

**SOC 4XX: Globalization and Development**  
**Course Introduction**

A definition of globalization is elusive. Castles, de Haas, and Miller (2014) find that it is commonly conceptualized as primarily an economic process that is highlighted by increased cross-border flows in finance and trade. They added that it also includes cross-border flows of democratic values, cultural and media practices, and people. As with its definition, the starting point for globalization is up for debate. Globalization conceptualized as simply an increase in global connectivity could be theorized to have begun centuries ago; however, after 1980 there was a clear change in international connectivity (Dollar 2005). Castles and colleagues (2014:33) find that “[t]he current globalization paradigm emerged in the context of neoliberal strategies.” This was in large part due to the expansive neoliberal strategies of the Reagan and Thatcher administrations in the 1980s (Castles et al. 2014), eventually leading to the enactment of several key free trade agreements. McMichael (2016) argues that globalization was the new way to economic growth. In this sense, globalization was a development strategy.

The history of international development is closely linked to the history of globalization. McMichael (2016) identifies two distinct periods in international development strategies, which hinge on the rise of globalization. He argues that the era of the development project existed from the 1940s through the 1970s in connection with the Cold War divide. While globalization was present during this period, it was much more central during the era of the globalization project, which ultimately succeeded the development project. The globalization project opened markets across national boundaries by liberalizing trade and investment rules and privatizing public goods and services (McMichael 2016). In era of the globalization project, the rights of corporations and powerful elites gained priority over the social contract. This shift, highlighted by increased global interconnectedness, made way for neoliberal development strategies. During

the 1980s, when the neoliberal globalization perspective was dominant, the meaning of development shifted (Nederveen Pieterse 2009). The new approach to development, one deeply embedded in globalization, became one of the most criticized eras in international development. Globalization brought a new face and a new pace to development.

This narrative of a brief stage in the history of international development exemplifies its close connection to globalization. Though intentional international development began in earnest after World War II, it took a new face during the rise of globalization. This crucial link between globalization and development is the very reason why this course is designed to cover both topics. Though substantive courses exist on each topic on its own, throughout this semester you will see how shifts in global interconnectedness shape international development strategies. You will see how these approaches to development at the surface seek to alleviate inequalities, but the stark realities are much different. You will learn about important development theories and major debates in the field, while considering the role of development actors such as governments and development organizations. Throughout the course we will engage in important discussions of global inequalities in health, poverty, and mobility, and begin to think critically about the future of globalization and development with regards to sustainability.

The common perception of international development is that it removes inequalities and solves the world's problems. In actuality, the role of development throughout history has not been as positive as one would hope. Escobar (2012) problematizes development, presenting it as a tool for the domination of the Third World by the West. He presents the history of development as "the history of the loss of an illusion, in which many genuinely believed" (Escobar 2012:4). The illusion he is referring to is that the developed parts of the world can solve the problem of underdevelopment. This illusion will be the focus of this course. This

introductory essay will discuss the schools of thought and major debates in globalization and development studies, providing a very brief history of the illusion of development.

### **Major Schools of Thought**

Escobar (2012), who is highly skeptical of globalization and international development, provides a critical analysis of development studies, demonstrating how the political and economic project of international development enables the global West and global North to dominate the Third World. Like Escobar, Nederveen Pieterse (2009) finds that development theory is almost always reading a history of hegemony and political and intellectual Eurocentrism. This framing of development theory suggests the necessity of interdisciplinary thinking in development and is evidence of a realization that grand theories of development will not work. Despite the supposed impossibility of a grand theory of development, major theories of development have risen as the prominent theories of the time.

Development strategies began in earnest following World War II. However, the true origins of development theory go back much earlier. Development was theorized during the 19<sup>th</sup> century through various classical theories with roots in the works of Adam Smith, Karl Marx, and Max Weber. Following WWII, the meaning of development changed rapidly as perspectives on development evolved (Nederveen Pieterse 2009). The period from 1940 through the 1970s brought forth what Payne and Phillips (2010) call ‘Golden Age Theories’, which are highlighted by growth and accumulation. The era from 1980 to the present, which McMichael (2016) calls ‘the globalization project’, is known as the period of neoliberalism, where structural reform was the primary focus of development. I will provide a brief overview of these three periods of international development and globalization.

*Classical Theories*

Before international development emerged as a separate body of ideas, classical social theorists postulated the role of international relations and international trade. Pre-Development Era development studies were mainly focused on economic theories, political ideologies, and class relations. Though pre-Development Era theories are typically excluded from development theory, Payne and Phillips (2010) argue that they should be included, as excluding them narrows the purview of the field unnecessarily. Payne and Phillips (2010) identify three categories of classical development theory: classical liberal economic theory, classical historical materialism, and classical economic sociology. These theories of political economy are based in the works of Adam Smith, Karl Marx, and Max Weber, respectively. Smith, Marx, and Weber were coping with changes in social structure that would ultimately become the advent of capitalism in Europe (Payne and Phillips 2010). The contributions of these social theorists cannot be ignored when considering the larger scheme of development and globalization studies. Despite the different global connectivity at the time of their writing, we can clearly identify the Smithian, Marxian, and Weberian origins of development theories of the past and present.

*Post-World War II Theories*

The post-World War II era saw the true beginnings development theory as a separate field. The period covering the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century is often called the Development Era. In the years immediately following WWII, governments embraced development as an alternative to colonialism that progressed into an international program of nationally sited economic growth across the Cold War divide that sent development aid (financially, technologically, and militarily) from the US and the Soviet Union (McMichael 2016). In its

earliest stages, development theory during the post-WWII era was rooted in development economics focused on national-level development efforts (Tandon 2000).

During the 1950s, development thinking expanded to include modernization. The primary approach to development was modernization theory, which saw the combination of economic growth alongside political and social modernization (Nederveen Pieterse 2009). In 1949, when US President Harry S. Truman gave an important speech on development, he divided the world into those who were modern and those who were not (McMichael 2016). As a result, modernization was the new benchmark for the post-colonial world, turning attention toward nation-building (Nederveen Pieterse 2009). Less-developed countries were expected to modernize through economic output to become more similar to more-developed countries.

Dependency theory—also discussed as underdevelopment theory—arose as a critique of modernization theory, creating what Payne and Phillips (2010) call the ‘Great Debate’. Dependency theory argues that modernization created unequal economic relations between the developed and developing world (McMichael 2016). Through this Marxian lens, development created an exploitative relationship where developed nations benefited at the expense of underdeveloped countries. Despite the debate between modernization and dependency theories, Payne and Phillips (2010) point out two important similarities between the two schools: (1) their basis in growth theories rooted in autonomous economic growth and capital accumulation and (2) the focus on ‘Third World’ problems rather than the earlier statist and liberal traditions that underpinned earlier development theories.

In the wake of the debate between modernization and dependency thinkers, arose the school of alternative development thinking during the 1970s. Alternative development was the first development theory to have a true focus away from economic growth and the advancement

of the nation-state. In this period, development was understood as human flourishing through social and community development (Nederveen Pieterse 2009). A similarly grounded approach, known as human development, rose in the early 1980s. The human development approach was based in the work of Amartya Sen on human capacities and entitlement, which led to the creation of the UN Development Program's Human Development Report and its focus on development as 'the enlargement of people's choices' (Nederveen Pieterse 2009).

### *Contemporary Theories*

While the alternative and human development theories shifted the focus away from economics and nation building, simultaneous a radically different perspective arose. Neoliberalism became a prominent theory of development during the 1980s. With its roots in neo-classical economic theory, neoliberalism is a set of economic policies and practices based on the ideas of the free market and free trade (Payne and Phillips 2010). The thought was that in opening a country to the free market, prices will set themselves based on economic forces (Payne and Phillips 2010). In the context of international development, neoliberalism was a grand theory that could theoretically be applied to any country. Nederveen Pieterse (2009) points out that under neoliberalism there is no 'special case', as any country can succeed by returning to this established economic theory. These neoliberal policies were common among Latin American countries that focused on inward-looking development (Escobar 2012; Payne and Phillips 2010). Broad and Cavanagh (2009) argue that neoliberalism is individualizing and benefits large corporations more than people, adding that neoliberalism is singly focused and unsustainable. Neoliberalism has garnered a great deal of criticism; however, Payne and Phillips (2010) make the important point that neoliberalism was not theoretically hegemonic, which cannot be said of many of its predecessors.

In the post-neoliberal era of development, we now see more humane approaches, though some still have neoliberal grounding (Payne and Phillips 2010). The post-development school of thought is rooted in shifting the focus away from the means of development (the building of the nation-state and economy) to the goals and results of development (Nederveen Pieterse 2009). This human focused approach was evident in the creation of the UN's Human Development Index (HDI) in 1990. With roots in the work of Amartya Sen, the HDI broadened measures of development to include education, health, and well-being indicators (McMichael 2016). With the new acceptance that one size does not fit all, the focus turned toward approaches to development that could enact structural change in multiple sectors.

At the UN Millennium Development Summit in 2000, world leaders signed a declaration that enacted efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The aim was to achieve or make significant progress toward the eight goals by 2015. The goals were (1) to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, (2) to achieve universal primary education, (3) to promote gender equality and empower women, (4) to reduce child mortality, (5) to improve maternal health, (6) to combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases, (7) to ensure environmental sustainability, and (8) to develop a global partnership for development. The MDGs were not received without criticism. Scholars noted the absence of inequality reduction in favor of absolute poverty reduction, the hegemonic positionality of developed nations in helping the developing world, and the lack of attention to globalization and the geopolitics created through increased global connectedness (Payne and Phillips 2010). Progress toward these goals was variable, as some countries achieved selected goals and others had limited success at progressing toward any (McMichael 2016). As 2015 approached, a new set of goals was put in place. The

UN proposed the Sustainable Development Goals: a list of seventeen ambitious goals with a general target date of 2030. The success of achieving these goals remains to be seen.

### **Major Debates**

Development and globalization studies are sites for many important debates on theories, practice, and policy. Since the dawn of the Development Era, we have seen debates concerning the effectiveness of development attempts, which drove the evolution of development theories. More recently debates have shifted toward the future of development and the current and lasting impacts of development programs. I will discuss three major development debates that are central to the future of development. The debates I will address here are sustainability, the object of development, and the deconstruction of development and degrowth economics.

#### *Sustainability*

A recent move in development efforts is toward sustainability, the UN's Sustainable Development Goals are one example of this. Sustainability efforts shift the attention away from immediate development and toward development strategies that will have a lasting effect. McMichael (2016) emphasizes that development is now about managing the future rather than improving on the past. McMichael (2016:13) theorizes the possible future of a sustainability project as the next step after the globalization project, as he identifies it, in which "the world transitions to a new project governed by environmental stress and climate uncertainty." The sustainable future of development is not limited to the environmental impact of worldwide development, as it is an important consideration regarding aid effectiveness. Sustainable development can generally be thought of as development practices that meet the current needs without compromising the needs of future generations (McMichael 2016).

Much attention has been paid to the sustainability of development organizations (see Swidler and Watkins 2009; Tandon 2000; Watkins, Swidler, and Hannan 2012). Sustainability is a fundamental goal that can constrain the actions, strategies, and technologies of development organizations (Watkins et al. 2012). Whether or not sustainability will drive future development is still unclear, but the debate on the centrality of sustainability continues both in its theoretical inclusion to development approaches and in its influence in the practices of development organizations and public policymakers.

### *The Object of Development*

Recent debates in development have arisen around the conceptualization of the object of development. While many earlier development theories focused on the nation-state, recent approaches have focused on the individual. The alternative development theories, which de-emphasize state-sponsored economic programs, stress development at lower levels. Banerjee and Duflo (2011), who study approaches to economic development focusing on the poor and their real experiences and behaviors, argue that policies should focus on the local level through incremental changes to the ‘rules of the game’. Escobar (2012) also notes how traditional development theories ignore the voices and experiences of men and women in the global South.

The central debate is on what the objects and targets of development should be. It remains in question due to the varying success of past development attempts, including those that have focused on nation-state development, such as neoliberalism, and those that have focused on human development, such as the UN’s Human Development Goals. Despite the varying success of previous programs, development theorists continue to struggle with what to target in development. The seventeen-point list of the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals is evidence

of this uncertainty. The question of what should be the objects and targets of development should be discussed among well-established and budding development scholars alike.

*Deconstructing Development and Degrowth*

McMichael (2016) suggests that the first step in rethinking development is to first *unthink* development and change our perception of what development should be. He reminds us that our typical notion of development is focused on the positive side of the ‘development ledger’ as “wealth accumulation has always depended on access to resources to exploit” (McMichael 2016:298). Thus, he argues, development in practice has been the development of capitalism. Within this development mindset is the flawed idea of unabated growth across the global economic strata. The unfortunate reality is expanding inequality, an inherent flaw of capitalism.

The idea of universal success in development is implausible under the influence of capitalist growth. In the context of this problem is the discussion of *degrowth*. Degrowth economics is a political and social movement that emphasizes downsizing production *and* consumption (McMichael 2016). Degrowth exists in contrast to sustainable development practices, though it does emphasize sustainability. While sustainable development practices are still based in the creation of jobs, housing, and products, degrowth emphasizes material responsibility by avoiding the creation of demand entirely and, therefore, the production of unnecessary material goods. Thus, degrowth is a movement based on shifting values and substituting altruism for egoism (McMichael 2016). This approach to development emphasizes sustainability while shifting the object of development to individual and corporate values. Nevertheless, this radical alternative approach to development has garnered significant criticism from economists and social theorists. Despite this criticism, degrowth, as an alternative to traditional development, is a growing movement with potential that is worth debating.

### **Annotated Course Outline**

This course is an overview of the sociology of globalization and development. The fields of globalization studies and development studies are very dense and garner much attention on their own. Studies of globalization and development are not limited to sociology, and this course incorporates readings and discussions from outside of sociology. The interdisciplinary nature of the readings will improve the understanding of theories, debates, and issues central to these fields. The course is broken into four units: Theories and Frameworks, Development Actors, Inequalities, and Future Perspectives and Debates. The first unit provides a critical background to development studies, offering a survey of major strategies, approaches, theories, and frameworks in the field. The second unit focuses on development actors, providing a look into power dynamics and who manages development. Unit Three includes a look into four topical issues relating to international inequalities: poverty, gender, mobility, and health. The final unit of this course covers debates on the future of globalization and development. This unit will feature readings on the environment, sustainability, and the work of Amartya Sen.

Each week, students are expected to have read the listed readings before class. Most weeks will feature a lecture followed by a class discussion. Students need to prepare and bring to class two questions based on the readings for that week. These questions will be used to facilitate class discussions. Students will receive participation points for submitting critical reading questions and contributing to discussions. In addition to the weekly discussion requirements, the course consists of three larger assignments: one each during Unit Two, Unit Three, and Unit Four. Each assignment is explained below in the respective unit.

#### **Unit One: Theories and Frameworks**

Unit One will focus on theories and frameworks, investigating the major historical eras of development and globalization. After a week of introduction to globalization and development,

we proceed with four weeks in this unit, each of which will cover a period of development theory and history. Week 2 covers classical theories, followed by a week on mid-century theories. We then dedicate a week to neoliberal theories and end this unit with a week on contemporary theories. These five weeks will provide a critical background for thinking about development and globalization as we discuss more topical issues in the following three-quarters of the course.

*Week 1: Introduction to Globalization and Development.* During this week, students will have the opportunity to find out what globalization and development studies are all about. In addition to the course introduction above, students will read the Introduction to Anthony Payne and Nicola Phillips' 2010 book *Development* and Chapter 1 of Jan Nederveen Pieterse's 2009 book *Development Theory*. Payne and Phillips' introductory chapter is an excellent read as they argue that international development should be viewed through a broad historical and theoretical lens, rather than as a specialized field. They root development theory in classical social theory. The same approach will be used in this course. In his first chapter, Nederveen Pieterse also highlights the roots of development theory in classical social theory and emphasizes the importance of an interdisciplinary approach. His first chapter explains his use of discourse analysis as an approach to development studies. Nederveen Pieterse provides a carefully considered overview of trends, theories, and actors in development.

*Week 2: Classical Theories.* Classical social and economic theories are the true roots of development thinking. During this week, we will explore the foundations of development in the thinking of Adam Smith, Karl Marx, and Max Weber. Students will read Chapter 1 ("Classical Theories") and Chapter 2 ("Catch-up Theories") from *Development* by Payne and Phillips. These two chapters provide an overview of development theories before the Development Era. In Chapter 1, they explore the roots of development theory in the classical liberal economic

theories of Smith, Marx's classical historical materialism, and Weber's classical economic sociology. These three writers were active during the advent of capitalism in Europe and they provide an excellent foundation for understanding how the field of development arose, as it has remained grounded in capitalism. In Chapter 2, Payne and Phillips discuss two main 'catch-up' theories: nationalism and communism. This chapter is important to understanding how development became a practical field, as catch-up theories sought to bring about development, not simply to theorize it. This shift toward implementing development would set the stage for the emergence of development studies.

*Week 3: Mid-century Theories.* Week 3 will begin our focus on the Development Era. This period from the late 1940s to the mid-1970s has been given many names. Payne and Phillips (2010) call this the 'Golden Age', featuring the 'Great Debate' between modernization and dependency theory. McMichael (2016) refers to this period as the 'development project'. Students will read Chapter 3 ("Golden Age Theories") from *Development* by Payne and Phillips. This chapter documents the important transition from growth theory to modernization theory to underdevelopment (or dependency) theory, highlighting the debate between modernization theory and dependency theory. This work is notable for its conclusion that the debate was in actuality more within each school of thought, rather than between them. Additionally, students will read Chapter 2 ("Instituting the Development Project") and Chapter 3 ("The Development Project: International Framework") from Philip McMichael's book *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective*. These chapters lay out McMichael's understanding of this period of development, ultimately arguing that the development project arose when the colonial world became simultaneously independent and underdeveloped. As a result, these countries sought a blueprint for national development. These two chapters provide an excellent

perspective on international development in a neo-colonial context, showing that national policies, which were intended to spur national economic growth, were in turn internationalizing and benefitted the First World more than the Third World.

*Week 4: Neoliberalism and Globalization.* This week focuses on a period of development thinking that existed during the early stages of rapid globalization. Starting with this phase, globalization would be a driving force of development going forward. The main topic during this week is neoliberalism. Neoliberalism is the political form of neoclassical economics, emphasizing the reliance on the free market and free trade (McMichael 2016). Week four will include Chapter 5 (“Instituting the Globalization Project”) and Chapter 6 (“The Globalization Project in Practice”) from McMichael’s *Development and Social Change* and Chapter 4 (“Neoliberal and Neostatist Theories”) from Payne and Phillips’ *Development*. McMichael argues that the era of the globalization project from the 1980s to the 2000s featured new forms of authority through poverty governance, outsourcing, displacement and land grabbing. He finds that this period is highlighted by the growing power of transnational banks and corporations. He contributes an important view on the centrality of globalization to development strategies and its unequal outcomes. In their chapter, Payne and Phillips discuss neoliberalism as well, but also feature an important alternative to neoliberalism by discussing neostatism, a prescriptive approach that focuses on the development capacity of the state, rather than assuming that all states can develop in the same way. While neoliberal strategies were common among Latin American countries, neostatist strategies were implemented in East Asia. This chapter is an excellent reading for broadening the view of development during this period, showing that neostatist strategies were implemented in this period as well, though they are often overshadowed by neoliberal approaches.

*Week 5: Contemporary Theories.* More recently the focus has shifted away from neoliberal development theories toward a multitude of alternative theories. These contemporary theories have incorporated human development, gender, the environment, and post-development approaches. Students will read Chapter 5 (“Alternative Theories”) and Chapter 6 (“Contemporary Theoretical Directions”) of Payne and Phillips’ *Development* and Chapter 8 (“The Globalization Project in Crisis”) from McMichael’s *Development and Social Change*. In their chapters, Payne and Phillips reject purely capitalist or economic solutions to problems of poverty and inequality, highlighting how alternative theories centralize the interlocking roles that are played by social, cultural, and historical contexts within international development. Chapter 5 serves as a solid introduction to alternative approaches to development and Chapter 6 discusses how the rise of China and India has shifted the context of development. McMichael’s chapter discusses this post-neoliberalism period as well, but does so in the context of crises. He argues that the globalization project has spurred social, legitimacy, geopolitical, and ecological crises. By focuses on crises created in the neoliberal era, McMichael sets the stage for discussions and debates in future weeks when we consider the efficacy of development at alleviating inequality.

## **Unit Two: Development Actors**

Unit Two moves the course beyond theories and approaches to development and begins our process of understanding how development operates. In this three-week unit, we discuss development actors. We first contemplate the role of governance. In the following week, we investigate development organizations (i.e. non-government organizations). In the final week of this unit, we explore micro-finance as a type of development organization.

*Week 6: Governance.* The first week of this unit will discuss the role of governance in globalization and development. During this week we will explore the effectiveness of foreign

aid and the implications of globalization for governance. Students will read William Easterly's 2007 article in *The American Economic Review*. In this article, Easterly argues that development assistance was based on three mistaken assumptions: that we know what actions achieve economic success, that our advice and money will make those correct actions happen, and that we know who 'we' are. Easterly makes a compelling argument that foreign aid should not be eliminated, but it should be refocused on specific tasks for which there is a clear demand. His problematization of foreign aid makes this a worthwhile reading. In addition, students will read Feiock, Moon, and Park's 2008 article in *Public Administration Review*. They compare and contrast the 'flat' vs. 'spiky' world arguments, two approaches to studying the impact of globalization. Ultimately, they find that the world is neither flat nor spiky, but it is something in between because regional governance strategies and intergovernmental coordination are important for economic development. This article provides three important perspectives on the ways that globalization has shaped governance. Lastly, students will read Gani's 2009 article in the *Journal of International Development*. This article provides a case study of the effectiveness of governance and foreign aid by focusing on Pacific Island countries, finding that for countries to benefit from the process of globalization, functioning and quality institutional practices are crucial. This article will help ground the other readings by examining the role of corruption and the rule of law in development assistance.

*Week 7: Development Organizations.* During Week 7, students will explore the important position of development organizations. Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are crucial to the effectiveness of development. Clark (1992) found that tension arises when governments and NGOs have different development theory and progressive NGOs may even view government as part of the problem. Students will read Rajesh Tandon's 2000 article in

*Development in Practice*. Tandon explains the alternative development paradigm, which was an alternative to the practices of the state. This article is useful as it explains the key dilemmas facing NGOs at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, which can be compared to how they are discussed in later studies. Students will also read Swidler and Watkins' 2009 article in *World Development*, which analyzes the social consequences of the sustainability of development programs in rural Malawi. They find that the indirect effects of sustainability on the experiences, identities, and aspirations of Malawians are much broader and deeper than the direct effects of funding. This article offers a valid perspective for looking beyond funding when evaluating a development program. Finally, students will read Watkins, Swidler, and Hannan's 2012 article in the *Annual Review of Sociology*, which emphasizes the importance of viewing NGOs as organizations that face uncertainties regarding their environments, goals, and social and material technologies they employ. The authors provide useful criteria for evaluating development organizations, which will assist students in when completing their Unit Two assignment.

*Week 8: Micro-Finance*. The final week in the unit on development actors will focus on micro-finance, a controversial development strategy that provides small loans to entrepreneurs that lack access to traditional banking, whether due to infrastructural or socioeconomic barriers. Students will read Naila Kabeer's 2001 article in *World Development* and Lamia Karim's 2008 article in *Cultural Dynamics*, which both explore the empowerment potential of micro-credit programs in Bangladesh. Kabeer argues that the micro-loan system has many benefits despite its imperfections, citing that past studies have been flawed. Meanwhile, Karim's study draws out an important structural flaw in the micro-credit system: loan recovery creates an *economy of shame*, through which debt leads to dependence and social pressure, halting empowerment efforts. Additionally, students will read Paromita Sanyal's 2009 article in the *American Sociological*

*Review.* Sanyal argues that participation in microfinance groups has the potential to mobilize groups of women through the development of social capital and an increased sense of trust and community. Sanyal provides a valuable case study, showing that micro-finance groups can have positive non-economic effects for women. Between these three articles, students will be exposed to both sides of the debate on the development potential of micro-finance.

*Unit Assignment.* Students need to submit a 2,500-word report that evaluates a development organization. Students are free to select any non-governmental development organization they wish to evaluate, provided that they can access sufficient information to successfully evaluate the program. This paper is due at the start of class in Week 8.

### **Unit Three: Inequalities**

While the typical aim of development is to reduce inequalities, the relationship between development policies and inequalities has not been so positive. These global inequalities, often discussed as the global gap, are not limited to economic poverty. Grave inequalities persist in gender, mobility, and health. In this unit, we explore the role of development and globalization regarding four sectors where inequalities have been both the target of development and hastened by development. We will explore poverty, gender, mobility, and health inequalities. These four areas are chosen for their scholarly attention and their drastic consequences going forward.

*Week 9: Poverty.* Our first topic in our unit on inequality is poverty. Escobar (2012) argues that poverty became defined as a social problem and a distinguishing characteristic of developing nations. According to Escobar (2012), the ‘invention’ of mass poverty in Asia, Latin America, and Africa solidified the global control held by the US and other Western nations. This week students will read Bergesen and Bata’s 2002 article in *The Journal of World Systems Research*, Martin Ravallion’s 2003 article in *International Affairs*, and David Dollar’s 2005

article in *The World Bank Observer*. Bergesen and Bata focus on the relationship between national income inequality and the global gap, finding that income inequality, both within and between nations, has been increasing over time. Importantly, they argue that income is not the best measure of global inequality and that sociologically it is more useful to measure class, which better transfers to the global scale. Ravallion discusses an important debate in poverty and inequality studies: how poverty and inequality should be measured. He finds that critics of globalization tend to think of poverty in relative terms and proponents think of it in absolute terms. This is a central debate in development because how poverty is measured determines the steps taken by policymakers. Dollar investigates how globalization has impacted poverty and inequality since its rise after 1980, predicting that global inequality will decline until 2015. His work is notable for the suggestion that increased openness to foreign trade and investment are a good strategy to consider for the future. This will provide an excellent discussion point as our earlier readings suggest that such neoliberal strategies are not fruitful.

*Week 10: Gender.* Many contemporary development theories emphasize gender, which has become a growing focus of human-centric development efforts. However, a gendered focus should not be taken as a feminine approach. Students will read Martha Nussbaum's 1999 article in the *International Labor Review*, in which she argues for cross-cultural objectives in development that are not Westernizing or colonizing, as women are alienated from their culture in the Western agenda. This article provides an alternative perspective on development, emphasizing individual vitality rather than economic measures. Additionally, students will read Sylvia Chant's 2008 article in *The Journal of Development Studies*. Chant questions the feminization of poverty thesis, which focuses on the disproportionately high levels of poverty for women compared to men. She finds that it neglects men in gender relations and instead

feminizes responsibility and obligation. This article offers the important view that development efforts should not essentialize male and female roles, as they may further marginalize and exhaust poor women. Alicia Swords' 2010 chapter in Philip McMichael's book *Contesting Development: Critical Struggles for Social Change*, the third reading for this week, shows why it is important to consider how development affects men. She finds that the military presence in rural Mexico and the free market system of neoliberal policies increased gender marginalization and oppression. As gender oppression has risen, men and women have found ways to adapt to and resist these neoliberal policies. Her work, along with Chant's, is important because demonstrates how development shifts gender relations for women and men, reminding policymakers, activists, and scholars to consider both genders.

*Week 11: Mobility.* Castles, de Haas, and Miller (2014:69) put forth the key question in migration and development today: "whether migration encourages development of the countries of origin or, conversely, hinders such development." This fundamental link between development and migration is the focus for this week. Students will read Ronald Skeldon's 2008 article in *Population and Development Review*, Stephen Castles' 2009 article in *Theoria*, and Raul Delgado-Wise's 2014 article in the *Annual Review of Sociology*. Skeldon argues that development can generate migration, as it creates and intensifies certain spatial inequalities. His article is an important contribution to the field because it emphasizes the need to recognize migration as a central part of the development process that must be planned for and accommodated. Castles explores the migration–development nexus, asking which comes first. Along with many migration scholars, Castles regards human mobility as a normal part of social transformation processes, in which people exercise agency to improve their livelihood. Delgado-Wise focuses the migration–development discussion on Latin America. He finds that the

implementation of the neoliberal model created a new context for migration within, to, and from Latin America due to stronger pressure to migrate with the instability of regional labor markets. This article is useful for its critique of neoliberalism as it influences migration processes. These three articles serve as a valuable introduction to the link between migration and development.

*Week 12: Health.* More recent approaches to development have incorporated other goals beyond economic development. Health has become one of the primary focuses of development efforts, as humanist goals and structural reform drive many of today's theories. During Week 12, students will read David Woodward and colleagues' 2001 article in the *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*. In this piece, they propose a framework for understanding and analyzing the economic aspects of globalization and their impacts on health. They argue that the effects of globalization will only be optimized when advances in health and well-being become central objectives of policymaking and management. This article is a great theoretical introduction to considering how globalization affects health. Additionally, students will read Michael Marmot's 2005 article in *The Lancet*, in which he fervently argues that health is socially determined and must be changed through social means. Marmot provides a strong argument for including health status as a measure of whether a population is thriving. This article provides robust evidence for why policymakers and governments need to monitor population health. Lastly, students will read Ruger and Kim's 2006 article in the *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, which finds that inequalities in child and adult mortality are wide and growing and these inequalities are influenced by several economic, social, and health factors. This article is valuable for its call for a commitment to social justice to reduce mortality and health inequalities.

*Unit Assignment.* Each week during Unit Three (i.e. Weeks 9, 10, 11, and 12) will feature two 15-minute group presentations to the class on an issue related to the topic of that week. The

class will be broken into eight groups at the beginning of the semester and groups will be assigned their presentation week. Groups will then need to select an issue related to that week's topic and get it approved by the professor. For example, a group assigned to Week 11 could choose to do a presentation on human trafficking or the current refugee crisis.

#### **Unit Four: Future Perspectives and Debates**

The final unit of this course moves the focus to future perspectives and debates. Over the first two weeks we will have important discussions on the position of the environment and the role of sustainability in development. We conclude with a final week that explores the work of Amartya Sen, a renowned development philosopher and economist. These three weeks are positioned at the end of the course so students can reflect on the various theories, topics, and actors as they consider the future of development and globalization.

*Week 13: Environment.* The environmental justice movement has increased across the world, with environmentalism making up one of the largest global countermovements (McMichael 2016). The connection between globalization, development, and the environment will be our focus for this week, which provides a wealth of discussion points and debates. This week, students will read Anantha K. Duraiappah's 1998 article in *World Development*.

Duraiappah disproves the hypothesis that poverty is a main cause of environmental degradation and in turn argues that the powerful and wealthy degrade the environment. This piece provides an important background for studying the poverty–environmental degradation nexus, which is increasingly central to development concerns. Students will read Jorgenson and Kick's 2003 article in the *Journal of World Systems Research*, which finds that underdevelopment can be both a cause and consequence of environmental degradation. This article is valuable for its discussion of the world systems theory approach, which is particularly useful for understanding

environmental connections to development. Additionally, students will read Chapter 9 (“Sustainable Development?”) from McMichael’s *Development and Social Change*. McMichael argues that the development project compelled nation-states to compete for economic growth and increased consumption at the expense of the environment. This chapter incorporates many important debates on the future of the environment–development connection, including the future of the human diet, fossil fuel consumption, and the challenge of climate change.

*Week 14: Sustainability.* In 2015, the UN proposed a new set of goals called the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The promotion of the SDGs indicates a new focus toward sustainability in development. This week, students will read Chapter 10 (“Rethinking Development”) from McMichael’s *Development and Social Change* and Chapter 11 (“Futures of Development”) and Chapter 12 (“Twenty-first-century Globalization and Development”) from Nederveen Pieterse’s *Development Theory*. McMichael argues that development needs to be reimagined around sustainability, as sustaining what we have with our current idea of development is not promising. Nederveen Pieterse’s chapters discuss the role of globalization and development in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, considering what has happened so far and what the future might entail. He finds that future trends in development are unclear, as the complexity of development makes future predictions difficult. However, he notes that in the young 21<sup>st</sup> century we are seeing increased south-south trade, shifting financial contexts, institutional crises, altered global power relationships, and new inequality dynamics. These chapters, with McMichael’s, offer valuable discussion points on the complex role of development in the future.

*Week 15: The Work of Amartya Sen.* The final week of the course will focus on the work of Amartya Sen, a celebrated economist, philosopher, and development theorist. Sen transforms economic theory through his emphasis on social location and context. Students will read the

introduction, the first three chapters, and the final chapter from his 1999 book *Development as Freedom*. They will consider the important perspective that Sen has on development, which sees development as expanding the freedoms that people enjoy. He focuses on five kinds of freedom: political freedom, economic facilities, social opportunities, transparency guarantees, and protective security. Sen's first three chapters force readers to consider thinking of development from a new perspective, in which freedom is the primary end and the principle means of development. In his final chapter, Sen forces his readers to consider a view of development that focuses on creating opportunities for people, rather than institutions and markets. He argues that we are only free to exercise our own responsibility for our well-being if we are surrounded by a state and institutions that promote that freedom. His work provides an important perspective of development, one that students should crave by the end of this course.

*Unit Assignment.* Students need to submit a 3,500-word paper on development and globalization given the prompt: *If development is a process of ensuring that each individual has full access to their human rights, how have the various theories and authors that we have discussed contributed to or hindered development?* This is due at the start of class in Week 15.

### **Student Competencies**

Four student competencies drive the development of this course: analytical thinking, cultural understanding, effective citizenship, and effective communication. These are adapted from Michigan State University's Liberal Learning Goals (Office of the Provost 2010).

#### *Analytical Thinking*

Throughout the course, students will engage in enriching discussions on a variety of topics related to globalization and development. Students will analyze ways of thinking from multiple sources within and across multiple disciplines. Readings come from sociologists, economists, anthropologists, and demographers that utilize a variety of methods of social research. Students will evaluate a multitude of opinions from classmates, scholars, and the professor, prompting the development of analytical thinking skills. Weekly submissions of reading questions encourage critical thinking, while the two course papers require students to analyze the efforts of development organizations and scholars, considering how they have influenced development.

#### *Cultural Understanding*

This course will encourage students to develop skills in cultural understanding, as they are prompted to reflect on how globalization and development impact social life from a variety of cultural perspectives. Unit Three, which is dedicated to inequalities, requires students to question forms of power and privilege, while respecting diversity and sensitivity. As students consider the effects of development and globalization in global and regional contexts, they will develop cultural awareness that will influence their own opinions and actions relating to global inclusion and tolerance. Throughout the course, discussion will touch upon cultural diversity in light of the Westernization common to globalization and development.

### *Effective Citizenship*

The two tenets of effective citizenship are (1) to understand and act effectively in the structures of local, national, and global governance systems and (2) the ability to solve social problems in ethical ways. This course seeks to build these important skills by approaching globalization and development through a theoretical lens that considers the human consequences of interactions at local, regional, and global levels. As students consider the roles of development thinkers and organizations in their course papers, they will consider the connection between individual and group behavior in the global system. Students will further their understanding of their own position within the societal structure in the United States and across the globe and explore what it means to be an effective citizen.

### *Effective Communication*

During the course, students will engage with and produce multiple forms of media. The course includes readings, lectures, discussions, and group presentations, which provide ample opportunity to develop active communication skills. Class discussions will provide myriad opportunities for students to engage with a variety of perspectives and practice effective and appropriate communication. Students will complete written assignments ranging from concise weekly writings to evaluative research reports, which together will improve written communication skills. Group presentations will require effective collaboration within groups while providing an opportunity to develop oral presentation skills and master the effective use of visual aids. This course will be an excellent opportunity for students to hone their communication skills as they consume and produce knowledge in many forms.

References

- Banerjee, Abhijit V. and Esther Duflo. 2011. *Poor Economics: A Radical Rethinking of the Way to Fight Global Poverty*. New York, NY: PublicAffairs. Retrieved December 9, 2014 (<http://site.ebrary.com/lib/alltitles/docDetail.action?docID=10469207>).
- Bergesen, Albert J. and Michelle Bata. 2002. "Global and National Inequality: Are They Connected?" *Journal of World Systems Research* 8(1):130–44. Retrieved (<http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/apcity/unpan003077.pdf>).
- Broad, Robin and John Cavanagh. 2009. *Development Redefined: How the Market Met Its Match*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Castles, Stephen. 2009. "Development and Migration—Migration and Development: What Comes First? Global Perspective and African Experiences." *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory* 56(121):1–31. Retrieved (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/41802453>).
- Castles, Stephen, Hein de Haas, and Mark J. Miller. 2014. *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World*. Fifth. New York: Guilford Press.
- Chant, Sylvia. 2008. "The 'Feminisation of Poverty' and the 'Feminisation' of Anti-Poverty Programmes: Room for Revision?" *The Journal of Development Studies* 44(2):165–97. Retrieved (<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00220380701789810>).
- Clark, John. 1992. "Democratising Development: NGOs and the State." *Development in Practice* 2(3):151–62.
- Delgado-Wise, Raúl. 2014. "A Critical Overview of Migration and Development: The Latin American Challenge." *Annual Review of Sociology* 40(1):643–63. Retrieved (<http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-soc-071811-145459>).
- Dollar, David. 2005. "Globalization, Poverty, and Inequality since 1980." *The World Bank Research Observer* 20(2):145–75. Retrieved December 9, 2014 (<http://wbpro.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/doi/10.1093/wbro/lki008>).
- Duraiappah, Anantha K. 1998. "Poverty and Environmental Degradation: A Review and Analysis of the Nexus." *World Development* 26(12):2169–79. Retrieved (<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0305750X98001004>).
- Easterly, William. 2007. "Was Development Assistance a Mistake?" *The American Economic Review* 97(2):328–32. Retrieved (<http://www.jstor.org/stable/30034470>).
- Escobar, Arturo. 2012. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Feiock, Richard, M. Jae Moon, and Hyung Jun Park. 2008. "Is the World 'Flat' or 'Spiky'? Rethinking the Governance Implications of Globalization for Economic Development." *Public Administration Review* 68(1):24–35.

- Gani, Azmat. 2009. "Governance and Foreign Aid in Pacific Island Countries." *Journal of International Development* 21(1):112–25. Retrieved (<http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/jid.1480>).
- Jorgenson, Andrew K. and Edward Kick. 2003. "Globalization and the Environment." *Journal of World Systems Research* 9(2):195–204.
- Kabeer, Naila. 2001. "Conflicts Over Credit: Re-Evaluating the Empowerment Potential of Loans to Women in Rural Bangladesh." *World Development* 29(1):63–84. Retrieved December 9, 2014 (<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0305750X00000814>).
- Karim, Lamia. 2008. "Demystifying Micro-Credit: The Grameen Bank, NGOs, and Neoliberalism in Bangladesh." *Cultural Dynamics* 20(1):5–29. Retrieved December 9, 2014 (<http://cdy.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0921374007088053>).
- Marmot, Michael. 2005. "Social Determinants of Health Inequalities." *The Lancet* 365(9464):1099–1104. Retrieved December 9, 2014 (<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0140673605711466>).
- McMichael, Philip. 2016. *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective*. 6th ed. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Nederveen Pieterse, Jan. 2009. *Development Theory*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Nussbaum, Martha. 1999. "Women and Equality: The Capabilities Approach." *International Labor Review* 138(3):227–45.
- Office of the Provost. 2010. "Liberal Learning & Global Competence at MSU." Retrieved ([https://msu.edu/~freshsem/LLG\\_GC\\_combined\\_table.pdf](https://msu.edu/~freshsem/LLG_GC_combined_table.pdf)).
- Payne, Anthony and Nicola Phillips. 2010. *Development*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Ravallion, Martin. 2003. "The Debate on Globalization, Poverty, and Inequality: Why Measurement Matters." *International Affairs* 79(4):739–53.
- Ruger, J. P. and H. J. Kim. 2006. "Global Health Inequalities: An International Comparison." *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 60(11):928–36.
- Sanyal, Paromita. 2009. "From Credit to Collective Action: The Role of Microfinance in Promoting Women's Social Capital and Normative Influence." *American Sociological Review* 74(4):529–50. Retrieved (<http://asr.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/000312240907400402>).
- Sen, Amartya. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. New York: Knopf.
- Skeldon, Ronald. 2008. "International Migration as a Tool in Development Policy: A Passing Phase?" *Population and Development Review* 34(1):1–18.

- Swidler, Ann and Susan Cotts Watkins. 2009. “‘Teach a Man to Fish’: The Sustainability Doctrine and Its Social Consequences.” *World Development* 37(7):1182–96. Retrieved (<http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0305750X08002878>).
- Swords, Alicia. 2010. “Teaching Against Neo-Liberalism in Chiapas, Mexico: Gendered Resistance via Neo-Zapatistas Networks Politics.” Pp. 116–31 in *Contesting Development: Critical Struggles for Social Change*, edited by Philip McMichael. New York: Routledge.
- Tandon, Rajesh. 2000. “Riding High or Nosediving: Development NGOs in the New Millennium.” *Development in Practice* 10(3-4):319–29. Retrieved (<http://www.tandfonline.com.ezproxy.massey.ac.nz/doi/abs/10.1080/U41MsfmSySo>).
- Watkins, Susan Cotts, Ann Swidler, and Thomas Hannan. 2012. “Outsourcing Social Transformation: Development NGOs as Organizations.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 38(1):285–315. Retrieved (<http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev-soc-071811-145516>).
- Woodward, David, Nick Drager, Robert Beaglehole, and Debra Lipson. 2001. “Globalization and Health: A Framework for Analysis and Action.” *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 79(9):875–81. Retrieved ([internal-pdf://2935970815/Woodward\\_Globalization\\_Health\\_fmework.pdf\nhttp://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11584737](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11584737)).