

*International and Comparative Administration*

## International Development Management in a Globalized World

Derick W. Brinkerhoff, Abt Associates, Inc.  
Jennifer M. Coston, Rutgers University, Camden

*Is development management, as a subfield of international and comparative administration, still relevant and applicable to the administrative problems facing today's managers in developing and transitional economies? The authors answer this question by exploring the implications of globalization for development management. They identify the global trends with the most direct impacts on governance and management in developing and transitional economies, and analyze how these relate to the theory and practice of development management. The analysis focuses on four facets of development management: as a means to foreign assistance agendas, as a tool kit, as values, and as process. While globalization has introduced many changes, much of what development management has to offer remains useful, appropriate and valuable. Maintaining relevance and applicability hinges upon a closer integration between theory and practice; more cross-fertilization among development management, comparative analysis, and mainstream public administration; clearer demonstration to policy makers of the timeliness of the subfield's concepts, tools, and approaches.*

It is difficult to pick up a newspaper or turn on a television without reading or hearing commentary on the impact of global trends on the fate of nations and the lives of their citizens. Fukuyama tells us that we have entered an unprecedented period where history as we know it is over (1990). Huntington lays out the parameters of an emerging new world order (1996). Commentators on the task of administration and management in the private, public, and nonprofit sectors, catalogue and analyze the ways managers need to change the ways they think and act as a result of the penetration of global economic, political, technological, and social forces.<sup>1</sup> The field of international and comparative public administration (ICA) has not been immune from self-examination and reflection in the context of these global trends. Three recent articles in *Public Administration Review* (PAR), part of a symposium in celebration of the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Section on International and Comparative Administration (SICA) of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA), offer perspectives on where international and comparative public administration has come from and where it needs to go in light of the changes underway around the world (Heady, 1998; Riggs, 1998; Welch and Wong, 1998).

This article constitutes a further contribution to the SICA symposium, and adds to the debate regarding ICA in today's world.<sup>2</sup> Our focus is on development management.<sup>3</sup> This term encompasses the set of ICA theory and practice that concentrates upon organizational and managerial problems, issues, and practices in the developing countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, and in the transitional economies of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. For many years mainstream public administration and development management had—with a few exceptions—very little interchange or cross-fertilization.

However, since globalization has led to closer integration between industrialized countries and those in the developing/transitional world, the lines between these two realms of public management have been blurred, both in terms of analytics and praxis. This integration suggests that development management has applicability to poverty alleviation in the industrialized world. We think that it is an opportune time to take a fresh look at development management.<sup>4</sup>

We consider the current state of development management, and explore the implications of global trends for the subfield's continued applicability to critical administrative problems and its contribution to the broader field of ICA. In the discussion below, we: (1) identify those global trends with the most direct implications for development management, (2) review the evolution and current status of the development management subfield, (3) explore the implications of the global trends for development management, (4) comment on development management theory and practice, and (5) reevaluate what development management has to offer in the global context.

## Global Trends: A Quick Overview

Tracking global trends has evolved into an analytic and prognostic industry in and of itself, and we do not pretend to offer a comprehensive overview of global trends and globalization. We offer a selective catalog of what we see as the major global trends that impact upon public managers in developing and transitional nations.<sup>5</sup>

*Economic and Financial:* The triumph of capitalism over socialist ideology has led to a veritable tidal wave of economic and financial reforms in developing and transitional economies. The International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, as well as other multilateral and bilateral assistance agencies have preached the gospel of the free market, backed up by structural and sectoral adjustment packages with similar contents. Bolstered by these packages, private international capital has flowed into the developing world.<sup>6</sup> The features of this new economic order are well known: the dominance and independence of transnational corporate investment, interconnected markets, an emphasis on export trade and competitive advantage, unfettered international financial flows, and rapid communication. New contours have superceded the old boundaries. At the supranational level, trading arrangements, such as the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), WTO (World Trade Organization), and NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement) reconfigure economic relationships among nations. At the regional and local levels, free trade areas, economic empowerment zones, regional development authorities, direct overseas links, and so on shape new forms of public-private interaction.

A major component of structural adjustment has been the reduction of fiscal deficits and the downsizing of the

**We** think that it is an opportune time to take a fresh look at development management.

public sector. Most developing/transitional countries cut back public expenditures drastically, with the effect of radically reducing basic services in public health, education, and social welfare. In some developing countries, communities were left almost entirely without national or state services. Particularly in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, this downsizing was accompanied by government bashing, tax revolt, and distrust in public officials and public problem-solving.<sup>7</sup>

*Technological:* The pace of technological innovation has accelerated. Coupled with the increased financial power of transnational corporations has been an increase in the search for new products, new production methods, and new markets. The East Asian miracle, now tarnished by the financial meltdown of Indonesia and other Asian tigers, was based in part on the combination of global capital and reengineered technologies that combined cheap labor with "high tech" production methodologies in global commodity chains. Particularly in agricultural and natural resource based products, developing countries have become, ready or not, integrated into the global technological marketplace.

Another global technological force is the ever accelerating development of information technology. The ability to transmit and access information around the globe both easily and cheaply is a profound change. The evolution of the Internet, cellular telephones, fax machines, and increasingly inexpensive personal computers has made possible communications and transactions in quantities and at speeds heretofore unimagined.

*Environmental:* A powerful set of global trends that threaten the very basis of livelihoods and well-being around the world relate to the natural environment. Unsustainable resource utilization rates, increased incidence of resource shortages (e.g., water, arable land), environmental degradation of the natural resource base, decreased levels of food security, pollution and contamination of both urban and rural areas, and global warming are among the litany here. These trends do not respect national borders; witness the disastrous effects of Indonesia's forest fires, deliberately set by timber firms, on its neighbors in the region. Many of these environmental issues have been tackled at the international level and have led to collaborative efforts to address them: for example, the 1992 Earth Summit (United Nations Conference on Environment and Development), the International Convention on Global Warming, etc. Many developing countries are signatories to such international agreements, and with external assistance have engaged in a variety of planning exercises to address environmental problems (e.g., Tropical Forestry Action Plans, National Environmental Action Plans) yet have extremely limited

capacity to implement them in any serious way. Further, their economic development policies often exacerbate environmental problems, as transnational corporations seek to invest where they are the least hampered by regulation.

*Socio-political:* Three trends are especially important in this category. First is the emerging primacy of democratic forms of politics and government. The dominance of market liberalization has been accompanied by democratization and political liberalization. This trend has been fueled both by the triumph of global capitalism and by citizen expectations. One of the effects of the information revolution has been that citizens can discover what goes on around the world as well as in their own countries, and there is little the state can do to prevent this. The second socio-political trend is the rise of civil society. Citizens are increasingly coming together and organizing to represent their interests, express their views, and undertake actions to assist themselves, either independent of, or in partnership with, government. Civil society groups are at the forefront of increased demands on the state in developing/transitional countries, and take an active role in monitoring state actions and performance. The third trend is the intensification of ethnic, religious, and tribal conflict, which at times has exploded into mass slaughter in places like Bosnia, Rwanda, and ex-Zaire. Among the consequences have been unprecedented refugee flows, complex humanitarian emergencies, and strain and occasional collapse of existing state security and basic service delivery functions.

## What Has Not Changed

In thinking about the impact of global trends on developing/transitional countries, we also need to bear in mind the things that have not changed. These too shape the landscape for development managers and development management. The poor are still poor, and there are a lot of them. In most countries, economic gains have not been evenly distributed, and income disparities have worsened. In many countries for those at the bottom of society gains have been wiped out by population growth. For example, India has an economically powerful middle class, a vibrant software industry, and nuclear capability, but huge numbers of India's citizens continue to eke out a living under conditions of extreme poverty.

Developing country government capacity is still weak, for the most part. Civil servants are underpaid and underskilled. Government agencies operate inefficiently, infrastructure and operations are neglected and crumbling. Outreach is limited; in some areas little effective public sector presence can be detected. Coupled with weak capacity, resources available for public investment and development are still scarce; tax systems are inadequate and/or nonfunctional. Local jurisdictions are particularly starved. Many countries are weighed down under a crushing burden of international debt that must

*In thinking about the impact of global trends on developing/transitional countries, we also need to bear in mind the things that have not changed.*

be serviced, leaving little room for discretionary social investment. As a result, in many countries, critical basic needs in education, health, welfare, and infrastructure still go unmet. A short trip off the beaten path reveals that villages in rural China, India, or the Sahel, or urban slums in Rio or Djakarta look much the same today as they did back 10 or 25 years. Many of the poor are in fact worse off now than they were a decade or so ago.

## Development Management: Yesterday and Today

Before turning to the question of what development management has to offer in today's globalizing world, we need a clearer understanding of what development management is. We start with some thoughts on development itself, because it is hard to separate discussion of development management from notions of development. Both have evolved in tandem.

Our rapid and, of necessity, highly compressed look backwards begins in the 1950s where the early post-World War II view of development saw a set of stages imitative of the growth path of Western industrialized societies. If countries could mobilize for take-off or the big push, then they would launch themselves on the road to economic growth. Development theory and practice was mainly concerned with economics. Experience soon revealed that economics and a focus on industrialization was insufficient, and analysts and practitioners in developing countries and in international development agencies expanded their focus beyond production to distribution, politics, basic human needs, and cultural values. Although variations in emphasis can be found, today there is relatively broad consensus that besides economic growth, development includes: equity, capacity, empowerment, self-determination, and sustainability. Along with the evolution of the concept of development have been changes in thinking regarding how to achieve it. The primary trajectory here has been along a path that began with centrally planned, state-dominated strategies to market-led polycentric approaches with the state as coordinator and regulator rather than as the sole or pre-dominant actor.

The evolution of development management, as an applied discipline like its parent field, public administration, has shifted along with changes in development strategies. The trend has been away from a technocratic, universalist, public-sector administrative model toward a context-specific, politically infused, multisectoral, multiorganizational model. From its initial focus

# Development *management is most often*

*sponsored by international aid agencies, all of which*

*have their own priorities and corresponding agendas.*

on institution-building for central-level public bureaucracies and capacity-building for economic and project planning, development management has gradually expanded to encompass bureaucratic reorientation and restructuring, the integration of politics and culture into management improvement, participatory and performance-based service delivery and program management, community and NGO capacity-building, and policy reform and implementation.<sup>8</sup>

Currently, development management is a broadly eclectic applied discipline whose analytic and practical contents reflect four related facets, depending upon which perspective is emphasized. Development management has an explicitly interventionist orientation that derives from its instrumental affiliation with international assistance agencies and programs whose objectives address socioeconomic development. So first, and most commonly understood, development management is a means to improving the efficiency and effectiveness of foreign assistance programs and to furthering international agencies' policy agendas. Second, development management is a toolkit; it promotes the application of a range of management and analytical tools adapted from a variety of social science disciplines, including strategic management, organization development, psychology, and political science. Third, development management incorporates a value dimension that emphasizes self-determination, empowerment, and an equitable distribution of development benefits. Fourth, development management is process intervention, where the application of tools in pursuit of objectives is undertaken in ways that self-consciously address political and values issues.

Each of these facets represents one essential aspect of development management as a field of theory and practice, and taken together they constitute a whole (Thomas, 1996). However, there can be inherent tensions among them and they can be contradictory. For example, while it is fairly straightforward to understand how its tools can promote foreign assistance agendas, less clear is whether or not their application in this context will promote espoused values of empowerment and self-determination, and whether or not the donor agency and its procedures can adequately support a genuine process approach. Such contradictions imply that development management means different things to different actors. The choice of balance among its four facets varies, contributing to what some might perceive as development management's ambiguity. An examination of each of the facets of development management illustrates their interdependencies and helps to answer the question of devel-

opment management's continued relevance in the globalized world of today.

*Development Management as Means to Foreign Assistance Agendas:* Development management is most often sponsored by international aid agencies, all of which have their own priorities and corresponding agendas. Typically, development management professionals enter the scene upon request from a donor agency for a predetermined task. It is not always clear if the need for and the design of this task represent priorities of the ultimate client, a developing country actor. In this sense, development management is a means to enhancing the effectiveness and efficiency of projects and programs determined and designed by donor agencies (Rondinelli, 1987; Spector and Cooley, 1997).

This facet of development management is perhaps the most problematic to reconcile with its other facets. First and most obviously, foreign assistance agendas at a minimum compromise some degree of self-determination in pursuit of socio-economic reforms; and sometimes these externally-derived reform agendas strongly limit the ability of countries to modify the reform package in ways that would support local empowerment. Second, donor programming requirements and incentives—such as loan disbursement schedules, project timetables, and compliance with predetermined indicators—can further inhibit the ability of groups in the recipient country, whether inside or outside of government, to play an active role in tailoring the assistance provided to their needs and their pace of change. These limitations can make it difficult to allow room to accommodate political realities, or to take a process approach.<sup>9</sup> What if, for example, the process leads to identified priorities and targets that significantly modify or contradict the foreign assistance package funding the effort? Third, these same pressures and incentives can also lead to superficial commitment to reform and pro forma meeting of targets. For example, development clients may go through the motions of complying with requirements and making changes without internalizing them. In recent years, development management specialists have had an impact on how international donor programs are designed and implemented to take more account of process considerations (see Brinkerhoff, 1996).

*Development Management as Toolkit:* Development management promotes the application of a range of management and analytical tools adapted from a variety of disciplines, including strategic management, public policy, public administration, organization development, psychology, anthropology, and political science. These tools assist in mapping the terrain in which policy reforms, programs, and projects are designed and implemented, that is the political, sociocultural, and organizational contexts of interventions. For example, strategic policy management might begin with SWOT analysis (identifying internal strengths and weaknesses and external opportunities and threats), which would then be followed by other tools to

assess the actors involved. These latter tools include stakeholder analysis and political mapping (Crosby, 1997; Lindenberg and Crosby, 1981). The results of these exercises feed into the elaboration of potential response strategies that incorporate flexibility and adaptation.

Development management tools merge policy and program analytics with action. It is precisely the blending of the process and value facets with the tools that accounts for the distinctiveness of development management as toolkit. On the analytic side, this means tools that explore the institutional and organizational incentive aspects of achieving results (see Brinkerhoff, 1997; Bryant, 1996), and that examine the psychology of change efforts (see Hubbard, 1997), focusing on individual incentives and motivation. On the operational side this means tools and approaches that focus on data gathering, such as participatory rural appraisal (Kumar, 1993; Blackburn with Holland, 1998), flexible and adaptive design and planning (Brinkerhoff and Ingle, 1989; Delp *et al.*, 1997), and action-learning and experimentation (Kerrigan and Luke, 1987; Rondinelli, 1993).

*Development Management as Values:* This facet of development management recognizes that development-promoting activities of any sort constitute interventions in the status quo, and that any intervention advances some particular set of interests and objectives at the expense of others. Thus, helping to implement a policy reform or program more effectively or building managerial capacity in a particular agency or organization is a value-laden endeavor. Development management as values is expressed in two ways. First, development management acknowledges that managing is infused with politics; successful management takes account of this fact and therefore is both contextual and strategic (see, for example, White, 1987; Brinkerhoff, 1996; Crosby, 1997, Lindenberg and Crosby, 1981). Second, development management takes a normative stance on empowerment and supporting groups, particularly the poor and marginalized, to take an active role in determining and fulfilling their own needs. Development management should enhance the capacity of development actors to effectively pursue their own development: it should be people-centered (see, for example, Bryant and White, 1982; Korten and Klaus, 1984; Thomas, 1996).

Development management as values is closely related to development management as process, as the section below clarifies. The values orientation also links to tools and the donor-funded provision of external assistance. Management tools and technologies are meant to combine external expertise with local knowledge and skills in a process that employs outside resources in the service of indigenously directed endeavors (see Spector and Cooley, 1997). Thus, development management blends indigenous knowledge and norms as it seeks to promote sustainable change, whose contours are developed through a participatory dialogue incorporating multiple perspectives (Joy, 1997).

*At the organizational level development management as process is concerned with the interplay between policy, program, and project plans and objectives, and the organizational structures and procedures through which plans are implemented and objectives achieved.*

*Development Management as Process:* The process facet of development management is most closely related to development management as values, both politics and empowerment. Development management as process operates on several levels. In terms of the individual actors involved, it builds on organizational development and process consultation; that is, starting with the client's priorities, needs, and values, development management specialists help to "initiate and sustain a process of change and continuous learning for systemic improvement" (Joy, 1997, 456). Because the process is client-driven, development management serves as handmaiden to (1) empowering individual actors to assert and maintain control, and (2) building their capacity to sustain the process into the future and in other situations.

At the organizational level—whether an individual agency or multiple organizations—development management as process is concerned with the interplay between policy, program, and project plans and objectives, and the organizational structures and procedures through which plans are implemented and objectives achieved. Here development managers look for a balance among these factors and the broader setting where development intervention takes place. This is the contingency notion; that is, the best managerial solutions are context-specific and emerge from a process of searching for a fit among programmatic, organizational, and environmental factors.<sup>10</sup> At the sector level—public, civil society, and private—development management as process addresses broader governance issues, such as participation, accountability, transparency, responsiveness, and the role of the state. This brings in empowerment in its societal and political dimension, looking at how various sociopolitical groups interact in the policy and program implementation process. Development management's process facet considers the following types of illustrative questions: Who has a place at the policy table? What process mechanisms allow which groups to play a role, and exclude others? What managerial practices and capacities are required for effective democratic governance and socio-economic development? How can public sector agencies and NGOs best cooperate to achieve joint objectives?<sup>11</sup> As these questions imply, the process facet of development management links with the tool and foreign assistance agenda facets. An important place in the toolkit is accorded to process tools, those that facilitate consultation, joint

problem and solution identification, ownership and commitment building, participatory strategy development, and so on. Further, many of these questions arise in the context of evolving international assistance agendas.

## Implications for Development Management

We now turn to the globalization trends overviewed earlier and examine their implications for this subfield of ICA. These implications are presented in relation to the four facets of development management.

### Development Management as Means to Foreign Assistance Agendas

Today there is much questioning regarding development strategies and the role of donors. The head of the United Nations Development Programme, for example, has called for a "new architecture for development cooperation." At the World Bank, senior staff are questioning its effectiveness as a poverty-focused lending institution (Overseas Development Institute, 1996); at the IMF, economists are reflecting upon the effectiveness of its policy prescriptions; and at the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), staff and implementing partners are reviewing its comparative advantage in light of funding cutbacks. Further, the constituencies of these agencies have raised their voices in criticism. For example, the NGO community faults the World Bank for being insufficiently participatory and failing to respect the views and desires of local people.<sup>12</sup> The U.S. Congress faults USAID for being insufficiently concrete about the results it seeks to achieve, managing poorly, and failing to demonstrate impact and value.

What does this mean for development management? As long as international agencies, governments, and, increasingly, NGOs and corporations, continue to engage in efforts to enhance the management, services, enabling environments for economic growth, and quality of life in developing and transitioning nations, there will be a demand for methods by which these efforts can be made more efficient and effective. That said, international development agendas and assistance modalities are in flux—indeed we have seen this already throughout the evolution of development. This is revealed in a closer examination of the four areas of global trends noted above.

*Economic and Financial Trends:* The globalization of economic activity has perforated the jurisdictional boundaries along which public administration has been organized. National, regional, and local governments have seen their traditional functions, powers, and authority leak away as the new international economic order has become established as the dominant factor in the public as well as the private sector. Governments in developing and transitional countries, along with those in the indus-

trialized world, are searching for efficient, effective, and equitable structures and processes to reconcile the core provision of public services in the new boundaryless era (Dobell and Steenkamp, 1993). Development management's focus on process and values, along with its toolkit, can help governments in this search, and holds the potential for a more situationally sensitive application of the so-called new public management, the one-size-fits-all managerial solution that has evolved out of the triumph of the free market and the drive to downsize the public sector.<sup>13</sup> In addition, development management can contribute to capacity-building for the new partners engaged in development.

The global economic and financial trends have brought new actors and new agendas onto the development scene. Predominant among them have been NGOs and civil society groups. As governments have been compelled to try to do more with less, and to cut back on state-supplied goods and services, NGOs have increasingly stepped in to fill the resulting gaps, both on their own and in partnership with the state (Coston, 1998a). One frequent observation is that NGO's managerial capacity is weak, thus development management has an important role in NGO capacity-building (see Fowler, 1997). This new set of actors generally has an agenda that stresses empowerment and people-centered development, which means that the value facet of development management emerges more strongly at the forefront.

The private sector constitutes a second set of new actors that has emerged as governments downsize and privatize, becoming more prevalent with the rise of corporate philanthropy. Multinational corporations are sponsoring and/or directly engaging in development activities, both independently and in partnership with donor agencies and national governments; for example, supporting infrastructure projects that benefit the operation of their factories, or providing infrastructure and/or health and education services in those communities that are sources of local labor (Tichy *et al.*, 1997). While the more limited agendas represented by corporate interests raise questions for development management's value facet, to the extent that development management can inject community empowerment and local control into those agendas as a function of assisting to implement them, the door is opened to broadening corporate philanthropy and deepening the commitment of multinational corporations to socially responsible actions in developing/transitional countries.

*Technological Trends:* New agendas also include the introduction of new technologies, specifically information technology. International assistance agencies are increasingly designing programs that transfer information and communications technology both in the service of sectoral objectives and broader democratization goals. For example, USAID's Leland Initiative supports Internet connectivity throughout Africa. Development management professionals can assist in a number of ways; for

example, addressing the organizational and process aspects of implementing new communications and technology policies, helping decision-makers focus on the equity and distributional issues, and so on (see World Bank, 1998).

*Environmental Trends:* The agendas of foreign assistance agencies, international environmental NGOs, and national governments seek to tackle the environmental trends sketched above. Donors, NGOs, and their partner governments have moved from an initial focus on the technical dimensions of environmental problems, to increasingly recognizing their social, organizational, and managerial dimensions. Development management has been, and will remain, instrumental to designing and implementing sustainable environmental and natural resources policies and programs in support of these agendas. New challenges for development management will be in the areas of conflict resolution, and advocacy support within the highly politicized arenas that characterize environmental concerns. Development management can usefully contribute at all levels, from the local to the transnational, the latter being particularly important in dealing with environmental trends.

*Sociopolitical Trends:* One implication of these trends for development management is that as the programmatic mix of foreign assistance agencies' objectives shifts to respond to more numerous and more serious complex humanitarian emergencies, development management specialists may be called upon for assistance. Despite the potential relevance of development management's process approach and toolkit, this has not yet taken place because of the politics of international relief and the disconnect between short-term emergency assistance and long-term development support (Anderson and Woodrow, 1998; Bryant, 1999).

Another implication of these trends relates to the continuing importance of international NGOs, the growing importance of civil societies worldwide, and the promotion of democratization agendas. International NGOs have long been important actors in development. While their role has generally shifted from one of providing primarily humanitarian aid to supporting development, and from working independently to contracting and partnering with donors, the activities of NGOs continue to represent an important proportion of development assistance. Like corporations, as private institutions NGOs are empowered to be selective in the services they choose to provide and the clients they work with.

The range of NGO actors and their roles are evolving fast with the growth of civil society globally. New, creative partnerships are also emerging, including those between corporations and NGOs, and corporations and local governments (Tichy *et al.*, 1997). Reconciling the interests of multi-party sponsorship will be a key challenge for development managers into the future. NGOs and other civil society actors are also increasingly important advocates for or against particular agendas. In fact,

**More** *and more, development management is expected to contribute to foreign assistance agendas that promote values, particularly democratization.*

some argue that advocacy is the most appropriate role for international NGOs (see Korten, 1990). Accordingly, as the capacity of local NGOs and civil society grows, tensions emerge between international NGOs and their local counterparts or partners. Development management will be increasingly challenged to integrate the participation of a diverse body of implementers and advocates.<sup>14</sup>

More and more, development management is expected to contribute to foreign assistance agendas that promote values, particularly democratization. While at first glance such an application would appear to be entirely consistent with the values development management espouses, sometimes foreign assistance agendas, especially the bilaterals, have a more limited definition of democracy and/or choose to limit participation for political reasons, as for example, limiting support for and participation of potentially disruptive elements of civil society such as fundamentalist Islamic groups. These decisions are by nature subjective and can conflict with the other facets of development management. In addition, limited foreign assistance agendas, if pursued in isolation, can generate negative consequences. For example, Coston (1998b) highlights the potential danger of addressing the demand side of democratic governance promotion, without considering the ability of states to respond to that demand.

### Development Management as Toolkit

Are development management's tools still relevant given the trends identified? Projects and programs still exist. Policy implementation still poses thorny managerial problems. Attention to participation and empowerment has increased, not diminished. Governments are still wrestling with capacity limitations. Thus it can be argued that a core administrative problem set remains for which the development management toolkit, with its combination of process and technical tools, continues to be useful and applicable. Process tools in particular are relevant—increasingly managers operate in settings where, as Bryson and Crosby (1992) say, no one is in charge.

The overarching implication of the global trends for development management as toolkit will be the need to take into account far greater complexity and uncertainty in the administrative environment of development managers. This suggests the need for more attention to theoretical and conceptual integration with practice, so that the key variables affecting administrative capacity and performance are identified and targeted for intervention.<sup>15</sup>

*Economic and Financial Trends:* These trends are per-

**With** respect to the growing importance of civil society, development management may need to borrow more from psychology and anthropology when considering the increasing diversity of development players.

haps the major source of the uncertainty and complexity that development managers face. The challenge for development management will be to sharpen and refine its analytic toolkit so as to usefully contribute to the debate on the appropriate role of the state, the trade-offs between economic and social development goals that have arisen more starkly in the wake of the current financial crisis in Asia, and the drive for ever more efficient public governance. Because development management's four facets explicitly address politics, values, and process in the context of development goals, and administrative tools and techniques to achieve them, the subfield has the potential to counter the tendency to look for quick solutions based on narrow economic criteria.

*Technological Trends:* Information technology advances represent an important opportunity for development managers to enhance existing tools and create new tools. Many of the standard project planning tools already exist in computer form, and several tools specific to international projects, programs, and policies have been developed.<sup>16</sup> Tools that do more than computerize analysis and store the information, but that use information technology to facilitate participation and empower people are an innovative avenue for development management to explore. For example, the World Bank has been experimenting with "groupware" as a means to a more participatory process of designing its Country Assistance Strategies. This experimentation is in its infancy. Another area ripe for exploration is how information technology can contribute to organizational redesign for performance in developing country public agencies (see Peterson, 1997).

*Environmental Trends:* Environmental trends pose two particular challenges to development management's toolkit. First, existing and new tools will need to incorporate broader and increasingly diverse constituencies in environmental projects, especially those that cross national borders. This implies a stronger focus on reconciling opposing interests; thus the tools of conflict resolution, negotiation, and consultation will become more important. Further, refined analytic tools are needed for institutional design of feasible policy and program solutions. Second, environmental trends imply severe future consequences of current resource utilization practices that are difficult to envision. Again, new tools could be advanced, for instance, with the help of information technology, to more clearly demonstrate the salience of the issues to decisionmakers. For example, computer games and simulations are being developed in which the players can

input and assess various policy alternatives and their impact on the environment. Negative consequences can be shown visually and quite dramatically, and alternative policy solutions can be graphically demonstrated using a simulated computer world.

*Sociopolitical Trends:* Similar to the environmental trends, among the most important implications of sociopolitical trends will be the need for crisis management, conflict resolution, and negotiation tools. Development management's experience with such tools in situations of complex emergencies is relatively new and untested (Bryant, 1999). Similarly, with the expansion of democratic governance around the world, and the attendant growth and diversity of civil society, new tools and approaches will be needed to build effective state-civil society partnerships, both national and international (Coston, 1998a). The trends also suggest a need for new tools and approaches to address building constituencies and motivation for sustained reforms to deal with citizen demands for transparency, accountability, and responsiveness.<sup>17</sup> Also related to reforms, is the need for methodologies that allow policymakers to better assess the political implications and trade-offs of policy alternatives in a democratic and/or politically unstable environment.

With respect to the growing importance of civil society, development management may need to borrow more from psychology and anthropology when considering the increasing diversity of development players. For example, how can the participation of the formerly voiceless be promoted in a newly democratic regime when there is no tradition or culture of democracy (see Coston and Butz, 1999)? How can the deeply internalized ethnic and religious conflicts be addressed?

### Development Management as Values

Development management's self-consciousness about politics and values, plus its focus on empowerment, increases the subfield's relevance to managers coping with the impacts of global trends. Development management involves tools and approaches that: (1) illuminate goal trade-offs and conflicts, (2) clarify who participates in decisions and who does not, and (3) build capacity for empowering managerial and decision processes. Hence, it can contribute to incorporating equity and sustainability into socio-economic development when the thrust of many of the trends may push toward a narrower focus on efficiency and the preservation of vested interests.

An important implication for development management specialists in regard to values is how, given global trends, to deal with the ethics of development intervention. This surfaces most starkly as a potential conflict between development management as an instrument of international assistance agendas versus the agendas of groups within developing/transitional countries, and in the conflicts among developing country groups. One response, related to development management's process



facet, is to be very explicit about who the client is for any change intervention (see Joy, 1997; Cooke, 1997). In this regard, some development management professionals have shifted their efforts away from the public sector to focus on NGOs and civil society, and to opt for challenging existing power structures (Thomas, 1996).<sup>18</sup>

*Economic and Financial Trends:* These trends have essentially imported private business values into the public sector. Market principles applied to public management transform citizens into customers and emphasize the "bottom line" as a paramount objective (see Larson, 1997). Mainstream public administration is questioning the politics and ethics that support this perspective, and in developing and transitional countries, such questioning is taking place as well. Just as development management's process approach assists in reconciling diverse interests, so too it may contribute to identifying the appropriate balance between private-sector values of least-cost efficiency and public-sector values such as responsiveness, accountability, and equity. With development management's emphasis on capacity-building, and its recognition that politics and administration are inextricably linked, development management can assist both governments and non-state actors to engage with each other on these issues.

Development management has traditionally acknowledged the importance of community self-determination and locally-driven development (Esman, 1991). The interdependence inherent in a global economy suggests that the challenge for the future will be addressing how to manage an appropriate degree of integration and linkage such that local, regional, national, and international priorities and interests can be balanced. If its empowerment emphasis is directed only locally, development management will likely be sidelined and considered less relevant.<sup>19</sup>

*Technological Trends:* These trends raise a number of implications for development management as values. Technology can open up people's horizons and possibilities, but there are always trade-offs. Information technology, for example, can be empowering if it provides information and linkages to societal groups that previously were excluded; but it will favor those groups who have the potential to take advantage of it. For those without the necessary resources and capacities, the gaps between technology haves and have-nots can widen. Knowledge flows and intellectual property rights are other important technological issues (see World Bank, 1998). Development management could play a role in helping countries establish and implement equitable and politically feasible trade and technology transfer policies.

*Environmental Trends:* Given the increasing diversity of environmental actors, noted above, development management's greatest challenge and contribution will be to grapple with the question of whose rights take precedence and how to address the political dimensions of the environmental trends, locally, nationally, and internationally.

For example, in natural resource management, whose interests should receive priority, those of local resources users, corporations whose investments bring in necessary foreign exchange, or national governments, who may or may not effectively pursue the public interest in regard to resource conservation? Development management can also help with designing and making operational the institutional structures and mechanisms that can be used to effectively implement policy priorities in the environment and natural resources sector.

*Sociopolitical Trends:* As democratic forms of government spread, development management will be increasingly important in helping governments build the capacity to respond to citizen expectations and to put in place the institutional structures that allow democracy to function effectively. The promotion of democratization and its associated values is among the agendas of a number of foreign assistance agencies, but those values are frequently translated into a relatively narrow view of what constitutes democracy. Traditional village governance structures in Africa, for example, are not considered "democratic" due to perceived limits in representation in their consensual model. The notion of traditional benevolent leaders runs counter to Western ideals of democracy. Development management, as Riggs (1998) points out, needs to be at the forefront of exploring various institutional options for democratization that fit with particular country circumstances, recognizing that the U.S. model is one path among many.

Concerning the rise of civil society and subnational conflicts based on ethnicity or religion, development management's value facet will need to address critical questions. Whose self-determination and empowerment should take precedence and who can legitimately speak for the constituencies involved? What organizational and procedural mechanisms can be used to develop sustainable solutions to problems of representation, participation, and conflict resolution among competing interests? In the search for answers, it will be important to confront the naiveté and mythologizing around civil society's homogeneity, harmoniousness, and civic-mindedness, and develop a realistic understanding of how societal interest groups actually behave.

## Development Management as Process

In each of the categories of trends we have summarized, the importance of process, as a crucial adjunct to good technical solutions, stands out. To paraphrase the popular aphorism, the trends may be examined globally, but acting to address them means intervening locally. Someone, located in a particular place with particular constraints, capacities, history and so on, needs to determine what to do and then mobilize and organize to do it. Development management's process facet holds important lessons to help move from analysis to action, beginning at the individual level with its emphasis on client-

driven change efforts (e.g., Joy, 1997), and extending to the organizational and sectoral levels with its concentration on understanding and building linkages and system-wide capacity (e.g. White, 1987; Brinkerhoff, 1996). All of the trends, as previously noted, heighten uncertainty, complexity, unpredictability, and interconnectedness.

Development management's focus on iterative solution design, testing and learning, and adaptation is highly salient to coping with these trends. As mentioned, an important set of development management tools and approaches are, in fact, process-focused. These trends highlight and reinforce the relevance of development management as process to helping developing/transitional countries to successfully cope with global trends. An important implication for development management will be the increasing use of cross-sectoral partnerships, multi-organizational networks, etc. When no one is in charge, the importance of process is heightened for several reasons: to bring to bear everyone's energies and ideas for solving problems, for generating widespread support for solutions adopted, for negotiating agreements on implementation, and for resolving conflicts and disputes throughout. Process changes can also result in shifts in power distributions and dynamics, important variables in shaping the politico-administrative environment.

*Economic and Financial Trends:* As already mentioned, these trends have increased the pressures on governments at all levels to increase efficiency and output, while at the same time pushing them to rethink their core functions. While evidence is accumulating that development management's process approaches can save money in the longer term, through contributing to the design of more feasible policies and programs and building commitment among stakeholders for their implementation, in the short term these approaches can prove costly and time-consuming. An important area for future development management attention is the cost-benefit analysis—broadly construed—of participatory process approaches. Development management needs to pursue questions that explore and clarify the connection between process inputs and policy and service delivery outputs (see, for example, Blackburn with Holland, 1998; Brinkerhoff, 1997).

*Technological Trends:* These trends affect development management as process in a number of ways. First, advances in information technology hold the potential for vastly expanding the possibilities for stakeholder consultation by government, for citizen participation, and for coordination and integration across organizations engaged in service delivery, as the tools discussion outlined. Information technology can facilitate the identification and mobilization of contributors to policy issues and solutions. The utilization of information technology for improving the organizational processes of public agencies is a burgeoning area of application, and relates to the worldwide drive for efficiency and decentralization. To remain relevant, development management's

process facet will need to keep pace and contribute to learning and adaptation related to information technology and its links to process innovations, organizational effectiveness, and outcomes (see Peterson, 1997).

Beyond the public sector, information technology has served as an important vehicle through which civil society groups have developed processes of constituency mobilization, advocacy, and demand-making. In this sense, information technology can multiply the challenge to the state's capacity for, or commitment to, responsiveness, openness, and accountability. On the other side, as we mentioned previously, technology can create gaps between haves and have nots; there is the potential to create exclusionary processes as well. In developing/transitional countries to a greater extent than in industrialized ones, this gap can be a factor in keeping the poor both from advancing economically and/or participating in democratic governance. Development management's process facet, when combined with values and tools, can help address this issue.

*Environmental Trends:* As previously noted, the trends here suggest that countries need processes and consultative mechanisms that can deal with priority-setting, clarification of public-private-NGO sector roles, participation of resource users groups, regulatory development and enforcement, and sustainable resource utilization. Besides the need for such processes nationally, because of the transnational nature of environmental problems, they are required at the international level as well (e.g., Killick, 1992). This is a burgeoning area of application and refinement of development management's process component with much potential for theoretical and practical advances.

*Socio-political trends:* Democratization and the rise of civil society have made citizens hyper-attuned to issues of responsiveness, transparency, and accountability. George Orwell got it partially right: someone out there is watching. But in today's world it is not some government monolith that has its lens turned on its citizens, rather the lens is reversed—citizens are watching their governments. Being responsive, transparent, and accountable are basically procedural and process issues; developing/transitional country governance structures need process capacity in order to institutionalize democratic governance. Development management has an ongoing role to play in building this process capacity from the central to the local level.<sup>20</sup>

Development management's process perspective is also applicable to the other sociopolitical trends. It is clear that civil society groups need the same kind of process tools and approaches as public managers if they are to fulfill their potential. Regarding ethnic conflicts and complex emergencies, process interventions can be important for conflict resolution and negotiation, and as Bryant (1999) points out, for seeking to begin as soon as possible to institute processes that help former combatants build a basis for, at a minimum, peaceful co-exis-

tence, if not cooperation. Development management's process approaches also have the potential to build upon and mobilize local capacity in the context of emergency situations, thus speeding the transition from relief to development (see, for example, Anderson and Woodrow, 1998).

## Bridging Practice and Theory

In the preceding discussion we have sought to map, albeit roughly and rapidly, the implications of several categories of global trends for development management. The discussion has revealed that some of these implications lead to applications of existing development management knowledge and practice to areas where they have yet to be brought to bear, some suggest the continued relevance of their applicability for areas that are their traditional bailiwick, and still others suggest areas where further analytic work is called for. Bryant characterizes development management as largely an inductive field, where what is known "has often been learned experientially, and usually from the bottom up, with a focus on a project or a program" (1996, 1540).<sup>21</sup> Thus, we can anticipate that as development management gains experience with the impacts of global trends on developing/transitional country public managers and their private and NGO sector partners, new knowledge will emerge. However, we think that it is critical to structure such learning so that it moves beyond the anecdotal and gains increased relevance across a range of settings and circumstances.

As globalization unifies the pressures facing public managers around the world, public administration scholars and practitioners are calling for more explicitly comparative investigation. Riggs (1998) advocates such investigation to combat what he sees as the ethnocentrism of American public administration. Heady (1998) argues for an integration of the analytic efforts of internationalists and comparativists to address the increasingly universal nature of administrative problems resulting from globalization, suggesting along the way that development management has been more international than comparative. How can the development management subfield move in this direction?

An important step is to build more robust bridges between theory and practice. This does not mean seeking to develop an all-encompassing and integrative theoretical and explanatory framework. We believe that such a search is ultimately counterproductive and can divert attention from what really counts in the applied field of development management: developing usable knowledge. Esman suggests that usable knowledge will emerge from interactively drawing upon three sources: (1) formal analytics from the professional and academic literature, (2) learning from concrete situations and interventions—that is, the experiential database referred to by Bryant (1996), and (3) experience and judgment of "front-line" develop-

**Development** *management, along with its parent discipline of public administration, has been criticized for lacking a unifying "grand theory."*

ment managers and the members of "client" publics (1991, 23). Combining these three sources, while not requiring an overarching theoretical framework, does call for some sort of midrange analytic framework so as to allow for sufficient abstraction to reach generalizable lessons.

Development management, along with its parent discipline of public administration, has been criticized for lacking a unifying "grand theory." It is interesting to note that recent efforts in this direction have been undertaken by scholars under the disciplinary umbrella of the new institutional economics (NIE), which has evolved constructs and vocabulary to describe and analyze many of the same concepts and issues that the development management subfield has focused on for years.<sup>22</sup> However, across the diverse theoretical and analytic lenses that development managers have used, there are more common building blocks for mid-range frameworks than are usually perceived. For example, concepts such as nested and interactive systems, organizational learning and adaptation, and political economy provide the elements for constructing the kind of frameworks that can usefully bridge theory and practice.<sup>23</sup>

Bridging theory and practice will continue to be a key challenge for the development management subfield—a challenge exacerbated by development management's instrumental orientation to serving the needs of international assistance agencies and their developing/transitional country partners/clients. In the past, international agencies have provided the resources and the opportunities for development management applied research and analysis; with rare exceptions, they are now less willing or able to support such investigation.<sup>24</sup> In today's increasingly complex world, it is unfortunate that there is shrinking patience for understanding and learning, but this in itself is an outgrowth of the impact of the global trends on the realm of foreign assistance, where the constituencies of international aid expect quick results, efficiency, and immediate impacts.

## Conclusion

Development specialists have a history of disillusionment and self-criticism; and, like public administration more generally but perhaps more acutely, development management has suffered a chronic identity crisis (see Esman, 1980). While painful and potentially demoralizing, the self-questioning of relevance and effectiveness among development management scholars and practitioners has yielded important advances in the field.

Through iterative cycles of analysis and practice, development management has, for example, evolved past the blueprint to elaborate process approaches; and has come to better appreciate and incorporate cultural, institutional, and political factors into the organizational and managerial arena in developing/transitional countries. These innovations emerged from a process of trial and error, reflection, and learning. This openness to embracing error and willingness to draw upon diverse experience bases and analytic perspectives are among the strengths of the subfield, even as they make its boundaries hard to pinpoint or describe.

What, then, are the prospects for development management's contribution now and in the future? As our above discussion indicates, we argue that development management remains applicable to current management and governance issues in developing/transitional countries, and as global trends continue to exert their impacts development management may be increasingly important. Capacity-building is an ongoing and crosscutting need. Process approaches will be necessary to identify, mobilize and incorporate diverse stakeholders and their viewpoints to develop policy solutions that can be successfully implemented and sustained. Around the world, attention to participation and empowerment has increased, not diminished, as core process elements of making democratic governance work. Development management's value facet is critical to reminding policymakers that development involves choices that advantage some societal groups and disadvantage others, and that how those choices are made affects the balance of winners and losers.

At the same time, our analysis points to several avenues to be pursued as the subfield of development management evolves. We single out just a few for mention here. As suggested above, development management needs to explore a closer integration between theory and practice through the development of midrange analytic frameworks. This path involves, for example, bringing institutional analysis and design perspectives to bear more directly on development management's tool and process facets. Another avenue includes a continuation of development management's interdisciplinary approach, but with a different balance in the mix, giving more emphasis to the fields of comparative politics, anthropology, and psychology. Along this avenue are questions, for example, of path dependence and how the past shapes the present, of the interplay between culture and management, and of the complex interaction of politics and values in shaping discourse both about socio-economic development and its management. A third avenue, also previously touched upon, concerns the implications of information technology for new organizational forms and processes, state-society interactions, and knowledge management.

We see the boundaries between the subfield of devel-

opment management, ICA, and mainstream public administration becoming fuzzier. As Mittelman observes, "globalization is about opportunities arising from reorganizing governance, the economy, and culture throughout the world" (1996, 237). In informing developing/transitional countries' search worldwide for best practices and lessons to deal with these opportunities—and challenges, development management needs to extend the subfield's scope. This means looking not simply at what has worked in other developing/transitional countries, but at industrialized nations as well. Conversely, industrialized nations have much to learn from developing/transitional nations' efforts.

However, beyond these responses, more is required to ensure development management's continued relevance. An important component to thinking about this question involves Schon's notion of "ideas in good currency" (1971). Those of us who see ourselves as development management professionals continue to see relevance in what we do and study, but often make assumptions about the perceptions of relevance of our discipline on the part of decisionmakers and policymakers, both in international donor agencies and in developing/transitional countries. Yet the extent to which management and administration are in good currency varies. The Reagan/Thatcher era in the 1980s of public-sector bashing is a case in point.

Development management specialists need to hone in on the critical managerial features of the problems that are preoccupying decisionmakers and demonstrate how the discipline is relevant and useful. It is these decisionmakers who must be convinced of the fit between development management and current global issues. Development management has made a difference in the lives of citizens in the developing world, but continuing to contribute means remaining "in good currency." This is as much a challenge to the subfield as renewing and advancing development management's practical and applied research agendas.

◆◆◆

**Derick W. Brinkerhoff** is a senior social scientist at Abt Associates, Inc. in Bethesda, MD and an adjunct lecturer at The Johns Hopkins University's Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, DC. He is a founding member of the Development Management Network, and a past chair of ASPA's Section on International and Comparative Administration (SICA).

**Jennifer M. Coston** is an assistant professor in the Graduate Department of Public Policy and Administration and coordinator of the International Public Service and Development Masters Degree Program at Rutgers University, Camden, NJ. An active member of the Development Management Network, she was 1998-99 chair of SICA and co-chair of ASPA's Campaign for International Relations.

## Notes

1. The management-related literature dealing with globalization is enormous and growing. To cite just a few examples related to public management: the role of nation-state (Guehenno, 1995; Panitch, 1996), the need for a theoretical reconceptualization of public administration (Baldadano, 1997), the detrimental effects on citizens of the global economic order (Korten, 1995), managing public affairs in a global economy (Dunning, 1997; Garcia-Zamor and Khator, 1994; Greidner, 1998), and the new public management (Ferlie *et al.*, 1996).
2. We build upon a dialogue among scholars and practitioners initiated at a mini-plenary entitled, "Postcards from the Edge: Future Directions in Comparative and International Administration," held at the 59th ASPA National Conference, Seattle, WA, May 1998, convened by Derick Brinkerhoff and Tjip Walker.
3. The term development administration has been the traditional label for the subfield of public administration in developing/transitional countries. However, this has in many circles been gradually supplanted by the term development management. Although some consider the shift nothing more than semantics, we see the replacement of administration with management as signifying a stronger emphasis on strategy and proactive style, as opposed to the tasks and tools of routine administration. Also, development management is not restricted to the public sector; development managers can be staff of NGOs, members of community groups, or businesspeople, as well as civil servants.
4. Our inquiry builds on earlier work that has, over the years, reflected upon development management, where it has been, and where it might go. Besides Riggs (1998) and Heady (1998), see Esman (1980, 1988, 1991), Korten and Klauss (1984), Rondinelli (1987), Nicholson and Connerley (1989), and Brinkerhoff (1986, 1990, 1997).
5. This section summarizes the broader literature on global trends, and draws upon the "Postcards from the Edge" session at the 1998 ASPA National Conference in Seattle.
6. The flow of private capital to developing countries grew from \$45 billion in 1990 to \$244 billion 1996 (World Bank, 1997).
7. Riggs (1997) elaborates on this trend and the threat to the legitimacy of public administration and public managers.
8. This overview obviously does not do justice to the evolution of development and development management. See the introductory chapters of Bryant and White (1982), the thematic overview of the development management field by one of its founders (Esman, 1991), the history of development management and U.S. foreign assistance (Rondinelli, 1987), the review of approaches to institutional development in Brinkerhoff (1986), the retrospective on policy analysis in Brinkerhoff (1997), and the framework building effort in Thomas (1996).
9. The literature on the politics of reform is vast. See, for example, Haggard and Kaufman (1992) or Bates and Krueger (1994).
10. The contingency approach has been widely applied in development management analysis and practice. See Brinkerhoff (1991), Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith (1990), Hage and Finsterbusch (1987), and Israel (1987).
11. See, for example, Brinkerhoff (1998), Coston (1998a).
12. See, for example, the monthly newsletter of the Bread for the World Institute's Development Bank Watcher's Project, "News and Notices for World Bank Watchers." This publication is available by e-mail at: [bankwatch@igc.apc.org](mailto:bankwatch@igc.apc.org).
13. This statement is a bit of an oversimplification, but new public management (NPM) does have identifiable features that its proponents advocate as good for what ails government around the world. For an excellent overview of NPM see Chapter 1 in Ferlie *et al.* (1996).
14. For example, a forthcoming symposium issue of the *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior* (Vol. 2, 1999), entitled, "Grassroots Organizations and Public Policy Processes," addresses this challenge.
15. This gap is at the crux of Nicholson and Connerley's thesis regarding the crisis of development management (1989), where they argue that the focus should be on larger issues of institutional choice rather than bandaid-like organizational improvement interventions. This argument is further elaborated in Nicholson (1997). See also Grindle (1997).
16. Microsoft Project exemplifies generic project planning software. Development project planning has been computerized (PCTeamUp), as has stakeholder analysis and political mapping (PolicyMaker) developed for the health sector (see Reich, 1996). Other tools include software for designing capacity-building interventions developed by the United Nations Development Program (<http://magnet.undp.org/capbuild/Read1st.htm>); and an analytic capacity assessment tool for NGOs, called DOSA (Discussion-Oriented Self-Assessment), developed by Private Agencies Collaborating Together (PACT) and Education Development Center, with USAID funding (<http://www.edc.org/INT/CapDev/dosintr.htm>).
17. See Brinkerhoff (1996) on the need for policy champions for reform, and Brinkerhoff (1999) for a preliminary effort to develop and assessment methodology for political will and anti-corruption efforts.
18. Perhaps the most well-known "defector" is David Korten, whose early work on bureaucratic reorientation, learning process organizations, and people-centered development has been very influential in shaping the development management subfield (see, for example, Korten, 1984; Korten and Klauss, 1984). Korten sees development management professionals who work with international donor agencies or developing/transitional country governments as contributors to the problem, not the solution. His reasoning is laid out in Korten (1995) and in the various publications of the advocacy NGO he founded, the People-Centered Development Forum (<http://iisd1.iisd.ca/pcdf>).
19. Uphoff and Esman (1974) were among the first to demonstrate that local communities could not develop without linkages to larger administrative and economic entities. The same principle of linkages applies today in the larger sphere of nations and global economy.
20. Some interesting work is being done in helping to improve the functioning and effectiveness of cabinet offices to manage the policy formulation and implementation process. This is critical for governments to be able to respond to citizen expectations. See, for example, Garnett

- et al.* (1997).
21. This characteristic of development management's knowledge base derives largely from the subfield's instrumental connection with foreign assistance agendas. Another perspective is that of Cooke (1998), who argues that development management is essentially organizational development (OD) where the theory-practice dichotomy does not apply because it is by nature a theory of practice.
  22. NIE discusses public sector management with a near-total disregard for any of the development management literature. See for example Girishankar and De Silva (1998). Some observers consider that development management has been encroached upon by the disciplinary "imperialism" of the NIE due to donor agencies' relatively higher regard for economists as constituting a "harder" social science than that of management and organization specialists (Bryant, 1996).
  23. For an example of an analytic framework explicitly developed to serve the purpose of organizing knowledge across experience to inform practice, see Brinkerhoff *et al.* (1990) and Oakerson and Walker (1997). Tendler uses the framework of industrial performance and workplace transformation in her cross-case study of good government (1997).
  24. The commitment of USAID to research and analysis on development management has been significant, beyond the agency's early support for work on institution-building. A series of centrally funded projects that began in the late 1970s and continue up to the present (Development Project Effectiveness, Performance Management, Decentralization: Financial Management, and Implementing Policy Change, Phases I and II) has underwritten an important segment of the subfield's applied research and literature base. Universities and foundations may have a role to play in supporting further inquiry.

### References

- Anderson, Mary B., and Peter J. Woodrow (1998). *Rising from the Ashes: Development Strategies in Times of Disaster*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Baltadano, Andrés Pérez (1997). "The Study of Public Administration in Times of Global Interpenetration: A Historical Rationale for a Theoretical Model." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 7(4): 615-638.
- Bates, Robert H., and Anne O. Krueger (1994). *Political and Economic Interactions in Economic Policy Reform: Evidence from Eight Countries*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell Publishers.
- Blackburn, James, with Jeremy Holland, eds. (1998). *Who Changes? Institutionalizing Participation in Development*. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Brinkerhoff, Derick W. (1986). "The Evolution of Current Perspectives on Institutional Development: An Organizational Focus." In Derick W. Brinkerhoff and Jean-Claude Garcia-Zamor, eds., *Politics, Projects, and People: Institutional Development in Haiti*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 259-273.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1990). "Technical Cooperation and Training in Development Management: Trends, Implications, and Recommendations." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies* 11(1): 139-149.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1991). *Improving Development Program Performance: Guidelines for Managers*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1996). "Process Perspectives on Policy Change: Highlighting Implementation." *World Development* 24(9): 1395-1403.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1997). "Integrating Institutional and Implementation Issues into Policy Decisions: An Introduction and Overview." In Derick W. Brinkerhoff, ed., *Policy Analysis Concepts and Methods: An Institutional and Implementation Focus*. Policy Studies in Developing Nations Series. Vol. 5, 1-18. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1998). "Democratic Governance and Sectoral Policy Reform: Linkages, Complementarities, and Synergies." Washington, DC: American Society for Public Administration, Section on International and Comparative Administration.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1999). "Identifying and Assessing Political Will for Anti-Corruption Efforts." Working Paper No.13, Implementing Policy Change Project. Washington, DC: U.S. Agency for International Development, Center for Democracy and Governance.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Arthur A. Goldsmith, Marcus D. Ingle, and S. Tjip Walker (1990). "Institutional Sustainability: A Conceptual Framework." In Derick W. Brinkerhoff and Arthur A. Goldsmith, eds., *Institutional Sustainability in Agriculture and Rural Development: A Global Perspective*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 19-49.
- \_\_\_\_\_. and Marcus D. Ingle (1989). "Between Blueprint and Process: A Structured Flexibility Approach to Development Management." *Public Administration and Development* 9(5): 487-503.
- Bryant, Coralie (1996). "Strategic Change Through Sensible Projects." *World Development* 24(9): 1539-1551.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1999). "Strategic Management in Complex Emergencies: A Role for International Donors." Working Paper No. 14, Implementing Policy Change Project. Washington, DC: U.S. Agency for International Development, Center for Democracy and Governance.
- \_\_\_\_\_. and Louise G. White (1982). *Managing Development in the Third World*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Bryson, John, and Barbara Crosby (1992). *Leadership for the Common Good: Tackling Public Problems in a Shared-Power World*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- Cooke, Bill (1997). "From Process Consultation to a Clinical Model of Development Practice." *Public Administration and Development* 17(3): 325-340.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1998). "Participation, 'Process' and Management: Lessons for Development in the History of Organization Development." *Journal of International Development* 10(1): 35-54.
- Coston, Jennifer M. (1998a). "A Model and Typology of Government-NGO Relationships." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 27(3): 358-383.

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1998b). "Administrative Avenues to Democratic Governance: The Balance of Supply and Demand." *Public Administration and Development* 18(5): 479-493.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Jennifer L. Butz. (1999). "Mastering Information: The Birth of Citizen-Initiated Voter Education in Mongolia." Symposium Issue on Grassroots Organizations and Public Policy Processes. *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior* 2 (1 & 2): 107-139.
- Crosby, Benjamin (1997). "Stakeholder Analysis and Political Mapping: Tools for Successfully Implementing Policy Reforms." In Derick W. Brinkerhoff, ed., *Policy Analysis Concepts and Methods: An Institutional and Implementation Focus*. Policy Studies in Developing Nations Series. Vol. 5, 261-287. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Delp, Peter, Arne Thesen, Juzar Motiwalla, and Neekakantan Seshadri (1977). *Systems Tools for Project Planning*. Bloomington: Program of Advanced Studies in Institution Building and Technical Assistance Methodologies, Indiana University.
- Dobell, Rodney, and Philip Steenkamp (1993). "Preface to the Symposium on Public Management in a Borderless Economy: National Governments in a World of Trans-national Networks." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 59(4): 569-577.
- Dunning, John H., ed. (1997). *Governments, Globalization, and International Business*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Esman, Milton J. (1980). "Development Assistance in Public Administration: Requiem or Renewal." *Public Administration Review* 40(5): 426-431.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1988). "The Maturing of Development Administration." *Public Administration and Development* 8(2): 125-134.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1991). *Management Dimensions of Development: Perspectives and Strategies*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Ferlie, Ewan, Andrew Pettigrew, Lynn Ashburner, and Louise Fitzgerald (1996). *The New Public Management in Action*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fowler, Alan (1997). *Striking a Balance: A Guide to Enhancing the Effectiveness of Non-Governmental Organisations in International Development*. London: Earthscan Publications.
- Fukuyama, Francis (1990). "Are We at the End of History?" *Fortune* 121(2): 75-78.
- Garcia-Zamor, Jean-Claude, and Renu Khator, eds. (1994). *Public Administration in the Global Village*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Garnett, Harry, Julie Koenen-Grant, and Catherine Rielly (1997). "Managing Policy Formulation and Implementation in Zambia's Democratic Transition." *Public Administration and Development* 17(1): 77-91.
- Girishankar, Navin, and Migara De Silva (1998). *Strategic Management for Government Agencies: An Institutional Approach for Developing and Transitional Economies*. Discussion Paper No. 386. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Greider, William (1998). *One World, Ready or Not: The Manic Logic of Global Capitalism*. New York: Free Press.
- Grindle, Merilee S., ed. (1997). *Getting Good Government: Capacity Building in the Public Sectors of Developing Countries*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, for the Harvard Institute for International Development.
- Guehenno, Jean-Marie (1995). *The End of the Nation-State*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hage, Jerald, and Kurt Finsterbusch (1987). *Organizational Change as a Development Strategy: Models and Tactics for Improving Third World Organizations*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Haggard, Stephan, and Robert R. Kaufman, eds. (1992). *The Politics of Economic Adjustment: International Constraints, Distributive Conflicts, and the State*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Heady, Ferrel (1998). "Comparative and International Public Administration: Building Intellectual Bridges." *Public Administration Review* 58(1): 32-40.
- Hubbard, Ruth (1997). "People—Hearts and Minds Towards Rebirth of the Public Service." *Public Administration and Development* 17(1): 109-114.
- Huntington, Samuel P. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Israel, Arturo (1987). *Institutional Development: Incentives to Performance*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Joy, Leonard (1997). "Developing a Development Practice: A Commentary in Response to Cooke." *Public Administration and Development* 17(4): 453-477.
- Kerrigan, John E., and Jeff S. Luke (1987). *Management Training Strategies for Developing Countries*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Killick, Tony (1992). "Policy-Making under Extreme Uncertainty: Developing Country Responses to Global Warming." *Journal of International Development* 4(1): 29-39.
- Korten, David C. (1984). "Strategic Organization for People-Centered Development." *Public Administration Review* 44(4): 341-352.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1990). *Getting to the 21st Century: Voluntary Action and the Global Agenda*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1995). *When Corporations Rule the World*. West Hartford, CT, and San Francisco, CA: Kumarian Press and Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Rudi Klaus, eds. (1984). *People-Centered Development: Contributions toward Theory and Planning Frameworks*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Kumar, Krishna, ed. (1993). *Rapid Appraisal Methods*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Larson, Peter (1997). "Public and Private Values at Odds—Can Private Sector Values be Transplanted into Public Sector Institutions?" *Public Administration and Development* 17(1): 131-139.
- Lindenberg, Marc, and Benjamin Crosby (1981). *Managing Development: The Political Dimension*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Mittelman, James H. (1996). "How Does Globalization Really Work?" In James H. Mittelman, ed., *Globalization: Critical Reflections*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 229-241.
- Nicholson, Norman (1997). "Analyzing Bureaucracy and Rural Development Policy Implementation: The Limits of Hierarchy." In Derick W. Brinkerhoff, ed., *Policy Analysis Concepts and Methods: An Institutional and Implementation Focus*. Policy Studies in Developing Nations Series. Vol. 5, 113-141. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Nicholson, Norman K., and Edwin F. Connerley (1989). "The

- Impending Crisis in Development Administration." *International Journal of Public Administration* 12(3): 385-426.
- Oakerson, Ronald J., and S. Tjitj Walker (1997). "Analyzing Policy Reform and Reforming Policy Analysis: An Institutional Approach." In Derick W. Brinkerhoff, ed., *Policy Analysis Concepts and Methods: An Institutional and Implementation Focus*. Policy Studies in Developing Nations Series. Vol. 5, 21-53. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Overseas Development Institute (1996). "Rethinking the Role of Multilateral Development Banks." London: Overseas Development Institute. Briefing Paper No. 4.
- Panitch, Leo (1996). "Rethinking the Role of the State." In James H. Mittelman, ed., *Globalization: Critical Reflections*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 83-113.
- Peterson, Stephen B. (1997). "Hierarchy Versus Networks: Alternative Strategies for Building Organizational Capacity in Public Bureaucracies in Africa." In Merilee S. Grindle, ed., *Getting Good Government: Capacity Building in the Public Sectors of Developing Countries*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, for the Harvard Institute for International Development, 157-177.
- Reich, Michael R. (1996). "Applied Political Analysis for Health Policy Reform." *Current Issues in Public Health* 2: 186-191.
- Riggs, Fred W. (1997). "Modernity and Bureaucracy." *Public Administration Review* 57(4): 347-353.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1998). "Public Administration in America: Why Our Uniqueness is Exceptional and Important." *Public Administration Review* 58(1): 22-32.
- Rondinelli, Dennis A. (1983). *Development Projects as Policy Experiments: An Adaptive Approach to Development Administration*. New York: Methuen and Company.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1987). *Development Administration and U.S. Foreign Aid Policy*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Schon, Donald A. (1971). *Beyond the Stable State: Public and Private Learning in a Changing Society*. London: Maurice Temple Smith Ltd.
- Spector, Bertram I., and Lawrence Cooley (1997). "Consultant Roles in the Strategic Management of Policy Change." Technical Note No. 8. Implementing Policy Change Project. Washington, DC: U. S. Agency for International Development, Center for Democracy and Governance.
- Tendler, Judith (1997). *Good Government in the Tropics*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Thomas, Alan (1996). "What is Development Management?" *Journal of International Development* 8(1): 95-110.
- Tichy, Noel M., Andrew R. McGill, and Lynda St. Clair, eds. (1997). *Corporate Global Citizenship: Doing Business in the Public Eye*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- United Nations Development Programme (1994). *Process Consultation for Systemic Improvement of Public Sector Management*. New York: UNDP.
- Uphoff, Norman, and Milton Esman (1974). *Local Organization for Development: Analysis of Asian Experience*. Ithaca, NY: Center for International Studies, Cornell University.
- Welch, Eric, and Wilson Wong (1998). "Public Administration in a Global Context: Bridging the Gaps of Theory and Practice Between Western and Non-Western Nations." *Public Administration Review* 58(1): 40-51.
- White, Louise G. (1987). *Creating Opportunities for Change: Approaches to Managing Development Programs*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- World Bank (1997). "Background Note on The World Bank's Corporate Citizenship Program." Corporate Citizenship Conference: Building Partnerships for Development. Washington, DC, May 21-22.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1998). *Knowledge for Development*. World Development Report. Washington, DC: World Bank.