International Public Management Journal

EMERGING TRENDS IN DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: TENSION AND COMPLEXITY IN THE CONTINUING SEARCH FOR SOLUTIONS

JENNIFER M. BRINKERHOFF
THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT: *This article presents the collective findings and implications of the International Public Management Journal symposium on emerging trends in development management. Each of the five articles emphasizes a particular type of change in international development: changing definitions of development; new tools, processes, and actors; new agendas; and new donor assistance modalities. In doing so, they address the values, process, tools, and institutional agenda dimensions of development management. The five articles are introduced and collectively analyzed. This overview article introduces the symposium papers, highlights what they contribute to our understanding of the four dimensions of development management and their inherent tensions, and discusses their findings with respect to definitions of development and the consequent role the development industry might play. The article concludes with some thoughts on new and continuing challenges and opportunities.*

Scholars and practitioners have long grappled with identifying and implementing the best policies and approaches to promoting socioeconomic development, whether at the community, national, or international level. Since World War II, the international development field has emerged as a discipline, marked by an evolution of approaches to understanding and addressing development challenges (for an informative overview of the history of international development see Rist [1997]). A primary change over time has been increased technical analysis in recognition of the complexity of promoting development, as opposed to single notions of economic take-off or big push theories. Other changes in the field have emerged as a function of shifts in values, such as a movement away from ethnocentric modernization agendas toward an emphasis on human development that embraces the inherent and functional value of local knowledge and culture.

Direct all correspondence to: Jennifer M. Brinkerhoff, School of Public Policy and Public Administration, The George Washington University, 805 21st Street, NW Suite 601, Washington, DC 20052. E-mail: jbrink@gwu.edu

International Public Management Journal, 7(2), pages 149-161

ISSN: 1096-7494

Over the post-World War II years, international development, both as an academic discipline (or set of disciplines) and as a practice, has grown to the point where, today, we can refer to an international development industry. This industry is driven by the international donors, multilateral and bilateral, whose resources are represented by official development assistance (ODA). Universities, private consulting firms, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) are the major producers of international goods and services purchased through ODA. Private capital is another source of resource flows to developing countries. In response to the need to use these resources efficiently and effectively, a subdiscipline of development management has emerged within the broader field of international development.

This special issue seeks to highlight current and emerging perspectives in development management as it is practiced at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Each article emphasizes a particular type of change in international development: changing definitions of development; new tools, processes, and actors; new agendas; and new donor assistance modalities. In doing so, they address various facets of development management; that is, its values, process, tools, and institutional agenda dimensions (Brinkerhoff and Coston 1999). The diversity and collective contribution of these papers provide a useful state-of-the-moment in development management, reflecting where the field has come from and providing signposts with respect to challenges and opportunities ahead.

This overview article introduces the symposium articles, highlights what they contribute to our understanding of the four dimensions of development management and their inherent tensions, and discusses their findings with respect to definitions of development and the consequent role the development industry might play. The article concludes with some thoughts on new and continuing challenges and opportunities.

WHAT’S NEW (AND OLD) IN DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT?

The articles in this symposium point to shifts in priorities and agendas. These reflect both substantive emphases, such as strategic approaches to poverty reduction and an endorsement of the need for empowerment, and the ongoing search for effectiveness—particularly in terms of performance-based approaches and the continued effort to develop analytic frameworks to capture the complexity of development contexts and processes. Challenges that have plagued the development industry from the start are taken up again here, demonstrating their continued relevance. These include the temptation to adopt blueprint approaches often based on Western models and delivered in a top-down fashion, and the continuing tension between a recognized, or at least advocated, need for community empowerment and the administrative machinery of donor approaches.

Now more than ever before, the international development industry explicitly embraces an emphasis on poverty alleviation beyond economic growth and trickle-down assumptions. Most recently demonstrated by the World Bank’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) (see Craig and Porter 2003) and the Millennium Development Goals (see Annan 2001) (notably goal one, to halve poverty by 2015), development actors broadly agree that poverty reduction needs to be the overarching goal of development efforts. This requires proactive strategies, which include a keen understanding of:

1. what poverty means,
2. what causes it, and
3. what structural barriers need to be addressed to alleviate it

(see the World Bank's Voices of the Poor series: Narayan 2000; Narayan et al. 2000; and Narayan and Petesch 2002; see also World Bank 2001).

In this special issue, Silverman takes up the challenge of the first and third of these questions. In the tradition of de Soto (1989) and Migdal (1988), Silverman seeks to illuminate the existence of parallel, nonformal governance systems that govern the lives of the poor. He clarifies the distinctions between institutions and organizations; states and nations; formal, informal, and nonformal systems; and government and governance. These distinctions allow for a deeper, more sophisticated understanding of poverty and how it is lived. He develops an incentive framework based on mutual dependency to link formal and nonformal governance systems, and outlines a demand-driven, supply-responsive approach to poverty reduction. He briefly compares this approach to the World Bank's PRSP modality, highlighting its shortcomings, notably its emphasis on what to do as opposed to how decisions should be made, i.e., in a way consistent with a recognition of the legitimacy of poor people's values and priorities.

Jafari and Sud examine performance-based approaches in development, examining the United States' Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) and its proposal for performance-based aid allocation. The emphasis here is not on performance management, but on eligibility criteria. They examine and critique the proposed indicators, which focus on the areas of ruling justly, investing in people, and economic freedom. Jafari and Sud argue that these categories, and the indicators used to gauge them, are too subjective to be reliable. They propose an alternative indicator, sustained economic growth, as a proxy. Comparing the proposed indicators with this alternative, they reveal the seemingly arbitrary exclusion of some needy and progressive countries from the MCA as it is currently conceived.

Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith are also concerned with aid effectiveness and focus more specifically on good governance. Good governance is simultaneously a funding criterion, as with the MCA, an enabling factor in development effectiveness, and a donor agenda. Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith examine good governance from the perspective of donor agendas related to reducing clientelism and patrimonialism. Specifically, they explore why strategies for tackling clientelistic practices tend to fail. Rather than viewing these practices as undemocratic or corrupt, according to Western notions of good governance, Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith argue that such systems persist because they provide some value to participants. At the societal level, patron-client institutions may be inefficient, but individuals may still derive benefits. In fact, they argue that clientelist systems are an important avenue for the poor to participate in governance systems (nonformal or otherwise) and obtain a response to their needs. In this sense, patron-client systems may be considered nonformal governance systems as described by Silverman.

The implication is that donors should first thoroughly understand these systems before they seek to dislodge them under the assumption that they do not meet the needs of the poor and are contrary to good governance, as defined by donors. To support these efforts, the authors propose an analytic framework for diagnosing patron-client systems and assessing their tradeoffs in a given society. The framework enables a better grasp of the complexity of these systems, including the range, interests, costs, and benefits of various sets of participants. Additional donor strategies for addressing patron-client systems are also proposed and include containment, civic education, the creation of islands of reform for demonstration effects, and increasing competition among nodes of power.

Kilby returns to the theme of results-based management in development, this time contrasting it with the emerging emphasis on empowerment as part of donors' governance agenda. In doing so, he highlights the importance of the accountability relationship between the disempowered and the development agent. He focuses his critique on the best-known manifestation of the results-based agenda: the logical framework for program design and its variations. As practiced, the logical framework, he argues, tends to reinforce upward accountability (i.e., from beneficiary, to development agent, to donor), with results indicators and timeframes predetermined by the donors. Such practice is contradictory to the self-determination and engagement required for empowerment. Other features of donors' performance-based management are similarly contradictory with the reality of development processes. These include the underlying assumption of certainty (as if empowerment would lead to more certainty) and short time frames, both of which ignore the necessity of process approaches and belie the complexity of development and empowerment.

To test his hypotheses, Kilby examined the work of fifteen NGOs promoting empowerment in India. His survey findings underscore the importance of downward accountability of the NGO to the beneficiary group, and the length of time the group has been together. The latter finding has implications for the duration of donor support. Donors typically do not fund projects and groups for more than three to five years, skewing the incentives of both the groups and the NGO development agents. On one hand, the groups may not develop sufficient cohesion to be sustained over time. On the other hand, NGOs might seek to work only with those groups who show promise in terms of three-year results, leaving other needy groups behind. He concludes by endorsing a process approach, which seeks to promote progressive positive change rather than meeting external targets within predetermined timeframes.

In a similar vein, Holcombe and her associates question the relevance of macrolevel economic growth models (such as the one embodied in the MCA), and focus on managing the implementation of development activities. They shed light on the operational realities of concepts such as ownership, partnership, accountability, capacity, and learning. Their premise is that our underlying values and definitions of development are tested in the management of development activities. They review evolving development definitions and, like Kilby, conclude that "development is about expanding the choices and enabling the agency of individuals and institutions to shape the course of their own development" (189). Therefore, it requires a demand-driven approach that encompasses transformation not only of targeted communities, but of development industry agents as well. The inherent paradox of requiring external resources confirms the need for reciprocal accountability in the aid relationship.

To explore how this view of development is operationalized, Holcombe and her associates examine three NGO programs: combating female genital mutilation in Senegal, AIDS orphans in Malawi, and capacity building in Pakistan. In the first instance, female genital mutilation was addressed indirectly, through empowerment and human rights training at the village level. The NGO stressed the importance of individuals and communities coming to their own conclusion about the desired abandonment of the practice. In Malawi, the NGO built upon a presumed failure, linking previously NGO-trained but unmobilized local civil servants to newly empowered, community-based organizations. Finally, in Pakistan, the NGO evolved from a donor-supported funding agency to a support NGO that seeks to enhance the capacity and sustainability of community-based organizations. The cases highlight the tension between donor requirements and the requirements for development on the ground, and the uncertainty and change that emerge during program implementation. The authors conclude that development is about asking questions, not answering them, and is thus an attitude as opposed to a model.

Collectively, these articles say a lot about emerging perspectives on development management. With respect to changing definitions of development, they suggest that several more liberal interpretations are entering the mainstream. For example, the industry is still experimenting with and learning that development is not the equivalent of, nor will it look like, Western models (e.g., Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith; Silverman). In addition, empowerment has now entered the mainstream development lexicon (e.g., Kilby; Holcombe et al.), and our understanding of development as poverty reduction is becoming increasingly sophisticated (e.g., Silverman). Finally, Holcombe and her associates imply that what development means to a particular actor is ultimately what gets enacted on the ground, though in responding to incentives we may not always be aware of these implications.

Several of the articles address tools, processes, and actors. Many of them explore results-based management of development, either for the purpose of improving its practice, modifying its criteria (Jafari and Sud), or critiquing its appropriateness (Kilby; Holcombe et al.). Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith, and Silverman offer new analytic frameworks and strategies in order to cope with and appropriately respond to the complexity of development contexts. Several of the papers critique donor practices and policies and offer recommendations. A particular target of analysis, critique, and recommendation is the relationship between donors and/or development agents and targeted communities. Both Kilby and Holcombe and her associates stress the importance of mutual accountability.

Donor agendas and modalities are specifically targeted for review. These include efforts to nuance elements of donors' good governance agenda (Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith). Donors' poverty reduction agenda is also subjected to scrutiny, notably by Jafari and Sud, and Silverman. And Kilby and Holcombe and her associates examine the tension between emerging empowerment agendas and donor practice. As for modalities, the articles shed light on a range of relatively new donor modalities, including the PRSP (Silverman) and MCA (Jafari and Sud; Holcombe et al.). The implications for development management are taken up in the next section.

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: SELECTIVE EMPHASES, CONTINUING TENSIONS

A number of frameworks seek to define or at least demarcate the subfield of development management. Perhaps the most straightforward distinction is that of Alan Thomas (1999): development management can be viewed as management of development or management for development. If only it were so simple. As the contributions to this symposium suggest, this distinction is not easy to make. Tools and modalities that emphasize performance-based measurement represent management of development (e.g., Jafari and Sud). However, attempts are often made to combine these with comprehensive, participatory processes. Holcombe and her associates, and Kilby address this tension more directly. Both articles conclude that such tools and modalities are inherently contradictory to development (i.e., management for development); Holcombe and her associates seem more open to the potential for marginal improvements. With respect to management for development, several of the papers underscore the importance of avoiding blueprint approaches (Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith; Kilby; Holcombe et al.) and emphasize demand-driven process approaches (Silverman).

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

Development Management As Values

With respect to the values dimension, the articles underscore the importance of recognizing the capacity of the poor and of indigenous, possibly nonformal systems. The emphasis is thus placed on both the inherent value of individuals enacting their own development, and on the instrumentality of such approaches, that is, enabling development objectives to be reached effectively. Kilby, Holcombe and her associates, and Silverman explicitly embrace empowerment as a values-based definition of development. In particular, Kilby stresses the importance of being able to call others to account: first, as a dimension of empowerment as a value, and second, as a dimension of effectiveness, where the confidence attained is applied in other relationships and arenas, promoting both development and empowerment more generally. Similarly, Holcombe and her associates describe the efforts of an NGO in Senegal to respect local values, even those related to female genital mutilation, while training communities in human rights. The NGO recognized that condemnation would not be an effective approach to eliminating the practice; the community needed to come to its own conclusion. Like Kilby, Silverman argues forcefully that effective participation of the poor requires that they influence the substance of decisions and implementation arrangements. He concludes with the need for attitudinal changes on the part of development managers to accept that “the subjective attitudes and prioritized demands of the poor have legitimacy” (243).

Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith argue that governance reform is mainly a domestic matter, with external actors playing only a supportive role. Therefore, local values and benefits of patron-client systems must be taken into account, as they will ultimately drive incentives for reform no matter the donors’ agenda. Silverman similarly emphasizes the importance of nonformal structures and the values and benefits they represent. In fact, he argues that much of the failure to achieve economic growth with equity is attributable to experts who ignore “deep-rooted values embedded within informal and nonformal political and economic systems” (230). He promotes working with nonformal systems, as opposed to trying to transform them.

At least two of the articles explicitly embrace the political nature of development. Because development necessarily encompasses values and interests, which may be conflictive, Silverman challenges development managers to recognize that conflict is inevitable, and can be functional to development. Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith address the political realities of institutional change, calling attention to power, resources, and costs and benefits.

Development Management As Process

Development is, by definition, a process, and one that requires learning approaches. Holcombe and her associates describe process approaches. The first case addresses the process of changing attitudes and practice related to female genital mutilation. Two other cases describe how NGOs learn and adapt their missions and development activities. In Malawi, the NGO built upon its presumed failure in the past to link previously trained local civil servants with newly empowered, community-based organizations. In Pakistan, the NGO learned that its funding was not resulting in sustainable programming or organizations. It, therefore, reinvented itself as a support organization, providing capacity-building training and seed money to community-based organizations.

Kilby argues that empowerment and management for development are processes that cannot be determined a priori or definitively measured. His examples from India demonstrate the necessity of process approaches, particularly when development is targeted to the marginalized poor, thus requiring major sociocultural shifts within the targeted communities. He describes a successful empowerment process as being iterative, with outcomes analyzed and the program modified accordingly throughout its lifetime. He explicitly endorses a process approach, which seeks “progressive, positive changes in peoples lives, rather than meeting externally prescribed targets” (221); and argues for “less micromanagement and scrutiny of inputs per se in favor of more evaluative processes of change over time” (ibid.).

The process dimension of development management also endorses contingency approaches and capacity building. Both are implicit in the learning approaches described above. Capacity building is also a more explicit aspect of the articles by Holcombe and her associates, and Kilby, whether for individuals, community-based organizations, or governments. Contingency approaches are represented in the analytic frameworks developed by Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith, and Silverman. Demand-driven approaches similarly seek to fit development activities to the local context (Kilby; Silverman).

Development Management As Toolkit

The articles develop new tools and critique and/or seek to modify existing ones. The main point of Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith's article is to develop a new analytic framework to inform future governance interventions. They also propose complementary strategies. Silverman seeks to develop an incentive framework that would form the basis for linkage strategies between formal and nonformal governance systems.

Several of the articles address results-based management and its associated tools. Kilby's main point is to critique the appropriateness of tools such as the logical framework. Instead of questioning the essence of these tools and approaches, Jafari and Sud evaluate and seek to modify them. They take the results basis as given and instead propose alternative indicators.

Development Management As a Means to Institutional Agendas

Collectively the articles describe, contribute to, and critique donor agendas. As noted above, empowerment (Kilby) and strategic approaches to poverty reduction (Silverman) are increasingly present in donor agendas, while at the same time, agendas that promote economic growth as a means—often the primary means—to development persist (Jafari and Sud). Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith seek to nuance donors' governance agenda, focusing on clientelism. Silverman seeks to inform poverty reduction agendas.

Two of the articles critique donors' performance measurement agenda. Kilby identifies results-based management as an institutional agenda driving the use of particular development management tools and questions its appropriateness. Holcombe and her associates describe how these agendas skew NGO implementer priorities at the risk of losing responsiveness to communities. Both articles examine the incentives created by donors' performance measurement agendas.

Development Management: Continuing Tensions

Development management has always been a complex undertaking, with various actors determining their own priorities as they seek to reconcile the tensions among its dimensions (see Brinkerhoff and Coston 1999). These articles demonstrate that the tensions among development management's four dimensions persist, and shed light on how they become operationalized as actors enact their respective priorities.

The most obvious tension, as this collection demonstrates, is that between institutional agendas and values and process. It is not so easily described, however, since some institutional agendas have direct bearing on the particular processes and tools of choice. This is evidenced in the emphasis on performance measurement, both as an institutional agenda and as operationalized through selected processes and tools.

In this symposium, institutional agendas are critiqued based on the values dimension of development management, feasibility, and contradictions. Donor agendas often run counter to local values in terms of the imposition of blueprint approaches (see Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith; Silverman) and the way they are operationalized, with results indicators and time frames determined a priori (Kilby; Holcombe et al.; Jafari and Sud). Jafari and Sud's article illustrates the values versus institutional agenda tension within the MCA, as it adopts a triage approach and seemingly accepts the inevitability of global poverty and inequality.

With respect to feasibility, Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith, and Silverman question the feasibility of donor agendas when they ignore local incentives. There is tension in Jafari and Sud's argument for the tool of rational, logical, feasible indicators (e.g., sustained economic growth) and underlying values addressed in the current configuration of MCA indicators that they critique (e.g., ruling justly and investing in people). Their article highlights the inherent contradiction between objectivity and feasibility on one hand, and how to account for the subjective, values-basis of priorities on the other. Silverman addresses the tension between feasibility and values by suggesting a demand-driven, supply-responsive approach that would retain a role for experts. He notes that the poor, applying their values and priorities through effective participation, may select options that may not be technically feasible or cost-effective, necessitating external expertise to assist them in evaluating the feasibility of their proposals.

The articles point out inherent contradictions in donor agendas. Reprising the emphasis on values, Kilby criticizes donor agendas as being inimical to development as defined as empowerment. Holcombe and her associates describe how the development industry, inclusive of donors, embraces the rhetoric of participation, ownership, and empowerment, yet donors' management agendas and modalities prohibit successful development along these criteria.

Some of the articles propose strategies for addressing these inherent tensions. Silverman seeks to rectify the tension between values and process, and institutional agendas by promoting a demand-driven, supply-responsive approach to poverty reduction, which includes technical support (as above) and responsibility of the poor in terms of the costs and implications of selected options. Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith's framework similarly seeks to account for local context, competing priorities, and feasibility in pursuing governance agendas.

WHAT IS DEVELOPMENT AND WHAT ROLE SHOULD THE DEVELOPMENT INDUSTRY PLAY?

This symposium goes to the very heart of what development means and what the role of the industry is and should be in that process. Implicit in any international development effort is a moral issue regarding how global poverty and inequality are perceived. If global inequality and poverty are viewed as regrettable but inescapable realities, then development is essentially an economic process by which all countries—rich and poor—develop by selling whatever it is that they can produce (exploiting their comparative advantage) in the global marketplace, utilizing the yield for employment, economic growth, and a reasonable tax base to fund public services, including redistribution of wealth according to national priorities expressed through the political process. The role of the development industry is to support the creation of facilitative conditions, or an enabling environment, for that economic growth. If, on the other hand, global inequality and poverty are viewed as morally unacceptable conditions, then development becomes a process by which developed countries assist developing countries more holistically, perhaps deepening attention to social and political conditions that create structural poverty and social exclusion, whether at the national or international levels.

Donor agendas are ambivalent in embodying a hard and fast distinction between these two approaches. On one hand, major donors have long embraced the so-called Washington consensus on political and economic liberalization, which includes a downsizing of the state (see Gore 2000). This agenda, most notably demonstrated in structural adjustment policies of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF), is frequently evaluated as serving the needs of the global economy, often at the expense of national economic development, political stability, and quality of life (Easterly 2001; Landes 1999). Donor institutions themselves now accept many of the arguments and evaluation results of their critics, admitting that the short term pain of shock therapy has not yielded the long term gains anticipated (see, for example, Thomas et al. 1991).

However, while the World Bank and International Monetary Fund are increasingly adopting more comprehensive, participatory strategies explicitly embracing poverty reduction, other actors, such as bilateral aid agencies and transnational trade organizations (such as the WTO) continue to emphasize the perspective that growth is the priority; poverty may be inevitable; and only by joining the world system will countries prosper, despite the fact that most industrialized countries maintain market distortions which disproportionately benefit rich countries. For example, cows in the European Union receive subsidies the equivalent of $2 per day, per cow, while the average African survives on less than one dollar a day (UNDP 2003).

Taking the perspective that poverty may be inevitable, Jafari and Sud examine the MCA, focusing on eligibility criteria. No matter which criteria are eventually adopted, the driving philosophy of the MCA is to invest in winners, maximizing the use of scarce resources by strategically consolidating investments to create the kind of economic take-off Rostow (1960) promoted more than forty years ago. Inherent in this philosophy is a triage approach: invest in those who are likely to survive. While the MCA will not be the only vehicle for U.S. foreign assistance, critics point out that its triage approach is silent on the question of what happens to the losers, underscoring the assumption that some degree of poverty and inequality are inevitable and/or acceptable.

From another perspective, the World Bank's PRSP is intended to be more holistic, participatory, and poverty-driven. The PRSP starts from the assumption that poverty should not be accepted as inevitable, but must be adequately understood and addressed. This is consistent with the endorsement of the Millennium Development Goals, endorsed by the 189 member countries of the United Nations, one of which is to halve poverty by 2015. Even if some poverty may be viewed as inevitable in practice, the fundamental premise of these modalities and goals is that poverty reduction should be the primary goal of development.

Beyond this macrolevel ethical dilemma lies the conundrum inherent to development management. As organizations and individuals reconcile the tensions between development management's four facets, there always remains the fundamental contradiction between institutional agendas, which most often determine priorities, policies, and approaches independently and a priori to interventions, and the values and process dimensions inherent in the very concept of development as an indigenous process. Here, Kilby, and Holcombe and her associates highlight this tension, particularly in the implementation of donor agendas. In doing so, they suggest the possibility that donor assistance as we know it is not conducive to development as a process of empowerment.

In short, the symposium articles demonstrate and confirm the coexistence of multiple perspectives of development and the continued failure to recognize the inherent contradictions among them. For example, while the U.S. government launches the MCA and continues to dominate the WTO, protecting its own industries, it has also played an important role in promoting the World Bank's and IMF's debt relief and PRSP process and has endorsed the Millennium Development Goals. Donors simultaneously argue the importance of local ownership, all the while mandating participation and adherence to their own scheduled investment priorities. As Holcombe and her associates point out, even individual actors have yet to definitively answer the question, development for what and for whom?

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT TODAY AND TOMORROW: CONTINUING CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

What, then, are the lessons for development management? This symposium suggests that if we are to take empowerment and poverty reduction seriously, we must change the workings of the development industry. This would include a reexamination of the appropriateness of results-based management; a greater willingness to embrace the complexity inherent to the systems we are trying to change, with more careful scrutiny of the industry's tendency to settle for Western-based blueprint approaches; more attention to accountability relationships; and, related to all of the above, more accommodation—more promotion—of process approaches.

A particularly disturbing characteristic of the development industry today is the emergence, whether intended or not, of triage approaches. We have at once an increased emphasis on poverty reduction and the need for proactive strategies to address the most vulnerable, and the emergence of triage approaches, whether explicitly or as emerging from the incentives presented by the donor industry. The MCA represents an explicit triage approach, investing intensively in those countries most likely to take off. At the same time, donors may induce triage approaches due to the incentives created by their agendas and modalities. Kilby's discussion of NGO disincentives to engage with groups who may require more than three years to succeed is an example of implicit triage.

As the saying goes, the more things change, the more they remain the same. Beyond macro-level planning, such as that embodied in the comprehensive development framework 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 performance-based management agenda. Despite more than fifty years of experience, the industry still seems to assume that development can be planned and results measured. Despite movements away from unilinear modernization approaches, we still see a need to stress the importance of understanding the rationale of current practices before rushing in to change them in the name of development. This is particularly underscored in Silverman's discussion of nonformal governance, Brinkerhoff and Goldsmith's revelations with respect to patron-client systems, and Holcombe and her associates' NGO program descriptions related to female genital mutilation. Thankfully, beyond continuing well-meaning prescription, more sophisticated analytic frameworks are continuously under development to inform our understanding of the complexity we seek to address and the development of corresponding strategies.

Development is also highly personal. It ultimately concerns human relationships and meaning created through community. The statistically significant variables emerging from Kilby's survey analysis underscore the importance of trust and human relationships. The first was downward accountability of the NGO to the beneficiary group; the second was the length of time the group had been meeting. Both variables imply trust building. Holcombe and her associates also emphasize the importance of the role and relationships of field staff in the local community, especially since regardless of what drives development planning and prescription what matters in the end is how it is operationalized on the ground. These findings confirm the notion that development (and empowerment) is predicated on trust—between intermediary organizations and community groups—and human relations. It cannot be preprogrammed, especially outside of the system of those relationships.

With respect to our understanding of development management, new analytic frameworks may assist us in resolving some of the tensions among its four dimensions. But their usefulness will be determined, to a large extent, on encouraging institutions to modify their agendas to clarify their underlying objectives, independent of the particulars of what solutions may look like, and to account for what will be feasible on the ground. The tensions within development management will persist as long as there are multiple actors with competing values. In short, the tension is 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.

REFERENCES

Annan, K. 2001. *Road Map towards the Implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration: Report of the Secretary General*. UN Doc. A/56/326. New York: United Nations General Assembly.

Brinkerhoff, D.W., and J.M. Coston. 1999. "International Development Management in a Globalized World." *Public Administration Review* 59:346-61.

Brinkerhoff, D.W., and A.A. Goldsmith. 2004. "Good Governance, Clientelism and Patrimonialism: New Perspectives on Old Problems." *International Journal of Public Management* (in this issue).

Craig, D., and D. Porter. 2003. "Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers: A New Convergence." *World Development* 3:53-69.

de Soto, H. 1989. *The Other Path: The Invisible Revolution in the Third World*. New York: Harper & Row.

Easterly, W. 2001. *The Elusive Quest for Growth: Economists' Adventures and Misadventures in the Tropics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Gore, C. 2000. "The Rise and Fall of the Washington Consensus As a Paradigm for Developing Countries." *World Development* 28:789-804.

Holcombe, S., S. Ali Nawaz, A. Kamwendo, and K. Ba. 2004. "Managing Development: NGO Perspectives?" *International Public Management Journal* (in this issue).

Jafari, S., and I. Sud. 2004. "Performance-based Foreign Assistance through the Millennium Challenge Account: Sustained Economic Growth As the Objective Qualifying Criterion." *International Public Management Journal* (in this issue).

Kilby, P. 2004. "Is Empowerment Possible under a New Public Management Environment? Some Lessons from India." *International Public Management Journal* (in this issue).

Landes, D.S. 1999. *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations: Why Some Are So Rich and Some So Poor*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Migdal, J.S. 1988. *Strong Societies and Weak States: State-Society Relations and State Capabilities in the Third World*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Narayan, D. (with R. Patel, K. Schafft, A. Rademacher, and S. Koch-Schulte). 2000. *Voices of the Poor: Can Anyone Hear Us?* New York: Oxford University Press, for the World Bank.

Narayan, D., R. Chambers, M.K. Shah, and P. Petesch. 2000. *Voices of the Poor: Crying Out for Change*. New York: Oxford University Press, for the World Bank.

Narayan, D., and P. Petesch. 2002. *Voices of the Poor: From Many Lands*. New York: Oxford University Press, for the World Bank.

Rist, G. 1997. *The History of Development: From Western Origins to Global Faith*. London: Zed Books, Ltd.

Rostow, W.W. 1960. *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Silverman, J.M. 2004. "The Missing Link: Creating Mutual Dependencies between the Poor and the State." *International Public Management Journal* (in this issue).

Thomas, A. 1999. "What Makes Good Development Management?" *Development in Practice* 9:9-17.

Thomas, V., A. Chhibber, M. Dailami, and J. de Melo, eds. 1991. *Restructuring Economies in Distress: Policy Reform and the World Bank*. New York: Oxford University Press, for the World Bank.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 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. Accessed 24 July 2003.

World Bank. 2001. *World Development Report 2000/2001: Attacking Poverty*. New York: Oxford University Press, for the World Bank.