

## Research Article

# From Solid Evolution to Liquid Evolution: Challenges to Public Administration and Institutions

Tuomo Rautakivi<sup>1\*</sup>, Maurice Yolles<sup>2</sup><sup>1</sup>Department of International Studies, Royal University of Phnom Penh<sup>2</sup>Centre for the Creation of Coherent Change & Knowledge (C4K), Liverpool John Moores University**ORCID**Tuomo Rautakivi: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2313-9403>**Abstract.**

This paper aims to explain some forms of development and the relationship between development adaptations. Development has a cultural perspective, and culture can be explored in terms of the relationship between institutional values and norms. Changes in internal and external climate affect and challenge prevailing culture, which includes values, beliefs, and norms. These changes (socio-cultural) have an impact on the social meaning, norms, and development of society. Development within a socio-political context is defined in terms of institutional processes, enabling a wide class of complex situations to be addressed. Development is an adaptive attribute of a changing socio-political agency with interactive ties to its environment. It is connected to globalization, which is part of that environment, as the global COVID-19 pandemic or Ukraine war clearly shows. The period of change creates instability and cultural uncertainty because values may become confused, and so, sociocultural processes may become a liquid society. The changes challenge public administration, public policy, and their capacity to answer changing situations. This study uses Bauman's idea of a liquid society and Yolles' Cultural Agency Theory (CAT). A political agent will be generically modeled using CAT, and the neo-institutional processes and their capacity for development will be explored.

**Keywords:** liquid evolution, uncertainty, sensate, Ideational, populism

## 1. Introduction

The current world is interconnected, which means that within globalization there are mutually related dependency effects in, for example, economic relations, political ties, digitalization and information, security issues, and trade. It also means that information and ideologies are fast moving. We can see this in the dynamic changes that may disturb traditional order, harmony and values, as well as the distribution of income and prosperity. The changes in society and its various systems make the future unpredictable (1) and it increases uncertainty in, and the complexity of, society (2). As a result these political, security, social, economic and other changes are needed that

Corresponding Author: Tuomo Rautakivi; email: [tuomo.rautakivi@gmail.com](mailto:tuomo.rautakivi@gmail.com)**Published** 24 February 2023

Publishing services provided by Knowledge E

© Rautakivi and Yolles. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the 2nd ICPSH 2022 Conference Committee.

**OPEN ACCESS**

present challenges to public administration. Consequently, public administration and governmental institutions must adapt and identify the development of new policies and functions, recognising that the connection between politics and the political culture of public institutions is a reflection of societal and/or organizational values.

Generally, public policies encompass all those authoritative public decisions that governments make (3). Broadly, public policy reflects regimes, values, the commitments of relevant institutions, and even the views of whole societies. Public policy is a direct output of a political system (4). Huntington and Nelson (5) consider public interest, and their view is that this deals with the interest of public institutions. Of critical importance to the state are the preeminent public institutions involved in the development process (6). The outcomes are the result of public policy and government efficacy.

Political development often refers to the modernization of institutions (7, 8). They continue by stating that such political development has certain requirements that include: rationalization of authority, replacement of large numbers of traditional institutions, the differentiation of new political functions, the development of specialized structures to perform those functions, and increased participation in politics by social groups throughout society. Public institutions absorb public societal voices. Social and economic change broadens political awareness, increases political demands and widens political participation. These changes weaken traditional sources of political authority and traditional political institutions, and enormously complicate the problems of creating new areas of political associations and new political institutions. The primary problem of politics is the lag in the development of political institutions behind social and economic change, and government organizations are unable to deliver public goods and absorb increasing social and economic demands. Thus it may lead to a gap between demand and surplus, and in turn this can easily create governmental overloads (9). Huntington notes that by public interest is meant interest in public institutions (10).

Development and change challenges public institutions in handling development, and development needs to follow processes of modernization. Following Huntington (11), modernization creates instability while modernity creates stability. This is because modernity creates new values that often conflict with old values. Globalization boosts new ideas, and development transforms society through processes of globalization. Such globalisation is underpinned by what Stiglitz identifies as a faulty conceptualization of neoliberalism. This promotes liberalisation through the removal of government participation in financial markets, capital markets, and trade (12). Globalization is a process of interaction and integration that occurs between people, enterprises and governments worldwide, and may have economic, political, technological, cultural dimensions. It can

lead to greater interdependence and mutual awareness among economic, political, and social units in the world, but, there are conflicting views about whether it is a positive or negative force (13). Globalization challenges culture and cultural change contributes to an important aspect of the recognition of how societies may change, especially when societies become incoherent because of cultural instability. Bauman (14) has described this incoherence very well through his ideas of liquid society.

Development can be seen as a complex phenomenon. As such the frame of reference that is adopted to examine it needs to be susceptible to complexity. In this paper our intention is to explore development through a three different perspectives. A living systems approach is a cybernetic metatheory that embraces complexity and that, has enabled the creation of Cultural Agency Theory (15), and its integration with (16) theory of sociocultural dynamics (17). This general approach can also be applied to development (18). This can also be link to the theoretic perspectives of Bauman (19), who writes on liquid society. These theoretical ideas are usually paradigmatically separate, being considered quite independently of each other. Creating synergies between them as will be undertaken here provides a novel and way of modelling development that has a potential to see development in new ways.

## 2. Method

This study applied literature review for providing a novel and way of modelling development perspectives in the context of changing environment such as the global COVID-19 pandemic or Ukraine war. By using literature review as a methodology, this study offers an overview of different perspectives of development theories. Several articles were selected for inclusion in the review to provide explanations about some forms of development and the relationship between development adaptations.

## 3. Results and Discussion

### 3.1. Development as Evolution

Development can be defined in many ways, depending on what factors we want to focus on, such as economic, social or institutional development. Here, our interest extends to “sustainable development”. A sound definition of development comes from free dictionary.com which is given as “a significant event, occurrence, or change” or “the act of improving by expanding or enlarging or refining. For CAT (20) the terms improvement

and progression are central to another concept, that of evolution: a process in which “something” passes progressively and by degree from one stage to another, leading to considering development as an evolutionary process. To think that development is an evolutionary process is therefore useful, but what specifically might this “something” be that enables development to be taken as an evolutionary process? Soares and Quintella 21) resolve this by distinguishing between three classifications of development as evolution, and which we shall refer to as economic, social, and institutional. These can be defined as follows:

1. Economic evolution: Development is a natural consequence of economic growth. Broadly speaking, it is concerned with the dynamics and change and has a focus on such processes as entrepreneurship, innovation, industrial and institutional dynamics, and on patterns of economic growth and development. Economic evolution is perhaps the largest, or at least the most globally significant part of cultural evolution (22). So that from this perspective, economic evolution is a cultural base phenomenon, and it may occur in different ways in different locations depending on prevailing culture. Economic development in the west is defined and underpinned by neo-liberal ideology where the central importance is trickle- down effect, where prosperity and wealth trickling from elites the poorest. Unfortunately the idea of trickle - down had been found not to work, both theoretically and practically (23, 24,25). Here one needs to need to note that three is also weak support of this theory like Worstall 26) explain. Probably the best-known economic evolution theory-based idea of Rostow’s five stages economic development [27]. Economic growth is not the same as economic evolution. Economic growth occurs at the operational level of economic analysis; economic evolution, however, refers to generic change and re-coordination (28).
2. Social evolution: This is concerned with how social interactions between social agents arise, change and are maintained. Social evolution theories have changed since the last Millennium and developed rapidly last 20 year (29). Social evolution is a 19th Century concept, then intended to justify processes of western colonization to facilitate advancement of less developed states that supported ideas of dependency and cultural inferiority. Taken as then conceived, it leads to the realisation that dependent countries would always have limited access to development because of their dependency (30). Veiga (31) links social evolution with cultural evolution, and explains that from the theory of political asymmetry, it operates as an ideological trap invented to perpetuate asymmetrical relationships

between dominant minorities and the dominated majorities in countries and among them.

3. Institutional evolution: A structure or mechanism of social order that governs the behaviour of a set of individuals within a given community (32). Turner (33) explains that it is a complex of positions, roles, norms and values lodged in particular types of social structures, this implying that there is a cultural base to it. Hodgson (34) see it in terms of norms, rules, practices, rituals and sanctions that influence decisions and that facilitates or constrains behaviour. It should be realised that values and norms provide inherent regulatory structures. Institutions can be long lasting due to the set of stable values that they adopt. Huntington (1965) explains that an institution becomes durable through a process of institutionalization. Institutionalization, from Britannica, is defined as a process that is intended to regulate societal behaviour within organizations or entire societies. Thus, institutions involve cultural, regulatory and decision elements that come together and generate social order (35).

### 3.2. Development as Growth

Growth is an external function of agency (occurring in its local or broader environment) having exogenous behavioural dynamics, and that has influences on agency (36), while development is an internal function of agency having endogenous immanent meta-dynamics (relating to culture, cognition and social structure. Growth can increase GDP/capita, and/or it can deliver social improvement, social change, where social improvement requires social change. Social change includes adjustments in populations like size, and composition like gender, ethnicity, nationality, and cultural values that vary between degrees of materialism or psychism (37).

O'Hara (38) sees development as a process of systemic institutionalization, where institutional development refers to the creation of a progression. By institutional development O'Hara is referring to a process of evolution, where growth and development mutually influence each other thereby creating progressive institutions. For O'Hara, such institutions can facilitate long-term sustainable growth. We can assume that development and growth are interconnected, but growth may not necessarily need development.

### 3.3. Development as Globalization

As the continuum of evolution, development is connected to growth which is in turn connected to such entities as economics, politics, technology and culture, where economies can become closer and more interrelated, and state interdependencies arise from globalization may occur, and may vary (in their dimensionality) across the world. It includes reference to economics, politics, technology and culture transformation, where economies can become closer and more interrelated, and state interdependencies arise.

Countries with large heterogeneity across their regions related to their degree of globalization have different patterns of development than countries with homogeneity (39). They further explain that a consequence of this difference is that there occurs an elaboration in the distinction between the haves and the have-nots, from which poverty and inequality result. The impact of globalization can enhance economic growth, but it can also increase inequality. It is also important to realize that Globalization is enhanced through processes of a neoliberal plurality (40). He also recognizes that globalization has within it varieties of dominating social neoliberalism. Neoliberalism promote individuals and corporations liberty and independence and fewer rules and regulations or even deregulation. The financial deregulation that underpinned neoliberal globalisation became a pathological socio-economic force as the seriousness of the resulting 2007/8 financial crises became apparent. This institutional de-evolution permits norms to be replaced as ethics became abandoned and commercial abuse for utilitarian profit against human condition resulted in the worst recession since the 1930s, this being responsible for social, political, and economic decline (41). Such decline is evident when cultural norms weaken or are abandoned. This is may not be universal, but may occur in weak states and its institution which are not able to handling changing cultural norms.

### 3.4. The importance of Culture to Development

State and its institutions (public administration) are the reflection of its culture where following attributes are important:

1. Values: Desirable individual or commonly shared conceptions (42);
2. Norms: Shared beliefs about conduct, composed as informal rules that guide cognition and behaviour of those who are members of a culture (43);

### 3. Beliefs: State of mind in which something is thought to be the case (45)

These attributes determine the behaviour of the society and societal life. Culture is important to any social, whether it is a society, an organization or a coherent long-lasting group, and provides a field of influence for it. The ratio and level of co-operation and communication are based on culture and mutual trust between people and organization's and trust is the main factor constituting coherence inside an organization and between humans and their organization (45).

Values and norms are dichotomous, and a value system can be modelled as dual cultural forces. In this, Sorokin (46) distinguishes between two extreme types of value system that determine culture: sensate and ideational. According Sorokin theory of sociocultural dynamics can be formulated in terms of two extreme types of value system that determine cultural state: sensate and ideational. The cultural value system may be relatively homogenous (similar values) or heterogeneous (mixed values). The value system of a cultures may be stable or unstable. Modernity and development or unexpected external changes or chock may change the stability and equilibrium. As note earlier modernization creates instability for society. So the shift from modernity to postmodernity is an entry into a period of cultural instability as Bauman and Yolles notes earlier. They explain that transform period from new stages changes also the views of reality and becoming a period that saw in the onset of socio-cultural uncertainty. This has transformed into Bauman's notions of liquidity, in which *uncertainty is a dominant feature* and the *movement from the solid development* to the full-blown uncertainties of liquidity can occur through the transition of new era or stage.

Sorokin's theory explains why certain conditions in society arise, and how they are likely to change and also explains that the state of society can ascend, achieve stability or decline. The indicators of stability are consistent with determinism, and movement to decline/ascendency with modernism and postmodernism. Yolles (47) notes that Bauman's paradigm only describes the liquid uncertainty of the current era. Sorokin's paradigm provides an explanation for longer term processes, but medium-term explanation of the dynamic process that brings us liquidity is also of value.

We can assume that Globalization, as a representation of development, is a process that has been going on for centuries, but which in the current era might be referred to as liquid globalization. The current period of liquid globalization is full of uncertainty and this can be explained in terms of Sorokin's theory of socio-cultural dynamics as Yolles described. He continue and noted that during these periods of instability that cultural norms also become unstable, making societies more susceptible to the rise of autocratic politics that diminishes the equality and devalues life.

Here, it is useful to introduce tight and loose cultures, and these can be related to Sensate and Ideational cultures. Tight cultures have many rules, norms, and standards that determine the nature of correct behaviour, while in loose cultures there are few rules, norms, or standards (48). In tight cultures, when individuals break rules or norms, they are likely to be criticized or punished with specific degrees of seriousness as determined socio-politically.

### 3.5. The Sensate and Ideational value system

The Sensate and Ideational cultural values interact, one functioning as an auxiliary influence on the other. Interaction between mutual auxiliaries may result in a dominant position for one in which the values adopted in a social are homogeneous, or a simple societal mix of values. In the former case the culture is said to be stable, in the latter is it not, and is the result of a shifting values balance that sees values in conflict and creates cultural uncertainty and When an unstable mix of values occurs after a dominant values-based culture has occurred, then it tends towards decline. (49) He explain that as its values-based auxiliary moves towards ascendance. Sometimes though, a mix becomes stable resulting in an Integral/Idealistic phase in which the attributes of both the Sensate and Ideational forces can be supportively coupled. Such cultural movements occur over decades or centuries, this depending the nature of the dynamic and the size of the population involved in a society.

As the table1 shows Socio-cultural movements may occur over decades or centuries, and can occurs in different period in history, the duration dependent of the size of a population due to something called cultural inertia (Yolles and Fink, 2021). This table explain the development in west hemisphere.

Period	Cultural Type	Begin	End
1200 BC - 900 BC	Dark age sensate	1200 BC	900 BC
900 BC - 500 BC	Archaic Greece ideational	900 BC	500 BC
500 BC - 320 BC	Classical Greece integral/idealistic	500 BC	320 BC
320 BC - 400 BC	Hellenistic - Roman sensate	320 BC	400 BC
400 BC - 600 AD	Transitional period Mixed (unstable)	400 BC	600 AD
600 AD - 1200 AD	Middle Ages ideational	600 AD	1200 AD
1200 AD - 1500 AD	High Middle Ages , & Renaissance Integral/idealistic	1200 AD	1500 AD
1500 AD - 1900 (mid)	Rationalism, & Age of Science Sensate	1500 AD	1900 (mid)
1900 (mid) - present	<b>Transitional Period Mixed ( unstable) 1900 (mid) present</b>	1900 (mid)	present

Table 1. Changes in Cultural Phases. Source Uebersax, 2012. (50)



In the West, Culture is currently likely to be in a state of transition as it loses its Sensate stability and moves into a mixed Sensate-Ideational cultural phase that is consistent with cultural decline.

Following this table the West has been in its third Sensate period (rationalism and the age of science) since 1500, and we postulate that now Sensate values are declining with Ideational values in the ascendant. Yolles analyses that results in cultural instabilities as values from one cultural value force diminish, allegiances are broken, and societies become dislocated and instrumentality develops. We can assume that developing countries will follow this pattern, and this happened faster than in the west, because the ideologies and technologies expand fast and widely around the globe, because free access for information.

Table 1, shows that in the sensate period the west is in decline, but at the same time there are other regions with different stages of change. Sorokin (51) indicates that in 20<sup>th</sup> the Century China was partly Ideational and partly mixed (another intermediary phase between the two extreme states of culture). He also he notes, in the same volume, that the “stars of the next acts of the great historical drama of the world” are going to be the renascent great cultures of India, China, Japan, Indonesia, and Islamic world.

Today, China is rising with a vigorous neoliberalism[?] that reflects the early Sensate period of the West with its new industrial revolution (52). This clearly suggests that China (like the Asian “tiger economies”) is in the vanguard of an early rising Sensate phase compared to the end of phase declining Sensate phase of the West. This recognition is also principally, if indirectly, underscored by Bauman’s (2008) recognition that Western society is currently in a liquid state of uncertainty, this being a representative description of Sorokin’s ideas of cultural instability and decline.

### 3.6. Cultural Instability and Liquidity

Following ideas of Sorokin and Bauman), one can predict that during the transformation stage cultural instability increasing. This is because values may become confused and situation become uncertain, so sociocultural processes may deliver liquid society. Bauman is essentially referring to its increasing uncertainty. This centres on the idea of liquid society, from which the word becomes applied to a variety of nouns. Palese and Bauman (53) define liquid society as extended social dynamics, high levels of mobility and perpetual social change for interactions and relationships, and in the configuration of structures and social systems. Bauman notes also that the liquid perspective on society helps explain instabilities in the practice of public relations because the crisis

has fuelled additional uncertainty to the state of liquid fear in a liquid society of liquid consumption.” Example of the change of the society arise postmodernity which recognises society’s radical change, a constant overthrowing of tradition and traditional forms of economy, culture, and relationship, and adopts an implicit recognition of uncertainty associated with social life and means conflict with old and new values. During periods of cultural instability it means cultural changes and changes in values and norms make development as liquid process and that explain the rise of populism (54, 55).

### 3.7. Discussion

The start of this paper identifies the nature of development, and concentrates on institutional theory. Institutional development implies an evolutionary transformation of human existence, institutions guiding and managing change toward progressive values, habits, and organizational arrangements. If this fails, under a condition of uncertainty, then Bauman’s notion of liquid society applies, when development too becomes liquid. The uncertainty occurs during period of cultural instability and development become liquid.

Globalization in a post pandemic era and when there is a war in Ukraine, challenges national institutions and public administration to adapt new situation. COVID-19 global pandemic effects negatively in Indonesian education, poverty, trade, and macro economy, despite that Indonesia was able to keep economic growth slightly up to 2 percent. Ukraine war increases the cost of living goods and energy and increases the inequality of prosperity of the society and challenges governments to create public goods. The primary function of national governments also change as nations move from one stage to another, and at each stage of the national government, if it is to qualify as development, must fill a new function as well as consolidate the gains of previous developments” (56), Huntington called this the adaptability of a government.

Globalisation is underpinned by deregulated neoliberalism that populists use as a reason for delivering illiberal politics in which minorities often suffer. Hence, rather than calling for more neoliberal regulation, globalisation can be used as a call by political populists now taking on an antiglobalist mantel (57). Populism can seen easily as right or left wings phenomenon, but it can be also nationalist or religions driven phenomena or countervailing force against globalization and ultraliberalism /”turbo-capitalism”

If the development of globalization has occurred at the time of uncertainty society and when society is liquid and where the social threat and fear (social tension) can dominate and change social norms and values and this may occur in parallel with the

rise of political authoritarianism, when for instance populist inequitable governments take power and are likely to deliver to vulnerable sections of society (as opposed to the majority) more suffering than benefit.

When public institutions are unable to satisfied increasing demand (social, economic or cultural) it facing governmental overload (58). Many developed states are experiencing rapid political change and its people becoming increasingly angry and stable party systems become disintegrating. Galsto (59) notes that is time for illiberal movement – like populist movement – using and accepting principles of popular sovereignty and democracy by taking majority power .Populism is real threat for state and its institutions following Yolles (2019) because Populism rejects not only the four democratic institutions, (Independent National Electoral Commissions; Political Parties; Pressure Groups and Arms of Government) but any formal institutions, procedures and norms that limit majorities from exercising their will as determined by the populist politicians who have gained power. In so doing, it overturns the protections for individuals and minority groups. It thus offers an inherent threat to democracy and its pluralist nature.

## 4. Conclusion

This study concludes that development has a cultural standpoint, and culture can be investigated in terms of the relationship between institutional values and norms. Changes in the internal and external climate have an impact on the prevailing culture, including values, beliefs, and norms, and these changes (socio-cultural) have an impact on the social meaning norms and development of the society. Development within a socio-political context is defined in terms of institutional processes, allowing for the resolution of a diverse range of complex situations. Development is an adaptive characteristic of a changing sociopolitical agency with interactive ties to its surroundings. It is linked to globalisation, which is a part of that environment, as evidenced by the global COVID-19 pandemic or the Ukraine war. Because values may shift during the transition period, there is instability and cultural uncertainty. Values can become confused and situations can become uncertain during a period of change, sociocultural processes can deliver a liquid society. This alters the challenges to public administration and public policy, as well as the capacity to respond to changing situations.

## Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest related to the writing or publication of this article.

## Acknowledgement

Author is grateful to the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences Universitas Jenderal Soedirman that fact

## References

- [1] Rosyadi S, Dharma S. New Public Management Practices at Local Government in Indonesia: A Case Study of Wonosobo Government, Central Java. *Icpm*. 2014;2014:46–51.
- [2] Yolles M. The socio-cultural dynamics of development: part 3 development through agency theory. *Kybernetes*, ahead-of-print. 2019; <https://doi.org/10.1108/K-02-2019-0085..>
- [3] Almond GA, Powell GB. *Comparative politics today: A world views*. 6th ed. New York: HarperCollins; 1966.
- [4] Jreisat JE. *Comparative public administration and policy*. Boulder (CO): Westview Press; 2022.
- [5] Huntington SP, Nelson JM. *No Easy choice: Political participation in developing countries*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976
- [6] Amsden AH. Taiwan's economic history: A case of teatime and a challenge to dependency theory. In: Bates RH, editor. *Toward a political economy of development: A rational choice perspective*. Berkeley (CA): University of California Press; 1988. pp. 142–75.
- [7] Todaro MP. *Economic development in the third world*. New York: Longman; 1989.
- [8] Almond GA, Powell GB. *Comparative politics today: A world views*. 6th ed. New York: HarperCollins; 1966.
- [9] Huntington SP. Political development and political decay. *World Polit*. 1965;17(3):386–430.
- [10] Huntington SP. Political development and political decay. *World Polit*. 1965;17(3):386–430.
- [11] Stiglitz JE. *Globalization and its Discontents*. New York, London: W.W.Norton; 2002.
- [12] Guillen MF. Is Globalisation Civilising, Destructive or Feeble? A Critique of Five Key Debates in The Social Science Literature. *Annu Rev Sociol*. 2001;27(1):235–60.
- [13] Bauman Z. Liquid fear. In: the World Social Summit, Rome. <http://www2.worldsocialsummit.org>.

- [14] Yolles M, Di Fatta D. Antecedents of cultural agency theory: in the footsteps of Schwarz living systems. *Kybernetes*. 2017;46(2):210–22.
- [15] Sorokin PA. *Social and Cultural Dynamic*. Porter Sargent, Boston, abridged from the original publication: 1937-1942, *Social and Cultural Dynamics* (in 4 volumes). Amer. Book. Co. N.Y. Re-published in 1962 by Bedminster Press; 1957
- [16] Guo K, Yolles MI, Fink G, Iles PA. *The Changing Organisation: an Agency Approach*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press; <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316544402>.
- [17] [18] Yolles M. Sustainability development: part 1 – from the cybernetic of cybernetics to the cybernetics of development. *Int. J. Markets and Business Systems*. 2018;(3):238-256.
- [18] [21] Soares JR, Quintella RH. Development: An Analysis of Concepts, Measurement and Indicators. *Brazilian Administrative Review*. 2008;5:104-124.
- [19] Dopfer K, Jason P. On the Theory of Economic Evolution. *The General Theory of Economic Evolution*; <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203507407>.
- [20] Galbraith JK. Dangerous metaphor: The fiction of the labor market: unemployment, inflation, and the job structure. *Public Policy Brief*. 1997;36:1997.
- [21] Warner J. Capitalism has forgotten to share the wealth. *The Telegraph*. 2010 <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/comment/jeremy-warner/7105004/Capitalism-has-forgotten-to-share-the-wealth.html>
- [22] Bakker K. Trickle Down? Private sector participation and the pro-poor water supply debate in Jakarta, Indonesia. *Geoforum*. 2007;38(5):855–68.
- [23] Worstall T. Trickle-down economics really does work, *Washington Examiner*; 2017 December <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/trickle-down-economics-really-does-work>, accessed October 2018.
- [24] Rostow WW. *The stages of economic growth, a non-communist manifesto*. 3rd ed. Cambridge University Press; 1960.
- [25] Dopfer K, Jason P. On the Theory of Economic Evolution. *The General Theory of Economic Evolution*; <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203507407>.
- [26] Cant M, Vitikainen E, Nichols H. Demography and Social Evolution of Banded Mongooses. *Adv Stud Behav*. 2013;45:407–45.
- [27] Furtado CO. *mito do desenvolvimento econômico*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra; 1974. P. 87.
- [28] Veiga JE. *Desenvolvimento sustentável: o desafio do século XXI*. Rio de Janeiro: Garamond; 2005. p. 79.

- [29] Lowndes V, Wilson D. Social Capital and Local Governance: Exploring the Institutional Design Variable. *Polit Stud.* 2001;49(4):629–47.
- [30] Turner J. *The Institutional Order.* New York: Longman; 1997.
- [31] Hodgson GM. What Are Institutions? *J Econ Issues.* 2006;XL(1):1–25.
- [32] [35. Yolles M. The socio-cultural dynamics of development: part 3 development through agency theory. *Kybernetes*, ahead-of-print. 2019; <https://doi.org/10.1108/K-02-2019-0085>..
- [33] Fink G, Yolles M. Political meaning of mindset types created with Sagiv-Schwartz values. *European J. Cross-Cultural Competence and Management.* 2016;4(2):87-115.
- [34] O’Hara PA. *Growth and Development in the Global Political Economy: Modes of Regulation and Social Structures of Accumulation.* Routledge; 2006.
- [35] Heshmati A, Lee S. The Relationship between Globalization, Economic Growth and Income Inequality. *Journal of Globalization Studies.* 2010;1(2):87.
- [36] Cerny PG. Paradoxes of the competition state. The dynamics of political globalization. *Gov Opposition.* 2007;32(2):251–307.
- [37] McCormick C. From post-imperial Britain to post-British imperialism. *Glob Discourse.* 2013;3(1):100–14.
- [38] Morris RT. A Typology of Norms. *Am Sociol Rev.* 1956;21(5):610–3.
- [39] Zetterberg HL. The Study of Values. Swedberg R, Uddhammar E. (Eds.), *Sociological Endeavor, Selected Writings.* Stockholm: City University Press; 1997. p. 191–219.
- [40] Churchland PS, Churchland PM. What are beliefs? In: Krueger F, Grafman J, editors. *Neural basis of human belief systems.* Psychology Press; 2013. pp. 1–18.
- [41] Yolles MI, Fink G, Frieden R. Organisations as Emergent Normative Personalities: part 2, predicting the unpredictable. *Kybernetes.* 2012;41(7/8):1014–50.
- [42] Sorokin PA. *Social and Cultural Dynamic.* Porter Sargent, Boston, abridged from the original publication: 1937-1942, *Social and Cultural Dynamics* (in 4 volumes). Amer. Book. Co. N.Y. Re-published in 1962 by Bedminster Press. 1957
- [43] Triandis HC. *Individualism and Collectivism.* Routledge. Reprint of the original 1995 edition. 2017
- [44] Uebersax JS. *Culture in Crisis: The Visionary Theories of Pitirim Sorokin,* Satyagraha Blog on cultural psychology. 2010 <https://satyagraha.wordpress.com/>, accessed September 2018. 2012
- [45] Robinson M. *China’s New Industrial Revolution,* BBC World Service Documentaries, 1 August, [www.bbc.com/news/business-10792465](http://www.bbc.com/news/business-10792465). 2010

- [46] Palese E. Bauman Z. Individual and society in the liquid modernity. Springer Plus. 2013; 2:191. online Apr <https://doi.org/10.1186/2193-1801-2-191>. 2013
- [47] Yolles M. The socio-cultural dynamics of development: part 3 development through agency theory. *Kybernetes*, ahead-of-print. 2019; <https://doi.org/10.1108/K-02-2019-0085>..
- [48] Organski AF. Stages of political development. New York. Alfred: A. A. Knopf; 1965.
- [49] Almond GA. & Powell GB. *Comparative politics today: A world views*. 6th ed. New York: HarperCollins; 1966.
- [50] Galsto WA. The Populist Challenge to Liberal Democracy. *J Democracy*. 2018;29(2):5–19. [cited 2018 Oct] Available from: [https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/04172018\\_gs\\_galston-democracy.pdf](https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/04172018_gs_galston-democracy.pdf)