Elements of development: From modernisation to participation

George Mutalemwa[1]

Abstract
The concept development has been shrounded in mystery and gronded in ambiguity. However, understanding development is necessary in appreciating the discourse, teasing out the disambiguation, and analysing strategies and processes by which societal conditions may be improved. This paper seeks to address the theoretical and political contestations of development and contextualise discernible definitions of development. Framed within the field of Development Studies (DS), this paper contributes to the extant literature in comprehending the complex and multifaceted nature of development, which means different things to different people and whose meaning changes from one context to another. The paper takes into account development as the dominant discourse of western modernity, a short-to-medium term outcome of desirable targets as well as a long term process of structural societal transformation within social science.
Keywords: Development theory, development Studies, societal transformation, social sciences

Introduction

Development is a concept that has been contested bith theoretically and politically (Sumner 2007). This paper attempts to unpack the meaning of development, its various types and the context within which the concept is used. Development professionals and particularly academics have discussed development issues each in their own conceptualisation (Mufuruki et al. 2017). Due to the dynamic nature of development as analysed in Development Studies (DS), it is necessary to keep oneself current. It may be important to point out at the outset that DS is a multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary subject. It is a field of study with its own contexts, complexities and specificities, often surrounded with a fog around the concept development itself (Seers 1969). In examining

[1] Saint Augustine University of Tanzania
Email: georgemutalemwa4@gmail.com

development, especially in developing countries such as Tanzania, development professionals also analyse its antithesis, namely underdevelopment (Rodney 1972).

DS is an inter-, multi- and trans-disciplinary field of study. It incorporates theories from various social science disciplines such as political science, economics and sociology. Whereas DS focuses on current issues such as the war in Ukraine, climate change, COVID-19 (United Nations 2020), Brexit (Jack, et al. 2020) Agenda 2030: Sustainable Development Goals, global terrorism (United Nations 2018; Kharas and Rogerson 2017) and Tanzania Development Vision 2025 (URT 2000), for example, development professionals or researchers strengthen their analysis by invoking present and past milieux by which these issues came into operation. Thus, knowing one's history is vitally important for appreciating major trends shaping local, regional and global developments.

In addition, development and underdevelopment are usually associated with a number of ideas and issues. Some of these ideas and issues include: poverty, economic growth, employment, population, environment, health, education, infrastructure, aid, trade, globalisation, entrepreneurship, governance, corruption, human rights and industrialisation. All these are ideas about development as they affect people's lives as individuals, nations, regions and global community.

In relation to the above thematic categorisation of development, this analysis advances an argument that an examination of the concept of development itself as well as some of its theoretical underpinnings, including underdevelopment, is indispensable for both theoretical and empirical purposes. Defining development is crucial because it enables one to design plans, strategies and programmes for development (Shao 2008; Seers 1969: 2).

Development is understood differently by different people and also connotes different things to different people. It would be useful to analyse development by its various models from a historical perspective, especially after the Second World War because as an aftermath of the war, development underwent major restructuring. To appreciate the meaning of development, some theorists provide some useful insights, particularly in relation to how issues such as poverty, inequality and unemployment are addressed:

> 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 of these three have become less severe, 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 has soared (Seers 1969: 24).

From Seer's observation above, it may be deduced that each person can explain what development is without depending on official statistics which are typically taken as a given and inadequately critiqued. As such Seers opens up to the contested meaning of development both theoretically and politically (Sumner 2007) categorising development as a dominant 'discourse' of western modernity, a short-to-medium term outcome of desirable targets, and as a long-term process of structural societal transformation. In this connection, development was equated with poverty reduction (Thomas 2004), short-term growth (Gore 2000), inclusion of spiritual and cultural assests (Hickey and Mohan 2003), an interntional activity (Cowen and Shenton 1998) articulation of own ideas (Chambers 2012) and no uniform or unique answer (Kanbur 2006).

Theories of development

The following section examines some of the development theories and approaches to organising against the backdrop of the relationship between development and PO organising. The approaches include modernist, Marxian, neoclassical economics, liberationist, technocratic and structural reformist. There is a great variety of development theory, which also has implications on the conceptualisation of development itself. For example, the literature postulates that while development connotes growth to the neo-classical economist, it means diversification to the structuralists, self-reliance to the dependency theorist and changing modes of production and class relationships to the Marxist (Jolly 2012: 29).

Theories of the 1950s and 1960s

In the 1950s and 1960s development meant modernisation. Modernisation was defined as the process by which individuals change from a traditional way of life to a more complex, technologically advanced, and rapidly changing style of life as Melkote and Steeves (2001: 71) illustrate. In short, modernisation consists in the building of a modern society through economic growth. The challenge was

for planners to make economic indicators show high growth rates in industry, agriculture and other sectors in the form of growth of Gross Domestic Product (GDP), Gross National Product (GNP) and per capita incomes as Shao (op. cit.) exemplifies. The social aspect of development was ignored. That is why issues such as education, water, health, nutrition and sanitation were excluded. However, this paper considers these aspects as the lifeblood of development because they affect the wellbeing and freedom of individuals and communities.

The modernisation theory was based on the assumption that societies in the less developed countries had to be modernised and take the north as models in the form of emulating the policies of economic growth including the form of transfer of technology and technical support from the North to the South (Melkote and Steeves 2001). The North stands for the developed countries whereas the South stands for the developing countries.

The literature suggests that developing countries were considered to be in the same stage of development as the European nations in circa 1600, that is, before the onset of the industrial age. This observation indicates that developing countries can still catch up with the developed countries (Melkote and Steeves op. cit.). Therefore, the solution to solving the problems of underdevelopment in Africa, Asia and Latin America was by retracing the development path of the European countries.

A wide range of social science theorising, which launched the developmental efforts of the 1950s and 1960s, emphasised the role of the central government and of nonlocal agents. Local communities were viewed by various writers as technologically backward; as traditional; as conservative or bourgeois; as controlled by parochial, reactionary elites; as disposed to consume rather than save and invest; as undisciplined; or as peripheral, needing to be penetrated to become part of the modern nation-state (Esman and Uphoff 1988; Melkote and Steeves 2001).

The approach to development stressing transfer of technology saw local communities as constrained by their low level of technological development. Their production techniques were regarded as hopelessly behind the times, needing to be replaced by advanced methods, which peasants would be taught to adopt as Esman and Uphoff (1988: 47) articulate. This technocentric view of development had little concern for local organisation except as a kind of transmission belt for technologies brought in from outside. Even then, unless and until they were educated, local people—it was thought—would be incompetent to do more than accept the new techniques and materials.

Modernisation theory is understood in this analysis as the act of bringing together all societies towards a common destination dictated by the technical and organisational imperatives of advanced industrialisation. The USA was projected as the perfect model of modern development. Modernisation meant westernisation. Thus, there was a duty to build a world in the USA's image and likeness. This approach encouraged technology transfer in terms of equipment and expertise from western countries to developing countries, such as Tanzania. Modernisation is a top-down, ethnocentric and paternalistic model of development that does not give a chance to local rural organisations to participate in determining the destiny of the people. As such the theory can hardly be employed in building or strengthening people's organisations (POs) or community-based organisations (CBOs).

It can be seen that the traditional and modern cultures were in conflict and that the latter wanted to replace the former. This triggered a rejection by rural people the majority of whom were illiterates. The indigenous local organisations were bound to remain traditional and resistant to the dictates of modernisation. Naturally, local people conceived development as the promotion of western technology and culture and a rejection of traditional beliefs and practice of the local people. The literature summarises this conflict as follows:

> The most prominent sociological approach to development from the 1950s (e.g. Hoselitz 1957) emphasised the difference between 'traditional' and 'modern' cultures, seeing the two in conflict so that the latter had to displace the former for progress to occur (Apter 1965; Riggs 1964). Indigenous local organisations were bound to be traditional and thus obstructive to the kind of change considered necessary by the agents of 'modernisation.' Thus, modernisation theorists were no more sympathetic to local organisations than were those promoting Western technology as the key to development (Esman and Uphoff 1988: 48).

One can see the evidence of modernisation in the availability of local-level projects that aim to persuade people to adopt technologies and in the macro-level policies of governments and aid organisations that pressure developing countries to sacrifice education and other social services for economic growth. It was difficult to institutionalise modernisation ingrained in modern science and technology on society whose people were basically traditional and formally uneducated. Moreover, some few of the local elite benefited from projects under modernisation leaving the majority of the population in rural areas behind,

anguishing in poverty and misery. That is probably why the literature dubs modernisation as incorrect and unhelpful (Acemoglu and Robinson 2013: 444).

Modernisation theorists claim that internal factors in developing countries such as illiteracy, traditional agrarian structure, the traditional attitude of the population, the low division of labour, the lack of communication and infrastructure are responsible for underdevelopment (Rostow 1960). There is little consideration of the differences in structure, history and external factors. As a response to this, Marxian theorists advanced arguments towards what they saw as workable solutions.

Marxian theorists refuted modernisation and technology transfer. They rejected both of these approaches in favour of changing the class structure of society. Still, they were no more disposed to champion bottom-up local organisation. Following Marx's view of the peasantry as basically conservative, mainstream Marxists looked to the urban sector and to the proletariat and the intelligentsia for leadership in transforming the class structure by seizing the organs of the state. The literature maintains that those who followed Mao Zedong's analysis were more inclined to favour a progressive role for the peasantry, but it was to be guided and controlled by a vanguard revolutionary party (Esman and Uphoff 1988: 48). By conceptualising and treating the populace as inert, Marxism eviscerates the potential of POs for self-help and transformation. Therefore there is need for a different approach because POs exist and perform self-help activities for development.

The alternative approach was advanced by neoclassical economists. The neoclassical economists saw the lack of capital formation as the main cause of underdevelopment. They stressed measures for increasing aggregate saving and investment. While they were highly market oriented and regarded the individual as the main unit of action, some of them advocated a strong role for central planning agencies, despite their support for a free market (Killick 1978: 2). Since reducing consumption was considered the key to more rapid GNP growth, it was up to the government to force such behaviour on the public by taxes and other measures. It was premised that permitting local communities to have a greater voice in decision-making might result in increasing consumption.

If local organisations could marshal resources through self-help, that would be a positive contribution. However, it was feared that they would more likely make claims through the political process, thus limiting the resources that could be squeezed out of agriculture for state-directed investment. The current analysis argues that although people and their organisations may be inclined to syphon

off state resources, the same people and organisations may also be inclined to contribute to such resources (Yunus 2011: 198). This analysis further suggests that civic awareness, political will and functional institutions may be essential in supporting a Public-Private-Partnership (PPP) and Community-Driven Development (CDD) nexus (Acemoglu and Robinson 2013; Mansuri and Rao 2013).

Equivalent theories in the political realm supported this position, including the view of Huntington (1968) that popular mobilisation should be restrained; of Myrdal (1968) that the 'soft state' needed to be hardened so as to enforce discipline on the unruly or impassive masses, and of Binder (1971) that the state should penetrate the periphery to tie it into national development objectives. None of these theories welcomed a self-directed capacity for organisation among rural constituencies. These writers presented much of the grand theorising about development in the first two decades of purposive efforts by governments—in less developed countries (LDCs) and in donor roles—to accelerate economic growth and social change. It is thus no accident that little support for local organisation was found in mainstream economic or political development theory during this period (Esman and Uphoff 1988: 49).

The literature indicates that there were some schools of thought that advocated local organisation with practical arguments made for organisations like co-operatives, credit unions, and marketing societies, but these were not considered very interesting theoretically as Esman and Uphoff (1988) emphasised. In an era guided by grand strategic formulations—particularly those reflecting technological or economic determinism—little prestige or influence was accorded local institutions. This insight seems to permeate even the more recent literature on lack of interest in researching POs (Hyden 1995; Shivji 2007; White 2008).

Theories of the 1970s

The development thinking of the 1950s, as pointed out above, was largely influenced by technological concerns. A technology gap was identified between the advanced and backward nations, to be filled by the transfer of technology to the latter. This thinking underlay foreign assistance programmes until economists became ascendant at higher policy levels in the 1960s (Esman and Uphoff 1988). Then various resource gaps were specified and measured: the budget gap between government expenditure and revenue, the foreign exchange

gap between imports and exports, the capital formation gap between desired levels of investment and actual levels of national saving.

The gaps mentioned above were to be filled by transfer of resources from richer to poorer nations in sufficient amounts; it was hoped, for take-off into self-sustained economic growth (Rostow 1960). Many extenuating circumstances could be pointed out to explain why neither of these theoretical formulations produced results: the technology was not appropriate; the social preconditions were lacking; there was not enough political will (ibid.). Some thinkers, for example Rodney (1972), refuted this way of thinking, arguing that if it applied to the north, it could not necessarily apply to the south because of different historical reasons. This paper argues that the transfer of resources to the developing countries has either been inadequate or inappropriate for poverty reduction. Otherwise, poverty would have been radically reduced, *ceteris paribus*.

In response to the modernisation theory, another theory emerged in the 1970s. It was known as the dependency theory (Rodney 1972). This theory demonstrated the total dependency of the south on the north for survival though unequal exchange of trade and a transfer of resources to the advanced capitalist countries and other macro-economic prices which make the capitalist countries reap more from the poor countries than they invest in those countries. In this process the developing countries which have a great deal of natural resources (Muhongo 2014), but which were and still are technologically poor end up becoming bulldozed and consequently underdeveloped.

As the 1970s began, a new development agenda was formulated, giving more thought to appropriate technology, labour-using strategies, self-reliance, and equitable growth and income distribution as well as participation. There was an organisation gap between central government agencies and the rural communities they were supposed to assist. As Esman and Uphoff (1988: 50) suggest, one of the first statements of this view was by Owens and Shaw (1972) and it rapidly gained support. While Korten (1980) found the World Bank's (WB) sector policy statements on rural development (1975) inadequate in its treatment of local organisation, decentralisation, and participation, the mere fact that these were considered important represented a significant departure for the WB, which had previously been preoccupied with technological and, especially, economic resource transfers. To be sure, organisation is no more valid as a single-factor explanation than the ones preceding it.

Organisation does not seem to have been appreciated as such despite its being equated with economic factors. The literature shows that technology, resources, and organisation are like the economic factors of land, labour and capital—complementary elements of larger processes and that any of them can constitute a bottleneck, but unless the other two are appropriately increased in amount and quality, increasing one by itself would produce diminishing returns (Esman and Uphoff op. cit.). This view of the role of organisation has not often been challenged, but difficulties in starting or sustaining effective local institutions have kept many agencies from making organisation a central part of their development strategy. The direct transfer of institutions is even more dubious than that of technology or resources. The fact that establishing local organisations is a more organic than mechanical process—that it is not predictable, takes time, and does not obviously move money in large amounts—has kept government agencies and international donors from developing much enthusiasm for this approach. Technology and resource transfers, for all their demonstrated limitations, have remained more programmable and thus more popular with planners and budgeters as Esman and Uphoff (ibid.) posit.

Esman and Uphoff (ibid) argue that paralleling technocratic resistance to local organisation has been the opposition from those who see any official development efforts as fated or intended to fail. Vehement critiques of the whole development enterprise have come from left circles, which regard it as a palliative at best and a deception at worst, masking forces of concentration and exploitation that doom the Third World to underdevelopment unless and until radical revolutionary transformations are achieved. Some of the prominent critiques include Frank (1968), Cardoso (1972) and Rodney (1972).

Local organisations that do not mobilise popular sectors to overthrow the existing political-economic order have been thought to detract from the class struggle. From this perspective, only revolutionary movements can contribute to development. A few dependency theorists—Cardoso, for one—have seen a useful role for organisations in educating and giving more weight to the poor majority within the existing order; they may succeed in changing structural relations even if they do not overthrow the system (Kahl 1976). Should revolution not be a realistic, imminent possibility, some amelioration of conditions and some increased competence for the lower classes would still be desirable, and organisation would be a useful instrument.

The above theory draws its arguments from the Marxist theory which views the problem of underdevelopment as caused by class structure and the

concentration of social power (Marx 1843). The dependency theory in the developing countries came into being as a result of the considerable shifts in international relations due to the growth of the socialist system, the collapse of colonialism as a system, the increased activity of democratic forces all over the world and the increasing role of international policy of the newly independent states (Esman and Uphoff op cit.).

Dependency theorists thought that the economy was dominated by a handful of giant firms and they operated in a variety of ways to control competition. They used their monopoly power to defend the status quo as giant corporations with crucial interest and a dominant position while reaping the economic surplus. To prevent the escalation of underdevelopment, the radical school from the developing world opted for self-reliance and increased co-operation amongst the developing countries (Cardoso 1972; Rodney 1972).

In relation to the paradigm shift from modernisation to dependency, Tanzania, with its adoption of socialism and self-reliance in 1967 (Nyerere 1973) became an active member of the coalition of developing countries known as the Group of 77. The donor community especially, the WB and the ILO argued for poverty orientated and basic needs approach to development. The emphasis was placed on poverty reduction or alleviation. However this paper contends that the appropriate goal would have been poverty eradication. This is because whereas alleviation reduces the gravity of the problem such as poverty, eradication seeks to annihilate it (ILO 1977).

Corollary, governments and planners took centre stage by designing policies for social service provision. The state offered to address directly issues concerning water, housing, education, health, transport, food and population control (Nyerere 1966). The public sector was expanded. However, the productive sector was de-emphasised and as a result, development lacked an essential element, namely sustainability. By taking centre stage the government in Tanzania undermined the development of POs (Dill 2010; Egli and Zürcher 2007: 6; Tripp 1992).

The literature shows that less extreme and more sympathetic critiques come from liberal analysts, who see the possibility, even probability, that local organisations would be captured by more privileged local elements (Esman and Uphoff 1988: 51). Some of these critics placed more confidence in targeted programmes of services and benefits, administered through a disciplined bureaucracy. Others recommended that standardised packages of innovations be distributed to the poor to raise their production and income. Since these could be

used individually, local organisations would not be needed, though if LOs could facilitate adoption of the techpacks by aiding extensionists or by providing credit on a group basis, they would be judged to be useful (Esman and Uphoff ibid).

Theories of the 1980s

From the 1980s onwards, the so-called neo-liberalism, embodying the free market economy, trade liberalisation, privatisation and globalisation through Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) and PPPs, has been instituted as a panacea for economic crisis and as a means to sustainable development (Amin 2004: 108). As a result, planners, administrators and the donor community were geared up at introducing stabilisation and adjustment measures such as deregulation, retrenchment of the public sector, restructuring, devaluation of currencies and similar measures.

Consequently, low income earners and people living in poverty were adversely affected by the cutbacks on health and education as cost sharing and layoffs were enforced. The re-emergence of POs is associated with this period (Dill 2010: 25). Therefore, this paper finds it appropriate to investigate the possible contribution of Mwanza POs to development, particularly following the economic and political reforms. These political reforms paved the way for the development of PPPs.

However, unlike the dependency theory which criticised the north for the impoverishment and underdevelopment of the south, the new thinking of liberalism, stated that the reasons for poverty and underdevelopment lie solely within the developing countries themselves and that global capitalism is the only sure way to development (Gibbon 1993; Giddens 2006). This paper argues that this line of argumentation extends modernisation theory which bemoaned traditional cultures as being behind poverty and backwardness amongst developing countries and undermined local organisations as Acemoglu and Robinson (2013: 444) maintain.

Critique of the theories

The above theories have both merits and demerits. They are essential in that they help identify a hiatus in development and organisation scholarship, advance a conceptual framework for development as well as provide a methodology for spearheading development. For example, whereas modernisation brings to light

development challenges facing traditional communities and provide stages through which growth could be brought about (Rostow 1960), Marxism examines inequalities in social structures which still exist (Giddens 2006). Dependency theory articulates the role of colonisation and neo-colonisation in underdevelopment (Rodney 1972). The theories serve as a launchpad upon which other theories could reflect, emerge and develop. This observation is important in the current analysis which advances an alternative theory on POs thus making a contribution to extant theories and knowledge.

Indeed, the paradigms discussed above were riddled with four shortcomings: first, they were introduced from the top, that is, internationally or nationally. They did not originate from the people at the grassroots. Second, they had no capacity building initiatives towards people living in poverty and other disadvantaged people. Third, they had no resource building capacity and fourth, they did not constitute capacity for poverty alleviation. According to Shao (op. cit.) the above models constituted neither the meaning of nor viable strategy for development.

Having examined the gap in the theories of development such as excluding the social aspect of development, over-emphasising economic growth and undermining the organisations' potential for development without external or government support, despite some examples to the contrary (Esman and Uphoff 1988); it seems logical to craft a more realistic, comprehensive and meaningful approach to development which takes into account the political, social and economic aspects of development of individuals and organisations in developing nations thus blending the political, economic and social capital as exemplified by Bourdieu (1986) and Putnam (2002).

Participatory and community-driven development approaches

Development theorists realised that there was an organisational gap between the central government agencies and the rural communities they were supposed to serve as Esman and Uphoff (1988) evince. Modernisation could not work and dependency was not feasible. Therefore a new approach to development, namely participation through CDD was introduced. It was envisaged to foster sustainable livelihoods, promote good governance and alleviate poverty (Dill 2009: 717). This approach to development accentuated listening to the people and empowering local communities by extending the organisational capacity and

responsibility to the people to enable them to determine the development of their community.

The approach encourages local innovations and supports local capabilities and therefore is more likely to generate sustainable processes and practices, all factors remaining constant. The Tanzania Social Action Fund (TASAF), for instance, has applied this approach with considerable success. This success is not without criticism as there seems to be indications that TASAF might promote political favouritism at the local level. Nevertheless, political neutrality and inclusion of citizens are TASAF's strong qualities as Braathen (2003: 2) manifests.

The importance of participatory local organisations as intermediaries between a government and its individual citizens—or clients—is not a new idea, and by the late 1970s it was gaining renewed support in a number of disciplines. Conservatives as well as liberals mustered arguments on behalf of mediating structures (Berger 1977). However, whereas emphasis had previously been placed on the lowest-level organisations—primary groups—it was now recognised that their effectiveness depends on the formation of federated or allied groups that reach more significant levels of membership and function as Esman and Uphoff (op. cit.) articulate.

The literature identified the development of methodologies which linked villages with upper levels in organisational structure (Esman and Uphoff, ibid). In anthropology, for example, new methodologies of regional analysis, building on the central place theory of Johnson (1970) and the market structure analysis showed the significance of socioeconomic units that operate beyond the village but are still subnational in function and benefit. Economists and planners began to argue for territorial units that draw strength from village units but integrate larger areas for decentralised projects. The following quotation places local organisation in context:

> Previously, the focus of analysis had been on the state or the individual (or perhaps on the community as an aggregation of individuals). By the end of the 1970s, such a bifurcated view was giving way to a new appreciation of organisational structures that can not only mobilise local efforts and draw on local identities but also relate these to larger enterprises, on a district or regional level, responding to the impetus of constituent members. The state can—and does—interact with such multi-tiered units, which are composed of aggregate groupings of individuals. The idea of 'local' organisation takes on an expanded

> significance in such a theoretical and practical context, no longer being merely a matter of community representation but—through vertical and horizontal linkage—bridging household and regional activities. This is the point to which social science theory seems to have evolved, placing local organisation in context. But the subject of organisation has its own intellectual roots, which merit some explication (Esman and Uphoff 1988: 52).

One of the critiques which is especially relevant for this analysis is directed towards the dichotomy between theorists' conclusions and people's experiences indicating that research findings might not of necessity reflect the views of the respondents. For example, Chambers (2012: 37) challenges development theorists and researchers to answer some questions, namely whose experience or whose reality, counts. That is, there is a need to unpack the reality of the scholars as they construct it with their mind-sets and methods and for their purposes, or people's reality as they analyse and express it. With recourse to participatory poverty assessments (PPAs), which were a methodological breakthrough of the 1990s, Chambers (2012) contends that in a participatory mode, PPAs enabled poor people to present and analyse their realities and what would make a difference for them. This approach seems appropriate for investigating PO strengths, challenges and their contribution to development from the people's own reality as they live, experience and explain it.

The concept of people's participation and recognition of the significance of their ideas, needs and experiences are central to understanding the strengths and challenges facing POs in Mwanza because people's reality counts as some scholars such as Chambers (1997) have illustrated. Communities in one or two neighbouring countries may have different needs, depending on individual conditions of each community and therefore this analysis suggests that each case be treated independently and in consultation with the people around. For example, a PPA in Zambia using participatory rural appraisal (PRA) techniques gave insights about conditions, trends and poor people's priorities with practical implications. Health was repeatedly and consistently given a higher priority than education. Indeed, education was not raised as a priority need in most communities (Chambers cited in Jolly 2012: 107). Hence, the question how researchers gave a priority to education over health raises concerns about the motive, criteria or methodology they employed in arriving at that conclusion.

Participation, important as it may be, could still not in itself be capable of singlehandedly boosting development in POs because of several intervening variables. The literature propounds that several constraints may prevent effective and meaningful participation of the people in the development process for instance inhospitable political climate, corruption, red tape, inadequate leadership and organisation, and authoritarian structures that stifle democratic decision-making (Melkote and Steeves 2001: 358).

The literature expounds several factors which constrain organisations in sub-Saharan Africa. For instance organisations that derive much of their financing from foreign donors frequently find their credibility, autonomy and effectiveness questioned, while organisations that criticise government policy can face restrictions on their formation and operation. And organisations that partner with the state risk being absorbed into it through funding dependency, ideological affinity or their role in filling gaps in public service delivery. Finally, some organisations are criticised for lack of accountability, poor internal management of financial and organisational resources and a clientilist approach to beneficiaries (Africa Human Development Report 2012: 122).

Research data shows that Africans and particularly Tanzanians are interested in public affairs and participate actively in civil society (Afrobarometer 2009). This interest and participation may be necessary for change but not sufficient to translate into tangible development results. The literature further contends the extent to which participation can be empowering, and for whom, when it is largely initiated and organised by others and identifies a gap between what is attempted and what is accomplished and concludes that what is accomplished leaves a lot to be desired (Dill 2009: 719). This implies that little can be expected of POs in relation to their contribution to development, despite their interest in doing so.

The participatory approach refutes the top-down models of development which implicitly and explicitly assume that the knowledge of governments and agencies was sacrosanct and that indigenous populations were either ignorant or had incorrect beliefs. While an investigation into epistemological complexities is beyond the scope of this analysis, attention may be drawn to the concept of the square of knowledge (Dompere 2013: 7) because the concept seems to have been inconsistent with the top-down model of development.

With respect to local and external communication relations for development, for example, the square of knowledge predicates an area of knowledge in which both the locals and foreigners possess equal or similar knowledge regarding a

certain phenomenon. However, there exists circumstances in which the locals know about a phenomenon but the foreigners do not. Yet, in another context, foreigners have certain knowledge which locals do not have. Lastly, there is a grey area for both locals and foreigners or nonlocals, where the only thing they share is the lack of knowledge on a particular matter. The idea here is to acknowledge the fact that humans, in various cultural settings, depend on each other for knowledge and none has the monopoly of knowledge. Table 2 summarises the square of knowledge.

Table 1. Knowledge square and participation potential

S/N	**Locals**	**Non-locals**	**Knowledge**	**Participation**
1.	know	know	Mutual	facilitated
2.	know	do not know	Partial	enabled
3.	do not know	know	Partial	enabled
4.	do not know	do not know	non-existent	complicated

Source: Developed for this research

Under the modernisation and dependency theories, for example, where programmes came from outside the villages, local people and communities felt that innovations did not belong to them but to the government and the external development agencies. Therefore, participation was eviscerated. Consequently, communities left donors and governments to fix things that went wrong. For example, many of the agricultural projects failed because farmers were unwilling to forfeit their traditional ways for foreign and unfamiliar methods (Shao 2008). Besides, the local people did not have a choice to turn down recommendations or come up with alternative modifications. The situation was further aggravated by the low prices of agricultural goods in the market and the absence of a more equitable distribution of land ownership.

However, in theory, community-based participation is assumed to be both legitimate and inclusive and therefore key to increasing citizens' capacity to direct development on the right path. Besides, as research has shown, it is in practice, riddled with limitations because community-based organisations (CBOs) or POs are shaped considerably by the ties they have to external actors, in particular the state and transnational organisations (Dill 2009: 732). The current analysis suggests that although this contention may be justified and applicable to certain organisations, it may not be predicated of all organisations, particularly the POs which may operate without such ties.

Key conceptual issues

This analysis seeks to demystify the concept development which is a debatable and complex term within the DS discipline, within which the present discussion is situated. The literature underscores the complexity of development in relation to Seers (1972) and contends that it is imperative to explain the concept precisely, as the following quotation explains:

> […] in discussing the challenges we now face, we have to dispel the fog around the word 'development' and decide more precisely what we mean by it. Only then will we be able to devise meaningful targets or indicators, and thus to help improve policy, national or international. The starting point is that we cannot avoid what the positivists disparagingly refer to as 'value judgements'. 'Development' is inevitably a normative concept, almost a synonym for improvement. To pretend otherwise is just to hide one's value judgements. […] what are the necessary conditions for a universally acceptable aim, the realisation of the potential of human personality? (Seers 1972 in Jolly 2012: 74).

In this analysis, development is conceived as an all-encompassing, capability-building process by which societal and living conditions are improved. Development entails raising the welfare of the people including advancement of relations of production with a view to improving people's standards of living both from within and from without. Development consists in the ability of society to be self-reliant, near to self-sufficient, self-generating and the ability to acquire sustainability. Attainment of higher standards of living includes betterment of basic human needs such as food, shelter, clothes, education and health both qualitatively and quantitatively (Green 2012: 96).

In addition, development further entails human success and progress and addresses problems of access to resources, provision of basic needs, the distribution of those resources, use of those resources and effective management of those resources. In short, development may be understood in this analysis as the process by which societal conditions are improved both for individuals, POs and society in general (Green 2012: 84).

Types of development

There are different types of development. The literature distinguishes human development and social development. For example, Burkey (1993: 38) defines human development as the process by which an individual develops self-respect, and becomes more self-confident, self-reliant, co-operative and tolerant of others through becoming aware of his or her potential for positive change. This takes place through working with others, acquiring new skills and knowledge, and active participation in the economic, social and political development of their community. Human development is a process of emancipation from impoverishment (HDR 2010: 2) as the following quotation accentuates:

> Human development is about…combating the processes that impoverish people or underpin oppression and structural injustice…[it] is the expansion of people's freedoms to live long, healthy and creative lives; to advance their goals they have reason to value (Griffin and Friedemann-Sanches 2011: 516).

Social development infers those investments and services carried out or provided by a community for the mutual benefit of the people of that community whether as a village, a district or nation (Burkey 1993). These might include health services and facilities, education, water supplies, energy, transport system and communications.

Economic development refers to general improvement in living standards or an increase in living conditions, improvement of the citizens' self-esteem needs and free and a just society. Burkey (ibid) suggests that the most accurate method of measuring economic development is the Human Development Index (HDI) which takes into account the literacy rates and life expectancy which in-turn has an outright impact on productivity and could lead to economic growth (Todaro and Smith 2012).

Political development may be defined as the institutionalisation of political organisations and procedures (Huntington 1965: 393). It entails institutions and process of governance, rule of law, human rights, peace, law and order. It is informed by the principle of the separation of powers amongst the executive, judiciary and legislature. Key to political development is participation of the masses and their wellbeing.

This conceptualisation of development puts human being as the foundation, the centre and goal of all development efforts: human, political, economic and

social development. Thus, one can identify six major types of development: human, economic, political, social, cultural and technological development. Similar views are expressed by Nyerere (1966) who maintained that there would be no human dignity in extreme poverty or debilitating disease— or in the ignorance which buttresses these things and that the purpose of society is man; but in order to serve man there must be a social organisation of economic activities which is conducive to the greater production of things useful for the material and spiritual welfare of man.

The literature defines development as empowerment which means gaining of control and masterly over one's social and economic situation. It is widely agreed that the preservation of human dignity and fulfilment of basic needs are the foremost duties of every society (Melkote and Steeves 2001).

From the common denominator 'basic needs', one can deduce five basic goals of development. These are economic growth to secure food and other requirements for the population; social justice to reduce inequality; employment as means of earning an income but also because of its ethical and social value; participation as political involvement and social sharing; independence as freedom from external domination. Development is thus understood as a simultaneous process towards these five goals. A similar conceptualisation is advanced by Sen (2008).

Corollary, the central idea of development becomes the social change for a better human living, society moving towards a better life which is associated with core values of life sustenance, self-esteem and freedom. When development is community-based, then there should be indicators such as changes in thinking, cultural beliefs and traditions, including an increase in social services such as descent housing, health, formal education, nutrition, access to clean water, decrease in infant and maternal mortality, and demand for modern technology, sustainable use of the environment and the reduction and, eventually, eradication of poverty (Shao, op. cit.). The employment of community structures to address social needs and groups of people is what constitutes community development (Mendes 2008: 3).

Actors in development

Initiatives from different actors, such as POs, private and public sectors, acting together as facilitators of development have been recognised as a means to put development on the right path (Shao, op. cit.). All people, gender, ethnicity, age

and race are the players in development. Thus the type of development this analysis advocates is people-centred, value-driven, from within and participatory. That is why the use of the concept 'people'—and hence people's organisations— becomes a predominant and deliberate focal point in this nalysis, as propounded by Shivji (2011). Local initiatives are essential as governments are increasingly becoming unable to provide adequate services (Njunwa 2007). Besides, indigenously-based knowledge, which is found at the local level, plays a major role in the development process (Kashaga 2013; Tarawalie 2008: 80).

However, people and their organisations do not live independently of the state. They are part and parcel of the state in the ambit of mutual rights and obligations. Thus, the state has an indispensable role to play in the development process. For example, the state provides a broad goal or framework within which market forces operate, especially under the PPP (Noman et al. 2012: 390). In a way the state supplements the market forces, protects the vulnerable groups and provides essential services to its people. As such, the state has the responsibility of intervening in order to direct development efforts including those of POs, in addition to contributing resources on an egalitarian basis.

The state in the developing countries, particularly in Africa, has over the decades failed to intervene effectively in promoting development. Hence CBOs, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), the private sector, civil society and the donor community have assumed a role as actors in development in this aspect. The involvement of all the actors is important for an effective and meaningful development. In recognition of POs as actors in development, the literature has proposed a paradigm shift from capacity building to capability building (Dutrenit et al. 2013). This is because capacity building is passive whereas capability building is active. The goal of this shift is development and its method is a civic-driven change (CDC) as described in the literature (Berkhout and Jansen 2012: 156). The negative effect on development or change is known as underdevelopment as the following section indicates.

Conceptualising underdevelopment

This analysis advances an argument in the literature that one may not understand 'underdevelopment' unless one knows its cause(s); processes, history and underlying features (Shao 2008). Underdevelopment is both a state and a process of backwardness that was and is still being generated by the relationship

between the north and the south. Underdevelopment is historical and it assumes some kind of relationship of exploitation (Rodney 1972) which started from the capitalist stage through to mercantilism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. It is a state and process where the surplus from developing countries was siphoned off by the industrialised countries, accelerating development in the north and underdevelopment in the south (Fanon 1963; Rodney 1972).

In explaining the reasons for underdevelopment, this analysis narrows its scope to developing countries. This is because these were and still are the underdeveloped ones through the second scramble for Africa (Nyerere 1962). The literature suggests that lack of development is caused by the process of underdevelopment. This is an external cause of underdevelopment (Shao op. cit.). Another explanation concerns lack of coherent domestic policies which include: inappropriate planning, lack of appropriate priorities in development, dominance of state presence in the economy, price distortions in the market for both labour and capital, rampant and institutionalised corruption particularly amongst the elite, lack of participation in development by the people, heavy dependency on agriculture as a source of income to the economy. There is also lack of emphasis on education and more so science education due to lack of clear policy of science and technology at least in practical terms (Shao, ibid).

In addition to the external and internal constraints which arise directly or indirectly from policy formulation and implementation, some countries such as those in Africa have problems of natural hazards such as floods and degradation of the environment. These problems are certainly not restricted to Africa. However, when natural calamities combine with internal and external causes of underdevelopment, particularly poverty, the outcome is devastating. A cross-country comparison of various levels of development indicates that Tanzania and other developing nations need to reconsider their development strategies.

For example, whereas Tanzania and other developing countries have demonstrated a slow rate of development, the so-called High Performing Economies especially in South East Asia have managed to score high rates of economic growth. Hong Kong, South Korea, Singapore, Malaysia, Taiwan and Thailand managed to score an average GNP growth rate of 5.5 per cent between 1965 and 1990 (Acemoglu and Robinson 2013; Joshi 2012; Shao 2008). Thus the question to ask is why this disparity has grown so wide.

This analysis concurs with the literature which proposes a comprehensive or holistic conceptualisation of development, which goes beyond its elements such as economic growth and technology transfer (Esman and Uphoff 1988). For

example, Joshi (2012: 360) in broadening the concept of the developmental state, articulates three states, namely human developmental, resource developmental and social developmental. In short, the kind of development perspective envisaged in this analysis is a holistic one because this is the nature of development unless one chooses to examine one or some of its parts for a particular reason.

Due to an oversight on a broader understanding of development, some development theories have attempted to explain the development process (modernisation theories, dependency and neo-liberalism) but with a glaring lack of concern for POs by laying emphasis on, for example, technology transfer, centralisation of power and economic growth at the expense of people's participation through their organisations such as POs. Such theories are by and large top-down, paternalistic or foreign (Freire 1985; Martinussen 1997, Stiglitz 2003).

It may be worth noting, however that there are other different theories which have attempted to propose an alternative development model with a special focus on participation of the people and the empowerment of the grassroots. In this context, development has been conceived as empowerment (Melkote and Steeves 2001), freedom (Sen 2000), people-centred (Nyerere 1974), and result-orientated (Kingsbury et al. 2004). All these theories employ a bottom up approach in contradistinction to a top down approach to development as suggested by previous models of development. In this new model, the people at the bottom considered being last, they become first as in Cernea (1991), Chambers (1983 and 1993) and Scoones and Thomson (1994).

In terms of the relationship between POs and external institutions, this analysis adopts the response model by White (2008) as an extension of participatory approaches. In this model people's needs, interests and priorities are given precedence over, or at least, taken cognisance of by external 'experts', donors, planners and international organisations. Mutalemwa (2019) provides a detailed account of people's participation through the people's organisations development theory (PODT).

A response model proposes a two-way communication environment and a dialogue between local needs of the POs and the commitment of the state as well as transnational organisations. The application of this model is not free from limitations as Melkote and Steeves (2001) argue. Nonetheless, it is regarded by some scholars, for example Mongula (2008) and Servaes (2008) as the most effective model because it assumes a symbiotic relationship between actors. It is

against this backdrop that the current paper investigates the broadening of partnerships between the state and the private sector informed by PPPs to include civic organisations, particularly POs through CDD models. A theoretical development model which integrates some of the arguments raised in previous theoretical perspectives is explained in Mutalemwa (2015).

Conclusion

This discussion attempted to debunk the meaning of development as advanced in various theoretical epochs. Each theory had a different conceptualisation of development. The analysis examined modernisation in the 1950s and 60s, dependency in the 1970s, and neoliberalism from the 1980s onwards. Types of development were identified as human, social, economic and political (Burkey 1993) but also cultural and technological. The collaboration amongst actors of development such as state, market, civil society and POs was identified as necessary for the improvement of societal conditions. Although some theorists supported participatory approaches to development, it was unclear how participation could actually deliver amid constraints such as the lack of legitimacy and inclusion for some of the organisations as well as the dependency on donors and government and despite being 'people-centred' and 'bottom-up' (Dill 2013) or at least claiming to being so.

References

Acemoglu, D. & Robinson, J. (2013). *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty*. New York: Crown Business.

Africa Human Development Report (2012). Towards a Food Secure Future. New York: UNDP.

Afrobarometer, (2009). Afrobarometer Data Analysis, Round 4 (2008-2009). Michigan University, East Lansing: Afrobarometer.

Amin, S. (2004). The Liberal Virus and the Americanisation of the World. New York: *Monthly Review Press*.

Berger, P. (1977). *To Empower People: The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy*. Washington: American Enterprise Institute.

Berkhout, R. & Jansen, F. (2012). "The Changing Face of Citizen Action". *Development: Citizenship for Change*, 55 (2) 154-157.

Binder, L. (1971). *Crises and Sequences in Political Development*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. In Richardson, J (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Braathen, E. (2003). "TASAF-a Support or an Obstacle to Local Government Reform?" Formative Process Research on the Local Government Reform in Tanzania. Project Brief No.4, Dar es Salaam: REPOA.

Burkey, S. (1993). *People First: A Guide to Self-reliant, Participatory Rural Development*. London and New Jersey: ZED Books.

Cardoso, F. (1972). Dependency and Development in Latin America. *New Left Review*, July-August, 83-95.

Cernea, M. (Ed) (1991). *Putting People First.* 2nd edition, New York: Oxford University Press/ World Bank.

Chambers, R. (2012). *Provocations for Development*. Warwickshire: Practical Action Publishing.

_____ (1997). *Whose Reality Counts? Putting the First Last*. London: Earthscan.

_____ (1983). *Rural Development: Putting the Last First*. Harlow, UK: Longman Scientific and Technical.

_____ (1993). *Challenging the Professions: Frontiers for Rural Development*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Cowen, M. & Shenton, R. (1998). *Doctrines of Development*. London. Routledge

Dill, B. (2013). *Fixing the African State: Recognition, Politics, and Community-Based Development in Tanzania*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

_____ (2010). "CBOs and Norms of Participation in Tanzania: Working against the Grain". *African Studies Review,* 53 (2) 23-48.

Dompere, K. (2013). *The Theory of the Knowledge Square: The Fuzzy Rational Foundations of the Knowledge-Production Systems*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer.

Dutrenit, G., Lee, K. & Nelson, R. (eds) (2013). *Learning Capability Building*: Palgrave Macmillan.

Egli, W. & Zürcher, D. (2007). The Role of Civil Society in Decentralisation and Alleviating Poverty: An Exploratory Case Study from Tanzania. Zurich: ETH & NADEL.

Esman, M. & Uphoff, N. (1988). *Local Organizations: Intermediaries in Rural Development*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Fanon, F. (1963). *The Wretched of the Earth*. (Transl. Farrington, C). New York: Grove Press.

Frank, A. (1968). *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*. New York: Monthly Review.

Freire, P. (1985). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Pelican Books.

Gibbon, P. (ed) (1993). *Social Change and Economic Reform in Africa*. Uppsala: Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.

Giddens, A. (ed) (2006). *Sociology: Introductory Readings*. Cambridge: Polity.

Gore, C. (2000). The Rise and Fall of the Washigton Consensus as a Paradigm for developing countries, World Development 28(5) 789-804.

Green, D. (2012). *From Poverty to Power: How Active Citizens and Effective States can Change the World*. Oxford: Practical Action Publishing & Oxfam.

Griffin, J. & Friedemann-Sanches, G. (2011). Defining the Boundaries between Unpaid Labour and Unpaid Caregiving: Review of the Social and Health Sciences Literature. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 12 (4) 511-534.

Hickey, S. & Mohan, G. (2003) *Relocating Participation within a Radical Politics of Development: Citizenship and Critical Modernism*: Draft Working Paper prepared for conference on "Participation: From Tyranny to Transformation? Exploring New Approaches to Participation in Development", 27-28 February 2003, University of Manchester, Manchester.

Huntington, S. (1965). "Political Development and Political Decay". *World Politics*, 17 (3) 386-430.

Huntington, S. (1968). *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hyden, G. (1995). "Bringing Voluntarism Back In: Eastern Africa in Comparative Perspective" in Semboja, J. & Therkildsen, O. (eds) (1995). *Service Provision under Stress in East Africa:* Copenhagen: Centre for Development Research.

ILO (1977) *Employment, Growth and Basic Needs: A One-World Problem*. New York: Praeger.

Jack, M; Jones, N; Marshall, J. and Sargeant, J. (2020). *Preparing Brexit: How Ready Is the UK?* London: Institute for Government.

Johnson, E. (1970). *The Organisation of Space in Developing Countries*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Jolly, R. (2012). *Milestones and Turning Points in Development Thinking*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Joshi, D. (2012). "Varieties of Developmental States: Three Non-western Pathways to the Millennium Development Goals". *The Journal of Developing Societies*, 28 (3) 355378.

Kahl, J. (1976). *Modernisation, Exploitation and Dependency in Latin America*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Kanbur, R. (2006) *What's Social Policy got to do with Economic Growth?*

Kashaga, F. (2013). "African Indigenous Knowledge and Social Security of the Elderly in Rural Tanzania: The Case of Bukoba Rural District". *African Review,* 40 (1) 120154.

Kharas, H and Rogerson, A. (2017). *Global Development Trends and Challenges: Horizon 2025 Revisited.* London: ODI

Killick, A. (1978). *Development Economics in Action: A Study of Economic Policies in Ghana.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Korten, D. (1980). Community Organisation and Rural Development: A Learning Process Approach. *Public Administrative Review*, 40 (5) 480-511.

Mansuri, G. & Rao, V. (2013). *Localizing Development: Does Participation Work*? Washington, DC: World Bank.

Martinussen, J. (1997). *Society, State, and Market: A Guide to Competing Theories of Development*. London: Zed Books.

Marx, K. (1843). *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. Translated by Annette Jolin and Joseph O'Malley. London: Cambridge University Press.

Melkote, S. & Steeves, H. (2001). *Communication for Development in the Third World: Theory and Practice of Empowerment.* London: Sage Publications.

Mendes, P. (2008). Teaching Community Development to Social Work Students: A Critical Reflection. *Community Development Journal,* 44 (2) 248-262.

Mongula, B. (2008). "Does National Development Policy Encourage Participatory Communication?" The Case of Tanzania. *African Communication Research,* 1 (1) 113-136.

Mufuruki, A., Mawji, R, Kasiga, G. and Marwa, M. (2017). Tanzania's Industrialisation Journey, 2016-2056: *From an Agrarian to a Modern Industrialised State in 40 Years*. Nairobi: Moran Publishers for CEO Roundtable of Tanzania.

Muhongo, S. (2014). "Investment Opportunities in the United Republic Tanzania". Paper Presented in Berlin on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Union of Tanganyika and Zanzibar, 25 April

Mutalemwa, G. (2019). Community-based organisations in Tanzania and development theory generation. In *Journal of Sociology and Development* 3(1)93-122

_____ (2015). People's Organisations in Tanzania: Strengths, Challenges andImplications for Development. Vechta: University of Vechta

Myrdal, G. (1968). *Asian Drama: An Inquiry into the Poverty of Nations*, 3 Vols. New York: Pantheon.

Njunwa, M. (2007). "Cooperative Public Service Delivery in Tanzania: Is It Contributing to Social and Human Development?" *JOAAG*, 2 (1) 32-39.

Noman, A. & Stiglitz, J. (2012). "Strategies for African Development" in *Good Growth and Governance in Africa: Rethinking Development Strategies* in Noman, A; Botchwey, K; Stein, H. & Stiglitz, J. (eds) (2012). New York: Oxford University Press.

Nyerere, J. (1966). *Freedom and Unity: Uhuru na Umoja*. London: Oxford University Press.

_____ (1976). "Adult Education and Development". Speech at ICAE: 7th World Assembly, No 67 at VHS, Bonn: DVV International.

_____ (1974). *Freedom and Development*. London: Oxford University Press.

_____ (1973). *Freedom and Development.* London: Oxford University Press.

Owens, E. & Shaw, R. (1972). *Development Reconsidered: Bridging the Gap between Government and People*. Lexington, Mass: D.C. Heath.

Putnam, R. (2002). *Democracies in Flux: The Evolution of Social Capital in Contemporary Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Washington: Howard University Press.

Rostow, W. (1960). *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Scoones, I. & Thompson, J. (1994). *Beyond Farmer First: Rural People's Knowledge, Agricultural Research and Extension Practice*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Seers, D. (1972). What Are We Trying to Measure? *Journal of Development Studies*, 8 (3) 21-36.

_____ (1969). "The Meaning of Development". Communication Series No.44. (1-26) London: IDS.

Sen, A. (2008). "Capability and Well-Being" in Hausman, D. (ed.) (2008). *The Philosophy of Economics: An Anthology*. 3rd ed. Cambridge University Press.

Servaes, J. (ed.) (2008). *Communication for Development and Social Change*. London: Sage.

Shao, I. & Msoka, C. (2008). "Grassroots Economic Development, Social Justice and Poverty Reduction". *Tanzania Journal of Development Studies*, 8 (1) 14-22.

Shivji, I. (2007). *Silences in NGO Discourse: The Role and Future of NGOs in Africa*. Oxford: Fahamu.

Stiglitz, J. (2003). *Globalisation and its Discontents*. New York: Norton.

Sumner, A. (2007). Meaning Versus Measurement: Why do 'economic' indicators of poverty still dominate? *In Development in Practice* 17 (1) 4-13.

Tarawalie, F. (2008). Blending New Technology with Local Indigenous Cultures: A New Approach to Communication for Rural Development. *African Communication Research* 1 (1) 61-85.

Thomas, A. (2004). *The Study of Development* . Paper prepared for DSA Annual Conference.

Todaro, M. & Smith, S. (2012). *Economic Development*, 11th ed. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Tripp, A. (1992) "Local Organisations, Participation, and the State in Urban Tanzania" in Hyden and Bratton (1992). *Governance and Politics in Africa*. Boulder, Colorado & London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

UNDP (2012). Africa Human Development Report: Towards a Food Secure Future. New York: UNDP/RBA.

White, R. (2008). Ten Major Lines of Research on Grassroots, Participatory Communication. *African Communication Research*, 1 (1) 11-45.

United Nations (2018). *Emerging Challenges and Shifting Paradigms: New Perspectives on International Cooperation*. Santiago: UN.

_____ (2020). *Recover Better: Economic and Social Challenges and Opportunities*. New York: UN.

_____ (2020). Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Trade and Development: Transitioning to a New Normal.

URT (2000) Tanzania Development Vision 2025. Dar es Salaam: Ministry of Planning

Yunus, M. (2011). *Banker to the Poor: The Story of the Grameen Bank*. Croydon: Aurum Press.