, solid

and hazardous wastes, soil degradation, deforestation, loss of biodiversity, and global warming—caused climate change.

Environmental Interdependence

The Environmentalists all over the world has emphasized the need for maintaining environmental quality through sustainable use of resources. All human activities designed and implemented for the economic growth of a country and the social needs would have directly or indirectly impact on environment. The qualitative and in some cases quantitative change in water, land and other resources have the same effect across the world. Unlike social and economic sectors, environmental concerns are similar in both developed and developing countries as the citizens of all countries must have access to clean water, air, safe drinking water and sufficient supplies of clean renewable energy. Furthermore, all industrial and agricultural activities depend on common environmental resources as land, soil, forests, ocean, rivers, mineral deposits, etc...

Some environmental issues are highly localized, whereas some others are cross-regional and some are global. For instance, wastes disposed into water courses in one country may have negative impacts on the health and the economics of the people living in downstream countries. Similarly, emissions of ozone depleting substances in one country may be transmitted in the atmosphere and brought effect on the health and agriculture of the countries located hundreds of miles away. The continued dependence of all countries on natural resources highlights the fact that greater cooperation and coordination are necessary among the nations regionally and globally to address environmental problems because environmental issues are inextricably linked to economic issues such as poverty.

Poverty compels the people to indulge in destructive activities like cutting trees to use wood as fuel, use agriculture land excessively, over-exploit water resources and avoid availing health improving services. Similarly, environmental issues originate from social factors. For example, population increase leads to the excessive use of natural resources in order to provide basic needs such as housing, healthcare, sanitation, safe water, education, food and electricity.

The environmental issues are very complicated because it has trade-offs between economic growth and environment. Higher economic growth means higher utilization of resources without considering its far-reaching consequences on the future generations. The resources consumed in the present period will not be available in the next period (in future). So their judicious use is necessary. The difficulty in maintaining balance between economic growth and environmental degradation is not only an uphill task but also a major policy implication for the developing countries which have been striving hard for sustainable economic growth since long.

It is generally observed that strong environmental policies complement and reinforce development. It is mostly poor who suffer from consequences of pollution and environmental degradation. Unlike the rich the poor cannot afford to drink clean water and clean air and pure food because they will have to spend much of their time on the streets, roads, breathing polluted air in the cities. Similarly, in rural areas they are more likely to cook on open fire of woods, haling dangerous fumes, their lands are most likely to suffer from soil erosion. In such an adverse situation, the policies must target poor communities.

7.3 Gender and Development

Gender and development is a new and cross-cutting issue which has got a global acceptance.

Gender: refers to social attributes that are learned or acquired during socialization as a member of a given community. Because these attributes are learned behaviors they can change over time and vary across cultures. Gender therefore refers to the socially given attributes, roles, activities, responsibilities and needs connected to being men (masculine) and women (feminine) in a given society at a given time, and as a member of a specific community within that society.

Gender identity determines how men and women are perceived and how they are expected to think and act as men and women. Even more, gender is one of the principal intersecting variables (along with race and caste or class) deployed in the distribution of privilege, prestige, power and a range of social and economic resources.

Gender equality: gender equality is a goal of equal opportunity for and equal enjoyment by women and men, girls and boys, of rights, resources and benefits/rewards. It doesn't mean that women and men become "the same" it means that women and men have equal opportunities to participate in and benefits from all aspects of economic, political, social and cultural life.

Gender roles: what women and men are expected to do and how they are expected to behave towards each other. Gender roles are different across community and across the world. They change over time in response to changing community circumstances and changing ideas about what is acceptable and not acceptable behaviors and roles. Gender roles and characteristics affect power relations between men and women at all levels and can result in inequality in opportunities and outcomes for some groups.

Many development programs failed to perceive the fact that men and women have various needs, priorities, experiences, knowledge and skills that makes them capable to play major roles in development. If development is to be real, it must be "total". Such concept emphasizes development cannot be viewed in isolation from the development of the whole community. As a matter of fact, women should not be seen as a resource for development, but rather as subjects of their own development. There are a number of reasons for gender to be a development issue. Some of the reasons are:

- ❖ Each sex constitutes half of the population, ignoring half of the population in development does not bring full, effective, and efficient development at all;
- ❖ Men and women are prime agents of development, each need to be recognized, addressed and mobilized;
- ❖ Both men and women must share the fruit of development equitably;
- ❖ It is important to understand why each sex behaves the way it does development workers should have information to plan and execution of programs to remove unnecessary bottlenecks to development;
- ❖ Addressing the Gender questions means partly addressing the cultural constraints and redefining development to cater for two sexes;
- ❖ Sustainability of development efforts can be achieved if both men and women's participation should be ensured;
- ❖ 70% of the world's poor are women therefore investing in women leads to economic growth, improved family welfare, a reduction in poverty and a more equitable distribution of the socio-economic benefits of development.

Gender and development (GAD) challenges the notion of unequal distribution of resources, opportunities, and benefits to different population groups served by a particular intervention. It

challenges the gender division of labor and the unequal relation of power that prevent equitable and sustainable development and women's full participation in development. Furthermore, GAD recognizes that women are not a homogeneous group; they are divided in many ways such as class, ethnicity and age.

GAD is people-centered development process, which aims to achieve sustainable development where men and women themselves participate as development agents. GAD seeks to address strategic gender needs and understand women's subordination through analysis of gender relations within the framework of important and relevant factors like social class, race, age, etc. This involves enhancing gender equality, by placing the issues of particular concern on the main agendas of those institutions which shape their relations.

Ethiopian women continue to share a high burden of poverty due to their vulnerable socio-economic position. Poverty for women in Ethiopia is more than physical deprivation. It has social and psychological effects, which prevents people from realizing their true potential. Women's limited access to land, labor and capital (as well as decision-making power) clearly affects their productivity and as a result of this they encounter problems like food insecurity and low productivity.

One of the several types of poverty that affects women in Ethiopia is "poverty of resources". As resources become scarce with high population growth, women are often the losers. Women need not just have "access to" but need to have "control over" resources.

Women are most of the time responsible for family care and house hold resource management, family welfare, family health, nutrition and education. The quality of care that mothers give to children has a decisive influence on children's prospects for healthy and productive lives. However, women's ability to produce enough food and earn adequate income which would ensure food security is hindered by the prevalence of gender asymmetries, both in resource allocation, i.e., access to input, credit, fertilizers, extension services, and access to technology and access to and control over productive resources/ assets, such as capital, land, income, skill/education, etc...

According to recent research findings, there is a direct link between women's access to income and management of household resources and the improvement of house hold level food security

and nutritional well-being of family members. This linkage, alongside with the importance of increasing women's productivity and their contribution to food systems, must constitute a central consideration of policies and programs aimed at enhancing food security and nutrition.

Gender related Socio-Cultural Problems and Disparities

Gender-based Violence: Is any undesirable act involving men and women, in which one sex (usually the women) are victims of physical, sexual and psychological harm, and the other (usually the male) are the perpetrators of the violent acts.

Sexual violence: is a term used to describe sexual exploitation, rape against women and girls by men. It always comes up because of low socio-economic status of the society. The vulnerable categories of women are the home makers, street girls, students' widows and workers. There is also an indication that husbands beat wives and force them to have sexual relations against their wish and this is violence against women in the household, in most cases we cannot get data on this type of acts because they are not reported in police station because they are regarded as domestic or family affairs.

Abductions: is an illegal taking away or kidnapping of girls into forceful marriage. This is common in rural areas especially among the poor men who are not capable of paying bride price. It is forced wife acquisition and it still persists in Ethiopia. Most of the time, this type of marriage is formalized through the mediation of elders.

Rape: is considered to be a serious crime and is treated as a felony in most countries with common-law systems. But in many rape trials the issue becomes whether or not the victim consented to sexual intercourse. The determination of consent can lead to distressing cross-examinations of rape victims in court, and, in light of this probability, many rape victims fail to report the crime to police or refuse to press charges against their assailant.

Harmful traditional practices include female genital Mutilation, Abduction, early marriage, etc.

Female circumcision / Female Genital Mutilation: FGM is the collective name given to several tradition practices that involve the cutting of female genitals. It is largely a ritual performance by elders in communities. It is one of the harmful tradition practices prevalent in Ethiopia and in many other African and Asian countries.

Early marriage: Marriage is a union between a man and a woman as husband and wife. Early marriage is relative term depending on the society. However, marriage is said to be early when the person is getting married immature in age and in physiological development.

Adverse effects of early marriage:

- Loss of opportunity for formal education
- No opportunity for wage employment
- Adversely affects on health
- Children of early married women suffer severe malnutrition, and poor health

According to UN and other similar statistics women are:

- 51% of the world population
- 70% of agricultural labor force
- Covering 66% of the world's working hour
- Earning 10% of the world's total income
- 2/3 of the world's illiterate
- Owning 1% of the world's property
- elected parliaments ranging from 6-39%

Generally, in order to redress the disadvantages there are four types of women empowerment such as: -

Self-empowerment – based on power within the individual and brings self-confidence and self – respect. Women self -empowerment will lead to the empowerment of their peers, their family, the community/society, and the nation at large.

Social empowerment: - it is an influential power of women in ‘agenda setting’ of the community and public, women’s competence in negotiation. It raises women’s ability to participate in public life, participation in local decision making bodies, involvement in leadership positions and the ability of influencing and the implementation of cultural practices.

Economic empowerment: - ability of women to participate as producer, consumer, entrepreneur and employee in the economy. It brings self-esteem in the society.

Political empowerment: - participation of women in politics as a voter, member of a political party and as pressure group.