*The Institute for Global and International Studies (IGIS)*
*Working Paper Series*

Working Paper #3*:* **International Development Management:**
**Definitions, Debates, and Dilemmas**

Derick W. Brinkerhoff
Research Triangle Institute

Jennifer M. Brinkerhoff
The George Washington University

# International Development Management:

# Definitions, Debates, and Dilemmas*

Derick W. Brinkerhoff
Senior Fellow in International Public Management
Research Triangle Institute
Associate Faculty
School of Public Policy and Public Administration
George Washington University


Jennifer M. Brinkerhoff
Associate Professor, Public Administration & International Affairs
School of Public Policy and Public Administration
George Washington University

## Introduction

Scholars and practitioners have long grappled with identifying the best policies and approaches to promoting socio-economic development. Since World War II, the international development field has been marked by an evolution of approaches to understanding and addressing development challenges.[1] Policies, approaches, and strategies need to be implemented in order lead to results and real improvements in people's lives; this is where international development management comes to the fore. In this chapter, we present a framework for defining development management, and review the major debates that make a simple definition difficult to craft. In conclusion, we highlight some of the ongoing dilemmas that face development managers.[2]

In the early post-World War II era, 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 donor agencies expanded their focus beyond production to distribution, politics, basic human needs, and cultural values. So a primary change over time has been increased recognition of the complexity of promoting development, replacing simpler notions of economic "take-off" or "big push" modernization. Other changes in the field have emerged as a function of

---

[1] For an informative overview of the history of international development see Rist (1997).

[2] Over the years, an extensive stream of literature has reflected upon development management, where it has been, and where it might go. We draw on our previous effort at elaborating a definition (Brinkerhoff and Coston (1999), and build on earlier work. See Riggs (1998), Heady (1998), Esman (1980, 1988, 1991), Korten and Klauss (1984), Rondinelli (1987), Nicholson and Connerley (1989), Brinkerhoff (1991, 1997), and Brinkerhoff and Ingle (1989).

shifts in values, such as a movement away from Western-centric modernization agendas towards an emphasis on human development that embraces the inherent and functional value of local knowledge and culture.  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.  Development terminology is descriptive both of societal patterns and processes found in many countries around the world (poverty, economic and social deprivation, lack of capacity) and of aspirational goals (having more and being more).

## From Development Administration to Development Management

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 predominant actor.  This shift corresponds with a change in the terminology to describe these processes, from development administration to development management.  The term, development administration, has been the traditional label for the sub-field of public administration in developing/transitional countries.  However, this has in many circles been gradually supplanted by the term, development management.  The replacement of administration with management signifies an emphasis on nimble organizations, flexible strategies, and proactive managerial styles, as opposed to the tasks and tools of routine administration in bureaucracies. Also, flowing from the polycentric concept, where numerous actors are actively engaged in the tasks of improving people's lives and generating socio-economic benefits, development management is not restricted to the public sector.  Development

managers can be staff of NGOs, members of community groups, entrepreneurs and businesspeople, as well as civil servants.

Development management encompasses the set of 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. However, as a variety of observers have pointed out, the same types of problems that confront the developing/transitional world can be found in pockets of poverty, marginalization, and inequality in industrialized countries as well. This overlap suggests that development management has applicability to poverty alleviation and community organizing in the industrialized world.

The evolution of development management, as an applied discipline like its parent field, public administration, has shifted along with the changes in development strategies we mention above. To oversimplify slightly, the trend has been away from techno-rational, universalist, public-sector administrative models toward context-specific, politically infused, multi-sectoral, multi-organizational models. From its initial focus on institution-building for central-level public bureaucracies and capacity-building for economic and project planning, development management has gradually expanded to encompass bureaucratic reform and restructuring to enhance democratic governance and responsiveness to citizens, including the poor; 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.[3]  In short, the trend in development management has been away from:

- Sole reliance on the technical-rational "fix:" concentrating on improving so-called hard systems (for example, budgeting/accounting and personnel) and structures, to the exclusion of "soft" systems (people).

- Universalist solutions: one size fits all, good for any situation.

- Focus on reactive administrative models: fulfilling routine functions and paying attention to day-to-day routine.

Development management has moved toward:

- Context-specificity, recognizing that while solutions in various settings will share some features, they must be adapted to the particular features that make each context unique.

- Recognition that any change, even if it appears to be just a "neutral" technical modification, is in fact politically infused (that is, somebody wins and somebody loses, and power matters).

- Multi-sectoral solutions: no single discipline or perspective has a corner on "the truth;" the best solutions emerge when the insights of many viewpoints and sources of expertise are brought to bear.

---

[3]  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, 1999).

- Strategic perspectives merged with operational administration: paying attention to the "big picture" and long-term direction while not neglecting the details of how to get there.

- Multi-organizational models: the complex problems of development almost always require the attention and intervention of numerous agencies, even if one organization is nominally "in charge."

## A Framework for Defining Development Management

The conceptual and operational threads we have just outlined weave a confusing definitional tapestry. How can we make sense of the numerous and disparate elements that reside within the development management term? Perhaps the most straightforward distinction is that of Alan Thomas (1999): development management can be viewed as management *of* development or management *for* development. This is akin to Warren Bennis' distinction between a narrow managerialist emphasis on doing things right, versus a leader's doing the right things (Bennis and Goldsmith 1997). Management of development focuses on applying the rules and procedures governing the mechanics of foreign assistance to achieve planned outcomes through projects and programs. Management for development encompasses a broader view of development as involving progressive improvements in societal well-being, and looks at the politics of donor agencies, whether poor people actually benefit from assistance, and the power imbalances inherent in development assistance relationships.

A more complex, though consistent, framework outlines four facets of development management (Brinkerhoff and Coston 1999). First, development has an explicitly interventionist orientation; it is a means to promoting institutional agendas. This facet most closely corresponds with Thomas' notion of "management of development": the emphasis of this dimension is to

5

enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of sponsoring institutional actors' plans and objectives. Most often, these agendas are those of international donor agencies; but alongside this driver, other institutional agendas compete or complement, including those of NGOs, private firms, and recipient governments. Second, development management is a toolkit consisting of a range of management and analytical tools adapted from a variety of social science disciplines, including strategic management, organization development, political science, and psychology. Third, development management is a process intervention, where the application of tools in pursuit of objectives is undertaken in ways that self-consciously address political and values issues. This dimension emphasizes process consultation and contingency approaches. Finally, development management encompasses a values dimension that emphasizes self-determination, empowerment, and an equitable distribution of benefits. This dimension also recognizes the inherent political nature of development, acknowledging winners and losers, and working with, rather than assuming away the political aspects of development. Taken together, these four facets encompass both aspects of Thomas' and Bennis' distinctions: doing things right, and doing the right things.

Each of the four facets represents one essential aspect of development management as a field of theory and practice, and collectively they constitute a complete definition. However, there are inherent tensions among them and they can be contradictory. For example, while it is fairly straightforward to understand how development management's 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. Emphasizing one

facet as primary can blur the tensions and contradictions among the four facets, exacerbating the challenge of specifying a unified definition for development management. The choice of balance among its four facets varies, contributing to development management's ambiguity.  An examination of each of the facets of development management further clarifies the framework, illustrates their interdependencies, and illuminates the debates surrounding them.

**Development Management as Means to Institutional Agendas**

Development management is most often sponsored by international donor 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.[4]  It is not always clear if the need for, and the design of, a 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 outside actors (see, for example, Rondinelli 1987).  Cooke (2003) takes a more radical position, arguing that this facet of development management reveals a connection to the imperialist agendas of colonialism, and that today's development management is the instrument of donor-imposed priorities just as colonial administration enabled Western imperialists to rule their acquired  territories for their own purposes.

---

[4]  Development management practitioners also reflect the agendas of the organizations they work for, which may or may not be aligned with international donor agencies.  For example, they may work in NGOs, which may or may not be recipients of donor funds, and in some cases pursue missions that are opposed to donor policies and practices.  See, for example, Fowler (1997).

This facet of development management is perhaps the most problematic to reconcile with its other facets. First and most obviously, institutional agendas, particularly those of international donor agencies, at a minimum compromise some degree of self-determination in pursuit of socio-economic reforms. 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.

Multilateral and bilateral foreign assistance programs, despite espoused policies regarding country participation and adaptation to local priorities and needs, share a common set of principles and objectives.[5] Most donor policy frameworks incorporate a combination of market liberalization, privatization, state downsizing, democratic governance, equitable delivery of basic services, and poverty reduction. They take a comprehensive approach to country-level planning, such as for example, the World Bank's Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF) and Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs); the Development Assistance Committee's strategy, Shaping the 21st Century; or the UN's Common Country Framework. All donor agencies, whether multilateral or bilateral, incorporate performance-based management into their agendas and practice and, by extension, so do the private sector contractors – firms and

---

[5] These are what is termed variously the Washington consensus (Gore 2000), neoliberal modernization (Cooke 2004), or the international development orthodoxy (Easterly 2001, Landes 1999).

NGOs – with whom they work.  The latest translation of this performance agenda into policy is the Bush administration's establishment of the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA), which offers foreign assistance to a select group of countries deemed to be high performers according to sixteen indicators.

These frameworks make it difficult (although not impossible) to accommodate local political realities, or to take a process approach.  What if, for example, the process leads to identified priorities and targets that significantly modify or contradict the priorities of the foreign assistance funder?  A well documented response is for recipient country governments to accept reforms for which there is significant reticence or opposition in order to get the funds, leading to superficial commitment to reform and proforma meeting of targets.[6]  For example, development clients may go through the motions of complying with requirements and making changes without internalizing them.  Development management specialists have pointed out the difficulties in implementing reforms that ignore process considerations and the failure to identify and support policy champions committed to change (see Brinkerhoff and Crosby 2002).

However, in today's world of scarce international assistance resources and expanding competition for those resources, development management is enlisted in the service of foreign assistance programs that largely assert the primacy of the donors' agenda.  As noted, the policies embodied in CDFs, PRSPs, and the MCA promote a particular development agenda related to economic liberalization, privatization, governance, service delivery, and democratization.  While the successful implementation of these agendas involves attention to process and values, these

---

[6]  The literature on the politics of reform is vast.  See, for example, Haggard and Kaufman (1992) or Bates and Krueger (1994).  Cooke (2004) argues that donor planning frameworks in essence impose an externally determined set of priorities and practices, and leave little space for local accommodation.

facets of development management tend to serve the donors' priorities and values first, and those of people in the recipient countries second or third. Thus, as Cooke (2004) points out, the relationship among the four facets of development management in practice often resembles something of a hierarchy, where development management's role in achieving foreign assistance agendas trumps the others. However, not all development management takes place within the context of foreign assistance; some NGOs and community groups operate independent of (to greater or lesser degrees) external resources and imposed priorities, and pursue their own agendas. In these cases the interface among development management's facets may be less dominated by the foreign assistance instrumentality.

**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, socio-cultural, 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 (Brinkerhoff and Crosby 2002, 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 2002a, 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, the toolkit includes tools and approaches that focus on data gathering, such

as participatory rural appraisal (e.g., Kumar 1993, Blackburn with Holland 1998); flexible and

adaptive design and planning (e.g., Brinkerhoff and Ingle 1989, Delp et al. 1997); and action-

learning and experimentation (e.g., Kerrigan and Luke 1987, Rondinelli 1983).

An important consideration in terms of the connection between this facet of development

management and the others is the issue of who is acquiring the toolkit.  Both the process and

values facets are explicit in their attention to assuring that tools and expertise do not remain the

sole province of outsiders, donor agencies, international NGOs and consulting firms, or other

technocratic elites.  Acquiring the appropriate tools and expertise is important, but so is

transferring them to others.  The dimension of development management as toolkit thus responds

to development as being more and having more, in this instance having more in one's own

toolkit and being capable of using those skills.

**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" (UNDP 1994, quoted in 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. 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).

This facet of development management is largely based on the process consultation model of organization development (see, for example, Cooke 1997, 1998, 2001, Blunt 1997, Bell 1997). Among others, Thomas (1999) confirms that development management means doing things with people, not for them. This statement encapsulates the core principles of process consultation:

- Clients know more about their own situation than the consultant ever will

- A consultancy process needs to engender psychological ownership of the activities

- The consultant should seek to develop clients' capabilities to solve their own problems (Cooke 1997).

Consistent with the tension among development management's four facets, these principles are complicated in their application. As Burkey (1993: 102) puts it, "The successful practice of the development practitioner is responsive, disciplined, flexible but constrained by the parameters of development itself." Those parameters concern each of the four development management facets: the institutional agendas at play, the conflicting values and political context of the intervention, the particular tools selected and their feasibility, all of which influence the strategy and effectiveness of the process.

At the organizational level – whether inside an individual agency or multiple organizations working together – 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.[7]

At the organizational level, tools also come into play. Particular tools may be required or standardized in ways that have implications for process. For example, the Logical Framework (and its variations) is a tool designed by the international development industry for program design, performance measurement, and evaluation.[8] It has been criticized on several fronts, most of which are really about the process of its implementation than the tool itself. It was originally intended to be a tool for participation and consensus building. Instead it is often applied as a blueprint, usually with a top-down approach that locks implementers and constituents into specific activities, results, and sometimes timelines. In fact, one development scholar has warned that it can be a "lockframe" rather than a logframe (Gasper 2000). In that sense, it has become more of an auditing and enforcement device than a learning tool. In their application, these types

---

[7] The contingency approach has been widely applied in development management analysis and practice. See Brinkerhoff (1991), Fowler (1997), Hage and Finsterbusch (1987), and Israel (1987).

[8] Most donors continue to use the Logical Framework, or logframe, but USAID has modified it into what it calls the Results Framework. The underlying program logic is the same, and both tools have faced similar criticisms.

of tools confirm one of the universal features of life in organizations: what gets measured gets done.

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 socio-political groups interact in the policy and program implementation process. Again, there are implications for the application of tools like the Logical Framework. Who gets to decide what the objectives and activities of a program will be? Who gets to participate in the process of identifying indicators for what success means? And if "beneficiaries" are consulted, which ones? Can we assume that community leaders represent the aspirations of the community as a whole? More broadly, 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/or 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?[9] As these questions imply, the process facet of development management is intimately linked 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 pursuing institutional agendas.

---

[9] See, for example, Brinkerhoff (2002a, 2002b), Brinkerhoff (2000), Coston (1998), Fowler (1997).

While development management's process approaches can be cost-efficient 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 consideration is the cost-benefit analysis – broadly construed – of participatory process approaches.  Development management has pursued 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, Brinkerhoff and Crosby 2002).

**Development Management as Values**

The values 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.  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 involves  tools and approaches that: a) illuminate goal trade-offs and conflicts, b) clarify who participates in decisions and who does not, and c) build capacity for empowering managerial and decision processes.  Hence, it can contribute to incorporating equity and sustainability into socio-economic development.

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 and Crosby 2002, Lindenberg and Crosby 1981). Part of this acknowledgment extends to the recognition that managers, whether the local managers in a particular country, or

the external providers of technical or managerial assistance, are "carriers" of values, and hence are inherently political whether they recognize it or not (see Grammig 2002). However, providers of international technical assistance often don a mantle of neutrality, assumed as a function of their scientific and professional expertise. However, knowledge and expertise cannot be separated from the values context in which they are developed and applied.[10]

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 Klauss 1984, Thomas 1996).

Another, more subtle, aspect of the values facet is that whether intended or not, development managers bring their own values to the work and these inform the decisions they make, including whose view counts, how resources are allocated, and what they choose to do and why. Values cannot be avoided. This aspect of development management as values is closely linked to work on development ethics, and the ethics of inquiry and intervention more generally. In the development field, scholars and promoters of development ethics argue that because values inevitably inform behavior and interactions with others (including those with whom and for whom development managers perceive they are working), there is an obligation to make those values explicit (see, for example, Crocker 1991). While values are an inherent component of development management, they are most often discussed only in terms of how they relate to programmatic objectives. For example, implementers may link to values when

---

[10] The classic reference here is Burger and Luckmann (1966).

discussing political feasibility and winners and losers of policy and program initiatives. Or, initiatives targeted to capacity building may specifically refer to empowerment and participation. Beyond that, values may not often be openly discussed.

Development management's values facet is closely related to development management as process. 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 local, indigenous knowledge and norms as it seeks to promote sustainable change, whose contours are developed through a participatory dialogue incorporating multiple perspectives (Joy 1997).

An important implication for development management specialists in regard to values is how to deal with the ethics of development intervention.  This dilemma surfaces most starkly as a potential conflict between development management as an instrument of external institutional agendas versus the agendas of groups within developing/transitional countries, and in the conflicts among developing country groups.  This is often a contest among unequal actors, with predominant power residing with the international donors in the case of negotiations between international funders and national governments.  Internal to the recipient country, power tends to be concentrated in political and economic elites, whose agendas overrule those of the poor and marginalized.

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 working with

international donors or the public sector to focus on independent NGOs and civil society, and to opt for challenging existing power structures and policy elites (Thomas 1996).[11]

Development management has traditionally acknowledged the importance of community self-determination and locally-driven development (Esman 1988, 1991). The interdependence inherent in the global economy suggests that the challenge for the future will be how to manage an appropriate degree of integration and linkage such that local, regional, national, and international priorities and interests can be balanced and some measure of local empowerment and autonomy maintained.[12]

Development management is crucial 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

---

[11] 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 sub-field (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). Bill Cooke (2003, 2004) similarly argues that development management's value and process dimensions have been co-opted by their subservience to the interests of the dominant foreign assistance orthodoxy.

[12] 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 the global economy. Bogason (2000) elaborates on the complex interplay among the forces pushing for economic and social integration, globalization, and capitalist production on the one hand, and those of decentralization, differentiation, individualism, and pluralism on the other.

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 (see Carothers 1999). 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 (2000, 1998) points out, has not always been at the forefront of exploring various institutional options for democratization that fit with particular country circumstances, and of recognizing that the U.S. model is but one path among many.

## Conclusion

Our four-faceted framework for defining development management has unpacked the term to expose both the complexity and the tensions contained within it. Development management is inextricably connected to the applied arena of intervention and change. The conundrum inherent in development management lies in the disconnect (potential and actual) between the two facets that concern doing things right (serving donor agency agendas and the toolkit) and the two that relate to doing the right things (process and values). There is increasing recognition that the process facet is also important to doing things right (i.e., effectively), though these considerations are often overwhelmed by concerns for immediate efficiency. In the ideal, the four facets reinforce and complement each other: development management serving to do the right things in the right way. However, in the real world, the practice of development management often falls short of this ideal, or approaches it only at the margins. As Thomas concludes in his article on "good" development management, it "will often remain an ideal rather than a description of what takes place" (1999: 17).

For development management and managers, the most fundamental contradictions and fiercest debates emerge around the determination of the answer to what is the right thing to do. The political economy of international development places predominant power to answer that question in the hands of the international donor community. For example, the US government's launch of the MCA seeks to reward countries that are doing the right things. The World Bank's PRSP process argues for the importance of local ownership all the while mandating participation and adherence to a set of investment priorities that closely resemble the Bank and the IMF's preferred policy agenda.

The debates in development management also extend to doing things right. Beyond macro-level planning, such as that embodied in the CDF and PRSPs, the project remains the donor modality of choice. Consonant with that emphasis is the continuing assumption that development can be "packaged" in discrete blocks of time and effort. The emphasis is also on the results of these short-term efforts, as is consistent with logframe and the more general donor performance-based management agenda. Here, many development scholars argue that donor assistance as currently practiced is not conducive to development as a process of empowered self-determination (see, for example, Kilby 2004, Holcombe et al. 2004, Cooke 2004).

New analytic frameworks may assist in resolving some of the tensions and contradictions among development management's four dimensions, but their usefulness will be contingent, to a large extent, on whether they can, first, encourage a more explicit recognition of the skewed power relations that affect what development activities are undertaken, and for whom; and second, make any inroads in rebalancing those power relations. The disconnect within development management will persist as long as there are multiple actors with competing values. In short, the tensions are inevitable. Like political processes more generally, the resolution of

these tensions in a particular context will reflect the compromises and power brokering of the actors involved. The ideal for development management may be unattainable in the messy real world, but that does not mean that analysts and practitioners should cease their efforts to move in that direction.

## Bibliography

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.

Bell, Simon. 1997. "Not in Isolation: The Necessity of Systemic Heuristic Devices in All Development Practice." Public Administration and Development 17(3): 449-452.

Bennis, Warren and Joan Goldsmith. 1997. Learning to Lead: A Workbook on Becoming a Leader. Boulder, CO: Perseus Books.

Blackburn, James with Jeremy Holland, eds. 1998. Who Changes? Institutionalizing Participation in Development. London: Intermediate Technology Publications.

Blunt, Peter. 1997. "Prisoners of the Paradigm: Process Consultants and 'Clinical' Development Practitioners." Public Administration and Development 17(3): 341-349.

Bogason, Peter. 2000. Public Policy and Local Governance: Institutions in Postmodern Society. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Brinkerhoff, Derick W. 2000. "Democratic Governance and Sectoral Policy Reform: Tracing Linkages and Exploring Synergies." World Development 28(4): 601-615.

Brinkerhoff, Derick W. 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. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, Policy Studies in Developing Nations Series, Vol. 5, pp. 1-18.

Brinkerhoff, Derick W. 1996. "Process Perspectives on Policy Change: Highlighting Implementation." World Development 24(9): 1395-1403.

Brinkerhoff, Derick W. 1991. Improving Development Management Program Performance: Guidelines for Managers. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

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, pp. 11-63.

Brinkerhoff, Derick W., and Jennifer M. Coston. 1999. "International Development Management in a Globalized World." Public Administration Review 59 (4): 346-361.

Brinkerhoff, Derick W. and Benjamin L. Crosby. 2002. Managing Policy Reform: Concepts and Tools for Decision-Makers in Developing and Transitioning Countries. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.

Brinkerhoff, Derick W. and Marcus D. Ingle. 1989. "Between Blueprint and Process: A Structured Flexibility Approach to Development Management." Public Administration and Development 9(5): 487-503.

Brinkerhoff, Jennifer M. 2002a. "Assessing and Improving Partnership Relationships and Outcomes: A Proposed Framework." Evaluation and Program Planning 25(3): 215-231.

Brinkerhoff, Jennifer M. 2002b. Partnership for International Development: Rhetoric or Results?. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Burger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann. 1966. The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise on the Sociology of Knowledge. New York: Doubleday and Company.

Bryant, Coralie. 1996. "Strategic Change Through Sensible Projects." World Development 24(9): 1539-1551.

Bryant, Coralie and Louise G. White. 1982. Managing Development in the Third World. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Burkey, Stan. 1993.  People First: A Guide to Self-Reliant, Participatory Rural Development. London: Zed Books, 1993.

Carothers, Thomas. 1999. Aiding Democracy Abroad: The Learning Curve. Washington DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Cooke, Bill. 2004. "The Managing of the (Third) World." Organization 11(5): 603-629.

Cooke, Bill. 2003. "A New Continuity with Colonial Administration: Participation in Development Management." Third World Quarterly 24(1): 47-61.

Cooke, Bill. 1998. "Participation, 'Process' and Management: Lessons for Development in the History of Organization Development." Journal of International Development 10(1): 35-54.

Cooke, Bill. 1997. "From Process Consultation to a Clinical Model of Development Practice." Public Administration and Development 17(3): 325-340.

Coston, Jennifer M. 1998. "A Model and Typology of Government-NGO Relationships." Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 27(3): 358-383.

Crocker, David A. 1991. "Toward Development Ethics." World Development 19(5): 457-483.

Delp, Peter, Arne Thesen, Juzar Motiwalla, and Neekakantan Seshadri. 1977. <u>Systems Tools for Project Planning</u>. Bloomington: Indiana University, Program of Advanced Studies in Institution Building and Technical Assistance Methodologies.

Easterly, William. 2001. <u>The Elusive Quest for Growth: Economists' Adventures and Misadventures in the Tropics</u>. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Esman, Milton J. 1991. <u>Management Dimensions of Development: Perspectives and Strategies</u>. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Esman, Milton J. 1988. "The Maturing of Development Administration." <u>Public Administration and Development</u> 8(2): 125-134.

Esman, Milton J. 1980. "Development Assistance in Public Administration: Requiem or Renewal?" <u>Public Administration Review</u> 40(5): 426-431.

Fowler, Alan. 1997. <u>Striking a Balance: A Guide to Enhancing the Effectiveness of Non-Governmental Organisations in International Development</u>. London: Earthscan Publications.

Gasper, Des. 2000. "Evaluating the 'Logical Framework Approach:' Towards Learning-Oriented Development Evaluation." <u>Public Administration and Development</u> 20(1): 17-28.

Gore, Charles. 2000. "The Rise and Fall of the Washington Consensus as a Paradigm for Developing Countries." <u>World Development</u> 28(5): 789-804.

Grammig, Thomas. 2002. <u>Technical Knowledge and Development: Observing Aid Projects and Processes</u>. New York: Routledge.

Hage, Jerald and Kurt Finsterbusch. 1987. <u>Organizational Change as a Development Strategy: Models and Tactics for Improving Third World Organizations</u>. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Haggard, Stephan and Robert R. Kaufman, eds. 1992. <u>The Politics of Economic Adjustment: International Constraints, Distributive Conflicts, and the State</u>. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Heady, Ferrel. 1998. "Comparative and International Public Administration: Building Intellectual Bridges." <u>Public Administration Review</u> 58(1): 32-40.

Holcombe, Susan, S. Ali Nawaz, A. Kamwendo, and K. Ba. 2004. "Managing Development: For What and For Whom?" <u>International Public Management Journal</u> 7(2): 187-205.

Hubbard, Ruth. 1997. "People – Hearts and Minds Towards Rebirth of the Public Service." <u>Public Administration and Development</u> 17(1): 109-114.

Israel, Arturo. 1987. <u>Institutional Development: Incentives to Performance</u>. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Joy, Leonard. 1997. "Developing a Development Practice: A Commentary in Response to Cooke." <u>Public Administration and Development</u> 17(4): 453-477.

Kerrigan, John E. and Jeff S. Luke. 1987. <u>Management Training Strategies for Developing Countries</u>. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Kilby, Peter. 2004. "Empowerment in a Results-Based Project Environment: Is it an Impossible Task?" <u>International Public Management Journal</u> 7(2): 207-225.

Korten, David C. 1995. <u>When Corporations Rule the World</u>. West Hartford, CT and San Francisco, CA: Kumarian Press and Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Korten, David C. 1984. "Strategic Organization for People-Centered Development." <u>Public Administration Review</u> 44(4): 341-352.

Korten, David C. and Rudi Klauss, eds. 1984. <u>People-Centered Development: Contributions toward Theory and Planning Frameworks</u>. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Kumar, Krishna, ed. 1993. <u>Rapid Appraisal Methods</u>. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Landes, David S. 1999. <u>The Wealth and Poverty of Nations: Why Some are so Rich and Some so Poor</u>. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Lindenberg, Marc and Benjamin Crosby. 1981. <u>Managing Development: The Political Dimension</u>. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Nicholson, Norman K. and Edwin F. Connerley. 1989. "The Impending Crisis in Development Administration." <u>International Journal of Public Administration</u> 12(3): 385-426.

Riggs, Fred W. 2000. "Exporting Government?" Leiden, Netherlands: Association for Law and Administration in Developing and Transitional Countries, Conference paper, June 23.

Riggs, Fred W. 1998. "Public Administration in America: Why Our Uniqueness is Exceptional and Important." <u>Public Administration Review</u> 58(1): 22-32.

Rist, Gilbert. 1997. <u>The History of Development: From Western Origins to Global Faith</u>. London and New York: Zed Books, Ltd.

Rondinelli, Dennis A. 1987. <u>Development Administration and U.S. Foreign Aid Policy</u>. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Rondinelli, Dennis A. 1983. <u>Development Projects as Policy Experiments: An Adaptive Approach to Development Administration</u>. New York: Methuen and Company.

Spector, Bertram I. and Lawrence Cooley. 1997. "Consultant Roles in the Strategic Management of Policy Change." Washington, DC: U. S. Agency for International Development, Center for Democracy and Governance, Implementing Policy Change Project, Technical Note No. 8.

Thomas, Alan. 1999. "What Makes Good Development Management?" <u>Development in Practice</u>, 9(1&2): 9-17.

Thomas, Alan. 1996. "What is Development Management?" <u>Journal of International Development</u> 8(1): 95-110.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 1994. <u>Process Consultation for Systemic Improvement of Public Sector Management</u>. New York: Author.

Uphoff, Norman and Milton Esman. 1974. <u>Local Organization for Development: Analysis of Asian Experience</u>. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, Center for International Studies.

White, Louise G. 1987. <u>Creating Opportunities for Change: Approaches to Managing Development Programs</u>. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.