

**PREFACE TO THE SPECIAL ISSUE ON EMERGING
PERSPECTIVES ON DEVELOPMENT
MANAGEMENT**

DONALD KLINGNER
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO AT COLORADO SPRINGS

In December 2002 the International Public Management Network and Information Age Publishing signed an historic agreement with the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA). This agreement added the Section on International and Comparative Administration (SICA) as co-sponsor of the *International Public Management Journal (IPMJ)*, a leading journal in the field of international public administration and management. SICA is ASPA's oldest section, and has a long history of excellence in fostering scholarly interaction and exchange. SICA and *IPMJ* are highly compatible in that both are dedicated to the facilitation and enhancement of scholarly communication between and among academics and practitioners from all nations around the world.

To celebrate this affiliation and commemorate SICA's thirtieth anniversary, SICA and *IPMJ* are co-sponsoring this special issue on "Emerging Perspectives on Development Management," co-edited by Jennifer Brinkerhoff and Donald Klingner. The editors of this symposium and the editors of *IPMJ* intend it not only to foster international communications and comparative research in development management, but also to recognize two fundamental commonalities of the IPMN and SICA: our shared interest in the implications of globalization and globalism, and our common goal of international economic development and administrative reform.

THE IMPLICATIONS OF GLOBALIZATION AND GLOBALISM

Globalization means a world that is smaller and more interconnected, because of a number of intersecting trends and conditions whose cumulative and concurrent effects mean that things happening in one place are more likely to affect people and events elsewhere

Direct all correspondence to: Donald Klingner, Graduate School of Public Affairs, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs, 1420 Austin Bluffs Parkway, PO Box 7150, Colorado Springs, CO 80933-7150. E-mail: Donald.Klingner@uccs.edu

(Friedman 2000). These trends and conditions include communication and transportation (airplanes, computers, and the Internet); economic interdependence (imports, exports, and movement of capital); war, terrorism, violence, and ethnic conflict; global migration in search of economic and political security; environmental pollution, natural disasters, and climate change; epidemics such as AIDS and malaria, and poverty; and conflict and cooperation among three alternative ways of solving problems (i.e., public policymaking, economic markets, and community-based organizations) (Yergin and Stanislaw 2002).

But while people generally agree on globalization's characteristics and impacts, they often disagree on its implications. Many of these disagreements focus on how to evaluate globalism, the underlying capitalist structural ideology for addressing the trends and conditions that characterize globalization (Farazmand 1999). In developed countries like the U.S., globalism is viewed primarily as a trend that offers increased personal choices such as international travel and imported consumer goods, or increased business profitability through international supplies of labor and raw materials, and international markets for exports. However, people in developing countries are more likely to view globalization as a mixed blessing, in that globalism presents them with threats (risk, uncertainty, and loss) as well as opportunities. For the southern hemisphere in particular, globalism is widely viewed as exacerbating an array of political, social, and economic issues in ways that clearly favor developed countries and hinder developing ones. The increasing imbalance between north and south renders governments incapable of responding to citizens' basic needs, and citizens less likely to participate in building societal and governmental capacity.

And just as people in general in developed and developing countries may view globalism differently, public administrators also tend to respond differently to the issues it raises (Pérez Baltodano 1997). U.S. public administrators who view their field parochially tend to respond to globalism primarily by continuing (in spite of events elsewhere) to fine tune U.S. governance systems and procedures so as to maximize goals like public service, effectiveness, participation, and accountability. But public administrators with a more comparative and international focus (including IPMN and SICA members) are more likely to focus on the interrelated big issues that concern public administrators globally (Pérez Baltodano 1997; Kettl 2000; Kirlin 1996, 2001). Among these are international economic development and administrative reform.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM

After World War II, the success of the Marshall Plan at rebuilding Europe and a global interest in economic development for least developed countries (LDCs) led to the creation of a new field of study and practice. Development administration emerged as an amalgam of development economics and public administration aimed at improving economic conditions and governance systems in LDCs by replicating Western concepts and techniques. It generally presumed that the laws, policies, structures, and procedures in developed Western countries were superior to those indigenous to developing countries because of their greater rationality, efficiency, and relationship to democratic ideals

(Rostow 1960; Fredland 2000). Their diffusion and adoption was considered both automatic (given the “evolutionary superiority” of reforms introduced by Western consultants) and purposive, in that Western lenders often mandated administrative reforms as a condition of continued credit (Adamolekun 1999; Farazmand 1999).

But this traditional notion of economic development has by and large been abandoned because it did not achieve the desired results (Heady 1998). It did not decrease the gap between rich and poor nations, nor reduce global poverty (United Nations Development Programme 2003). One scholar clearly summarizes this failure as reported by the UN: “The United Nations’ *Human Development Report, 1999*, notes that between 1980 and 1996 gross national product (GNP) per capita declined in no less than fifty-nine countries. It reports that the income gap between the fifth of the world’s population living in the richest countries, and the fifth in the poorest widened from 30 to 1 in 1960 to 74 to 1 in 1997” (Hoogvelt 2001, xiii). In sum, macroeconomic growth and increased average income are now considered to be necessary but not sufficient factors in economic development. In many cases, a country rich in exported oil or other natural resources may have a high average income, yet evidence political, economic or social conditions that lead to its being classified as developing (Klingner 2000; Klingner and Pallavicini Campos 2002).

Three analytically separate yet interdependent approaches have emerged in response to the now discredited traditional approach to development administration: comparative administration, development management, and international public management. Comparative administration began as a social science discipline intent on correcting the two fundamental intellectual flaws of traditional development administration: ethnocentrism and ignorance (Riggs 1998). Its adherents are primarily scholars and researchers who believe that traditional development administration failed because development administrators tended to automatically and erroneously assume that Western techniques and structures were superior to their indigenous counterparts (Fredland 2000), and because they were unaware of the unique historical factors that had led to the success of Western management techniques (Riggs 1998). In contrast, comparative administration is the more value-neutral study of public administrative systems across countries and cultures (Riggs 1980, 1991; Rutgers 1998). It examines alternative governance models as outcomes of cultural contexts (historical, economic, political, and social), and evaluates the relative capacity of administrative systems based on underlying trends and conditions (Peters 1988; Van Wart and Cayer 1990; Heady 1996). Its intellectual antecedents are political science and sociology. Its primary purpose is to compare alternative systems in order to understand how they have evolved and why they function as they do, rather than to evaluate them, describe their shortcomings, or prescribe recommendations to improve them.

The subfield of development management, which encompasses the management of particular development efforts as well as the indigenous process of development, broadened in the 1990s. With the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989, the underlying structural mechanism for international economic development changed fundamentally, from politically motivated state-to-state aid to market-oriented economic transactions by transnational corporations (Fredland 2000). But while capitalism has clearly triumphed

globally as a system of production, some of its more negative consequences (e.g., inequitable distribution of wealth and a focus on economic rather than social, political, or environmental objectives) led detractors to question the underlying assumptions of globalism and to suggest structural alternatives, appropriate technologies, sustainable development, and non-economic criteria for assessing development (Korten 1995; Schumacher 1973). Thus, development managers adopted many of the insights learned from comparative administration. First, they recognized that macroeconomic growth is not the sole or even the primary goal of development. Other valued outcomes are balanced economic development, the growth of civil society as measured by such factors as citizen participation, the development of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) as a supplement to the public and private sectors, and strengthening public administrative capacity so as to increase public confidence in government policies and administrative capacity. Second, they explicitly recognized that strengthening the capacity of government agencies and NGOs was not only a desirable antidote to the dominance of market-based structural responses to globalization (Farazmand 2002), but also a prerequisite to development (Werlin 1990). Robust administrative systems are largely present in developed countries such as the U.S., but developing countries may not only lack administrative capacity but also the conditions in civil society and government that engender it (Heady 1996). Third, these development managers formed new alliances with international donor organizations and became, in effect, a global industry with different clients, sponsors, and objectives than in the cold war era (Brinkerhoff and Coston 1999).

Throughout the world, demands for development and democratization have pressured governments to make good policy decisions and use scarce resources effectively (Dilulio, Garvey, and Kettl 1993). So, a third successor to development administration is New Public Management (NPM). Its fundamental objective is to create a more innovative, flexible, problem solving, and entrepreneurial culture within public agencies (Barzelay 1992; Kettl 1997, 2000; Rosenbloom 1998; and Brudney et al. 2000). Proponents believe that because NPM reforms are designed specifically to make public agencies more homogeneous in vision, more responsive to administrative leadership, and more focused on customer satisfaction, they are essential to building government capacity globally (Kettl 1997). They side with traditional development administration in presuming that administrative systems in developing countries tend to evolve toward increased rationality and transparency as indicators of development (Savoie 1990; Welch 1998). Yet they side with comparative administrationists in recognizing the necessity of understanding administrative systems in context before attempting to change them piecemeal (Klingner 2000; Farazmand 2002). This insight is exemplified by Huddleston's (1999) dictum to learn anatomy before doing surgery.

So over the past half century, international economic development has evolved from relatively simplistic and patronizing efforts to develop LDCs by transplanting Western technology (including administrative systems and processes) to something much more complex. There is no agreement in the literature on its definition as a field of study or body of practice (Dwivedi and Henderson 1990; Heady 1998). Yet by agreeing to this historic affiliation, SICA and the IPMN have recognized that their members have much in common—particularly a shared interest in globalization, globalism, and a common

concern for international economic development and administrative reform. As co-editor of this symposium, it is my hope that it will stimulate a closer examination of our differences and a stronger awareness of our commonalities.

REFERENCES

- Adamolekun, L., ed. 1999. *Public Administration in Africa: Main Issues and Selected Country Studies*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press.
- Barzelay, M. 1992. *Breaking through Bureaucracy: A New Vision for Managing in Government*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Brinkerhoff, D., and J. Coston. 1999. "International Development Management in a Globalized World." *Public Administration Review* 59:346-61.
- Brudney, J., L. O'Toole, Jr., and H. Rainey. 2000. *Advancing Public Management: New Developments in Theory, Methods, and Practice*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Dilulio, J., G. Garvey, and D. Kettl. 1993. *Improving Government Performance: An Owner's Manual*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Dwivedi, O., and K. Henderson. 1990. "State of the Art: Comparative Public Administration and Development Administration." Pp. 9-20 in O. Dwivedi and K. Henderson, eds., *Public Administration in World Perspective*. Ames: Iowa State University Press.
- Farazmand, A. 1999. "Globalization and Public Administration." *Public Administration Review* 59:509-22.
- Farazmand, A., ed. 2002. *Administrative Reform in Developing Nations*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger.
- Fredland, R. 2000. "Technology Transfer to the Public Sector in Developing States: Three Phases." *Journal of Technology Transfer* 25:265-75.
- Friedman, T. 2000. *The Lexus and the Olive Tree: Understanding Globalization*. New York: Bantam.
- Heady, F. 1996. *Public Administration in Comparative Perspective*. 5th ed. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- . 1998. "Comparative and International Public Administration: Building Intellectual Bridges." *Public Administration Review* 58:32-40.
- Hoogvelt, A. 2001. *Globalization and the Postcolonial World: The New Political Economy of Development*. 2d ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Huddleston, M. 1999. "Innocents Abroad: Reflections from a Public Administration Consultant in Bosnia." *Public Administration Review* 59:147-58.
- Kettl, D. 1997. "The Global Revolution in Public Management: Driving Themes, Missing Links." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 16:446-62.
- . 2000. *The Global Public Management Revolution: A Report on the Transformation of Governance*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings.
- Kirlin, J. 1996. "The Big Questions of Public Administration in a Democracy." *Public Administration Review* 56:416-23.
- . 2001. "Big Questions for a Significant Public Administration." *Public Administration Review* 61:140-43.
- Klingner, D. 2000. "South of the Border: Progress and Problems in Implementing New Public Management Reforms in Mexico Today." *American Review of Public Administration* 30:365-73.
- Klingner, D., and V. Pallavicini Campos. 2002. "Building Public HRM Capacity in Latin America and the Caribbean: What Works and What Doesn't." *Public Organization Review* 2:349-64.

- Korten, R. 1995. *When Corporations Rule the World*. New York: Kumarian.
- Lijphart, A. 1984. *Democracies*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Pérez Baltodano, A. 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* 7:615-38.
- Peters, B.G. 1988. *Comparing Public Bureaucracies: Problems of Theory and Method*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.
- Riggs, F. 1980. "The Ecology and Context of Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective." *Public Administration Review* 40:107-15.
- . 1991. "Public Administration: A Comparativist Framework." *Public Administration Review* 51:473-77.
- . 1998. "Public Administration in America: Why Our Uniqueness Is Exceptional and Important." *Public Administration Review* 58:22-31.
- Rosenbloom, D. 1998. *Public Administration*. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rostow, W. 1960. *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rutgers, M. 1998. "Paradigm Lost: Crisis As Identity in the Study of Public Administration." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 64:553-64.
- Savoie, D. 1990. "Public Management Development: A Comparative Perspective." *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 3:40-52.
- Schumacher, E. 1973. *Small Is Beautiful: Economics As If People Mattered*. New York: Harper & Row.
- United Nations Development Programme. 2003. *Human Development Report 2003: A Compact among Nations to End Human Poverty*. New York: Oxford University Press. Available at <http://www.undp.org/hdr2003>, Internet.
- Van Wart, M., and N. Cayer. 1990. "Comparative Public Administration: Defunct, Dispersed, or Redefined?" *Public Administration Review* 50:238-48.
- Welch, E. 1998. "Public Administration in a Global Context: Bridging the Gaps of Theory and Practice between Western and Non-Western Nations." *Public Administration Review* 58:40-50.
- Werlin, H. 1990. "From an LDC to an MDC: Lessons for American Public Administration." *Public Administration Review* 50:477-79.
- Yergin, D., and J. Stanislaw. 2002. *The Commanding Heights*. New York: Simon & Schuster.