1. Development policy: ideas and practice

Habib Zafarullah and Ahmed Shafiqul Huque

INTRODUCTION

The world faces major challenges due to wars, natural disasters, environmental fallout, humanitarian crises, economic downturns, political and social upheavals and global pandemics. Improving the quality of life in a hostile environment is a daunting task. Until recently, the state has been the driver of change and engine for growth. State intervention propelled the South and the East to advance but from economic perspectives – accelerated growth through robust fiscal and monetary policies, export expansion, import substitution, industrialization, infrastructure building and technological innovation (Zafarullah & Huque, 2012). State intervention was accompanied by policy intervention for promoting equality, equity, economy and social well-being (see Karagiannis & King, 2019).

However, with the state's roll-back shaped by neoliberal approaches to development and the ramifications of globalization, the influences and interventions of the market, private sector, non-state organizations and international regimes take on critical dimensions in development and the policy process. Arguably, with restrained state functionality and the growing intensity of self-regulating markets, the sphere of democratic policymaking has considerably shrunk and the potential for policy failures increased (Peck, Theodore & Brenner, 2012). Perhaps this can be reversed or remitted by 'inclusive neoliberalism' (Porter & Craig, 2004).

In general, the nature of the state, 'ideological' leanings of policy regimes, the structure of political power arrangements and the effects of stressors stemming from within national boundaries or beyond, determine the kind of policies to be adopted. The sorts of social, economic, environmental or technological transformation that a policy aims to attain will influence the preferences of the political leadership, amplitude of bureaucratic support, mechanics of the policy process, the degree of stakeholder involvement, force of public opinion and the influence or participation of the 'attentive' public (Burstein, 2003). Citizen engagement in the policy process is desirable, as development policies are ultimately meant for people's welfare and in response to their needs, but this often remains unattempted or difficult to realize. Development policymakers should recognize the needs, values, interests and preferences of citizens and incorporate these in the design of policies and create a public space for citizens to contribute to policymaking for the sake of transparency and accountability (Brinkerhoff & Crosby, 2002a; Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2005). Policies constructed on concrete evidence are more likely to produce valid results than those based on grapevine, anecdotes and biased judgment (Head, 2016). To obtain responsiveness to policy obligations and secure reasonable policy outcomes, implementation snags caused by policy accumulation need removal (Adam et al., 2019; Knill, Steinbacher & Steinebach, 2020).

This chapter identifies and highlights the trajectory of development policy across states and analyses the trends. It will help understand the diverse contexts in which development policies are envisioned and designed to serve the interests of governments or regimes. The discussion is

based on a critical overview of models to ascertain the emergence of doctrines of development and identify approaches that influenced policies. An analysis of ideas and approaches adopted by countries of both the capitalist and socialist blocs and other participants offer insight into the conceptualization and practice of development policy. Changes in political milieus, shifts in ideology and transformation of societies have resulted in challenges and complexities that pose risks, but also provide opportunities for experimenting with innovative development policies. This chapter draws attention to the foundations and dynamics of development policy-making and implementation. The state machinery needs to work in unison with civil society, the market forces and all other stakeholders to reach the goals of development.

THE STATE OF DEVELOPMENT AND MODELS

Civilizations sought to transform themselves to achieve societal welfare and positive changes in the lives of the people. Attempts at improving agricultural production and manufacturing processes, building infrastructure, constructing communications and transportation networks, unearthing and utilizing resources, and harnessing energy have always been evident. However, apart from the economic dimension, the human, social, cultural and political dimensions of development took time to be acknowledged. Over time, the idea of progress was bolstered by themes from liberalism, democracy, socialism, communitarianism, Cartesianism, modernization, poststructuralism, developmentalism and environmentalism, as well as the contributions of science and technology (Bury, 2010; de Rivero, 2001; Polanyi [1944], 2001). Escobar (1995, p. 45) argues that development is ‘a historical construct’ and thus ‘requires an analysis of the mechanisms through which it becomes an active, real force. These mechanisms are structured by forms of knowledge and power and can be studied in terms of processes of institutionalization and professionalization’.

Development is a normative concept seeking to make qualitative changes in people’s lives through deliberate design. It focuses on human enrichment, perceptions, choices, functionings and capabilities, and ‘ethical judgements regarding the good life’ and ‘relations among people and with nature’ (Goulet, 1997, p. 1161; see also Sen, 1999). It is reflexive in orientation and often meanders through a complex circular cause–effect relationship to adjust to social change occurring at an accelerated pace through time and space (Giddens, 2000). Reflexivity allows policy approaches to be frequently reviewed ‘in keeping with changing demands, outcomes of strategies applied, and feedback from ground operations’ (Zafarullah & Huque, 2012, p. 50). Development aggregates multiple goals and functions, incorporating interconnected economic, social (including human), cultural, political and environmental aspects (Sen, 1999; Todaro & Smith, 2020). This multidimensionality gives development an all-inclusive multiscalar character encompassing different levels – from the individual to the national, through to the global (Pieterse, 2010). A multiplicity of variables may be significant because policymakers need to be conscious in their pursuit for appropriate development outcomes in their unique settings.

DOCTRINES OF DEVELOPMENT

Ideas for development change over time. New patterns and paradigms emerge. Some are endorsed and applied, while others are either mutated or rejected. Policies at different times

in different places have been the product of the ideological leanings of the political regime or made in response to the dictates of international donors. Since the nineteenth century, several approaches to resolving problems relevant to development have been in currency. Some have lost their relevance, but continue to inform and influence policy development and practice, perhaps by deliberate design or unwitting action. Some were discarded, others synthesized because of unique localized circumstances, their long-term tenability and appropriateness. In the following paragraphs, we discuss some of these and follow their implications for development policy and practice.

Keynesianism provided the intellectual roots of economic growth theories and was instrumental in conceiving ‘statism’ in development. Keynes’s ideas appealed to the post-colonial newly independent nations needing authoritative interventions in economic matters. Soviet-styled central planning covering all sectors of the economy was pursued (even though most were not fully socialist in ideological orientation) and newly created international financial and trade regimes supported economic policies there (Pieterse, 2010). The economic growth approach had its limitations, being generally insensitive to social and environmental issues, and the policy process was virtually insulated from outside influences.

Classical modernization theory envisaged development as evolutionary and functional, and advanced the doctrine that the rich–poor gap among nations could be narrowed provided the poorer nations embraced western-type nation-building processes, capitalism, technological diffusion, urbanization, rationalization, universalism and specialization in managing development (Leys, 2009). But the process of modernization was considered revolutionary, complex and lengthy. The dualism created by exogenous and endogenous influences and the juxtaposition of both traditional and modern elements in the developing world made the modernization approach untenable from a governance and policy perspective (Pieterse, 2010). Moreover, the idea could not accommodate the empirical evidence generated from social, political and economic studies (Goorha, 2017). The theory was critiqued for its emphasis on transplanting western values into traditional societies and its unidirectional nature defying the fact that modernity can be reached via several paths (Pieterse, 2010).

‘Dependency theory’ rejected modernization theory for its Eurocentric disposition and irrelevance in the developing world. The main thrust of dependency theory was that the world capitalist system created the divide between the rich (the core) and poor countries (the periphery). By influencing policies and strategies, the core steered the course of development of the periphery, and the inequitable terms of engagement (especially trade, commerce and technological diffusion) between the two and the uneven composition of the global economy further widened the gap. Although dependency theory highlighted global inequalities and the primacy of cultural contextuality of developing countries, it suffered from over-generalizations and ethnocentrism in assessing underdevelopment against western criteria (Tausch, 2010).

‘Alternative development theory’ (ADT) considered the conventional ways of managing poverty, social marginalization and environmental degradation as futile, and advanced a more pro-people and society-centred normative and substantive approach to complement the economic dimensions of development (Brohman, 2001; Pieterse, 2010). ADT underscored decentralized administration, social inclusion, participation, volunteerism, empowerment, self-reliance, morality and ethics, and environmental sustainability as crucial determinants in development. While not a coherent body of principles and methods, it had some impact on development practice in alleviating poverty, removing inequalities and undertaking social

transformation. ADT influenced civil society organizations, international aid agencies and developing country planners and practitioners to adopt them.

The advent of neoliberalism as a variant of liberalism compelled the state to play a diminished role and created the conditions for markets to be more engaged in allocating resources and disseminating information for efficient economic governance. The state has been ‘degovernmentalized’ and politics ‘marketized’, with political parties taking on the role of entrepreneurs. An ‘enterprise society’ has been created with the ‘marketization of the social’ (Peters, 2010, cited in Zafarullah & Huque, 2012, pp. 67–8). Rejection of structural economics complemented by individualism, private property, deregulation, competition, uncontrolled price setting, corporatization, privatization, free trade, fiscal discipline, private contracts, bureaucratic managerialism, public sector downsizing, cutbacks and austerity define the character of neoliberalism. The state contributes to market creation but restrains itself from interfering (Boas & Gans-Morse, 2009; Harvey, 2007). With market mechanisms becoming dominant, the state relinquished its role as the principal instrument of development.

Neoliberalism was embraced by many countries of the North and reluctantly, often in condensed versions, by the South, under pressure from international aid bodies. Existing institutions in the aid-recipient countries are either dismantled or weakened. Citizens are turned into customers, social welfare is losing its value, agriculture and primary industries are barely subsidized, employment opportunities shrinking, education and healthcare costs surging, and environmental protection and climate control compromised for economic benefit (Zafarullah & Huque, 2012). Yet, neoliberalism or its spinoffs continue to influence development policies in one form or another.

Each of the above theories, models or approaches have had some impact on the practical aspects of development, especially in the framing of policies and their application in specific contexts. Concepts and ideas about development have shifted as analysts presented explanations based on theories of classical modernization, dependency and alternative development. However, the rise of neoliberalism contributed to distortions in the original principles, goals and strategies underpinning development policies. Interestingly, the responsibility of states remained unchanged despite challenges from the forces of neoliberalism and globalization.

RIPPLES OF DEVELOPMENT

Development thinking and praxis began changing from the mid-twentieth century. The Marshall Plan aimed for the reconstruction of war-ravaged Europe, and the underdeveloped countries of the world, while the Colombo Plan helped former British colonies pursue development (Berger, 2006). Both plans sought to counter the spread of communism and create a technical elite in developing countries (Oakman, 2001). To some extent, the plans served as frameworks for development by providing technical assistance and creating opportunities for infrastructure building, increasing agricultural production, industrial financing, community development and programmes in education and health.

The Bretton Woods institutions (World Bank, International Monetary Fund [IMF]) advanced a set of guidelines for policy reforms in the developing nations. It was directed at structural adjustment of the economy together with stringent fiscal discipline, prudent public expenditure and open direct foreign investment. The programme was refined and extended to include governance (e.g., political reform, anti-corruption) and development (poverty

reduction, social safety nets) elements and ‘rebranded’ as the ‘post-Washington Consensus’ (Williamson, 2000). The World Bank, originally sanguine about minarchism – minimal statism – changed its stance and called for a stronger state with effective institutions to support economic efficiency and growth. It highlighted social, political, economic and legal factors that shape market behaviour and stimulate investment and growth with fewer transactions and reduced costs (Cameron, 2004). With globalization wandering through the world with its most prominent baggage – ‘neoliberalism’ – the state–market relationship was redefined. The expanding participation of non-state entities in development and the interventions of a variety of policy networks have made the policy arena more vibrant and dynamic and the state more receptive to and adaptive of outside influences and interpretations of development (Sørensen, 2004; Weiss, 2009). Thus, the state can neither be ignored nor relegated to a secondary position because it will not wither away but continue framing public policies for development.

Over the years, the practice shifted from substantial investments in projects for infrastructure and technical assistance to a humane approach to development. The challenge became stronger with the infiltration of new forces such as the market and the ideology of neoliberalism into the equation, and development policymakers were unable to disregard them. The recognition of human development as an important element for consideration in development policies was a positive turn. Not surprisingly, this resulted in new challenges and states struggled to accommodate demands from diverse forces in formulating development policy.

The 2000–15 United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) represented a concerted initiative for developing countries to address their numerous problems and inadequacies. It created the scope for global partnerships for countries to interact and work together to accomplish the target of halving world poverty and creating a more sustainable environment. However, despite some positive outcome in some countries, especially those in the low-income category, success has been partial or mixed for others (McArthur & Rasmussen, 2017). Nonetheless, the United Nations (UN) reported that ‘Unprecedented efforts have resulted in profound achievements’ but acknowledged ‘uneven achievements and shortfalls in many areas’ (UN, 2015a, p. 4).

The UN 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (ASD; UN, 2015b) outlined the strategies to implement the post-MDGs development project with the active involvement of civil society. It was also a politically pledged initiative to ‘mainstream sustainable development at all levels, integrating economic, social and environmental aspects and recognizing their interlinkages...to achieve sustainable development in all its dimensions’ (UN, 2012, p. 2). As Raco (2005, pp. 324–5) argues, ‘Development has become anything but sustainable as the demands of enhanced capital accumulation override the broader needs of social reproduction’. Market forces are becoming stronger, but the hegemonic influences of the market cannot be rejected. Markets can, nonetheless, be regulated and harnessed to provide social, economic, ethical and environmental dividends (Kumi, Arhin & Yeboah, 2014). Despite the challenges of neoliberalism and its concomitant elements, ASD needs to be pursued with ‘renewed ambition, mobilization, leadership and collective action’ (Guterres, 2020, p. 2).

The COVID-19 pandemic has adversely affected the progress of ASD, as it exposed the inequities inherent in current development practice. Countries with capacities to deal with the pandemic have engaged in competing for producing and marketing vaccines to take advantage of the laws of demand and supply. The pandemic affected socially backward communities across the globe and deepened the social divide that development policy needs to address.

COVID-19 emerged as a strong signal to the development policy community to acknowledge the inherent anomalies and make conscious efforts to remove them.

DEVELOPMENT POLICY: COMPLEXITIES AND CHALLENGES

Despite the growing challenges of globalization and neoliberal forces, the state retains its role in governing development. It has significant clout over the policy process at the macro level while abandoning some of its direct engagements at the micro. The state's role as a stimulant in social, economic, environmental and technological transformation is now reinforced by multiple complex networks of organizations and interests functioning in a more expansive and open policy space. In reality, the policy process is no longer the restrictive sphere of influence of a nation's political and bureaucratic establishment, nor prevailed upon by global institutions or regimes. Inclusive development demands the spontaneous or even steered participation of civil society, stakeholders and citizens in a setting where the public and private domains intersect. Even though the government is the repository of information, policy efficacy needs a continuous flow of inputs from knowledge producers (academics, researchers, policy evaluators) for the use of knowledge consumers (policymakers, implementors, managers) (Bogenschneider & Corbett, 2011). The role of independent think tanks, research organizations, societal intelligence and intellectual forums made up of non-partisan, dispassionate scholars can be critical in policymaking. As members of civil society (national and global), they are also active constituents of policy dynamics with influencing capacities.

Within 'social-political governance', diversity, complexity and dynamics are embedded features in the policy process, making it an extremely challenging undertaking (Kooiman, 2008). The plurality of actors and their contributions provides credibility and legitimacy to the policy process and ensures inclusivity and participation. They draw attention of governments to issues and problems that help shape policy agendas, critically follow their formulation and adoption, and monitor implementation and outcomes. In all these, the state can keep its prerogative secured and use ideas strategically to convert 'policy consensus' into essential 'policy decisions' (Paoli, 2003). A combination of social, political and technical orientations add rationality to the policy process (Howlett, Ramesh & Perl, 2020). However, development to be sustainable requires 'a specific "steering" logic' or 'goal-directed intervention by governments and other actors' (Meadowcroft, 2007, p. 302).

Evidence-informed policymaking lends credence to the policy process, but this is difficult to attain in places where information accumulation, assimilation and application are hindered by poor statistical infrastructure, inadequate research and analytical skills, and an insensitive policy environment. For instance, technical policies often show a science-policy gap caused by unsound professionalism and low-level capacity and expertise in comprehending and analysing problems and advancing appropriate policy options (Head, 2008). In developing countries, fabricated statistics and prejudiced information compromise the quality of policies and make them untenable in practice. Flawed data analytics and fraudulent research practice pose a serious issue there (see Finn & Ranchhod, 2018; Jerven, 2013).

Compass of Development Policy

Developing countries began shedding their statist orientation in the 1980s in response to the signals from the global regimes (UN, IMF, World Bank, World Trade Organization [WTO], World Health Organization [WHO] and others) with a stake in aid, development, international business and the environment. Accommodation and adaptation to external directions often turned out to be complicated manoeuvres in volatile domestic political conditions and an unpredictable economic climate. These economically hard-hit countries could ‘neither afford to be idealistic nor too ideologically inclined in making choices...they require[d] adopting a pragmatic approach in handling problems while not being totally oblivious to the political orientation of [their] government[s] and the national interest’ (Zafarullah & Huque, 2012, p. 211). However, policymakers gave way to making unrealistic assumptions and idealistic expectations. With insufficient technical expertise and capabilities, incomplete prescience, inadequate data and ambiguity of programme objectives, they stumbled in making long-term strategic plans, unable to undertake evidence-based research, overcome institutional challenges and properly utilize external inputs to the change management process (Lane, 1999; Lindenberg & Ramírez, 1989; Young, 2005).

Nonetheless, the several governance and development indexes, environment and climate change protocols, the MDGs and SDGs have advanced some guidelines for action on several fronts. These have enlarged the dimension of policy renewal. The range of issues covered in development policy praxis is vast – from human development issues (poverty, inequality, health, education, sanitation, social safety) to large global and regional matters (international trade, Internet and satellite communication, climate change).

Governance issues that have implications for sound development management (transparency, accountability, integrity, participation) cannot go unnoticed. While the focus of development has mainly been on the developing nations and transitional economies, the advanced industrialized nations are also participants in the process. Within the widened compass of development and the presence of normative frameworks and standards, the pressure on proactive policymaking and implementation has intensified, but with the wide range of issues to be covered, making coherent realistic policies and strategizing them in uncertain conditions have become a challenging exercise (Marchau et al., 2019).

Context and Ownership of Development Policy

The ramifications of globalization have been pervasive, with implications for national development. Intensified global social relations influenced the policy domain, causing a cultural shift that drove nation-states to become interdependent and forcing them to reconfigure their policy stance (Giddens, 2000; Held & McGrew, 2007). Development takes place on the ground and in distinctive overlapping phases. It cannot be divorced from field realities or disregard popular aspirations and perceived problems. Thus, feasible development policies, often incrementally made, cannot overlook a country’s priorities and strategic goals.

However, with ‘imperious’ conditionalities since the 1980s by international aid institutions for financial and technical support, recipient countries have often been trapped in tricky situations. They are to abide by specified policy directions and achieve stipulated targets, which are too generic and inappropriate for country-specific contexts and, thus, have a debilitating effect on development practice (Mourmouras & Boughton, 2002; OECD, 2009).

Development can be strengthened through assertive policy ownership and attuning policies to the social, cultural and economic needs of communities. Development not only requires some sort of protection from negative externalities to enhance recipient autonomy and ease off the possibility of ‘a misalignment of priorities between donor and recipient’ by emphasizing ‘recipient preferences or needs’ (Lee & Izama, 2015), but also insulating it from the ‘elite capture’ syndrome particularly at the local level in developing societies (Fung & Wright, 2003; Platteau, 2004).

Country-specific and needs-sensitive policies with inputs from the ground are imperative for sustained progress and less dependence on external sources. By being too compliant and yielding to external pressures, some countries appear to lose their economic sovereignty to govern and make policies in their own right (Zafarullah & Huque, 2012). Relenting to outside domination may have negative overtones for a country’s democracy, political stability, institutional consolidation and social cohesion (Stiglitz, 1998).

At best, international organizations and global conventions can provide overarching directions for national governments or a selection from international best practice, but not ‘one-size-fits-all’ type of recipes (Rodrick, 2007). As early as the mid-1990s, the World Bank highlighted the primacy of ‘home-grown’ policy initiatives and urged policymakers to be more forthcoming and responsible in their tasks (World Bank, 1995). However, at the international level, with multiple parallel spaces in concurrent action, a country policy process cannot discount the ramifications of globalization and especially the influence of the non-state or sovereignty-free transnational actors (multinational corporations, international non-governmental organizations, social and environmental movements, global regimes) (Ip, 2010). An equilibrium in global governance can be struck by moderating domination but also creating partnerships among participating countries and supra-sovereign organizations that would provide more dividends for development on the ground. This would protect country ownership of development policy while boosting transformative, inclusive and accountable governance for development (Beisheim & Ellersiek, 2017).

Policymaking Dynamics

Development policies change over time, with new problems emerging, new ideas developing and new analytical techniques introduced. The policy landscape also changes with the continuing interplay of social political and economic forces in the charged globalized environment. The policy process, informed by the maxims of democratic governance, is expected to be more open, deliberative, rational, innovative, accountable, conscientious, balanced and participatory, but simultaneously responsive to political signals, ethical standards, technical requisites and, most importantly, representative of the public interest (Brinkerhoff & Crosby, 2002b). The level of democratization and the extent of political institutionalization determine the nature of policy dynamics. Deliberative policymaking demands the active participation of a range of actors, advocacy coalitions, policy networks and citizens. Such engagement can promote debate and dialogue between competing interests on crucial and contentious policy issues and bolster the policy process in all its phases (Howlett et al., 2020).

While policymaking is fundamentally a vital political process – a government’s legitimacy is cogently linked to its policy performance. On the contrary, policy implementation is more bureaucratic, *albeit* with touches of the political elements (Zittoun, 2014). Development policies directly reflect the ideological orientations of political leaders and major social groups;

their beliefs and perceptions determine the nature of policies and their anticipated impact on development (Johnson & DiNitto, 2016). Political processes have direct relevance to the format of policymaking, implementation and evaluation. Agenda setting is the phase where ideology matters and the seriousness of the political leadership with which it approaches the tasks of government and policymaking. The ways policies are conceived, framed and put into effect with support from civil society organizations and policy networks are critical elements in their success.

Designing and implementing sound policies relevant to development is a complex task that needs a complete understanding of the policy problem and a clear sense of the real world from where problems emerge. Policy planners and strategists need to be conversant with the way their governmental system works and the fundamentals of the policymaking process. They are expected to be equipped with in-depth knowledge, research expertise and the ability to dig out and assimilate information and evidence. Policy framers and implementors' thorough professionalism, pragmatism and stewardship can lead to the framing of appropriate policies for positive outcomes. The right balance between political interests and technocratic imperatives or between empathy and rationale is essential for a policy to produce desired results.

In every country, though, the politics of development policymaking is a hard reality, not only from the perspective of the different shades of policies (constituent, distributive, redistributive and regulatory) and their implications for domestic social and economic relations, but also from the politics of aid delivery and geopolitics, both of which play critical roles in the international arena (Inter-American Development Bank [IADB], 2006). On the other hand, Lowi remarked that 'Policies determine politics' and argued that 'It is not the actual outcomes but the expectations as to what the outcomes can be that shape the issues and determine their politics' (Lowi, 1964, p. 707; 1972, p. 299). Indeed, conflict and consensus, debates and deliberations on policies are part of the political life of nations, especially those that are pluralist and democratic. Also, the degree and intensity of policy reform and change depend in considerable measure to the extent to which governments and others with a stake in policymaking can work to shift to a heterodox agenda rather than being stuck in orthodoxy for the greater interest of the country. Indubitably, not always do circumstances allow this, nor are the commitment and obligations of those at the helm positive.

Policymakers and their 'inventive' calling are products of the time, place and circumstances from which they cannot remain detached. They also work under domestic constraints (sensitive to political influence) and extraneous demands (receptive to the counsels of international organizations), along with being responsive to crises (e.g., financial, environmental, pandemic, etc.) in charting strategies for development.

CONCLUSION

Development policies in post-colonial developing countries in the past may have reflected the ideological leanings of their leadership. However, gradually they became significantly influenced by dominant global regimes or political and economic alliances they were affiliated with, such as the capitalist West or the socialist bloc. Ironically, these factors did not contribute to equitable development outcomes because countries were favoured or discriminated against based on their ability to extend support to powerful international actors. The process was

severely impacted mainly due to unidimensional approaches and disregard for the contexts in which development took place.

While the development policymaking scenario might have somewhat changed with the advent of collaborations and partnerships among nations and between them and regional/international institutions and the use of sophisticated planning techniques and modelling, other problems remain. The formulation and implementation of meaningful development policies are affected by the lack of credible information and statistics, inadequate research and biased analysis. The policy environment often guides and determines the substance of policies, but many developing countries have been unable to establish appropriate policy infrastructure.

It is unrealistic to expect quick resolution of the multidimensional problems that impact development policy. The replacement of the practice of domination by a few powerful actors with a partnership-based approach is essential for equitable development across the globe. This needs to be complemented by the protection of policy ownership by countries that will enable them to craft equitable and inclusive development policies. With the autonomy to design development policies according to the context without the imposition of external ideas, countries will acquire the capacity to manage domestic needs and respond to the global community's requirements and move forward with the freedom that is essential to ensure human and humane development.

Some of the factors that shape development policy are contextual, while others are moulded by ideas and institutions that guide and regulate the process. Unfortunately, the world system is overwhelmed by pressures, demands and influences from strong neoliberal and hegemonic forces that constrain the development of policies for people's well-being. Fortunately, the literature reflects an awareness of the sources of inequities and undesirable consequences.

REFERENCES

- Adam, C., Hurka, S., Knill, C., & Steinebach, Y. (2019). *Policy Accumulation and the Democratic Responsiveness Trap*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Beisheim, M., & Ellersiek, A. (2017). Partnerships for the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: transformative, inclusive and accountable? Research paper. Berlin: German Institute for International and Security Affairs. Accessed 7 December 2020 at https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/24722017RP14_bsh_elk_01.pdf.
- Berger, M.T. (2006). 'Colombo Plan'. In T.M. Leonard (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Developing World* (pp. 353–4). New York: Routledge.
- Boas, T.C., & Gans-Morse, J. (2009). Neoliberalism: from new liberal philosophy to anti-liberal slogan. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 44, 137–61.
- Bogensneider, K., & Corbett, T. (2011). *Evidence-Based Policymaking*. New York: Routledge.
- Brinkerhoff, D.W., & Crosby, B. (2002a). *Managing Policy Reform: Concepts and Tools for Decision-makers in Developing and Transitional Countries*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Brinkerhoff, D.W., & Crosby, B.L. (2002b). *Citizen Participation in the Policy Process: Concepts and Tools for Decision-Makers in Developing and Transitioning Countries*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Brohman, J. (2001). *Popular Development: Rethinking the Theory and Practice of Development*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Burstein, P. (2003). The impact of public opinion on public policy: a review and an agenda. *Political Research Quarterly*, 56(1), 29–40.
- Bury, J.B. (2010). *The Idea of Progress: An Inquiry into its Origin and Growth*. Fairford, UK: Echo Library.

- Cameron, J.D. (2004). Review: the World Bank and the new institutional economics: contradictions and implications for development policy in Latin America. *Latin American Perspectives*, 31(4), 97–103.
- de Rivero, O. (2001). *The Myth of Development: Non-viable Economies and the Crisis of Civilization*. London: Zed Books.
- Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Finn, A., & Ranchhod, V. (2018). Genuine fakes: the prevalence and implications of data fabrication in a large South African survey. *World Bank Economic Review*, 31(1), 129–57.
- Fung, A., & Wright, E.O. (2003). *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. London: Verso.
- Giddens, A. (2000). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Goorha, P. (2017). Modernisation theory. In N. Sandal (ed.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies* (online edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Goulet, D. (1997). Development ethics: a new discipline. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 24(11), 1160–71.
- Guterres, A. (2020). Foreword. In United Nations (UN), *The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2020* (p. 2). New York: UN.
- Harvey, D. (2007). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 610, 22–44.
- Head, B. (2008). Three lenses of evidence-based policy. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 67(1), 1–11.
- Head, B. (2016). Toward more ‘evidence-informed’ policy making? *Public Administration Review*, 76(3), 472–84.
- Held, D., & McGrew, A. (2007). *Globalization/Anti-Globalization: Beyond the Great Divide* (2nd edition). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Howlett, M., Ramesh, M., & Perl, A. (2020). *Studying Public Policy: Principles and Processes* (4th edition). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) (2006). *The Politics of Policies: Economic and Social Progress in Latin America*. Washington, DC: IADB.
- Ip, E.C. (2010). Globalization and the future of the law of the sovereign state. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 8(3), 636–55.
- Jerven, M. (2013). *Poor Numbers: How We are Misled by African Development Statistics and What to Do About It*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Johnson, D.H., & DiNitto, D.M. (2016). *Social Welfare: Politics and Public Policy* (8th edition). London: Pearson.
- Karagiannis, N., & King, J.E. (2019). *A Modern Guide to State Intervention: Economic Policies for Growth and Sustainability*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Knill, C., Steinbacher, C., & Steinebach, Y. (2020). Balancing trade-offs between policy responsiveness and effectiveness: the impact of vertical policy-process integration on policy accumulation. *Public Administration Review*, 81(1), 157–60.
- Kooiman, J. (2008). Exploring the concept of governability. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 10(2), 171–90.
- Kumi, E., Arhin, A.A., & Yeboah, T. (2014). Can post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals survive neoliberalism? A critical examination of the sustainable development–neoliberalism nexus in developing countries. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 16, 539–54.
- Lane, J.-E. (1999). Policy implementation in developing countries. In S.S. Nagel & F.A. Lazin (eds), *The Policy Implementation Process in Developing Nations* (pp. 11–22). Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Lee, M.M., & Izama, M.P. (2015). Aid externalities: evidence from PEPFAR in Africa. *World Development*, 67, 281–94.
- Leys, C. (2009). *The Rise and Fall of Development Theory*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Lindenberg, M., & Ramirez, N. (1989). *Managing Adjustment in Developing Countries: Economic and Political Perspectives*. San Francisco, CA: ICS Press.
- Lowi, T. (1964). American business, public policy, case studies and political theory. *World Politics*, 16(4), 677–715.

- Lowi, T. (1972). Four systems of policy, politics and choice. *Public Administration Review*, 32(4), 298–310.
- Marchau, V.A., Walker, W.E., Bloemen, P., & Popper, S.W. (2019). *Decision Making under Deep Uncertainty: From Theory to Practice*. New York: Springer.
- McArthur, J., & Rasmussen, K. (2017, 11 January). Future development: how successful were the Millennium Development Goals? *Brookings.edu*. Accessed 22 November 2020 at <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/future-development/2017/01/11/how-successful-were-the-millennium-development-goals/>.
- Meadowcroft, J. (2007). Who is in charge here? Governance for sustainable development in a complex world. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 9(3–4), 299–314.
- Mourmouras, A., & Boughton, J.M. (2002). *Is Policy Ownership an Operational Concept?* Washington, DC: IMF.
- Oakman, D. (2001). The seed of freedom: regional security and the Colombo Plan. *Australian Journal of Politics & History*, 46(1), 67–85.
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2005). *Evaluating Public Participation in Policy Making*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2009). *Policy Ownership and Aid Conditionality in the Light of the Financial Crisis: A Critical Review*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Paoli, L. (2003). Politics: bringing the public back into public policymaking. In I. Kaul, P. Conceicao, K.L. Gouvlén & R.U. Mendoza (eds), *Providing Global Public Goods* (pp. 181–4). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Peck, J., Theodore, N., & Brenner, N. (2012). Neoliberalism resurgent? Market rule. *South Atlantic Quarterly*, 111(2), 261–88.
- Pieterse, J.N. (2010). *Development Theory: Deconstructions/Reconstructions*. London: SAGE.
- Platteau, J.-P. (2004). Monitoring elite capture in community-driven development. *Development and Change*, 35(2), 223–46.
- Polanyi, K. ([1944] 2001). *The Great Transformation*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Porter, D., & Craig, D. (2004). The third way and the third world: poverty reduction and social inclusion in the rise of ‘inclusive’ liberalism. *Review of International Political Economy*, 11(2), 387–423.
- Raco, M. (2005). Sustainable development, rolled-out neoliberalism and sustainable communities. *Antipode*, 37(2), 324–47.
- Rodrick, D. (2007). *One Economics, Many Recipes: Globalization, Institutions, and Economic Growth*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. New York: Knopf.
- Sørensen, G. (2004). *The Transformation of the State: Beyond the Myth of Retreat*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stiglitz, J.E. (1998). Knowledge for development: economic science, economic policy, and economic advice. In B. Pleskovic & J.E. Stiglitz (eds), *Annual World Bank Conference on Development Economics* (pp. 9–58). Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Tausch, A. (2010). Globalisation and development: the relevance of classical ‘dependency’ theory for the world today. *International Social Science Journal*, 61(202), 467–88.
- Todaro, M., & Smith, S.C. (2020). *Economic Development*. London: Pearson.
- United Nations (UN) (2012). *The Future We Want*. New York: UN General Assembly. Accessed 27 December 2020 at https://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/66/288&Lang=E.
- United Nations (UN) (2015a). *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2015*. New York: UN.
- United Nations (UN) (2015b). *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. New York: UN.
- Weiss, L. (2009). Introduction: bringing domestic institutions back in. In L. Weiss (eds), *States in the Global Economy: Bringing Domestic Institutions Back In* (online edition). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Williamson, J. (2000). What should the World Bank think about the Washington Consensus? *The World Bank Research Observer*, 15(2), 251–64.
- World Bank (1995). *Strengthening the Effectiveness of Aid: Lessons from Donors*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

- Young, J. (2005). Research, policy and practice: why developing countries are different. *Journal of International Development*, 17, 727–34.
- Zafarullah, H., & Huque, A.S. (2012). *Managing Development in a Globalized World: Concepts, Processes, Institutions*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Zittoun, P. (2014). *The Political Process of Policymaking: A Pragmatic Approach to Public Policy*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.