




## Chapter 3

# The Disciplinary Power of Eurocentrism: Development Studies in the United Kingdom and Ethiopia

Wei Ye 

*The Institute for International Affairs  
The Chinese University of Hong Kong   
Shenzhen, China*

### Introduction

Eurocentrism in the knowledge production of social sciences is increasingly criticised for the lack of social relevance in non-Western countries. This is particularly the case in development studies. Born primarily in the U.K., development studies concern non-Western countries, while it differentiates itself from the anthropological focus on the way of beings in the non-Western world. It concerns the transformation of developing countries and integrates knowledge from various disciplines, including economics, political science, sociology, anthropology, geography, etc. Over time, development studies has evolved beyond its initial focus on economic development to encompass broader dimensions, including economic, social, and human aspects. Ironically, development studies is committed to developing countries' distinctiveness while dedicated to producing similarities to the West in its knowledge production (Corbridge, 2007). Despite the popularity of the critical stance, empirical research on how Eurocentrism maintains and exercises its power in development studies to produce irrelevant knowledge of the Global South are limited. Particularly, how Eurocentric knowledge maintains its authoritative power in an era when flourishing national development in developing



countries drives their higher education expansion and knowledge production remains unveiled.

This chapter employs Michel Foucault's genealogical methods of knowledge and power as the analytic framework to explore the research question. The analytic framework focuses on how development knowledge evolves to form disciplinary power and how the disciplinary power is exercised beyond geographic boundaries through hierarchical observation, normalising judgement, and examination. It investigates development studies programmes in 131 top ten institutions in the United Kingdom (UK), as well as in 44 state universities in Ethiopia, to investigate how Eurocentric disciplinary power is established and reproduced. Ethiopia is selected as a critical case. Theoretically, as the only African country that was not colonised, Ethiopia is more likely to sustain its indigenous knowledge and develop endogenous knowledge based on its indigenous tradition, especially in a post-colonial field like development studies. However, the Eurocentric development knowledge and disciplinary power, reinforced by the uneven post-war power structure, shape development studies in Ethiopia. This chapter reveals the covert mechanisms through which Western-centric knowledge and practices are reproduced in development studies in Ethiopia.

The chapter is structured as follows: First, it examines the concept of academic disciplines in higher education and the necessity to employ Foucault's genealogical methods to explore the mechanism of how the disciplinary power of Eurocentrism is exercised in development studies across geographic boundaries. Second, it employs genealogical analysis to examine the Eurocentric origin of modern academic disciplines to locate the discursive regime that defines truth in social sciences. Then, it traces the emergence and evolution of development studies and the knowledge shifts. The central inquiry pertains to identifying whom discourse serves and how. Third, it investigates the rise of development studies as in British universities to explore how the disciplinary power formed and exercised within and beyond the UK. Fourth, it examines development studies in Ethiopia; particularly how it is transferred from development institutes

funded initially by Western donors and how it is continuously influenced by development aid. Finally, it concludes the chapter by arguing that the disciplinary power of Eurocentrism shapes the intuitional development of development studies in Ethiopia through development aid.

### **Academic Disciplines and the Genealogy of Knowledge and Power: An Analytic Framework**

Academic disciplines are entities in the higher education system based on recognisable intellectual, institutional, and cultural structures. A discipline suggests a specific knowledge domain based on intellectual validity (Becher & Trowler, 2001:41). It implies a shared concern for subject matter, concepts, theories, methods, and epistemological considerations that attain a certain extent of international validity. Academic disciplines usually involve institutional recognition manifested in organisational structures in universities and professional associations (Becher & Trowler, 2001:41). It argues that disciplines are the primary organising base in universities. They serve as the fundamental framework for departments and research centres to conduct teaching and research activities and to facilitate knowledge production (Clark, 1983:14). Alongside the organisational settings in universities, professional associations are crucial to fostering the disciplinary development of specific domains. Many emerged to support specific disciplines by building a community, publishing journals, establishing standards, disseminating knowledge, and raising public awareness (National Academies, 2005:137). Disciplinary cultures exert a less overt yet influential force in shaping disciplines. Individuals are socialised by the cultural structures of disciplines and, in return, shape the structures. On the one hand, attaining membership in a particular discipline is exemplified by the mastery of intellectual discourse, commitment to collegiality, and conformity to norms (Becher, 1981; Becher & Trowler, 2001:47). On the other hand, individuals' professional experiences, particularly in the same domains of their academic endeavours, also influence the academy (Potts, 1997:224). Disciplinarity defines curricula through institutional

structure in universities, quality research through prestigious journals of disciplinary associations, and academic recruitment and promotion standards based on institutional structure and academic journals (Repko et al., 2020:32–33).

Despite identical similarities persisting within disciplines, geographical disparities exist. The geographical differences of a given discipline are confined by the specific situation of economic development, education systems, and socio-cultural elements (Becher, 1981; Becher & Trowler, 2001:43). Taking economics as an example, Keith Tribe (2022:364) notes that by the late 1940s, the institutional development of taught programmes in Economics at undergraduate and graduate levels in the US was more established and closely linked to employment than that in Britain. The restrictions in post-war Britain are attributable to resistance from the labour market, influenced by the education system and socio-cultural factors. It is suggested that post-war Britain's socially selective schooling system prevented most pupils from qualifying for university entrance. Consequently, the chance to attend university was primarily a privilege of the middle class. Their motivation for attending higher education was cultural rather than vocational. Therefore, Economics in British universities was more about courses for independent research than degree programmes (Tribe, 2022:365–367).

However, discussions on geographical disparities of disciplines primarily focus on the institutional dimension. Disciplinary cultures transcend geographical boundaries. Despite phenotypical variations, the genotypical culture of a particular discipline is identical (Ruscio, 1987:363). It is observed that international disciplinary associations manifest collective norms, exert implicit control on curricula, and create a common base for transnational inquiry (Becher, 1994). The intellectual dimension, or knowledge production, is more intricate.

On the one hand, the intellectual validity of a discipline implies international recognition of shared subject matter, theories, and methods. Thus, economists from different countries understand each other in their academic

communication (Becher & Trowler, 2001:44). On the other hand, this shared intellectual validity, particularly in many social science disciplines, is increasingly deemed as the hegemony of Western knowledge or Eurocentrism. Eurocentrism in knowledge production of social sciences in non-Western countries is described as the lack of social relevance resulting from colonialism and political influence (Shin et al., 2023). Nevertheless, how Eurocentric knowledge maintains its authoritative power, particularly in an era when flourishing national and societal development in developing countries drives their higher education expansion, remains unveiled. More specifically, for development studies, a discipline born in decolonisation concerned with developing countries, how does Eurocentric knowledge win and exercise its power?

Michel Foucault's genealogical methods shed light on developing an analytic framework of knowledge and power. This framework helps to investigate how Eurocentric knowledge exercises its power in development studies across geographical boundaries. Foucault considers modern society a disciplinary society where power is exercised to regulate individuals (Foucault, 1977:193-194). According to his argument, discipline serves as a means to exercise power. It can be realised by the organisation of space (e.g., prisons, schools, hospitals, etc.), time (e.g., timetables for work, study, etc.), and activities (Foucault, 1977:147-161). Disciplinary control is achieved through *hierarchical observation*, *normalising judgement*, and *examination*. Combining hierarchical observation and normalising judgement, the examination deploys force and defines truth (Foucault, 1977:184). In this sense, *examination* exemplifies the power/knowledge nexus. In particular, Foucault argues that education is a channel through which individuals gain access to discourse. Education systems are political means with knowledge and power, aiming to maintain or alter the control over discourse (Foucault, 1972:227).

In Foucault's account, academic disciplines are anonymous systems in which objects, methods, true propositions, rules, definitions, techniques, and tools exist and interplay. The inclusion of a proposition in a discipline is

contingent upon its association with particular theoretical fields. It should be “true,” which is subject to its conformity to the rules of renewable discursive policy. A discipline is not a sum of truths or acceptable propositions. Instead, it suggests a control system in discourse production and the continuous power of renewing rules (Foucault, 1972:224). Foucault considers power a productive network that forms knowledge and discourse. The transformation of empirical knowledge implies the discursive regime that formulates scientific truth (Foucault, 1980:112). Understanding this discursive regime requires reflections on the effects of power on scientific statements, what constitutes the mechanism of this power, and how and when this mechanism undergoes global changes. He then situates these questions in genealogy, a historical framework examining the formation of knowledge and discourse (Foucault, 1980:117). The genealogical analysis examines discursive formations or epistemes, either in defiance of or with the assistance of these systems of constraint. It investigates the particular norms governing each discourse and the circumstances surrounding their emergence, development, and divergence (Foucault, 1972:234-235).

Drawing on Foucault’s insights on discipline and genealogy, this chapter advances an analytic framework that focuses on historical accounts of how knowledge evolves and how disciplinary power is exercised within and beyond geographic boundaries. Specifically, it helps us to formulate a set of guiding questions: 1) How is “truth” defined in social sciences and development studies? 2) How does development knowledge evolve and transcend geographic boundaries to become recognised as “global knowledge”? 3) To whom do development knowledge and practices cater? 4) What kind of power is exercised, and in what manner, through the epistemes and practice of development studies? Guided by these questions, this chapter examines how the disciplinary power 1) is achieved through the organisation of space, teaching, and research activities in British universities; 2) is exercised beyond geographic boundaries to Ethiopia through *hierarchical observation*, *normalising judgement*, and *examination* supported

by uneven power structures in international relations and international development cooperation.

### **Knowledge Professionalisation, Institutionalised Social Sciences, and Development Studies**

Academic disciplines in academies resulted from the professionalisation of knowledge in Europe in the nineteenth century which was driven by epistemological and social changes after the Middle Ages. With the rise of modern science, characterised by the Scientific Revolution, empirical science prevailed over metaphysics in the new age. Enlightenment thinkers advocated empiricism based on the scientific method of observation and experimentation. The triumph of empirical science implies profound epistemological changes that eventually led to the separation of natural sciences and philosophy in the nineteenth century. Natural sciences were then institutionalised with the rise of royal academies (Henry, 2002:1-11).

Secularisation separated religious power from science and political life. Martin Luther's thought of the two kingdoms paved the way for the separation of church and state. Modern concepts of sovereignty, state, and state structure in Europe emerged after the Thirty Years' War. The demand to serve modern states' functions and explain social systems arose. This demand was further enriched as the Industrial Revolution generated pressing needs in various fields related to industrial processes and in social sciences to explain the rapid social changes. Accordingly, new categories of knowledge emerged and classified as disciplines in universities for knowledge and talent producing. By the early twentieth century, History, Economics, Sociology, Political Science, and Anthropology were established as the primary foundation of social science disciplines in major European countries. Europe's dominance across the globe further reinforced the institutionalisation of social sciences. With the shift of political and economic power from Europe to the US in the post-1945 era, the US dominates defining issues,

methodology, and priorities. It strengthens scientific paradigms in social sciences (Wallerstein, 1996:34).

The split between natural science and philosophy and the social demand in the nineteenth century constructed the epistemic tradition of social sciences with a preference for positivist epistemology and Darwinian influence on theories. The dominance of Newtonian science over philosophy led to heightened expectations for the social sciences to integrate more closely with positivist approaches on the epistemological spectrum of disciplines (Wallerstein, 1996:10–20). Charles Darwin's theory of evolution by natural selection played a crucial role in shaping social science theories, particularly in understanding social change and development. The concept of social Darwinism, raised by Herbert Spencer, was coined by influential scholars in disciplines such as Sociology, Anthropology, and Political Science, suggesting that societies evolved through competition and the survival of the fittest. Despite positivist epistemology's emphasis on the objectivity of knowledge, the Darwinian influence subtly legitimates the superiority of Europe over the rest of the world (Wallerstein, 1996:29). Europe, as the "Western" civilisation, demonstrated superior productive and military prowess at that time. The survival of the fittest legitimated the self-evident superiority (Wallerstein, 1996:29). This is especially manifested in anthropological and sociological studies on race, culture, civilisation, and social changes. Particularly in development studies, this superiority is manifested in modernisation theories which considered European experience as the final stage of developing countries (Rostow, 1959) and claimed that traditional thoughts impeded "underdeveloped" countries to progress (Parsons, 1964).

As revealed above, the rise and evolution of social sciences embody the secular state over the church in governing individuals' lives and empiricism over metaphysics in understanding social reality. The new formation, i.e., secular state, and epistemology, i.e., empiricism, do not signify the vanishment of the old ones. Instead, it implies that another form of power necessitates undergoing genealogical

analysis, that concerns the discursive regime that defines propositions in social sciences, how power is exercised through discursive formation, and whom discourse serves and how. The power of defining propositions as scientifically true in social sciences is constituted by the interplay of the Eurocentric institutionalisation of social sciences and the episteme, which implicitly reinforces the Eurocentric institutionalisation worldwide.

On the one hand, in the late nineteenth century, social sciences were divided into disciplines concerning the “modern” world, i.e., idiographic history, economics, political science, and sociology, and disciplines concerning the “non-modern” world, i.e., anthropology and oriental studies (Wallerstein, 1996:36). This Eurocentric divide reflected the social demands of industrialised countries at that time and their viewpoints of the rest of the world. At the same time, this divide shaped those disciplines’ issue areas and priorities as the institutionalisation of social sciences expanded with Europe’s superiority over the rest of the world. Modern universities in the US inherited European models, particularly the German and British ones while developing their peculiar competence based on their distinctive labour market and funding demand (Tribe, 2022:21). This peculiar competence primarily includes supporting the economic base for higher learning (Kohler, 1990), maintaining powerful academic disciplines (Abbott, 2001:122), and gaining rapid academic vitality measured by international recognition (Tribe, 2022:31).

The unique feature of dual institutionalisation of academic disciplines further granted American universities the resilience of academic disciplines (Abbott, 2001:126). In this dual institutionalisation, on the one hand, academic disciplines, rather than universities, constitute the labour market. On the other hand, the disciplinary system is applied in individual universities. Consequently, the disciplinary system paves the way for faculties and students’ careers, which cannot be deprived by universities (Abbott. 2001:126). With this dual institutionalisation, disciplinary structures remain in degree programmes even if departments are merged (Abbott, 2001:128).

As the American variant does not touch upon episteme, it does not impede the Eurocentric institutionalisation of knowledge. Instead, it reinforces the disciplinary power and resilience of academic disciplines. This reinforced disciplinary power expanded to the rest of the world with the US's superiority of political and economic power in the post-1945 era.

However, political and economic power alone cannot realise the institutionalisation of social sciences globally, as they do not necessarily generate the power to define propositions as scientifically valid in social sciences. Instead, the epistemic tradition does. The Darwinian influence on theories and preference for positivist epistemology subtly justifies Eurocentrism in the episteme of social sciences. Based on the evolution theory, modernisation theories consider the European experience as the model for economic and societal development and argue that developing countries are at different stages of the path. The positivist epistemology in social sciences further supports the legitimacy of Eurocentrism. By emphasising scientific methods, empirical data, and generalised laws, nomothetic social sciences, i.e., Economics, Political Science, and Sociology, claim their universal application. Scientific paradigms in social sciences are further strengthened with the spillover effect of the US economic expansion and investment in science (Wallerstein, 1996:35). Therefore, the combination of Darwinian influence and positivist epistemology justifies the Eurocentric episteme in social sciences as global knowledge. With its implicitly recognised universality, the global knowledge is reproducing itself in developing countries.

The knowledge production of development studies is a compelling case, exemplifying the above-mentioned interplay of Eurocentric institutionalisation and episteme. Over time, development studies has evolved beyond its initial focus on economic development to encompass broader dimensions, including economic, social, and human aspects. The changes are manifested in knowledge shifts in development theories, which are both epistemological and political. Modernisation theories (Rostow, 1959; Parsons, 1964) gained significant popularity during the initial years following World War II (WWII).

As discussed previously, modernisation theories consider industrialised nations' experience as the model for economic and societal development. Developing countries are considered at different stages of the path (Rostow, 1959). Apart from the Eurocentric episteme, modernisation theories also ignored the epistemological divergence between universality and particularity. The concept of development was quite politicised in the ideological rivalry of the Cold War in which the UK stood with the US bloc. For instance, US President Truman (1949) stated development as the growth of underdeveloped regions based on material resources and progress driven by industrial and scientific knowledge and democracy. This address created a plausible correlation between the concern of development and modernisation theories, which argue for a common modernisation path for all.

Modernisation theories were strongly criticised for their epistemological parochialism and failure in the non-Western world by dependency and structuralist theories in the 1970s. The dependency theory and the world-systems theory contributed to the knowledge of development from a structural perspective by criticising the negative effect of the spread of capitalism in shaping the unequal structure of the world economy. It is argued that the global capitalist system shapes the central-periphery relationship, which grants industrialised countries the structural advantage of exploiting developing countries (Prebisch, 1962; Cardoso, 1972; Wallerstein, 1976). Dependency and world-systems theories emerged as macro-level theories that focused on structural forces while overlooking local factors that could contribute to divergent development processes and outcomes. Therefore, it was more of a critical stance rather than providing feasible solutions.

The neoliberalist shift occurred during the global economic recession and debt crisis of the 1970s and 1980s, wherein developing countries, having borrowed extensively from multinational agencies and developed countries to fund large-scale infrastructure projects, faced difficulties repaying their debts. Development economics, which emphasises state intervention and investment in infrastructure, was criticised

for its unproductive implications in developing countries (Kay, 1993). Drawing upon classical liberalist principles of *laissez-faire*, neoliberalism argues that economic growth is attained through diminishing government intervention and unleashing the market's "invisible hand." Neoliberal packages of policy reform, known as the structural adjustment programme (SAP), were prescribed by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund to Latin American debtors and proliferated to Africa, Asia, and post-communist countries (Peet & Hartwick, 2015:98-105). The Washington Consensus, raised by John Williamson in 1989, further strengthened the orthodoxy of neoliberalism. Based on this implicit orthodoxy and their dominant role in the international development cooperation architecture, international organisations also impose *normalising judgement* and *examination* on developing countries. Through the neoliberal policy reform attached to their financial assistance, those international organisations essentially considered neoliberalism as the norm for developing countries' development. With their dominant role in the international development cooperation architecture, they are also examiners to monitor and evaluate development progress in developing countries. Similar to modernisation theories, neoliberalism maintains the Eurocentric episteme and overemphasises universality.

While neoliberalism continues to prevail, post-developmental thoughts have emerged to influence development knowledge. Post-developmentalists (Sachs, 1992:1-5; Escobar, 2010:1-65; Ziai, 2017) strongly criticise the universality of the market, productivity, and materialistic needs of humans. Instead, they considered economics as cultural values rather than a universal science. They pay attention to various dimensions of economics and advocate alternatives to development rather than alternative development, which is still based on the original power structure (Ziai, 2017). While exhibiting internal divergence, post-developmentalists emphasise endogenous development rooted in local contexts, prompting critical reflections on the Eurocentric nature of development knowledge and practice. Post-developmentalism expands the scope of development studies to encompass issues

such as basic human needs, environmental sustainability, and gender equality. In contrast to other theoretical streams that tend to overemphasise universality, post-developmentalism highlights the significance of particularity. However, it is an ongoing process of theorisation.

As the above shifts revealed, despite struggling and reflection, development studies has yet to escape the profound influence of Eurocentrism. Development studies is committed to developing countries' distinctiveness while dedicated to producing similarities to the West in its knowledge production (Corbridge, 2007). Therefore, developing countries appear as subjects without subjectivity under the Western gaze, which implies *hierarchical observation* in Foucault's terminology. The epistemological tradition of overemphasising universality in development knowledge and policy production strengthens the Eurocentric episteme in development knowledge.

### **Development Studies as a British Discipline**

After WWII, development studies emerged as an interdisciplinary discipline, or more precisely an interdisciplinary field targeting the transformation of developing countries. It is primarily a British field regarding its institutional settings (Harriss, 2005:18). This is closely linked to decolonisation. With the unfolding of decolonisation in the post-1945 era, the UK faced a shift in focus from governing colonies to fostering development in newly independent nations. Development studies then differentiates itself from the anthropological focus on the way of beings in the non-Western world. It integrates knowledge from various disciplines, such as Economics, Political Science, Sociology, Anthropology, and Geography. Based on the colonial tie and Britain's historical involvement in colonial administration, British universities have developed expertise in multidisciplinary African and Asian studies. This foundation allowed them to engage with development challenges in developing countries.

Along with the expansion of the UK's higher education system in the 1960s, multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary

studies were considered the new direction in expanding teaching programmes. In this context, the institutional setting for development studies emerged in British universities (Kothari, 2005:23). In 1966, the Institute of Development Studies was founded at the University of Sussex as Britain's first national institute of development studies (Jolly, 2008). The first undergraduate programme in development studies was established at the University of East Anglia in 1973 (Harriss, 2005:23). Since then, development studies has flourished in universities in the UK. In 1978, the Development Studies Association was founded to serve as a platform to promote research and facilitate networking within the development studies community in the UK. However, over time, its influence and reach have extended far beyond the UK borders (Tribe, 2009).

With strong policy attention, development studies is also influenced by aid agencies and international organisations. This influence is manifested in both teaching and research. The rise of development studies is partly driven by the demand to train professionals for international development. Aid agencies and international organisations are also major fund providers for the research of development studies. Research shows that most research funding for development studies in the UK from 2000 to 2007 came from the UK's Department for International Development (DFID), the World Bank, the European Union, and other official aid agencies (Colclough, 2010). The talent demand and funding pattern suggest a close link between university knowledge production and policy practices. As former colonial officers involved in teaching development studies and providing policy consultancy for aid agencies, international organisations, and non-governmental organisations (Kothari, 2005:52), this connection is further reinforced with a complex and contradictory influence both sustaining and challenging colonialism. If seen from the perspective of developing countries, an "other" created development studies as a discipline specifically on developing countries primarily based on the former's policy and practice of delivering aid to those countries. With the knowledge produced by British universities

informing the policy practice of aid agencies and international organisations in developing countries, developing countries appear as subjects without subjectivity in development studies.

The initial disciplinary practice of development studies works through the institutional setting at universities. Research centres and teaching programmes provide the initial institutionalised space and timetables to regulate the teaching, learning, and research of development studies. While less mature than traditional disciplines, the institutionalisation of development studies is making significant progress. According to *Top Universities*, world university rankings by subject 2023, the top ten universities in the UK that are best for development studies include the University of Sussex, SOAS University of London, the London University of Economics and Political Science (LSE), University of Oxford, University of Cambridge, The University of Manchester, University of East Anglia (UEA), University of Leeds, The University of Edinburgh, King's College London (KCL) (QS, 2025). As illustrated in Table 1, seven of them have established independent departments / schools / institutes to provide degree programmes on development studies. Three of them, i.e., the University of Cambridge, the University of Leeds, and The University of Edinburgh, place development studies programmes under politics-related departments. As shown in Table 2, more than half of them have developed undergraduate programmes on international development or global development.

Apart from SOAS, which insists on the Department of Development Studies, the remaining six name those independent units as Department / School / Institute of International Development or Global Development. This naming approach more accurately reflects the nature of development studies in the UK, which is about the development beyond the UK. Thus, this discipline for developing countries is clearly about their national development, while it concerns other countries' development for the UK. The UK's position as a knowledge hub of development studies is complicated. Therefore, its lens is neither cosmopolitan nor endogenous. International or global development suggests a broader scope

and vision beyond developing countries, while it essentially concerns developing countries.

**Table 1:** Top Ten Universities for Development Studies 2023, UK

		University	Unit
Independent Unit	1	Sussex	Department of International Development
	2	SOAS	Department of Development Studies
	3	LSE	Department of International Development
	4	Oxford	Department of International Development
	5	Manchester	Global Development Institute
	6	UAE	School of Global Development
	7	KCL	Department of International Development
Politics-related Unit	1	Cambridge	Department of Politics and International Studies (Center of Development Studies)
	2	Leeds	School of Politics and International Studies
	3	Edinburgh	School of social and political science

*Source: compiled by the author based on information from the QS (2025) and official webpages of the universities.*

Education systems are primarily part of the public system to serve the country. Developing human resources through education for the country is especially the case for post-colonial countries where an established education system to develop human resources for the country did not exist. Universities and academic disciplines largely serve this purpose in such countries at least at the initial stages of national development. Specifically, regarding development studies, the initial establishment of development studies institutions in African and Asian countries were supported by Western countries.

**Table 2:** Undergraduate Programmes Amongst the Top Ten Universities for Development Studies 2023, UK

University	U.G. Programme	No.
Sussex	BA Anthropology and International Development, BA Economics and International Development, BA Geography and International Development, BA International Development, BA International Development with a Language, BA International Relations and Development, BA Sociology and International Development	7
SOAS	BA Global Development, BA Global Development and (Languages/Languages and Cultures/Linguistics/East Asian Studies/Economics/History/History of Art//Music/International Relations/Law/Politics/Social Anthropology/World Philosophies)	2
Manchester	BSc Global Development	1
UEA	BA (Hons) in Geography and International Development, BA (Hons) in International Development, BSc (Hons) in International Development and the Environment, BA (Hons) in International Development with Anthropology, BA (Hons) in International Development with Politics, BA (Hons) International Development with Economics, BA (Hons) Media and International Development	7
Leeds	BA International Development	1
KCL	BA International Development	1

*Source: compiled by the author based on information from the official webpages of the universities.*

Those African and Asian countries developed such institutions to contribute to their own national development rather than being interested in how Western countries would develop better, or just developing a university showcase. For developed countries like the UK, development studies has been about the development of other (poor) countries since the very beginning. But for a country like Kenya just after its independence, the UK-supported DS institution is about Kenya's own development. However, the institutionalisation of development studies in universities granted the UK authority of knowledge

and, therefore, disciplinary power in development studies. This disciplinary power is exercised through its academic influence in developing countries and connects with the development industry.

How disciplinary power is exercised through the connection with the development industry is mainly manifested in taught master's programmes. Amongst the 131 programmes, 91 are taught master's programmes, accounting for 70% of the total. Unlike undergraduate programmes, which are general or with discipline-based concentrations, taught master's programmes usually have issue- or function-based specialisations. Environment and climate change, conflict and security, migration, gender issues, humanitarianism, and education are popular specialisations of taught master's programmes in international development. Functions related to development planning, financing, management, and evaluation are also found in the concentrations. As these programmes aim to train development professionals, field trips and engagement with development projects are included in some programmes. Some of the students enrolled in such programmes already possess prior professional experience. Therefore, development knowledge is transmitted from universities to the development industry, while students' prior experience also informs knowledge production in universities. This two-way transmission strengthens universities' power of discursive formation in development studies.

Compared to taught master's programmes, undergraduate programmes are more general or with discipline-based focuses. Anthropology, Economics, Geography, Sociology, International Relations, and Politics are primary disciplines that are combined in the discipline-based focuses. As discussed previously, those disciplines also support the interdisciplinary field of development studies. Therefore, the knowledge taught in general programmes without discipline-based focuses is also informed by such disciplines. A further examination of the modules that these undergraduate and postgraduate programmes offer reveals that Economics and development theories, policy, and practice are shared foundation knowledge in teaching. It is also the case

in taught master's programmes and research programmes. Since the Eurocentric episteme profoundly shapes these social sciences disciplines and development knowledge, Eurocentrism is unconsciously reproduced in the teaching to some extent. As British universities become hubs for development studies that attract scholars and students from developing countries, their institutionalisation and episteme expand beyond the UK's boundary. The post-developmental preference manifested in the concentrations of taught master's programmes may imply reflections on Eurocentrism. However, whether such concentrations also exemplify the agenda setting of the West on developing countries required scrutiny of the issue areas and knowledge production of development studies in developing countries. The following section examines development studies in Ethiopia.

### **Development Studies as a Discipline in Ethiopia**

The emergence of development studies in Africa diverges from the context in the UK. In the case of most African countries, the inception of development studies reflects their internal quest for national development following independence. This internal pursuit necessitates establishing national systems and various sectors to foster development. However, these development endeavours were intricately intertwined with external influences, driven by the US-Soviet competition during the Cold War and the rise of international organisations and development agencies. The US-Soviet competition incentivised both sides to vie for and support their respective allies in Africa through foreign aid. These allies, in turn, chose either capitalist or socialist development models based on their relationships with the competing powers. Concurrently, with international organisations gaining prominence in the development field and establishing the OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development)-dominated architecture of international development cooperation, the Western neoliberal development model has profoundly influenced aid-dependent Africa. Consequently, Africa has become an experimental arena where different development models are tested, and this distinctive

attribute inevitably shapes the field of development studies on the continent.

This is also the case in Ethiopia. Ethiopia's demand for national development is endogenous, while the discipline of development studies is profoundly shaped by development aid, which is external to the country. During the Cold War, despite the fact that being a non-colony prevented Ethiopia from the type of aid based on colonial ties (Abegaz, 1999), Ethiopia was deeply involved in ideological and geopolitical competition. The imperial government of Ethiopia (until 1974) was a major strategic partner and aid recipient of the US. This was attributable to Ethiopia's strategic location in the Horn of Africa (The Reporter, 2025), its leadership in African unity and stability (The Reporter, 2025), and its famine as a potential seedbed for communist revolution (Kissi, 2000). Consequently, military and food assistance were the priorities of USAID (United States Agency for International Development) in Ethiopia. In 1972, the Institute of Development Research (IDR) was established at Haile Selassie I University (the predecessor of Addis Ababa University, hereafter AAU) in collaboration with USAID and Ford Foundation to facilitate indigenous development research and support their development projects. Conformed to the contracts of the US side, the IDR concentrated on agricultural and rural development in Ethiopia and developed a social sciences-oriented feature (Sisaye, 1978). The socialist revolution in 1974 led to the Derg regime (1974-1991), which developed a close tie with Moscow and embraced a centrally planned economic approach. Western influences were portrayed in the manner of the ideological competition between the US and the Soviet Union. Although the socialist ideology prevented Ethiopia from neoliberal reform, Official Development Assistance (ODA) to Ethiopia and the US humanitarian aid in response to famine continued (Abegaz, 1999; The Reporter, 2025). Intertwined with humanitarian purposes, humanitarian aid was deployed by the US as a tool to weaken the Derg regime (Poster, 2012).

Because of its domestic political situation, Ethiopia's exposure to the neoliberal SAP was later than that of many African countries. After the Ethiopian People's Revolutionary

Democratic Front (EPRDF) came into power in 1991, the World Bank acknowledged the EPRDF's liberal gesture. It launched the Emergency Recover and Reconstruction Program (ERRP) in Ethiopia. Donors of the ERRP included the International Development Association, UNDP, African Development Bank, European Economic Commission, European Investment Bank, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the US (World Bank, 1992). In 1996, the Center for Regional and Local Development Studies (RLDS) was set up in AAU in collaboration with the Institute of Social Studies in The Hague as part of a capacity-building project funded by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Ahadu, 2019).

As revealed above, the initial establishment of development research institutes in Ethiopia was shaped by foreign aid. However, the USAID and aid from international organisations shaped development research institutes in Ethiopia in distinctive ways. In the USAID, primarily in the form of military and food assistance, Ethiopia appeared as a subject of the ideological and geopolitical competition which was essentially about the US and Soviet Union. Despite the critical importance of agricultural development to national development from the Ethiopian side, the ultimate goal of the US intention to support IDR was to prevent communism and, later on, to weaken the new socialist regime. In this sense, Ethiopia was a subject under the gaze of the US and Soviet Union. By contrast, development aid initiated by international organisations shaped Ethiopia's development research institutes in the knowledge dimension. Capacity-building projects were the primary means of transmitting Western development knowledge and agendas to Ethiopia. Such knowledge and agendas have become central themes in Ethiopian development studies, serving as the basis for normative judgements. The evolving institutional setting of development studies in Ethiopia, which I will discuss in the following section, further reveals how normalising judgement occurs.

## **The Institutional Setting of Development Studies in Ethiopian Universities**

In contrast to the initial establishment, the formal institutional settings of development studies, manifested as teaching and research programmes in departments / institutes / colleges of universities, have been established with the expansion of Ethiopia's higher education driven by national development. The ERRP later transferred into an SAP, which triggered neoliberal reforms, including devaluing the Ethiopian currency and privatising public enterprises. Nevertheless, the EPRDF rejected Western donors' demands for liberalising land, banking, telecommunication, and energy sectors (Feyissa, 2011). The tension projected the EPRDF's agency in managing donor relations and the divergence of development approaches. This divergence was more overt when the EPRDF embraced the developmental state approach in the 2000s.

Along with the agricultural development-led industrialisation adopted since 1994, the developmental state approach has long been a dominant discourse in the development process of Ethiopia (OECD/PSI, 2020:125). From 2005 to 2019, Ethiopia achieved a double-digit annual gross domestic product (GDP) growth rate (African Development Bank, 2022). Higher education in Ethiopia has expanded rapidly since the mid-2000s to serve national development. New universities and institutes are built to serve industrial policy based on international experiences, particularly those of Germany and East Asian emerging economies (Oqubay & Lin, 2019). A number of teaching programmes and departments on development studies have also been set up.

As illustrated in Table 3, amongst the 44 public universities listed on the official webpage of the Ministry of Education, three have established independent colleges or institutes for development studies. In 2008, AAU integrated the original IDR, RLDS, and the Institute for Gender Studies (IGS) to form the country's first College of Development Studies (COD) to conduct postgraduate training and research. The COD comprises six centres on environment and development studies,

gender studies, population studies, rural development studies, food security studies, and local and regional development studies, respectively (AAU, 2023a). The Institute of Policy and Development Research and the Institute of Environment, Gender, and Development Studies were established at Hawassa University and Mekelle University, respectively, in subsequent years. Below the college or institute level, the institutional setting of development studies is situated in the College of Business and Economics (CBE) and the College of Social Science and Humanities (CSSH). Fourteen universities have built the Public Administration and Development Management in the CBE, while six universities locate development studies in the CSSH. In the CSSH, gender studies, governance, and environmental management are the concentrations of development studies.

Apart from the comprehensive attention of the COD at AAU, gender, environment, and development management are the core themes of the institutional setting of development studies in Ethiopian universities. Similar to the IDR and RLDS, gender studies in the institutional setting of development studies in Ethiopia is a legacy of development aid intertwined with Ethiopia's higher education expansion. In 1991, the Ethiopian government and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) jointly set up the Centre for Research Training and Information on Women in Development (CRTIWD) under the IDR at AAU. This centre was upgraded to the IGS in 2006 to offer a postgraduate programme, responding to the government's graduate expansion programme (Mulugeta, 2007). By contrast, establishing development management is a proactive response to development aid in the context of higher education expansion. The first Department of Public Administration and Development Management was established in the CBE of AAU in 2004 and has played a critical role in designing the national curriculum on public administration and development management (AAU, 2023b.), which has expanded to 14 public universities. According to AAU, the development management module in the curriculum includes courses on macroeconomics, microeconomics, theories and politics of development, and development administration

(AAU, 2024). The rise of the institutional setting and curriculum of development management is largely a response to the talent demand of the “development industry,” of which Ethiopia is an aid recipient.

**Table 3:** Development Studies in Ethiopian Public Universities

Type	Unit	University	No.
College	COD (2008)	AAU	1
Institute	Institute of Policy and Development Research (2015)	Hawassa	1
	Institute of Environment, Gender and Development Studies	Mekelle	1
Department	Public Administration and Development Management (CBE)	AAU, Ambo, Assosa, Dila, Dire Dawa, Gambella, Haramaya, Injibara, Jigjiga, Kebri Dehar, Mekelle, Wachamo, Warabe, Wollega	14
	Gender and Development Studies (CSSH)	Bahir Dar, Gambella, Gondar	3
	Governance and Development Studies (CSSH)	Mizan-Tepi, Wolkite	2
	Development and Environmental Management Studies (CSSH)	Gondar	1

*Source: compiled by the author based on information from official webpages of the universities*

As discussed above, the institutional setting of development studies as a discipline in Ethiopian universities echoes to the expansion of higher education driven by Ethiopia’s national development. Nevertheless, development aid remains the primary channel through which Eurocentric development theories and themes exert influence. On the one hand,

Ethiopia's rapid economic growth has fostered higher education expansion, resulting in new universities and more disciplines and programmes to accommodate this growth. It is in this context that development studies was established as a discipline and expanded. On the other hand, the core themes of this discipline inherit the initial development research institutes funded by early development aid and proactively responds to talent demands of development assistance. In this sense, the "development industry," dominated by aid agencies and international organisations, implicitly defines the standard of what is useful and should be taught. Therefore, development studies fails to generate endogenous development knowledge derived from local practices. Instead, it is primarily based on the practice of being an aid recipient. In this way, it implicitly positions Ethiopia as a subject under the normalising judgement of Eurocentric development theories and examination by international organisations and aid agencies.

### **The Misperception of Development Studies as a Social Science Discipline**

The normalising judgement and examination also shape the misperception of development studies as a social science discipline in Ethiopia. As the above survey reveals, development studies is primarily set up in the CBE and CSSH in Ethiopian universities, making it a social science discipline. Meanwhile, many development-related issues, such as agriculture, land, water, environment, etc., are addressed in discipline-based colleges, schools, institutes, or departments in natural science. The split of development studies as a social science discipline and development-related issues scattered into natural sciences is partially in line with that in the UK. Nevertheless, in the Ethiopian context, this split was initially shaped by development theories and the interaction of donors' policies, particularly in the field of agricultural and rural development.

In the 1950s and 1960s, agriculture was not given high priority, as Ethiopia's national development strategy was guided by the prevailing development idea of import substitution

industrialisation (OECD/PSI, 2020:121). The initial institutional setting of agriculture in Ethiopia's higher education, manifested in teaching programmes and institutions, was built with the USAID. In 1953, the first Bachelor of Science programme in general agriculture was established, after which various teaching programmes at different degree levels and institutions were set up (Belay, 2008). Giving agriculture was not prioritised in national development strategy; it was largely limited in the domain of natural science in Ethiopia's higher education system.

When it came to the late 1960s, donors' policies, particularly those of the Sweden, World Bank, US, and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, changed to value agriculture in Ethiopia. They incorporated their ideas in Ethiopia's Third-Five Year Development Plan (1968–1973) (Aredo, 1992). While the design and implementation of agricultural plans in Ethiopia was dominated by technical scientists, these international funding agencies had an increasing demand to involve social scientists in planning, formulating, and evaluating their development projects (Sisaye, 1978). As discussed previously, the IDR was established at AAU accordingly and became the initial foundation for disciplinary evolution of development studies in Ethiopia. Donors' demands raised and sustained social science expertise in agricultural and rural development in Ethiopia while not in the way of facilitating integration with natural science. This institutional split contradicts Ethiopia's reality. Unlike developed economies, the agricultural sector in Ethiopia contributes to over one-third of the country's GDP. However, it encounters constraints arising from both abiotic and biotic factors (Wendimu, 2021). Consequently, the integration of natural science and social science becomes particularly significant within the Ethiopian context.

In a nutshell, development theories and the interaction of donors' policies in Ethiopia shape the misperception of development studies as a social science discipline. As discussed, agricultural and rural development was a natural science subject that did not gain primary attention in Ethiopia in the 1950s and 1960s. The prevailing development idea of dependency theory

which emphasises import substitution industrialisation to reduce foreign dependency (Singer, 1950; Prebisch, 1962) shaped this preference. By contrast, the country turned to highlight agriculture in the late 1960s to accommodate donors' demands. Apart from the US' ideological and geopolitical considerations, this shift also projected the implicit influence of modernisation theory which considers agricultural-based economy as the initial stage to the modernisation process to the age of mass high consumption (Rostow, 1959). With donors' rising demands to involve social scientists in planning, formulating, and evaluating their development projects (Sisaye, 1978), social science expertise in agricultural and rural development sustained in Ethiopia with integrating with natural science.

Notably, it is important to acknowledge that the limited incorporation of natural science and social science within development studies in Ethiopia does not suggest the absence of development research within the local context. Various discipline-based institutions such as colleges, schools, institutes, and departments that focus on specific development issues demonstrate substantial endeavours in extensive developmental exploration. Additionally, the comprehensive attention given to development by the COD at AAU holds promise for the integration of development studies.

## **Conclusion**

This chapter explored how Eurocentrism maintains and exercises its power in the discipline of development studies in an era when flourishing national and societal development in developing countries drives their higher education expansion. Drawing on Foucault's insights on discipline and genealogy, it employs genealogical analysis to examine how development knowledge evolves, who discourse serves, and how the disciplinary power of development studies is exercised in the UK and Africa, with Ethiopia as the critical case. It argues that the interplay of the Eurocentric institutionalisation of social sciences and knowledge production constitutes the power of defining propositions as scientifically true in development studies. The combination of Darwinian influence and positivist

epistemology justifies the Eurocentric episteme as global knowledge. Through development aid, which has long been dominated by OECD countries and international organisations, the “global knowledge” on development studies is reproducing in the developing world.

Since the Eurocentric episteme profoundly shapes these social sciences disciplines and development knowledge, Eurocentrism is unconsciously reproduced in higher education institutions and development assistance practice. As British universities become hubs for development studies that attract scholars and students from developing countries, mainly former colonies, their institutionalisation and episteme expand beyond the UK’s external boundaries. The teaching and research of development studies are also influenced by aid agencies and international organisations that fund research and demand professionals in international development. Development knowledge is transmitted from universities to the development industry, while students’ prior experience also informs knowledge production in universities. This two-way transmission strengthens universities’ power of discursive formation in development studies. With the development knowledge production in British universities guiding the policy practice of aid agencies and international organisations in developing countries, developing countries appear as subjects without subjectivity in development studies.

Decolonisation does not lead to the vanishing of uneven power structures. Instead, the previous colonial power structure transferred into the uneven post-war power structure featured by the US-Soviet competition during the Cold War and the divide between developed and developing countries. In this structure, Africa has become an experimental arena where different development models are tested, which inevitably shapes the landscape of development studies on the continent. The power competition during the Cold War and development aid profoundly shapes Ethiopia’s national development and its discipline of development studies. The initial establishment of development research institutes was facilitated by development aid from the US, the Netherlands, and the UNFPA. Despite

development-related intentions, institutes were mainly set up at critical transitions in Ethiopia with donors' geopolitical or ideological considerations and intertwined with prevailing development theories. Particularly in the field of agricultural and rural development, the misperception of development studies as a social science discipline has been shaped by development theories and the interaction of donors' policies in Ethiopia.

The thematic preference of development studies in Ethiopian universities, i.e., gender, environment, development management, was jointly shaped by the origin of Ethiopia's development studies institutions and talent demands arising from development aid. Ethiopia's higher education expansion is driven by economic growth, which propels the institutional setting and expansion of development studies in universities. However, it does not necessarily promote endogenous knowledge production. Development studies proactively responds to the talent demand of development aid to develop new teaching and research programmes. In this sense, similar to that in British universities, Ethiopia remains a subject that has undergone implicitly normalising judgement and examination of Eurocentric development theories, international organisations, and aid agencies. Notably, in a wider sense of development research, various discipline-based institutions such as colleges, schools, institutes, and departments in Ethiopian universities that focus on specific development issues demonstrate substantial endeavours in extensive developmental exploration based on local practice.

## References

- Abegaz, B. 1999. Aid and reform in Ethiopia. In: Devarajan, S., Dollar, D. R. & Holmgren, T. (eds.) *Aid and reform in Africa*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Group. Available at: <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/110381468751519166/Aid-and-reform-in-Africa>
- Abbott, A. 2001. *Chaos of disciplines*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

## How We Teach Africa Matters

- Addis Ababa University (AAU). 2023a. *College of Development Studies*. [Online]. Available at: <https://etd.aau.edu.et/communities/4a722c06-7722-4a9a-b2f8-aff8d06dba4b>
- Addis Ababa University (AAU). 2023b. *Public Administration & Development Management*. AAU. [Online]. Available at: <https://etd.aau.edu.et/communities/46c4e571-04a7-4903-a1a9-67709e29246d> [Accessed: 5 April 2024].
- Addis Ababa University (AAU). 2024. *Overview*. AAU. [Online]. Available at: <https://aau.edu.et/college/CBE>. [Accessed: 5 April 2024].
- African Development Bank. 2022. *Accelerating Growth in Ethiopia: Key Structural Challenges to Address: A Policy Note*. Addis Ababa: African Development Bank Group.
- Ahadu, E. 2019. Assessment practices in the Center for Regional and Local Development Studies, College of Development Studies in Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 10(4):9-25.
- Aredo, D. 1992. Developmental aid and agricultural development policies in Ethiopia 1957-1987. *Africa Development/Afrique et Développement*, 17(3):209-237.
- Becher, T. 1981. Towards a definition of disciplinary cultures. *Studies in Higher Education*, 6(2):109-122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075078112331379362>
- Becher, T. 1994. The significance of disciplinary differences. *Studies in Higher Education*, 19(2):151-161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079412331382007>
- Becher, T. & Trowler, P. 2001. *Academic tribes and territories*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: McGraw-Hill Education.
- Belay, K. 2008. Linkage of higher education with agricultural research, extension and development in Ethiopia. *Higher Education Policy*, 21(2008):275-299. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.hep.8300139>
- Cardoso, F. H. 1972. Dependency and development in Latin America. *New Left Review*, 1(1972):83-95. <https://doi.org/10.64590/5na>
- Clark, B. R. 1983. *The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520340725>

### Chapter 3

- Colclough, C. 2010. Development studies and comparative education: where do they find common cause? *Compare*, 40(6):821–826. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2010.523256>
- Corbridge, S. 2007. The (im) possibility of development studies. *Economy and Society*, 36(2):179–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03085140701264869>
- Escobar, A. 2010. Latin America at a crossroad: alternative modernizations, post-liberalism, or post-development? *Cultural Studies*, 24(1):1–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380903424208>
- Feyissa, D. 2011. Aid negotiation: the uneasy “partnership” between EPRDF and the donors. *Journal of Eastern African Studies*, 5(4):788–817. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17531055.2011.642541>
- Foucault, M. 1972. *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. A. M. S. Smith (transl). New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. 1977. *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. A. Sheridan (transl). New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. 1980. *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–79*. (ed. C. Gordon). New York: Pantheon.
- Gordon, C. (ed.) 1980. *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings* (by M. Foucault). New York: Pantheon.
- Harriss, J. 2005. Great promise, hubris and recovery: A participant’s history of development studies. In: Kothari, U. (ed.) *A radical history of development studies: Individuals, institutions and ideologies*. London: Zed Books.
- Henry, J. 2002. *The scientific revolution and the origins of modern science*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Hong Kong: Palgrave.
- Jolly, R. 2008. *A Short History of IDS: A Personal Reflection*. Discussion paper, no. 388. Available at: <https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/bitstream/item/14972/Dp388.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.
- Kay, C. 1993. For a renewal of development studies: Latin American theories and neoliberalism in the era of structural adjustment. *Third World Quarterly*, 14(4):691–702. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436599308420351>

## How We Teach Africa Matters

- Kissi, E. 2000. The politics of famine in U.S. relations with Ethiopia, 1950–1970. *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 33(1):113–131. <https://doi.org/10.2307/220260>
- Kohler, R. 1990. The Ph.D. machine: building on the collegiate base. *ISIS*, 81(4):638–662. <https://doi.org/10.1086/355543>
- Kothari, U. 2005. From colonial administration to development studies: A post-colonial critique of the history of development studies. In: Kothari, U. (ed.) *A radical history of development studies: Individuals, institutions and ideologies*. London: Zed Books.
- Mulugeta, E. 2007. Trajectory of the Institute of Gender Studies at Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia. *Feminist Africa*, 9(2019):85–92.
- National Academies. 2005. *Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/11153>
- OECD/PSI. 2020. *Rural Development Strategy Review of Ethiopia: Reaping the Benefits of Urbanization*. Paris: OECD Development Pathways & OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/a325a658-en>.
- Oqubay, A. & Lin, J. Y. 2019. *China–Africa and an economic transformation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198830504.001.0001>
- Parsons, T. 1964. Evolutionary universals in society. *American Sociological Review*, 29(3):339–357. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2091479>
- Peet, R. & Hartwick, E. 2015. *Theories of development: Contentions, arguments, alternatives*. New York & London: Guilford Publications.
- Poster, A. 2012. The gentle war: Famine relief, politics, and privatization in Ethiopia, 1983–1986. *Diplomatic History*, 36(2):399–425. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7709.2011.01027.x>
- Potts, A. 1997. *College academics*. Charlestown: William Michael Press.
- Prebisch, R. 1962. The economic development of Latin America and its principal problems. *Economic Bulletin for Latin America*, VII(1):1–22.
- Repko, A. F., Szostak, R. & Buchberger, M. P. 2020. *Introduction to interdisciplinary studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

## Chapter 3

- Rostow, W. W. 1959. The stages of economic growth. *The Economic History Review*, 12(1):1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0289.1959.tb01829.x>
- Ruscio, K. P. 1987. Many sectors, many professions. In: Clark, B. R. (ed.) *The academic profession: National, disciplinary, and institutional settings*. Berkeley: University of California Press. <https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520311329-011>
- Sachs, W. 1992. Introduction. In: Sachs, W. (ed.) *The development dictionary: A guide of knowledge as power*. London: Zed Books.
- Shin, J. C., Huang, J. W., Lee, J. K. & An, Y. 2023. Localization of social science research in selected academic disciplines in South Korea. *Current Sociology*, 71(5):762-779. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921211048528>
- Sisaye, S. 1978. The role of social sciences in rural development planning: The case of Ethiopia. *African Studies Review*, 21(3):75-85. <https://doi.org/10.2307/523887>
- Singer, H. W. 1950. The distribution of gains between borrowing and investing countries. *American Economic Review*, 40(2):473-485.
- The Reporter. 2025. *USAID in Ethiopia's Development and the Risks of Its Potential Withdrawal*. The Reporter, 29 March 2025. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.thereporterethiopia.com/44401/>
- Top Universities (QS). 2025. *QS World University Rankings by Subject 2023: Development Studies*. QS. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.topuniversities.com/university-subject-rankings/development-studies/2023?countries=gb> [Accessed: 10 March 2024]
- Tribe, K. 2022. *Constructing economic science: The invention of a discipline 1850-1950*. New York: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190491741.001.0001>
- Tribe, M. 2009. A short history of the Development Studies Association. *Journal of International Development*, 21(6):732-741. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.1609>
- Truman, H. S. 1949. *Inaugural Address*. The Truman Library. [Online]. Available at: <https://www.trumanlibrary.gov/library/public-papers/19/inaugural-address>. [Accessed: 10 March 2024].

## How We Teach Africa Matters

- Wallerstein, I. 1976. A world-system perspective on the social sciences. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 27(3):343–352. <https://doi.org/10.2307/589620>
- Wallerstein I. (ed.) 1996. *Open the social sciences: Report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the restructuring of the social sciences*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781503616219>
- Wendimu, G. Y. 2021. The challenges and prospects of Ethiopian agriculture. *Cogent Food & Agriculture*, 7(1):1923619. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311932.2021.1923619>
- World Bank. 1992. *Emergency Recovery and Reconstruction Project*. World Bank Documents. [Online]. Available at: <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/761661498957592454/pdf/Ethiopia-Emergency-Recovery-and-Reconstruction-Project.pdf> [Accessed: 8 April 2024].
- Ziai, A. 2017. 'I am not a Post-Developmentalist, but...' The influence of post-development on development studies. *Third World Quarterly*, 38(12):2719–2734. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2017.1328981>