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Abstract

This chapter helps readers unfamiliar with sociology to obtain a concrete picture of what a sociological approach to development is. It presents arguments based not only on previous research in the English-speaking world, but also on research trends in Japan. Sociological studies of development can be divided into two fields based on their disciplinary origins and research orientation: ‘Sociology of Development’ and ‘Development Sociology’. First, this chapter explains the difference between these research areas. Furthermore, as a case study, the issue of displacement and resettlement induced by dam construction is presented to examine what kind of sociological analysis has been conducted in these research areas. Accordingly, the author presents research perspectives that are considered unique to sociology in development issues: power relations among actors at development sites; secondary, indirect, mid-, and long-term impacts of development projects; macro–micro linkages among international, national, and regional transformations; and values, culture, and discourse on development. Finally, a discussion is presented on the role of sociological research in the debate on sustainability and how it can play a significant part.
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6.1 Introduction: Development-Induced Displacement and Resettlement in the SDGs

This chapter considers the issue of development-induced displacement and resettlement (DIDR). It shows how the discipline of sociology approaches development, assuming that readers are unfamiliar with sociology. We begin by reviewing the relationship between DIDR and SDGs, which is the central issue of this book.

Among the goals set out in the SDGs are the eradication of hunger (Goal 2\(^1\)), the provision of safe drinking water (Goal 3\(^2\),

\(^1\) ‘Goal 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition, and promote sustainable agriculture’.

\(^2\) ‘Goal 3: Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages’. In particular, Target 3.9 is as follows; ‘By 2030, substantially reduce the number of deaths and illnesses from hazardous chemicals and air, water and soil pollution and contamination’.
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Achieving these may to some extent involve expectations of dam construction for irrigation, water resources, electricity generation, and flood control functions. However, the problem of infrastructure construction is not simple. As is well known, dam construction has often resulted in the destruction of nature and negatively impacted the ecology in many parts of the world. Further, social conflicts have arisen over the rights of indigenous peoples to land ownership and habitation, and over the restoration of the livelihoods of residents whose homes are submerged following dam operation.

The central concern of DIDR research is not the positive effects of infrastructure construction itself, but the negative effects as a side-effect of the project. In particular, this is an issue-oriented research area that seeks to understand how to reduce the sacrifices made by those who are evicted, and to examine the necessary procedures to improve this scenario, while comprehending the actual status of compensation and livelihood restoration support. The perspective of DIDR, which considers measures to avoid imposing development-related sacrifices and pain on some people, is deeply related to the basic SDG principle of ‘no one will be left behind’.

However, issues related to DIDR are not explicitly included in the SDGs’ goals, targets, and indicators. One might suggest that in the SDGs, issues related to means and procedures for migration and livelihood restoration, such as Goal 1, 10, 11, and 16, could be considered relevant, but this is only an interpretation and does not imply that the issues addressed by DIDR are directly incorporated into the SDGs. Even if one tries to apply the SDG framework to DIDR, it is difficult to comprehend the essence of DIDR.

In fact, sociological and anthropological research is central to this DIDR research. In particular, the discipline of sociology emphasises capturing the ‘other side’ of events and looking at the gap between ideology and reality. The first half of this chapter will therefore first review the basic perspective of such sociological research. Sociological debates on development have been raised in Europe, such as in the UK and the Netherlands, as well as in India and Latin America, and, although not well known, there is also sufficient accumulation of such debates in Japan. Therefore, in this chapter, I will discuss the debate based partly based on Hamamoto and Sato (2012), Hamamoto (2013), and Hamamoto (2019), as well as on the accumulation of discussions not only in the English-speaking world but also by Japanese researchers.
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1 ‘Goal 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all’. Puthucherril and Peters, while acknowledging the significance of SDG Goal 6 on safe water supply in this regard, argued ‘if their human and environmental costs are not adequately factored-in, it raises the specter of social injustice and inequity. These can hamper the fulfillment of the SDG goals’ (Puthucherril and Peters 2021, p. 10).

2 ‘Goal 7: Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all’.

3 Conflicts between upstream and downstream areas are also common. The construction of a dam in Yunnan Province, China, in the upper Mekong River basin is of great concern to Laos and Thailand, which are in the middle and lower reaches of the river. Similarly, the Great Ethiopian Renaissance Dam on the upper Nile has caused friction downstream with Egypt and Sudan.

4 For example, it is also relevant to ‘Goal 1: End poverty in all its forms everywhere’, as resettlers are often impoverished. In particular, it also relates to Target 1.4 in terms of guaranteeing land rights. Additionally, regarding support for restoration of livelihood, Target 10.7 in ‘Goal 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries’ overlaps in terms of the resettlement action plan, but this is primarily concerned with economic migration, refugees, and internally displaced persons and does not directly include DIDR. Further, in terms of human settlements, ‘Goal 11: Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable’ is also considered relevant (e.g., Target 11.1, 11.2, 11.5, 11. a). Regarding procedures in development programme, ‘Goal 16: Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable, and inclusive institutions at all levels’ is comprehensive and will be relevant under many sections of development goals. As mentioned in Target 16.5, dam construction is associated with corruption because of the interests of the contractors involved. The fairness and transparency of the resettlement process is important (e.g., Target 16.6, 16.7, 16.10, 16.b).
6.2 The Discipline of Sociology

6.2.1 Sociological Perspective

The discipline of sociology can be described from many different points of view, as diverse texts have been published in this field. Along with Western societies in the first half of the nineteenth century, when sociology was born, the classical work of sociological masters such as Durkheim, Weber, Simmel, and Marx is probably the orthodox entry point for sociology. Alternatively, there is a style in which sociology considers each of the thematic areas of study, such as urban/rural, family, gender, and environment.

However, such an explanation is not provided here. Rather, we would like to simply confirm sociology’s basic perspective and way of considering social phenomena/problems. Put simply, sociologists do not speak in terms of ‘something should be done’. Before thinking about ‘what should be done’, we must carefully look at ‘what is happening now’. Further, we assign importance to unravelling the complex social situation. That is, sociology suspends value judgments such as ‘good or bad’, rejects prejudice, and concentrates all of its efforts on understanding the contemporary society.

Speaking of ‘analysis without prejudice’, one might think that this is a basic scientific attitude, the same as in other disciplines. However, it is important to note that many traditional sociologies do not from the outset have principles or goals such as ‘we should move towards XX’ or ‘XX is desirable’. This is a very different stance from disciplines that work towards principles and goals such as ‘how to eliminate bullying in schools’, ‘how to create an easily accessible environment for special needs individuals’, or ‘how the technology of renewable energy can be developed for practical use’. For these researchers, bullying is something that ‘should be eliminated’, accessibility is something that ‘should be created’, and renewable energy is something that ‘should be made practical’. They believe that they can contribute to society through such ‘shoulds’ and ‘good things’ and, in fact, these studies are important research fields. However, traditional sociology approaches these issues from a different perspective. It is not concerned with ideals, but rather with the social mechanisms themselves and their changes and transformations, such as which functions of society work and how they work.

Therefore, sociology tries to look at aspects of what is considered ‘good’ that may be ‘not good’. The reverse is also true. Sociological research with this stance tries to view contemporary society from multiple perspectives, without being preoccupied with what is ‘good’, but rather from the perspective of ‘do they really all work well?’ and ‘even if they do work well, are there other problems occurring?’ This positionality of sociology has the advantage of presenting arguments that other disciplines cannot highlight when considering policy.

6.2.2 Sociological Approach to Development

If one bears in mind this positionality of not talking in terms of ‘shoulds’, one will soon realise how the debate on development is full of ‘shoulds’ and ‘musts’. For example, slogans such as ‘Raise per capita income and become rich’ and ‘Promote import-substitution industrialisation and achieve economic growth’ express a growthist ideology based on the assumption that these are ‘good’ and ‘great’ things. Although these ideologies are pervasive and commonplace values for the members of the society in question, sociology often considers such perspectives with scepticism.

This sociological stance can be seen in the trend from modernisation theory to dependency theory, known as the fundamental theory of development studies. Modernisation theory, which adopts the optimistic scenario that post-independence developing countries will achieve economic growth according to the logic of capitalism, is related to the functionalism of the sociologist Parsons, but above all, it is strongly based on the assumptions of modern economics.

---

7 See Max Weber’s discussion of value freedom/neutrality.
In contrast, dependency theory attracted attention in the late 1960s and 1970s as a critique of modernisation theory. This argument, based on Marxism, argued that ‘developing countries will still remain underdeveloped’ not because of insufficient capacity or infrastructure in developing countries, but because of the consequences of the structural exploitation relationship between developed and developing countries. This argument incorporated considerable sociological knowledge and addressed aspects that had been overlooked by modern economics. In addition, the world-system theory by the sociologist Wallerstein, which succeeded and developed dependency theory, was a dominant paradigm in development theory, as it explained the functioning of the capitalist system historically, rather than using the state as the unit of analysis.

The above is, according to sociology’s classification, a macro theory of social change, but even in micro analyses addressing individual concrete issues, sociology remains ascetic regarding talking about ‘should’. As social power takes many forms such as economic, cultural, sexual, and sociological, development analysis can help us understand how and why development has occurred and how and why it has not. However, the above explanation does not apply to all sociological research. In applied sociological research, there are positions that adopt a normative approach towards a ‘desirable’ society and an orientation towards policy science contributions, which also apply to development research. Let us consider this in more detail next.

6.3 ‘Sociology of Development’ and ‘Development Sociology’

Development is a central issue because sociology, since its inception, has been concerned with what is social evolution and progress. However, setting aside early sociological works and focusing on the social changes that have taken place especially since World War II, two main types of sociology can be distinguished in the field of development. As shown in Table 6.1, these are ‘Sociology of Development’ and ‘Development Sociology’. Although these are not always clearly differentiated by sociologists, the following section considers the subject areas, issues, and orientations of the two, partly referring to research trends in Japan.

6.3.1 ‘Sociology of Development’

The sociological approach to development discussed above basically corresponds to the first ‘Sociology of Development’. It is a sub-discipline within traditional sociology. Alongside, for example, sociology of religion, sociology of law, sociology of education, sociology of medicine, and social psychology, the field of sociology of development can be located here.

As mentioned above, the trend from modernisation theory to dependency theory and world-system theory is positioned as the basic genealogy of the ‘Sociology of Development’ (Kiely 1995; Singh 2010; Viterna and Robertson 2015; Webster 1990). In contrast, since the 1990s, there have been theoretical developments that directly and indirectly discuss modernisation and development, such as Giddens and Beck’s reflexive modernisation and risk society theory, but these are regarded as macroscopic contemporary social theories that discuss social change and the characteristics of modern society. Touraine’s social movements and the urbanisation debates of Castel, Sassen, and others are not generally included in the ‘Sociology of

---

8 Another important point is that dependency theory was discussed by scholars from or based in developing countries, such as A. G. Frank in Chile and Brazil, and S. Amin in Egypt. In this respect, dependency theory was also meant to be a civilisational objection to the dominant values prevalent in the already developed Western world.

9 Of course, concerns with development issues did not only occur in sociology. Development became a new and central sub-field across most social science disciplines, as well as an integral part of many schools of public policy (Viterna and Robertson 2015, p. 242).
Development’, but they are relevant when addressing issues related to globalisation and development\textsuperscript{10}.

Despite the above developments in macro-social theory, there has been little commitment from traditional sociology to the development phenomena in developing countries or to the cross-border phenomenon of development assistance. Hence, the field of ‘the Sociology of Development’ is far from being established within sociology, in contrast to family sociology, urban sociology, and so forth, which have been institutionalised academically in many countries.

However, this does not mean that research on development does not exist. For example, in Japan, there is a vast and wide range of empirical research on development in the domestic context. At the same time, in sociology, where modernisation, industrialisation, and urbanisation have been the main subjects of research, ‘development’ has been quite commonly considered as a social phenomenon and issue (Machimura 2011, p. 8). For example, questions such as how the introduction of modern-style machinery in rural communities has transformed feudal human relationships have been discussed in rural sociology. The social changes in post-war Japan have also been depicted alongside the history of development and its effects, such as the impact of construction of hydropower facilities in mountainous areas and industrial development in coastal areas, housing development and the emerging new communities in the suburbs of large cities, residents’ movements against regional development, and the urban renewal of inner-city areas (Machimura, ibid.). Since many of these development-related phenomena have already been addressed in extant sub-disciplines of sociology, there is no need to establish a new field of ‘Sociology of Development’. The common stance of these researches was to critically observe the nature and reality of development, rather than to conduct research that would be useful for development.

Research trends in such traditional sociology vary from country to country and region to region, but often deal with development phenomena within the researcher’s own country or culture. Such studies also generally have in common a research focus of Sociology of Development that is not necessarily limited to developing countries (Barnett 1988; Hooks 2016; Webster 1990). The Indian sociologist Singh, while applying the sociological theories of development to Indian society, argued that Sociology of Development examines the interface between socio-cultural circumstances and the processes of development (Singh 2010, p. 3) and that its aim is to trace the non-economic factors underlying economic development (ibid, p. 5). Singh’s definition seems to indicate a strong preference for the use of sociological research in the analysis of economic development, but such characteristics will vary depending on the context in which each country is situated.

\textbf{6.3.2 ‘Development Sociology’}

The second approach, namely Development Sociology, is a sub-category of interdisciplinary applied sciences of Development Studies,

\textbf{Table 6.1 Dichotomy of sociologies in the field of development}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary distinction</th>
<th>Sociology of development</th>
<th>Development sociology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research orientation</td>
<td>Relatively academic and theoretical</td>
<td>Relatively practical and applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research objects</td>
<td>Both developed and developing countries</td>
<td>Mainly developing countries and relations with donor agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{10} Debates on post-development and degrowth are also closely related to sociological research, both theoretically and empirically.
together with related disciplines, such as Development Economics and Development Politics. Development Sociology can be described as a ‘sociological approach to development studies’. The roots of development studies may be traced to the cultural understanding of underdeveloped and colonial societies as objects to be conquered, but were directly triggered by the Truman speech of 1949, which made the advancement of developing countries a common goal of the international community (Esteva 1992). Initially, when development was mentioned, it was almost synonymous with economic growth, but later emphasis was placed on understanding socio-cultural aspects as a prerequisite for economic development. Currently, social development itself has become a goal of development, and sociology has become an indispensable discipline, alongside anthropology, for this purpose.

As Development Sociology adopts the above concerns as its starting point, the discipline has a stronger practical orientation than traditional sociology. While there are arguments and suggestions based on sociological theory, such as those of Long (2001) discussed below, there is a need for practitioners, such as aid agencies and NGOs, to mobilise social knowledge in their specific activities, such as rural development and community development. These social development practitioners are often not only sociological researchers, but also administrative staff, consultants, or NGO specialists, and the boundary between researchers and practitioners is unclear. In addition, in some countries, applied Development Sociology often takes precedence while the accumulated findings of traditional sociology in academia remain immature, or sociology and anthropology are recognised as almost the same discipline.

It is important here to carefully consider that discussion in Development Sociology often involves ‘shoulds’ and ‘musts’. While it is rather natural that applied sociological research should aim to contribute to policy, it is important to note that ‘shoulds’ here include both conscious and unconscious value judgments and the positionality of the researcher. In Japan, for example, the sociologist Tsurumi advocated ‘endogenous development’ from the late 1970s, arguing for proactive change at the local level as opposed to ‘exogenous development’ at the national level (Tsurumi and Kawata 1989). This was a manoeuvre in which she articulated her value judgments in an extremely conscious manner. In contrast, there are pitfalls when social development centred on local people is not questioned as an ideal. This was clearly expressed in the debate on participatory development.

The concept of ‘participatory development’ is a bottom-up, grassroots type of development method that overcomes the problems of traditional top-down development. It conceives the local population not as a passive entity, but rather as the subject of development at all stages of its planning, implementation, and evaluation (Chambers 1983). Since the 1990s, ‘participatory development’ has quickly become mainstream and ‘desirable’ in development assistance. Persons involved here have included not only development specialists such as Chambers, a leading development expert, but also advocates of development sociology. However, as Cooke and Kothari (2001) critically argue, ‘participation’ has become authoritative in development settings and has been invoked as ‘tyranny’, affecting social relations within communities. The ideal of ‘community participation’ held by donors does not always match the actual image of the local community, and there are also cases of tokenistic ‘participation’. In response to such a situation in Japan, Sato expressed concern that ‘participatory’ as a tool is polysemic and ambiguous, noting that there is confusion as to whether participation is a means or a target (Sato 2003, 2005).

Nevertheless, sociology in the development domain has the potential to become a testing ground for policy practice, which has been considered a weakness of traditional sociology. In this respect, Michael Cernea’s work at the World Bank is instructive in terms of the applied
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11 In response to this controversy, Hickey and Mohan (2004) discussed the need to focus on the agency of each actor in the transformation of local communities associated with participatory development.
practice implemented on the foundations of traditional sociology. Let us now examine further, through Cernea’s work, what sociological research on development looks like.

### 6.4 Displacement and Resettlement Induced by Infrastructure Construction

#### 6.4.1 Michael Cernea’s IRR Model

Michael Cernea was first employed as a sociologist in 1974 at the World Bank, the world’s largest development assistance organisation and a conglomerate of economists. In his subsequent work with the World Bank, Cernea focused on the resettlement problems that arise in infrastructure financing projects. He proposed a check on the organisation’s internal financing decision-making process and has led the institutionalisation of this within the Bank.

Cernea advocated the basic principle of ‘Putting people first’ in development assistance projects. He presented the adverse impacts of infrastructure projects, such as dams, on the relocated and proposed sites as an ‘Impoverishment Risk and Reconstruction’ (IRR) model. The eight risks are as follows: landlessness, joblessness, homelessness, marginalization, food insecurity, increased morbidity and mortality, loss of access to common property and services, and social disarticulation (Cernea 1991; Cernea and McDowell 2000).

Before the recognition of these issues and subsequent discussions by Cernea and colleagues of the social development division at the Bank, the residents to be relocated were often ‘just kicked out’ when infrastructure construction proceeded. It would have been better if they were ‘moved first and dealt with later’. That is, they were perceived as nothing more than obstacles in the way of the construction engineer. In this context, the concept clearly showed that the negative social impacts of infrastructure construction are multifaceted and extremely significant: the IRR model specifically highlights the risks that are likely to occur if no measures are taken in the event of displacement and resettlement; thus, the model can be used as a frame of reference to avoid risks. Accordingly, the model has been practically referenced and applied by many international organisations as a tool or checklist.

What is important here is that Cernea, who is trained in traditional sociology, not only understood the reality of project sites and extracted their essence from field research based on a sociological perspective, but also constructed a model that is compatible with the screening, monitoring, and evaluation systems of international financial institutions.

In his later work based on this model, Cernea criticised the cost–benefit analysis used in development projects for overlooking the social aspects of livelihood restoration, and further argued that compensation alone is not enough. He has published practical and concrete recommendations, such as advocating ‘compensation with development’ (Cernea and McDowell 2000; Cernea and Mathur 2008; Cernea and Maldonado 2018). Cernea was a pioneer and applied practitioner of Development Sociology.

#### 6.4.2 Experiences of Japan

Let us now also look at the Japanese debate on DIDR. Cernea’s argument is based on the reality of developing countries; thus, the IRR model cannot be applied directly to countries such as Japan. In the past, such as in the pre-war period, there were cases in Japan where people became impoverished after displacement, but in contemporary Japanese society there are
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12 For more on Cernea’s work at the World Bank, see Koch-Weser and Guggenheim (2021).

13 Not to go into the details here, but the guidelines for resettlement were first laid down as an internal regulation in February 1980 in the form of an Operational Manual (OM 2.33, Operational Manual Statement 2.33) and, after the Narmada experience, were published externally in 1986 as ‘Operational Policy’ (Operations Policy Issues in the Treatment of Involuntary Resettlement in Bank-Financed Projects). Various institutional designs and revisions have been made since then, including OP 4.30 (Involuntary Resettlement) in June 1990.
few cases where people cannot restore their livelihood. In addition, the system of ‘compensation with development’, as Cernea advocated, was already institutionalised as a law in the 1970s.

So, is IRR not an issue at all in Japan? In fact, the issue of dam construction has long been one of the most significant sites of social conflict in Japan, and the distress associated with development has been more severe than that associated with the restoration of economic livelihood. Based on the theory of social structure of victimisation, an analytical model in Japanese environmental sociology, Hamamoto clarified the long-term damage experienced by the residents who were supposed to be relocated from the Tokuyama Dam. The model created by Iijima (1984) analyses the multi-layered nature and derivation of the social damage experienced by victims, and considers cases of pollution, harmful effects of medicines, and industrial accidents that occurred during the period of rapid economic growth in Japan.

Applying the model, Hamamoto found that the suffering of the residents who were relocated as a consequence of the Tokuyama Dam project varied depending on the phase of construction; for example, deterioration and conflicts in interpersonal relationships within communities as well as anxiety about the future occurred in the site planning and negotiation phase, and seeking reemployment and adapting to a new community were present in the life reconstruction phase. More importantly, the project was re-examined 10 years after the resettlement, when the validity of the construction purpose was questioned; it was re-examined regarding whether it should continue or not. If it were cancelled, re-settlers would experience a sense of alienation, as if their whole life had been denied, with them wondering why they had spent so much time being forced to adapt to the project. This revealed that the former villagers had lost the meaning of their own existence, suffered an identity crisis and, in general, suffered extremely strong psychological pain (Hamamoto 2001, 2013, 2015). No major problems in terms of economic livelihood restoration have been identified regarding resettlers from the Tokuyama Dam project. However, Hamamoto noted that dam-induced social impacts are not only limited to livelihood restoration, but also include psychological harm.

Significantly, the social impact of constructing dams cannot be simply explained by the number people relocated or the amount of compensation payments that they received. When one focuses on the timing of the disputes from dam problems, it becomes apparent that Japan’s problems with constructing dams differ from those of developing countries (Hamamoto 2009, 2013). In the projects in developing countries, the process of getting the consensus of citizens living on the planned site is often simple, and the relocation procedure is fast. This is possibly because of the fragility of the land ownership system and protection of private ownership or possibly because of the asymmetrical power dynamics between the business people involved in the project and the residents living on the planned site. However, the relocation of citizens involves difficulties caused by citizens not wanting to live in a new area, and people demand the fulfilment of promises made regarding the relocation conditions and support with respect to their life reconstruction. Occasionally, these matters can turn into intense disputes. In many cases, these disputes occur after the citizens have relocated; these types of disputes could be called the ‘post-project problem model’. In contrast, in Japan it is not rare to observe complications between the business people involved in the project and the residents living on the planned site during the period before construction work begins. This is the ‘pre-project problem model’. Further, this can prolong a project and lead to the disruption of lives.
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14 The model has been well applied in recent years in studies with victims and evacuees of the Great East Japan Earthquake and the Fukushima nuclear power plant accident. Another analytical framework by Harutoshi Funabashi, which is not detailed here, includes the twin concepts of the benefit and victimized zones, which captures the composition of social conflicts over infrastructure construction (Hamamoto 2013).
6.5 Sociological Approaches to Development; What Kind of Sociological Research Do We Aim to Conduct?

The above has examined the specific example of DIDR, but there are many other areas of development phenomena that require a sociological approach, including the domains of urban, rural, labour, poverty, public health, primary healthcare, and gender. In the following sections, we will examine research perspectives specific to sociology when targeting these diverse areas and tentatively organise them into the following four analytical perspectives15. These are the accumulated research findings of sociology in the field of development, as well as the sociological viewpoints that bridge the Sociology of Development and Development Sociology.

6.5.1 Power Relations Among Actors at Development Sites

Sociology excels at understanding social relations and is sensitive to the various relationships in the development field. In particular, it is important to note that development assistance is often characterised by the intervention by outsiders. Power relations are embedded in the act of ‘assistance’, reflecting the agendas and interests of international organisations, governments, and NGOs. The recipients of development are also diverse. It is not uncommon for the acquisition of resources from the outside to strengthen the extant leaders’ power within the community. Leaders in the recipient society also make use of aid. This focus on relationships shares interests with political science and anthropology of development, of which Long’s actor-oriented approach (2001) is perhaps the most representative. Using this framework, Long explored how social actors are locked into a series of intertwined battles over resources, meanings, and institutional legitimacy and control16.

In Japan, Hiroshi Sato (1996) used the concepts of spoilage and jealousy to describe the relational changes in local communities where development programmes were implemented. Here, ‘spoilage’ refers to ‘an increase in dependency among people and marginalisation of their efforts towards self-reliance’ (Sato 1996, p. 118) as a result of assistance, and ‘jealousy’ refers to ‘people who feel that the benefits are concentrated in someone else’s place and wish to change that situation’ (ibid, p. 132). Such phenomena are a dynamic of social relations that often occurs in development aid settings, but are easily overlooked because they are outside the direct target. While this can be seen as the social relations of development settings, it can also be seen as an ‘unanticipated consequence’ of development projects. This is considered in the next section.

---

15 Hamamoto and Sato (2012) listed five of these, but ‘a gaze towards the logic of local communities and residents’ is common to all of them; thus, it is not included here and has been reorganised into four points in this paper. Viterna and Robertson (2015) discussed research trends in development in economics and political science, particularly in microeconomics, in which randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have become the gold standard. In comparison with these trends and outcomes, they identified five sociological areas where Development Sociology can offer better insights. These are institutions, social mobilisations, culture, inequality, and evaluation. The analytical objects in these five areas are also close to the four analytical perspectives mentioned in this paper.

16 Long argued that the outcomes of development programmes should not be myopically evaluated according to the intentions of the interveners but should rather focus on the historical processes of the recipient area, the accumulated experience of various stakeholders, and the interaction of actors in terms of negotiations, confrontations, and conflicts (Long 2001). The anthropologist Mosse’s point also fits here. In a participatory rural development project in India undertaken by the UK Department for International Development (DFID), he describes the authoritative nature of assistance, the diversity of recipients, and the complex social relations of local communities (Mosse 2005).
6.5.2 Unanticipated Consequences: Secondary, Indirect, Medium-, and Long-Term Impacts of Development Projects

‘Unanticipated consequences’ is one of the most important propositions in sociology, as proposed by R. K. Merton. When an event has a certain impact and produces some positive consequence, it is called an ‘eufunction’. Oppositely, when a certain influence has a rather negative result, it is called a ‘dysfunction’. For example, if the bureaucracy of a modern state can carry out its duties efficiently because the roles of its staff and chain of instructions are clear, this is called the ‘eufunction’ of the system. In contrast, if it is bound by roles and cannot flexibly respond to what is not in the precedent or in the manual, this is the ‘dysfunction’ of the bureaucracy. Similarly, regarding the economic assistance of international organisations, it is an ‘eufunction’ if the economic growth of developing countries is promoted, rather than a ‘dysfunction’ if the independence of developing countries is undermined and their economic growth is hindered. The aforementioned ‘spoilage’ concept of Hiroshi Sato captured exactly the ‘dysfunction’ in the development field, but engineers and administrative workers rarely pay attention to these ‘dysfunctions’.

Such ‘dysfunctions’ are often observed in society, but in many cases, they are the result of the accumulation of individual behaviour and are not expected by the actor. Therefore, for the actor, the situation in which ‘dysfunction’ occurs is indeed an ‘unanticipated consequence’, and it can be said that the secondary and indirect impacts of development are precisely these unintended consequences. The DIDR studies discussed above considered various aspects of resettlement as ‘unanticipated consequences’ of infrastructure construction, and followed up the process of livelihood restoration from a medium- to long-term perspective. However, this does not necessarily denote only the undesirable, but also the unexpected desirable consequences.

A study by Hamamoto (2008), (2011), Hamamoto et al. (2005), (2011) on resettlers in Beijing’s urban renewal identified those kinds of experiences. The locals relocated from the inner city to the urban suburbs initially were disappointed with the decrease in living standard, but their dissatisfaction decreased as the property values of their new homes increased over time and living circumstances improved with the extension of subways and opening of commercial facilities due to the expansion of the suburbs. These are also examples of ‘unanticipated consequences’ that can be captured by following the impact over the medium to long term.

In this way, sociology, while critically examining the one-sidedness of economic development, focuses on the relationships between actors in social development and, furthermore, examines keenly whether there are any deviations from the original aims and what the unintended positive and negative consequences are (Hamamoto and Sato 2012)\(^\text{17}\).

6.5.3 Macro–Micro Linkages Among International, National, and Regional Transformations

Empirical sociological research in the development field seeks to understand daily life practices from the perspective of local communities and residents. However, trends in local communities are not closed and complete within local communities but are often associated with policies and measures at the national level. In addition, the impact of globalisation cannot be ignored. International market prices for certain agricultural products may rise or fall depending on events in seemingly unrelated distant countries.

\(^{17}\)The proposition of ‘unintended consequences’ has been identified by sociologists, but even without using it, some studies have critically explained it as a paradoxical phenomenon. For example, the anthropologist Ferguson (1990) found that the World Bank and Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) rural development programmes in Lesotho did not work as the donors had intended, as they overlooked the social significance of livestock ownership for farmers and various poverty reduction programmes created conflicts of interest among local government organisations.
which may in turn increase or decrease migrant jobs. That is, it is not possible to understand a local community simply by looking at it intrinsically. This perspective of analysing macro trends and micro social transformations, linking this hidden relationship, is one of the strengths of sociology.

In this respect, Viterna and Robertson (2015) suggested that development is best explained by analysing how a few key factors evolve across variable national and subnational contexts. Barnett argued that Sociology of Development asks how social change occurs, what we mean by social change, how it affects individuals, how it affects whole societies, and most recently, how it affects the whole world taken as one ‘social system’ (Barnett 1988, p. 11). Webster also indicated that the present state of poorer countries in the world can only be understood by examining their place in the socio-economic relations of the global system (Webster 1990, p. 4). Thus, sociology has a dynamic perspective that links macro and micro trends. It tries to capture both macro and micro aspects of ‘bottom-up’ as well as ‘top-down’ development, and the element of ‘endogenous development’ that is partly contained within ‘exogenous development’ (Hamamoto and Sato 2012).

6.5.4 Values, Culture, and Discourse on Development

Sociology does not only study concrete infrastructure construction and development programmes; the meaning of development is highly polysemic, varying according to the local and historical context. The shape of development is multifaceted.

People’s attitudes change in the context of macro-social change. Values such as ‘what kind of society do we want’ and ‘what kind of state can we call development’, with respect to improved material living standards, political democratisation, and a sense of social justice, differ from society to society and even within the same society at different times. They are related not only to political and economic systems, but also to local history, religion, and culture. In this regard, Webster stated the following.

What, for example, do the ‘ordinary’ members of society think ‘development’ is? Their version of an improved world may be very different from that of the economist oriented towards the expansion of industrial production. Sociologically it is important to examine people’s own conception of their lifestyle, life-chances, and motivations in order to see how they respond to apparent ‘development opportunities’. If people themselves do not think that an opportunity exists, whatever promoting the economist may give, they are unlikely to want to make a move (Webster 1990, p.10).

In Japan, developmentalism and developmental states have been examined in-depth by Southeast Asian studies scholars, economists, political scientists, and sociologists. The important point here is that people did not blindly follow the authoritarian top-down development policies put forward by these political leaders, but rather positively supported developmentalism through the medium of a shared growthist ideology (Institute of Social Science 1998; Suehiro 2000). Accordingly, the question then must be asked as to how the values of a growthist ideology, in which people aspire for a prosperous life, are generated and shared.

Following these discussions, the sociologist Machimura (2011) explored the discourse of development surrounding the Sakuma Dam (completed in 1956), one of the leading power generation dams in post-war Japan. This civil engineering project became a symbol of post-war development not only because of its massive size and economic benefits, but also because a documentary film on the construction of this dam project was widely shown in theatres throughout Japan. People witnessed the Sakuma Dam construction through the documentary and shared the development experience. It is too early to say that the documentary acted as some sort of device that engendered the growthist ideology that development is a wonderful dream, but there is no doubt that a shared value, which Machimura 18 These key factors here are institutions, social divisions, and questions of human growth (Viterna and Robertson 2015, p. 259).
calls the ‘developmentalist mentality’, was formed during Japan’s period of rapid growth. Dam construction in Japan was a symbol of development in the 1950s and 1960s, but since the late 1990s, it has become a primary target of criticism as ‘meaningless public works’. How these changes in perception developed needs to be analysed at a meta-level, and sociology is responsible for capturing these changes.

6.6 Concluding Remarks

The above has confirmed the basic stance of sociology in the field of development, considering the issue of DIDR. If DIDR is viewed in the broad sense of the SDGs goals and targets, vocational training to support re-settlers’ employment is closely related to Goal 4\(^{19}\), and in terms of participatory development and consensus-building, Target 6.b\(^{20}\) may also be relevant. DIDR can often be discussed together with climate change related displacement and resettlement, which is also closely related to Goal 13\(^{21}\). Furthermore, although we have considered the negative impacts on human society, it also has a point of contact with Goal 15\(^{22}\) in terms of the impacts of dam construction on the natural environment. However, what is more important than listing the relevant items in this way is to develop understanding case by case and context by context from the perspective of the Sociology of Development/Development Sociology, as explained above.

Developed countries have already shifted towards post development or degrowth, and growthist ideologies may seem somewhat old-fashioned. However, the goal of development that has driven the world enthusiastically since World War II still exists, albeit with qualitative changes. Goals such as ‘reduce CO\(_2\) emissions by X% compared to the level of the year XXXX’ and ‘step towards decarbonised society’ are ‘desirable’, and the international community’s commitments to these goals are quite similar to the pursuit of conventional developmentalism.

The dominant values are the ideology of sustainability, which has become a world of normative ‘shoulds’. Sustainable development is considered as a matter of course, as well as discussing how to achieve the SDGs. Given the situation, sociology’s most significant role is neither simply to act as a flag-bearer for the SDGs, nor to criticise the ambiguity and inadequacy of the numerical indicators\(^{23}\).

Just as development used to be a beautiful-sounding word that caused many problems, the push towards the beautiful goals of the SDGs does not always bear only great fruit. Alternative energies such as wind and solar are also causing health hazards for residents and landscape destruction at the community level. Nuclear power is also touted by pro-nuclear advocates as a ‘clean energy’ that does not emit CO\(_2\), but the issue of final disposal of spent nuclear fuel indicates that it is not sustainable. Environmental NGOs have criticised the phenomenon of enterprises pretending to take environmental action as ‘greenwash’, and similar concerns about ‘SDG-washing’ are now being raised. The common goals of the international community may

\(^{19}\) ‘Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all’.

\(^{20}\) ‘Target 6.b: Support and strengthen the participation of local communities in improving water and sanitation management’.

\(^{21}\) ‘Goal 13: Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts’.

\(^{22}\) ‘Goal 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss’.

\(^{23}\) While environmental sociologist Lockie criticises sceptical sociologists who regard the sustainability debate as a meaningless rhetorical device (Lockie 2012), he argues that there is significant scope for sociology’s contribution, as follows: ‘Sustainability is bigger than the SDGs or any other UN-led agenda. We can do more than monitor progress towards the ‘social’ targets agreed through multilateral negotiations. We can engage more directly with questions of what ought to be sustained alongside questions of who decides, who acts and who benefits. In doing so, we are presented with additional theoretical and methodological questions about how best to apprehend and influence social relationships that do not yet exist—questions we should be encouraging all sociologists to consider’ (Lockie 2016, p. 3).
be dysfunctional and have ‘unanticipated consequences’.

Portes once argued, while pointing to the failure of structural adjustment policies based on neoliberalism, that without sociological work in development and its diffusion within policy-making circles, it is probable that the fulfillment of the developmental goals of sustained growth and social equity will become anything but certain (Portes 1997, p. 254). The development phenomenon is more complex than it appears on the surface. The perspectives discussed in this chapter provide clues regarding how to identify and understand this complex composition. Putting aside once and for all the value norms of ‘good or bad’, sociology attempts to view society objectively and from multiple perspectives. From this standpoint, sociological perspectives will be of great help when trying to gain a deeper understanding of the phenomena surrounding the SDGs.
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