Inclusive development: a multi-disciplinary approach
Nicky Pouw¹ and Joyeeta Gupta²,³

The term inclusive development has emerged in the 21st century and has been adopted in a series of scholarly and policy documents. Its roots, however, can be traced to different concepts in different disciplines. While some see inclusive development as only combining social aspects with economic growth through political approaches, we define inclusive development instead as focusing on social wellbeing and protecting the ecosystem services of nature through redefining political priorities, especially in the context of the Anthropocene. This term can potentially bridge different disciplines together. This article reviews the scholarly and policy literature on the term inclusive development and presents a guiding framework for examining how different disciplines deal with inclusive development.
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Introduction
Although the concept of sustainable development has reached centre stage in international scholarly attention [1] and the policy arena [2] with the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in 2015 by the United Nations General Assembly [3], the room for trade-offs that this concept allows, is intensely debated [4]. While strong sustainable development allows no trade-offs between the social, ecological and economic aspects and between current and future generations [5], experience shows that vested interests can interpret sustainable development to further their own interests leading most often to weak sustainable development in favour of economic growth [6]. The sustainable development concept allows neoliberal capitalists, social wellbeing scholars and environmentalists to formulate the trade-offs towards their own interests leading to a tug of war between these schools of thoughts [7,8]. Inevitably, if neoliberalism and laissez-faire has political and economic weight, the interpretation and implementation of sustainable development leans towards growth first, as is dictated by the market.

This has led to the birth of the concept of inclusive development [9], which had its roots in social justice scholarly papers and social movements, and focused on the participation [10*], human rights and social demands of the most marginalized people [11] and communities [12,13]. Second, the poorest and marginalized are also those who depend on natural resources such as land, water, fish and forests [14*], while they are also those who are the most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change [15], land and resource grabbing [16], and run the risk of stranded resources (i.e., that they may not deforest or use their oil resources because of new knowledge regarding the impacts of doing so) [17]. This is a major risk that is exacerbated in the context of the Anthropocene as growing demands of humans leads to large-scale environmental risk and has led to the expansion of the concept to also imply environmental inclusiveness.

Third, some scholars and policymakers interpret inclusive development as helping the poor in a patronizing manner; however, others argue that it is much more about empowering the poor through rights, creating equal opportunities and ensuring redistributive justice and thus also requires addressing the political processes that lead to the concentration of power [18]. Thus inclusive development is about social, environmental and relational inclusiveness, and defines development as enhancing ecological and social wellbeing [19] rather than as growth [7]. While others see inclusive development as inclusive growth [23,24], we disagree arguing that ecological and social inclusiveness is significantly more important than economic inclusiveness especially in the context of the Anthropocene [7].

The term ‘inclusive’ has been mentioned 52 times in the UN Global Sustainable Development Report 2015 [20] and represents the effort by social justice and environmental actors to bring the centre of gravity of the trade-offs between social, environmental and economic issues towards social and environmental goals [21]. The underlying argument is that social inequality reduces opportunities
for enhancing human well-being while reducing the resource base and exacerbating the climate vulnerability of these people. The question is whether governing by SDGs will succeed. Although these goals aim at addressing socio-ecological issues, the actual achievements may be measured through a conservative economic framework, which may emphasize efficiency at the cost of inclusiveness. This leads to institutions such as the World Bank, Asian Development Bank, and the International Labour Organization to use ‘inclusive growth’ for advocating a pro-poor perspective [22,23]. Their inclusive perspective is confined to market participation (by creating jobs for the poor) and efficiency (of economic processes, policies, institutions), and builds further upon an economic paradigm that does not assign value to social or environmental sustainability in its growth models. Only when multiple criteria of development performance are accepted, an inclusive development policy agenda can be grounded in a new economic theory that goes beyond growth [24].

Hence, this introductory paper to our Special Issue on Inclusive Development examines the literature on inclusive development and develops a guiding framework for broadening the inquiry into creating a theory of inclusive development by building on related elements that have been developed in different disciplines and thematic areas, beyond international development studies.

Inclusive development: definitions and contestations
Inclusive development is a contested term in four distinct ways. The first refers to whether scholars and policymakers choose to use inclusive development (where development is much broader than growth and may even mean a steady state [25] or de-growth), inclusive growth (where there is a focus on both increasing growth and sharing the growth through, for example, employment opportunities for all [26] and redistributive mechanisms), or inclusive wealth (focusing less on flows of income to reproducible stocks in society and includes the argument that investing in growth may be at the cost of wealth [27]).

The second is with respect to the content of development. For many, development is equivalent to increasing GDP. For others [28] development is an ever-evolving concept including the satisfaction of basic social and economic human rights, meeting basic human needs [29], reducing poverty, enhancing wellbeing [29], financial inclusion [30], minimizing externalized environmental impacts, a focus on rural development to balance urban development [31], the need to incorporate the ideas of social movements, encouraging participatory development [32], ultimately aiming at enhancing the capabilities and freedoms of people [33] so that inequality is reduced [34] and human progress is enhanced for all [35], and according to people’s own priorities for development.

The third is with respect to the content of inclusiveness [36]. Inclusiveness can mean emphasizing the needs of disadvantaged and marginalized people [37], peri-urban areas, sectors and regions; participation in policy and politics [38] especially with respect to moderately structured and unstructured problems [39]; multiple sources of knowledge including that of indigenous peoples [40] and a broad education processes [41]; social infrastructure for all [42]; contextual issues [42]; capacity building to enable the marginalized to use the opportunities [43]; the recognition of plural systems of rights, that is, also customary rights, enabling people to help themselves [27,43]; and the re-distribution of power to allow for redistribution of resources [44]. This has also been expressed in global policy documents as “leaving no one behind” [20].

Finally, there is debate regarding the content of inclusive development as a whole. While some focus exclusively on social and economic inclusiveness [45], others on social and relational or political inclusiveness, we argue that it includes social, ecological and relational inclusiveness [21].

Promoting inclusive development from a relational perspective also implies tackling inequality [46]. Inequality is historically inherited and institutionalized in social rules; but modern policies can also explicitly or implicitly exacerbate inequalities. For example, at local level privatization of public services can exacerbate the access of the poor to these services; while climate change can exacerbate the vulnerability of the poorest in society. Technologies are also increasingly replacing the jobs of low-skilled workers.

Many instruments are being promoted as ways to promote inclusive development. This includes the adoption of goals [21], principles, regulatory, economic and auspicious instruments that aim at job creation, infrastructure for provision of basic needs (e.g., food, water, sanitation, roads, public transport, telephone lines) [46], enhancing human capital, and investing in social security and safety nets.

Disciplinary questions
Having discussed the recent literature focused on inclusive development, we now turn to develop a guiding framework to assess the scholarship on various aspects of social and environmental justice spread through many disciplines (e.g., inclusive economics [47]). Each discipline has developed its theories further and sometimes in relation to specific fields. This framework aims to guide the authors in this Special Issue to develop and engage with the concept of inclusive development by exploring related concepts and developments in their respective fields. This framework draws inspiration from a previous framework developed by the Earth System Governance programme, which elaborated on inclusiveness as Access.
Table 1

| Multi-disciplinary Guiding Framework for Analysing Inclusive Development (ID) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Discipline | Overarching questions | Access | Allocation | Development and wellbeing | Authors |
| Political science | Who gets what, when, where, and why? | Whether and how basic rights/needs should be met and what are these? | What principles should guide the allocation of resources (including sinks), responsibilities and risks (e.g., climate impacts)? | How is development defined? What is the role of growth, de-growth, wealth in promoting wellbeing? | Gupta and Pouw |
| Law | What principles are relevant? How can they be implemented? | Who represents the interests or the marginalized? Who resists efforts to guarantee access, and why? Role of state? | How does allocation of resources, responsibilities and risks take place? What factors influence this? How role do power relations play? How do equity principles interact with existing ownership principles in determining allocation? | Who decides what is development/wellbeing and why? Who resists these definitions and why? Whose voice determines outcomes? | Mohan; Brand, Boo and Brad; Arts; Obani |
| Economics/finance | What role do economic, financial and legal instruments play? | Can subsidies and incentives deal with the issue of access? How does privatization/cost-recovery affect access? | Can markets allocate resources equitably and efficiently? Are job markets and financial systems fair? What is the social and ecological responsibility of business? | What factors influence how economists define development/wellbeing? What are their alternative definitions? | Corrado and Corrado; Ngepah; Kumar; Likoko and Kini; Kourula, Pisani and Kolk |
| Sociology | What role does education, social relations and movements play? | How do they influence access, when and under what circumstances? | How do they shape institutions that allocate benefits, risks and burdens? What are the equity outcomes? | How do they influence the definition of development/wellbeing, when and under what circumstances? | Bonal and Fontdevila |
| Anthropology | How do different societies make sense of their world? | How and why do different cultures deal with access? | How and why do different societies deal with distributive challenges? | How and why do they interpret development/wellbeing in specific ways? | Bakker and Noteboom |
| Gender studies | How does gender stereotypes, differences and discrimination affect ID? | How and why does this affect access? | How and why does this affect distributive justice? | How and why does this affect development/wellbeing; and how can development enhance outcomes for women? | Koralagama et al. |
| Environment waterscientists | What physical, biological, geological/chemical characteristic shapes ID? | Are there physical limits to specific resources that hamper access? | Does the natural characteristics of a resource or problem shapes allocation rules? | How and why does the natural characteristics of resources shape definitions of development/wellbeing? | Dos Santos and Gupta; Araos and Ther; Rawat; Luo et al. |
| Engineering | What role do technologies play in ID? | How, why, and under what circumstances do technologies limit access? | How, why, and under what circumstances do technologies shape distributive issues? | What should be the role of technology in development? Should development shape technology or vice versa? | Siddiqi and Collins |

Source: Building on Gupta and Lebel (2010) [48].

and Allocation [48] where access refers to being able to secure the minimum resources needed for survival, and allocation refers to the distribution of resources, risks, infrastructures, products and services in society (see Table 1 for the questions and the authors who have attempted to address these questions).

**Conclusions**

This paper has assessed the state of the literature on ‘inclusive development,’ and has elaborated on a guiding framework for expanding on the concept of inclusive development, by building on related concepts and approaches in different disciplines as well as thematic...
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areas. While historically societies have tended to be more and more unequal, the 20th century and early 21st centuries have experienced a period in which there has been relatively more equality [34-37], now followed by a period of rising inequality. However, what is clear is that globally societies have decided to address access issues, reduce inequalities, and promote more inclusive and sustainable societies through the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals. This Special Issue explores how different disciplines and fields can give meaning to the concept of inclusive development.
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