# Inclusive Development in Africa

Dekker, M.

Prof.dr. Marleen Dekker

# Inclusive Development in Africa

Universiteit Leiden

Bij ons leer je de wereld kennen

# Inclusive Development in Africa

Inaugural address by


## Marleen Dekker

Leiden University & African Studies Centre Leiden


October 9, 2017


Universiteit Leiden

Mijnheer de Rector Magnificus
Leden van het bestuur van het Afrikastudiecentrum Leiden
Zeer gewaardeerde toehoorders,

Het is een privilege om voor deze gelegenheid in dit prachtige gebouw te staan en u toe te mogen spreken. In de voorbereiding op deze rede, en meer in het algemeen, voelt het soms ongemakkelijk om vanuit mijn comfortabele leven in Nederland over armoede en ongelijkheid in Afrika te praten. Ik beoefen mijn vak niet louter uit nieuwsgierigheid maar ook uit betrokkenheid. En dat maakt dat ik als wetenschapper, met collega's uit Afrika, een bijdrage wil leveren aan het duiden van hedendaagse veranderingen op het continent. Vandaar dat ik mijn rede in het Engels uitspreek.

**Introduction**

*"Our economy prospers, but the fruits of this economic growth are not yet sufficiently felt by all in daily life. More people should benefit from this prosperity."*

According to Dutch media, this, was the main message from the speech from the throne, delivered by His Majesty King Willem Alexander three weeks ago (Van Oranje Nassau, 2017). Obviously, he was referring to the economy of the Netherlands and inequality in the Netherlands. Yet, it could just as easily be the main message of a speech given in another part of the world.

Across the globe, inequality within countries is on the rise. In 2013, President Obama (2013) said "inequality is the defining challenge of our time". This was recently reinforced by Prof. Stefan Hawking (2016), who, to paraphrase, said that if we do not address inequality we must start looking for another planet to save humanity.

Today, more than 75 percent of the population in developing countries are living in societies where income is more unequally distributed than it was 30 years ago (UNDP, 2016).

Inequality is a great concern. For those who are "left behind", from a rights perspective, and for the future prospects of societies and economies. Large and increasing inequalities fuel political and social instability. And large and increasing inequalities reduce future economic growth (Berg et al, 2014).

In response to this concern, academics and policy makers call for inclusive development – development that counters exclusion and inequality.

In this lecture I would like to share my perspective on inclusive development in Africa with you. I will do this in four parts:

1. First, I will talk about economic growth and inequality in African economies since the turn of the century
2. Then, I will elaborate on the concept of inclusive development
3. Thirdly, I will present a case study on land reform, a policy that is assumed to contribute to more inclusive development.
4. This Zimbabwe case reveals two key lines of research on inclusive development that I will discuss in the closing section

**1. Africa: growth and development**

Many African economies are growing. They have been growing at impressive rates and over a long period of time. This year, economic growth in Kenya is calculated to be 6 per cent, in Ghana 7 per cent and in Ethiopia 8 per cent (AEO, 2017) To put this in perspective, the much-heralded high growth rate of the Dutch economy is currently 3,3 per cent (NOS, 2017).

Following the Asian Tigers, the strong and sustained economic growth in these African Lions has spurred expectations, both within and outside Africa. Expectations that tomorrow will be a better day. And, in many respects it is a better day. In many countries, new jobs have been created, more children are going to school and less mothers die in childbirth. Also, more HIV/AIDS patients are receiving treatment and there are more women in parliaments, to name but a few achievements (UN, 2015)

The key question is, is it a better day for everyone? Who is benefitting from this growth?

The population in many African countries has been growing and it continues to grow at a fast rate. So fast that, in some cases, the population is actually growing faster than the economy. Making it impossible for all to benefit from the economic growth. That is, if the distribution of the benefits was equal in the first place.



But the distribution of the benefits has not been equal: most growth has been concentrated in specific economic sectors, specific geographical areas and specific groups within countries. It has failed to spread to other sectors, regions and groups. African economies are dualistic. It is extremely difficult to find a formal sector job and the majority of people work in informal economic activities on farms and in small firms. Lived poverty is largely unchanged (Dulani et al. 2013). Inequality within countries is on the rise.

How, then, can we increase participation in the process and benefits of economic growth? This is both the biggest of policy challenges and an academic puzzle. To answer this question, we need to better understand how these inequalities come about and how they are maintained, as well as what can be done to reduce them. It raises important questions about connections between different sectors of the economy and society.

What happens in markets, businesses and organizations? There, processes of inclusion and exclusion and power struggles take place. There, farmers, women, youth, entrepreneurs can jump at opportunities that arise, create opportunities for themselves or are blocked from these opportunities. There, they are included or marginalized. This is where inclusive development takes place, or not.

This brings me to the second part of my lecture, to inclusive development.

**2. Inclusive development**

Inclusive development is a new concept in development studies and policy. Its use comes at a time when the words inclusive and inclusivity increasingly pop up in everyday vocabulary, including in The Netherlands.

This summer, for example, Dutch Railways said it was contributing to a more inclusive society by changing their travel announcements from “dear ladies and gentlemen” to “dear travelers”, to ensure that everyone feels welcome on the train. In a radio interview during the Women’s European Championship Football, Martine Prangen, a Professor in Philosophy and former professional football player, stated that discussions on the position of women in society should go beyond equal pay and equal opportunity and promote inclusivity and diversity.

Similarly, there is talk about inclusive architecture, promoting a way of building that make spaces and buildings accessible to all. This means, for example, that in the town hall, people in a wheelchair are not directed to a hidden side entrance, but can enter the facility via the main public entrance, just like everybody else. And take inclusive business models, commercially viable models that benefit the poor by including them as clients or as producers.

These terms are used to refer to a society, way of building or business model that is open to everyone, and has benefits for all in daily life. Inclusiveness and inclusivity is framed to counter exclusion, leaving people behind, or out.

Combining the term inclusive with development refers to change that counters inequality, exclusion and exclusiveness. Change that has benefits for all in daily life.

I deliberately use the term change here. The concept of "development" carries many normative connotations, about modernity and progress based on Western ideas. It is often associated with intentional change, produced by policies, programmes and interventions. In reality, many farmers, women and youth in Africa are "invisible" to such interventions. For them, change occurs more unintentionally (Hart, 2001). For this reason, I am following Melber's (2017) recent proposal to use development as merely a technical term. Development is change.

Web of science, a database with academic journal publications, first signals the use of the term inclusive development in a 1995 edition of the *Journal of Historical Sociology* (Gootenberg, 1995). In this publication, Gootenberg used the concept of inclusive development to identify a change in 19th-century Peruvian development thinking. It changed from one that focused solely on advancement of the urban political and economic elite, to one that was also concerned with provincial groups. This concern was not driven by a genuine desire on the part of the elite to include these groups. Inclusion was driven by the need to maintain social order.

Many more and rather opposing interpretations of the concept have been offered since. From different academic disciplines (see for example Gupta and Pouw, 2017), as well as from policymakers and practitioners. Inclusive development sometimes focuses on particular groups, such as people with disabilities, or a more general cause, for youth, women or the elderly.

NGOs often adopt inclusive development as an approach to addressing development issues. An approach that values and incorporates the contributions of all stakeholders equally – including marginalized groups. Here, inclusive development is about participation and collaboration between civil society, governments and private sector (OXFAM, nd).

It is obvious that the concept inclusive development means different things to different people.

The fuzziness of the concept can be seen as a strength. It gives metaphoric power. And it facilitates cooperation between different disciplines and between academia and policy and practice (See Gupta and Pouw, 2017 and also Uwe Schneidewind and Karoline Augenstein (2016) who make a similar argument for transformation).

However, this fuzziness also carries the danger that the term is co-opted. Inclusive development can be used as a smoke screen. Actors can say they promote inclusive development when their strategy is still focused on economic growth without addressing inequality and assuming trickle down to the poor and marginalized. This is old wine in new bottles.

One could argue that this makes inclusive development a useless concept. I beg to differ. I do recognize the metaphoric power of the term. However, for it to be truly useful we must be much more explicit about what we mean when we are talking about inclusive development. And what expectations there are in terms of change. The Sustainable Development Goals, for example, are very specific in the first target of the goal on inequality, goal number ten: the income of the bottom 40 per cent of the population must grow faster than the national average.

Along this line, I follow Rauniyar and Kanbur (2010), who defines inclusive development in terms of outcomes for people, communities or countries. Inclusive development

concerns change that improve both the average level of social and economic conditions, as well as the distribution of these dimensions across the population.

So, specifically emphasizing a reduction of inequality. In terms of levels of education more inclusive development is achieved when children, on average, spend more years in school and when the differences in school attainment between boys and girls for example become smaller.

It is important, however, to go beyond the description of outcomes. We also have to deepen our understanding of the mechanisms and processes that lead to these outcomes and inequalities. Here, as in the NGO approach, elements of power and participation play a role. For me, this translates to the question: who gets what, when, where and why?
How can we use the concept of inclusive development to interpret socio-economic changes in current day Africa? This brings me to land reform. The third part of my lecture.



**3. Land reform**

Land reform is a policy to redistribute land. It can be a means to alleviate poverty and to reduce inequality. Whether this is realized, is, of course, an empirical question and depends on the context in which land reform is implemented. I will talk about land reform in Zimbabwe. Some may say that this is an odd case, with very specific characteristics. That is true, and illustrative for my argument.

At independence in 1980, Zimbabwe inherited a highly unequal distribution of land: 70 per cent of the best arable land was owned by less than 1 per cent of the population. And these people happened to be white. While the black majority were congested on land that was not productive. In the next twenty years, more than three million hectares of land were given to more than seventy thousand (70,000) rural families (Moyo, 2011).

This redistribution aimed to redress colonial imbalances and to boost agricultural production after the war of independence. It was accompanied by several supporting policies, including the establishment of schools and clinics, loans for houses and agricultural inputs and a solid agricultural extension service.

To illustrate how this land reform has changed people's daily lives, I will introduce you to John and Dorcas. They benefitted from land reform in this first phase, in a growing economy. But they also suffered the consequences of an economic downturn that followed a more recent land reform that I will introduce later.

***John and Dorcas***

John and Dorcas are smallholder farmers in Mupfurudzi Resettlement Scheme. We first met in 1999, when they proudly welcomed us to their *musha*, their homestead. We were invited to sit under the mango tree and talked about their farm. I am sure you can picture us sitting there.

John and Dorcas had settled in Mudzinge village with their young children 17 years before, in 1982. They received 12 acres of farming land. Six times the amount they were farming in the crowded rural area where they came from.

John and Dorcas explained that the initial years after resettlement had been tough. They had to clear the land, build their house and get to know their new neighbors. Neighbors helped each other with practicalities. At times, they teamed up to collectively buy seeds and fertilizers from the depot in Shamva, some 30 kilometres away.

At first, they only planted maize and some years had been really hard, especially when the rains failed. Over time, John and Dorcas also started to grow cotton, groundnuts and beans. They now had a varied diet and used part of the cash income from the crops to pay for the education of their children, buy cattle and build additional structures on their *musha*. They

had clearly fared well and proudly showed us the newly built tobacco barn. This year, for the first time, they were growing tobacco and they planned to cure the tobacco leaves from their fields, at their own home.

John and Dorcas also often participated in village groups that were set up to address communal problems, for example to pay for and cook at funerals, or to process groundnuts to make peanut butter. Mudzinge really had become their home.

The strong social ties they had built were clearly visible in work that my colleagues Abigail Barr, Marcel Fafchamps and I did in Mudzinge and other land reform villages. We reconstructed the groups that had been formed in 20 years and studied their composition. The groups were established without external support and were popular in the land reform communities. In fact, there were twice as many groups here as compared to other rural areas.

And these groups were highly inclusive: the poorer households had joined groups, equally. And also joined groups with the rich. They were not excluded. Nor were households in which a woman was in charge (Barr et al. 2015).

This is an example of how, despite existing differences, equal participation can be achieved. Using data on these same village Gunning, Hoddinot, Kinsey and Owens (2000) demonstrated that economic differences that existed between settlers in the early 1980s evened out over time. Between 1982 and 1997, income inequality fell. The largest increases in income have been achieved by households who started out with the lowest income when they settled.

In this first phase, land reform contributed to inclusive development. The redistribution of land went hand in hand with improvements in various dimensions of daily life, a boost in agricultural production and a reduction in inequality. However, pressure was mounting.

During our first encounter, John and Dorcas noted that not all shared problems could be addressed by the community groups. They complained that the 12 acres of farming land were no longer sufficient. Two of their sons, Simba and Tinotenda, had grown up and married. Although they finished secondary school, they had not been able to find a job. Occasionally they were able to get work, harvesting cotton or tobacco on Donna Rosa Farm, right next door. As Simba and Tinotenda now also had their own family, John and Dorcas gave each son 2 acres of their land. John and Dorcas were joking that, by now, the land reform communities were starting to have the same problems as the other rural areas.

When we met John and Dorcas again two years later, in 2001, Simba and Tinotenda and their families had gone to new farms, at what used to be Donna Rosa Farm. They were clearing their fields and establishing a homestead, just as John and Dorcas had done twenty years ago.

With their sons in the new farms, pressure on their own farm was reduced. John and Dorcas expanded the tobacco field with one acre and also planted more maize fields.

The new farms that Simba and Tinotenda acquired were part of the second wave of land reform in Zimbabwe. This second wave was called the Fast Track Land Reform Programme, or Fast Track for short.

***Fast track***

In terms of size, Fast Track was three times bigger than the first phase. In a short period, an estimated 220.000 households, mostly rural farming households, obtained a new farm (*Moyo,2011*). Fast track not only differed from the first wave of land reform in terms of scale, it also took place in a different political and economic context. This redistribution of land was politically motivated. There were minimal supporting policies in place and because of its scale it had significant spillover effects to the national economy.

The initial reduction in agricultural production affected for example the cotton spinners and the fruit processing industry, as well as other sectors of the economy. This subsequently developed into an economic recession, followed by hyperinflation and scarcity of goods across the country. The redistribution of land also dramatically changed agricultural market structures. Including where farmers could obtain credit and inputs and where and how they sold their crops. In short, it changed their linkages to the larger economy.

Clearly, these economy-wide effects impacted various population groups differently. Here, I will talk about two groups: the smallholder farmers who went to the new farms and those who stayed on their own farm.

***Small holder farmers with a new farm***

Ian Scoones and his colleagues (2010) documented the settlement process in Fast Track areas and showed how many smallholder farmers, like Simba and Tinotenda, were able to establish a new farm. And they were able to do so despite the challenging economic environment and with little support services.

Fast Track deliberately included women. Widows, divorcees and single unmarried women were three times more likely to register a plot in their own right in land reform areas compared to other rural areas. And it was more common for husband and wife to jointly register the new plot.

Sukume and colleagues (2015) observed that the population influx, in areas that were previously sparsely populated, created new economic opportunities. The local market changed from one dominated by a small set of economic players with strong linkages to the capital city, to a more locally rooted economy. In one area, for example, the new smallholders started growing tobacco. This provided employment opportunities for harvesting and curing. And the cash coming in from tobacco sales was spent locally, in shops and other businesses.

In other areas, meat production is developing. The supplies for this line of business, such as cattle feed and chemicals, are now locally available. And there is a small group of abattoirs that jointly established links to local as well as external markets.

In these areas, land reform provided new economic opportunities where previously there were none. These new economic activities are more widely shared and more localized than before.

Despite the specific endeavors to include women and the reports of economic dynamism, the distribution of the benefits from the new economic activities was unequal. And this is a contrast to the first phase of land reform. In Fast Track, some smallholder farmers and entrepreneurs succeed, while others do not. Success depends on being able to respond to the emerging opportunities, on being connected to other actors in the local economy, or, on being able to create such linkages.

It is a highly dynamic process with rapid differentiation. In 2007, half of the new settlers were accumulating assets, regularly producing crops for sale or successfully diversifying off-farm. The other half were hanging in or returning to their old farms.

Have the new opportunities in Fast Track land reform areas spread across the country to other farming areas well? Let's look at the smallholder farmers who stayed on their farm, John and Dorcas.

***Smallholder farmers on existing farms***

When we met John and Dorcas again in 2008, it was immediately clear that they had not shared in this economic dynamism. They were deeply affected by the economic conditions and changing market structures that came with Fast Track. Dorcas explained that for the past three years they had not been able to grow crops on all their fields. Now, with the exception of the tobacco fields, they were growing crops

without inputs. This means they are only growing maize, *nyimo* and sweet potatoes. They no longer planted cotton, as it was impossible to buy the seeds and fertilizer.

Also, the money they were making from tobacco had become useless due to inflation and a scarcity of goods in the shops.

John explained: "Last year, after I got paid for my harvest, I went to the shops in Bindura. Goods were now scarce. All I could do was buy exercise books with the money. I bought them and brought the exercise books home. When schools started, people came to exchange almost anything – chicken, mealie meal, soap. – for school exercise books."

This was at the height of hyperinflation in 2008. After dollarisation in 2009, the situation normalized. The latest reports on the state of the Zimbabwean economy do not paint a rosy picture, however. With the observed inflation of bond notes, a new currency that was introduced last year, John may be forced to buy exercise books again this year.

Let us now reflect on land reform from a national perspective. In terms of scale, the redistribution of land in Zimbabwe has been unprecedented in Africa. Three decades of land reform have redressed colonial imbalances and dramatically changed the distribution of land. Sam Moyo estimated that small holders now own 80% of arable land, up from 50%. Large farms and agro-estates now own 9 per cent of the land, down from 47% (Moyo 2011). Clearly, the most productive asset in Zimbabwe, land, is now more equally distributed among the population.

Has this more equal distribution of land also resulted in a more equal society? Here the evidence is less clear. Reliable data on changes in income inequality over time is not available. And different population groups have been affected in rather different ways by the re-distribution of land, the changing market structures and the economic downturn that followed.

There are many reports on a highly dualistic economy. Consider for example this recent post on Facebook. I quote: "It appears we have two economies in this state. One economy for the minority political elites and their connections. The other one is for the majority of ever suffering Zimbos. In the economy of the minority there are no cash crises. They can have $7 million cash in their car boots when the majority are struggling to get $7 from the bank. The elites can buy a ring for $1.4 million when the majority are sweating to get $1.40 to buy a loaf of bread. The minority can raise $800 000 for a birthday bash when a pregnant lady in Binga cannot get $8 to register for prenatal care".

**4. Research on inclusive development**

The experience of John and Dorcas before 2000, shows that land reform has the potential to be transformational. With additional support services, land reform can improve daily lives and reduce inequality. It can contribute to inclusive development.

Fast Track Land Reform was also transformational, in a different way. It transformed the national and local economy. With few supporting policies and in a highly volatile environment, the benefits of land reform were much less equally distributed.

What does this mean for research on inclusive development in Africa?

In the last part of my lecture I will talk about two important lines of research that emerge from this case study. First, the need to consider in more detail inequality in opportunity and outcome. And second, the importance of the socio-economic context for understanding inequalities in opportunities and outcomes.

***Inequality***

Let me start with inequality. And more specifically with a contradiction that I have been observing.

The concept of inclusive development is advanced as a "response" to concerns about increasing inequality. At the same time, academic research and policy debates on inclusive development are not yet sufficiently speaking to issues of inequality. The outcome of an intervention is often measured in averages and does not consider the distribution of outcomes across the population. And interventions are more often than not formulated without systematically addressing inequalities in opportunity that may prevent the poor, women or children from benefitting from an intervention.

Let me give two examples.

When studying the impact of private sector investments on inclusive development in Africa, it is not sufficient to only report the number of jobs that are generated; it is important to also document who gets the jobs, where the jobs are created, how this affects the distribution of benefits in society, does it reduce inequality or are new inequalities created?



Another example considers inequality at the most micro level, within households. This example comes from the work I did with Abigail Barr, Wendy Janssens, Bereket Kebede and Berber Kramer in Nigeria (2017). It is commonly found that children in polygynous marriages, marriages with more than one wife, spent less years in school and are less healthy compared to children in monogamous marriages.

It is one thing to observe such differences. It is another to understand why such differences exists. A possible explanation may be that spouses in households with more than one wife cooperate differently, compared to spouses in a monogamous marriage. We studied this intra household cooperation in Nigeria. We found that monogamous couples were more cooperative than polygynous couples. Specifically, polygynous husbands are less cooperative towards their wives and co-wives are less cooperative towards each other.

This difference cannot be explained by a lower level of cooperativeness in people in polygynous marriages. We found that the difference is explained by different responses to expectations about how cooperative the spouse will be.

Polygynous husbands and co-wives act reciprocally. If they expect their partner to be less generous, they will themselves contribute less. Monogamous spouses are less likely to act in such a way. They behave more altruistically and are more likely to fully cooperate, even if they do not expect their spouses to do the same. The influence of expectations on spousal behavior should not come as a surprise, I am sure many of you will recognize some of it.

Why then, is it important to know that spouses in monogamous and polygynous marriages behave differently? This is not just about curiosity, it's also out of concern.

Many poverty reduction interventions, such as cash transfer programmes, assume there is full cooperation between spouses and assume that households are monogamous. Yet, polygyny is common.

In Nigeria, an estimated half of married women are in such a marriage. If differences in cooperation between monogamous and polygynous households are not taken into consideration at the design stage of a program, such interventions could lead to worse outcomes for members of polygynous households. Exacerbating existing inequalities, rather than reducing inequalities.

Of course, inequality analysis is not new. And there are many techniques and methods, both quantitative and qualitative, to study inequality. My call is to systematically include this in inclusive development research, irrespective of the research

being more policy oriented or fundamental, on the macro or micro level.

***Context***

The second line of research concerns the importance of context. The Zimbabwe case demonstrates that processes of change are embedded in a specific context. Changes take place at a specific time. In a specific place. And in interaction with the political, social and economic environment. Of course, it is not sufficient to say that context matters. That is just too obvious.

The challenge for researchers is to better understand how context matters and what elements of the context matter most. Here, I would like to build on the work of North et al (2007) Fafchamps (2004) and others (Elbers (2016a and 2016b), Gul et al (2017), Bold (2016), De Hoop (2012)), who emphasize the social and political embeddedness of economic linkages and the importance of social norms in change.

Methodologically, it is a challenge to disentangle these forces at play, to get into the black box. But it is too important an aspect to ignore. In the coming years, I would like to develop a mixed methods approach to unpack this black box. This approach will combine different disciplinary perspectives and methodologies.

The core of the approach is to systematically compare change in different contexts by addressing the same question with the same type of data in different villages, different economic sectors, for different groups or in different countries. It will have a strong empirical focus. This means it will depend on the availability of comparable data across different contexts, and/or the possibility to generate such data myself.

With this emphasis on inequality and context, I am deviating from what is seen as the "gold standard" in development policy research.

The assessment of development interventions, in Africa and elsewhere, increasingly uses rigorous evaluation methods, so-called randomized controlled trials. This approach follows the randomized study designs in medicine that test the average effect of medication on health outcomes.

Impact evaluations in development aim to identify the changes in outcomes for the average child, woman, or farmer that are directly attributable to an intervention. For example to identify the improvement in children's health that result from an intervention that regularly transfers money to young mothers.

Although such studies contribute to our understanding of what works in a particular context, they do not analyse the *mechanisms* or underlying *processes* that have led to the impact. And they ignore the influence and complexity of the particular time, place and political context of the intervention that is being evaluated. This challenges the possibilities to scale up such a program to other regions or countries.

With my emphasis on inequality and context, I am making a plea to always go beyond the average treatment effect of an intervention and look at the distribution of effects. Between men and women, between boys and girls, between the young and the old, between the rich and the poor. And to better understand what mechanisms and processes have led to the outcomes observed.

This translates to addressing the question who gets what, when, where and why? For example in community based health insurance programmes, in large scale land deals for private sector investments, mining or in higher education (when research funds can be secured).

A final word on research. Assuming that inclusive development is not a quick fix, but requires structural transformation, the need for long-term research is obvious. This is underscored by the Zimbabwe case where the perspectives on the impact of

land reform change substantially when moving from the early years to the 1990s and after 2000.

It is, however, increasingly difficult to secure long-term scientific research funding. And in policy circles, there is a growing emphasis on short-term research with direct relevance for policy and practice.

My reflections on land reform in Zimbabwe demonstrate that long-term research is relevant for policy. Even more, a longer timeframe is essential to know if changes actually endure, if they are sustained over time. To understand processes of inclusive development in Africa, more long term research needs to be done.

**Dankwoord**

Nu ik aan het einde van mijn rede ben gekomen, wil ik het bestuur van het Afrika-Studiecentrum en de Universiteit Leiden bedanken voor het vertrouwen dat het in mij heeft gesteld. En voor het op de kaart willen zetten van Inclusive Development in Africa, een thema dat zo goed past bij het motto van de Universiteit, "bij ons leer je de wereld kennen". Ik zal, samen met mijn collega's, mijn best blijven doen om ontwikkelingen op het continent te duiden en die kennis met anderen te delen.

Een oplettend toehoorder zal het zijn opgevallen dat ik vaak in de meervoudige persoonsvorm heb gesproken. Dat is natuurlijk niet voor niets. Op mijn weg naar vandaag ben ik vaak vergezeld geweest van inspirerende collega's en mentoren. Bovendien is onderzoek doen teamwork.

Ton Dietz en Jan Willem Gunning hebben mij op heel verschillende manieren de kneepjes van het vak geleerd. Van Jan Willem leerde ik het belang van een stevige methodologische onderbouwing en Ton opende mijn ogen voor strategie. Ik wil jullie enorm bedanken voor de mogelijkheden die ik van jullie heb gekregen en het vertrouwen dat jullie mij daarmee hebben gegeven.

Abigail Barr has been a great mentor and friend ever since we first met in Zim. Her sharp insight and passion for in research remain a source of inspiration. Although our individual life events meant that we at times lost contact, we have an excellent track record of collaboration in three polygynous research teams and I am looking forward to our next research marriage!

A special word of thanks goes to Bill Kinsey. Not only for being the driving force behind the long-term research programme on land reform in Zimbabwe. But also for always offering a home in Zimbabwe. I am happy that we can offer you a temporary home at the ASCL next year and to take our analysis on 30 years of land reform a step further.

Ik wil mijn collega's van het Afrika Studiecentrum bedanken voor de inspirerende werkplek die we met elkaar creëren. Onze verschillende perspectieven dragen bij aan een meer compleet gezicht op sociaal economische verandering in Afrika. Aan de onderzoekers vraag ik of ze de impliciete verwijzing naar Foucoult herkent hebben. En voor de andere collega's: jullie staan altijd klaar om me te helpen! Dank! Ik kijk uit naar onze verdere samenwerking.

Ook dank aan mijn collega's van ontwikkelingseconomie op de Vrije Universiteit, die mij nog altijd een thuis bieden. Een speciaal woord van dank voor Wendy Janssens, de andere vrouw in een van mijn onderzoekshuwelijken. Gesprekken met jouw geven altijd meer inzicht. Of het nou inhoudelijk is of over de prive-werk balans, waar we allebei wel eens mee worstelen.

Ik dank ook het Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken voor het zoeken naar nieuwe manieren om de dialoog tussen kennis en beleid vorm te geven, in de kennisplatforms. En het oprichten van INCLUDE, een van deze kennisplatforms, specifiek gericht op inclusieve ontwikkeling in Afrika. Margriet Kuster en haar collega's hebben zich enorm ingezet voor INCLUDE en onze nauwe samenwerking helpt mij om de beleidswereld beter te doorgronden.

Since 2014, I am coordinating the secretariat of INCLUDE. The interaction with Platform members, Steering Group, Researchers and the larger INCLUDE network, in Africa and The Netherlands, has been a tremendous source of inspiration to me. Our work and our discussions have of course shaped my thinking about Inclusive Development. It is good to emphasize that today, I have not presented the views of the Platform, but my own.

In particular, I would like to thank Karin, Gitty, Fenneken, Simone, Saskia, Annemarie, Frank, Witness and Obadia, for their commitment and collegiality in the Secretariat. It is a pleasure to be working with you and I am looking forward to continue our collaboration!

Lieve vrienden en familie, Wat kan een mens het toch treffen met zo'n fijne club om zich heen. Van familie weekenden en spontane etentjes, tot een lekkere kop koffie en de lulletjes op het hockeyveld. Het is zo fijn dat jullie er zijn!

Een speciaal woord van dank voor Anne, Jenny en Arienne, voor onze lange en mooie vriendschap. Anne, wij zetten samen de eerste stappen op de weg die mij hier bracht. Ik denk nog vaak terug aan de vuurtjes die we met Beauty Marufu en Rindirai Dube stookten. Arienne, ik ben blij dat Hans en jij mij ervan hebben overtuigd dat het gewoon leuk is om onderzoek te doen.

Ook een speciaal woord voor mijn fietsvriendinnen. Gisteren nog samen onder de Spaanse zon en nu hier in Leiden. We delen al jaren lief en leed tijdens onze zondagochtendtochtjes in de buurt en tourtjes in het buitenland. De beklimming van de Ventoux heeft een gouden randje. Wie had toen gedacht dat ik nu hier zou staan.

Lieve pap, Jullie leerden mij om betrokken bij de wereld te zijn, en daarin mijn eigen weg te kiezen. En dat leefden jullie voor. Bijvoorbeeld toen jullie mijn school advies van de lagere school negeerden. Dat kon toen nog. Ook dat heeft me gebracht waar ik nu ben. Ik ben blij dat jij dubbel trots kan zijn.

Lieve Rob, Jij leest met me mee bij het schrijven van deze rede. We stappen samen op de fiets en rommelen in de tuin. Jij moedigde onze kleine Floor en Maartje aan bij hun eerste stapjes op Afrikaanse bodem, terwijl ik interviews deed in het veld. Ik kan me geen fijnere lief indenken! Dank je wel.

Lieve Floor, Maartje en Siemen; er zijn natuurlijk wel leukere dingen dan een uur lang stilzitten op een houten bank en mij weer te horen praten over mijn werk..... Herkenden jullie in mijn verhaal de duif en het gemiddelde? Ik ben blij dat jullie ER zijn. Ik geniet er enorm van om te zien hoe jullie, ieder op je eigen manier, de wereld instappen, om die zelf te leren kennen.

Ik heb gezegd.

**Referenties**


African Economic Outlook (AEO), (2017) *Statistics*, Real GDP growth rate, http://www.africaneconomicoutlook.org/en/statistics

Barr, A., M. Dekker and M. Fafchamps (2015) The formation of community based organizations in sub-Saharan Africa: An analysis of a quasi-experiment. *World Development*, 66: 131-153.

Barr, A. , M.Dekker, W. Janssens, B. Kebede, B. Kramer (2017) *Cooperation in polygynous households*. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), IFPRI discussion paper 1625.

Bold, T., M. Kimenyi, G. Mwabu, A. Ng'ang'a and J. Sandefur (2016) *Experimental Evidence on Scaling Up Education Reforms in Kenya.* Mimeo available at: http://www.tessabold.com/uploads/7/0/1/0/70101685/scaling_up_december_2016.pdf

De Hoop, T. (2012) *How context matters for development effectiveness: A study into social norms and heterogeneous impacts*. Enschede, The Netherlands: Ipskamp Publishers. Dissertation.

Dulani, B., Mattes, R., & Logan, C. (2013). After a decade of growth in Africa, little change in poverty at the grassroots. *Afrobarometer Policy Paper No. 1*. Available at http://afrobarometer.org/ sites/default/files/publications/Briefing%20paper/ab_r5_policypaperno1.pdf.

Elbers, W. and Z. Mohammed (2016a) Why the political system matters. *Breaking down Barriers project sheet 1*. Leiden: ASCL. Available at: https://www.barriersfree.org/downloads

Elbers, W. and S. Potthof (2016b) *Which organizational resources matter? Breaking down Barriers project sheet 2*. Leiden: ASCL. Available at: https://www.barriersfree.org/downloads

Fafchamps, M. (2004) *Market Institutions and Sub-Saharan Africa: Theory and Evidence*, MIT Press.

Gul, F. A., Podder, J., & Shahriar, A. Z. M. (2017). Performance of microfinance institutions: does government ideology matter? *World Development*, 100, 1-15. DOI: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.07.021

Gootenberg, P., (1995), Order[s] and Progress in Developmental Discourse: A Case of Nineteenth Century Peru. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 8: 111–135. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6443.1995.tb00083.x

Gunning, J. W., Hoddinott, J., Kinsey, B. H., and Owens, T. (2000). Revisiting Forever Gained: Income Dynamics in the Resettlement Areas of Zimbabwe, 1983-96. In B. Baulch, & J. Hoddinott (Eds.), *Economic Mobility and Poverty Dynamics in Developing Countries* (pp. 131-155). London: Frank Cass Publishers.

Hart, G. (2001) Development Critiques in the 1990s: Culs de Sac and Promising Paths. *Progress in Human Geography*, 25(4): 649–658.

Hawking, S. (2016) *This is the most dangerous time for our planet*. Opinion Editorial. The Guardian, UK. Available at https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/dec/01/stephen-hawking-dangerous-time-planet-inequality

Melber, H. (2017) *Development Studies and the SDGs - Mapping an Agenda. Lecture* at the CERES Summer School 2017 Utrecht and EADI Policy Paper August 2017. Available at https://www.eadi.org/typo3/fileadmin/Documents/Publications/EADI_Policy_Paper/EADI_policy_paper_Melber_August_2017.pdf.

Moyo, S. (2011) Three decades of agrarian reform in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 38(3): 493-531. doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2011.583642

North, D.C., Wallis, J.J, Webb, S. B., Weingast, B.R (2007) *Limited Access Orders in the Developing World : A New Approach to the Problems of Development.* World Bank Policy Research Working Paper; No. 4359. Washington DC: World Bank. Available at https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/7341

NOS (2017) *Nederlandse Economie groeit uitzonderlijk sterk*. Available at : https://nos.nl/artikel/2188291-nederlandse-economie-groeit-uitzonderlijk-sterk.html

Obama, B. (2013) speech for the Center for American Progress at the Town Hall Education Arts Recreation Campus in Washington D.C. , December 4, 2013. Available at https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/running-transcript-president-obamas-december-4-remarks-on-the-economy/2013/12/04/7cec31ba-5cff-11e3-be07-006c776266ed_story.html?utm_term=.ec11bde695f6

Ostry, J.D., A. Berg, and C. G. Tsangarides (2014), *Redistribution, Inequality and Growth*, IMF Staff Discussion Note. Washington D.C., IMF.

OXFAM (nd*) Inclusive Development. Ensuring Benefits for all.* Available at: https://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/inclusive_development.pdf

Pouw, N. and Y. Gupta (2017) Inclusive Development: an multi-disciplinary approach. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 24, 104-108. doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2016.11.013

Rauniyar, G. and R. Kanbur (2010) Inclusive growth and inclusive development: a review and synthesis of Asian Development Bank literature. *Journal of the Asia Pacific Economy*, 15 (4): 455-469.

Schneidewind, U. and K. Augenstein (2016) Three Schools of Transformation Thinking: The Impact of Ideas, Institutions, and Technological Innovation on Transformation Processes. *GAIA - Ecological Perspectives for Science and Society*, 25 (2), 88-93. doi.org/10.14512/gaia.25.2.7

Scoones, I. with Marongwe, N., Mavedzenge, B., Mahenehene, J., Murimbarimba, F. and Sukume, C. (2010) *Zimbabwe's Land Reform: Myths & Realities*. Oxford: James Currey Press.

Sukume, C., B. Mavedzenge, F. Murimbarima and I. Scoones (2015) Space, Markets and Employment in Agricultural Development: Zimbabwe Country Report. Institute for Poverty, Land and Agrarian Studies Research Report no. 46. Cape Town: PLAAS. Available at: http://www.plaas.org.za/sites/default/files/publications-pdf/PLAAS_RR46_SMEADZim%20%281%29.pdf

United Nations (UN) (2015) *The Millenium Development Goals Report.* New York, United Nations. Available at: http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2015_MDG_Report/pdf/MDG%202015%20rev%20(July%201).pdf.

UNDP (2016) *UNDP Support to the Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development,* UNDP Policy and Programme Brief. New York, UNDP. Available at http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/SDGs/SDG%20Implementation%20and%20UNDP_Policy_and_Programme_Brief.pdf

Van Oranje Nassau, W. A. (2017) *Troonrede 2017.* Netherlands, The Hague, 19th of September 2017. Available at: https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/documenten/toespraken/2017/09/19/troonrede-2017.

## Prof.dr. Marleen Dekker

| | |
|---|---|
| 2017 | Professor Inclusive Development in Africa at Leiden University |
| 2014 | Coordinator INCLUDE Knowledge Platform |
| 2007 | Senior Researcher African Studies Centre |
| 2004-2007 | Post-doctoral Researcher Vrije Universiteit |
| 1999-2004 | PhD research Risk Resettlement and Relations in Zimbabwe |
| 1994 | MA Human Geography (with distinction) |

Marleen Dekker is Professor of Inclusive Development in Africa at Leiden University. She is trained as a human geographer and holds a PhD in Development Economics. Marleen's research is interdisciplinary in nature and analyzes the role of social networks in accessing markets and local socio-economic development. The focus of her work is on access to formal and informal insurance networks, including community-based health insurance and intra-household resource sharing. Marleen has co-organized several international events including a conference on micro-insurance, seminars on land reform in Zimbabwe, women's bargaining power and economic development, and social protection. Furthermore, she has collaborated in several international research projects in Zimbabwe, Ethiopia, Togo and Nigeria on social networks, insurance, marriage and intra-household collaboration. Since 2014, Marleen also coordinates the INCLUDE Secretariat, the Knowledge Platform on Inclusive Development Policies in Africa. INCLUDE aims to promote the use of research evidence in policymaking on inclusive development. The platform supports research, shares relevant knowledge with policy makers and practitioners and organizes international policy dialogues on inclusive development themes both in The Netherlands and in African countries.

**Keywords:** inclusive development, markets, risk, social networks, polygyny, land reform.

Universiteit Leiden