Development DESTIN Studies Institute

Working Paper Series

LSE

ISSN 1470-2320

2009

No.09-99

The Future of Development Management:
Examining possibilities and potential

Nilima Gulrajani

Published: May 2009

Development Studies Institute

London School of Economics and Political Science

Houghton Street **Tel: +44 (020) 7955 7425/6252**

London **Fax: +44 (020) 7955-6844**

WC2A 2AE UK **Email: d.daley@lse.ac.uk**

Web site: www.lse.ac.uk/depts/destin

The future of development management:

Examining possibilities and potential

By Nilima Gulrajani
London School of Economics

ABSTRACT

Critical development management (CDM) is an emerging field of study that is 'questioning development management' by connecting scholars in critical management studies to those identifying with post-development theory. Development management is an object of criticism for CDM, where this critical analysis derives from the perniciousness and pervasiveness of *managerialism* in aid interventions. This paper provides an overview of CDM and takes issue with this exclusively managerialist understanding of development management. I offer a more positive vision for the future, one where the aid industry can believe in the *ability* of generating improved livelihoods without the wholehearted import of managerialism as well as the *desirability* of radical reform. A theoretical argument is sketched out to support a future for development that is neither defined nor destined for failure.

Key words: development management, managerialism, post-developmentalism, aid effectiveness

Word count: 7, 559

'Scratch a management scheme, and you'll find a power struggle, even if couched in terms of rational action.'

-Escobar, 2008: 201

INTRODUCTION

Critical development management (CDM) is an emerging field of study that is 'questioning development management' by connecting scholars in critical management studies to those identifying with post-development theory. The most coherent and powerful formulation of CDM comes in the form of a recently published book *The New Development Management*.[1] In the introductory chapter, editors Cooke and Dar theorize critical development management by highlighting the continuity between the works of Barbara Townley in critical management studies and James Ferguson in post-developmentalism.

> Both these studies question the ethics of managerialization (in Townley) or bureaucratization (in Ferguson) through seemingly mundane and neutral practices. […] Identifying the similarity in these approaches…indicates how the demarcation between critical work on development and critical work on management might begin to be bridged. (Cooke & Dar, 2008: 2).

As CDM draws greater two-way interactions and relevance between these two 'critical' sub-fields within management and development studies, Cooke and Dar suggest there is a theoretical basis for a *new development management.* The term 'new development management' is both an attempt at irony and a political tactic, for CDM is in the main a critical analysis of the ways in which contemporary development management sustains 'modernization and the modern'

[1] A number of past works have nevertheless provided a foundation for this formulation (Cooke, 1997, 2003; Cooke, 2004).

by emphasizing technical fixes that do not address deeper structural and contextual challenges. Its 'newness' derives mainly from the fact that it does not distinguish contemporary market friendly development management from its earlier and more traditionally state-oriented development administration, preferring instead to underline the continuities and commonalities between them (Cooke et al., 2008: 2, 9,10). The new development management is the object of criticisms for critical development management, where this critical analysis derives from the perniciousness and pervasiveness of *managerialism* in aid interventions.

The purpose of this paper is to examine more closely the theoretical foundation for this 'new' managerialist understanding of development management. Must development practice always be destructively managerialist as is apparently being suggested by CDM scholars? Given post-developmentalism has a much longer history in development studies whose lines of debate are already well defined, this paper is centred on a theoretical examination of critical management studies literature and its usage in CDM. Post-developmentalism is defined, to the extent that a universal definition is possible, as the adoption of post-structuralist theory to underline development as a power-knowledge complex that propagates itself via development interventions, subordinates citizen-subjects and neo-liberalizes social transformation (Escobar, 1995a; Esteva, 1993; Ferguson, 1994; Rist, 2002). While coming in many guises, it is united by its radical view of development as an 'impossibility' and thus recommends development's dissolution (Corbridge, 1998, 2007). At best, it moves beyond the architecture of development to consider alternatives to it, most commonly those that celebrate indigenous social movements (Escobar, 1995b; Ferguson, 1997).

It must be noted that there is in CDM occasionally a call for 'democratic, tolerant and self-critical approaches to analysis and action' (Cooke et al., 2008) and reference to the possibility of 'emancipatory development management' (Cooke, 2004). Nevertheless if the claimed purpose of CDM is not to dismiss management or suggest it has no place in development (Willmott, 2008: xiii), this generally appears as a subordinate goal in existing CDM literature. Its main

purpose appears to be a radical deconstruction of the ways a seemingly benign management legitimates a universalized development with detrimental effects for representation and power. This destructive tendency is beginning to frustrate even those who associate themselves with CDM (de Vries, 2008: 160).

While recognizing the incisiveness of the CDM critique, including its ability to keep 'the raw nerve of outrage alive' (E.P. Thompson as quoted in Corbridge 2007: 143), I argue it remains predicated on a partial understanding of critical management studies and thus ignores its own ability to theorize a non-managerialist development. Examining the work of Townley and others, I suggest there is potential to re-construct an alternative vision of development practice that offers a non-rationalist humanistic conception of modernity from which flows the possibility of non-managerialist engagement. Critical management studies leave open opportunities for a reconstituted development practice that recognises the possibilities for a non-rationalist, politicized, embedded and embodied practice, even if CDM has remained relatively silent about this potential and the way it takes hold.

Not only is it theoretically possible that CDM moves towards a more radical-reformist centre, this is normatively desirable. While the radical critique offered by CDM is not without its merits, its new development management is a subscription to a future of development theory and practice is unnecessarily and unjustifiably bleak. There is both the theoretical possibility and moral desirability of a non-managerial development practice that is under-recognised by CDM scholars. The contemporary debate that pits radicals against reformers in development management can and should be reconciled.

RADICALS AND REFORMERS: DEBATING THE POSSIBILITIES AND POTENTIAL OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

Development management is both a theory of planning and a way to describe the contents, locus and manner of this planning. It thus has both analytic and practical components and is characterised by eclecticism (Brinkerhoff, 2008: 991; Brinkerhoff & Coston, 1999). Despite recognizing this distinction between theory and practice, discussions of development management often move beyond it. For example, Thomas suggests development management can either be management *in* developing countries or management *of* the development effort, depending on whether development is understood as an uncontrollable historical process or a deliberate effort at social progress (Thomas, 1996).[2] Development management is thus a statement on the scope of the planning process to steer development as well as its location either within the local country context or in the development policy process more generally. Another well known distinction identifies four facets of development management: as a *means* to foreign aid and development policy, as a *toolkit* to achieve progressive social change by linking intentions to actions, as positive *values* that address both the style and goal of management in political and normative terms, and as a *process* that operates at the individual, organisational and sectoral levels (Brinkerhoff, 2008; Brinkerhoff et al., 1999). In this definition, development management speaks to an idea of planning as a deliberate attempt at achieving social progress at the same time as it identifies key components of the way planning occurs.

At a theoretical level, there are two alternative views of the nature of development planning that are fundamentally at odds with one another. In the first, development management implicitly assumes the possibility for amelioration that serves the interests of citizens. This 'reformist' understanding of development management sees the possibility and desirability of deliberate efforts for social progress (Brinkerhoff, 2008; Brinkerhoff et al., 1999; Thomas, 1996, 2007). The alternative understanding of development management highlights its power and violence as a control mechanism over the Third World. This 'radical' perspective has long identified development planning as economic, political and

[2] Management for development was later added as an additional category used to describe a particular empowering style of engagement (Thomas, 2007).

bureaucratic modernization that secures elite power (Escobar, 1993, 1995a; Ferguson, 1994). Building on post-developmentalism since early 2000, scholars working in the tradition of critical management studies[3] also began to theorize the totalizing and de-humanizing effects of development management discourse in journals that included *Public Administration and Development*, *Organisation* and *Third World Quarterly*. It is this research that is constitutes the emergent sub-field of Critical Development Management (CDM).

The practice that constitutes development management is another dimension that divides reformers from radicals. For the former, development administration is distinguishable from development management in terms of the contents of planning. Development administration represented a Keynsian welfare economics understanding of development that saw the state as a primary development actor. The creation of development administration was a task for specialists that sought to transfer Western Weberian administrative apparatuses to developing countries that could undertake planning, direct service provision and economic management (Brinkerhoff, 2008: 988-9; Hughes, 2003: 226; Turner & Hulme, 1997: 12). When that model was discredited by failing to deliver on its development aims, its successor development management became shorthand for an alternative model of organisation that accepted a smaller role for government, emphasized the importance of a market orientation and the need for greater flexibility, autonomy and efficiency in public administration. Development management is associated with attempts to 'create public value' in the public throughout the developing world. It is largely associated with New Public Management reforms that include decentralization, outsourcing and performance measurement among other policies (Minogue, 2001; Moore, 1995). For reformists, the evolution from development administration to development management is more than just a semantic difference. It represents a fundamental

[3] The field of critical management studies constitutes a vibrant left-wing research community within organizational studies, with growing numbers situated under its umbrella working on development-related issues (Academy of Management, 2009).

shift in planning practice that has its origins in the bifurcation that occurred between public administration (traditionally linked to political science) and public management scholarship (connected to public policy and business schools) (Kaboolian, 1998).

In contrast, for left-wing radicals, the continuities between development administration and management far outweigh their dissimilarities. Development management, far from being something different from development administration, is in fact united to it in the way that both view Third World countries and subjects as still needing to achieve modernity (Cooke, 2004). Development management, like development administration before it, thus still represents the falsely neutral social engineering of modernization, albeit to new state and non-state locations (Cooke et al., 2008: 9). For CDM to describe development management as something 'new' is ironically to highlight its pernicious continuities with development administration.

Overall, development management is characterised by a breakdown deriving from a fundamental disagreement between radicals and reformers (Hirschmann, 1981; Hirschmann, 1999). At the heart of this long-standing debate is a question that revolves around whether the bureaucratic apparatuses of development are hurtful or helpful for development's aims and aspirations. Reformers are a diffuse multi-disciplinary group who claim that development failures derive from the sub-optimal application or specification of development management within unfavourable contexts rather than any intrinsic failing per se (Brinkerhoff, 2008; Brinkerhoff et al., 1999). In their view, while development management is not above reproach, there is an assumed ability to tweak and improve this effort where necessary. On the other hand, for radicals of the left like those associated with critical development management, there is something 'intrinsically wrong with the very idea of management and its application in international development' (Cooke et al., 2008: 1). It is inherently opposed to democracy, equality and the interests of the poor. Although not of central concern to this paper, it is also worth noting that there are a growing number of radicals on the right who argue that centrally

planned, geo-politically motivated aid needs to be replaced by greater involvement of private market-based initiatives (Easterly, 2006, 2008; Moyo, 2009). If reformists can be described as *critiquing* development management, radicals are fundamentally *critical of* development management.

Contemporary development management remains an important site for scholarship for both reformers and radicals. Both suggest development management is increasingly served by a number of different agendas, rationales and actors (Brinkerhoff, 2008; Cooke, 2004; Cooke et al., 2008). Nevertheless, they continue to disagree on the prospects for development management as a positive source of change. For example, concerns with overseeing development assistance for greater efficiency and effectiveness have provided greater attention to development management as a means of improving the functioning of donor agencies to ensure 'country ownership' and 'mutual accountability' (Development Assistance Committee, 2005). On the other hand, CDM sees the global good governance paradigm as a ruse to introduce neo-liberal New Public Management reforms in the developing world and privilege corporate technologies of control (Craig & Porter, 2003, 2006; Kerr, 2008). Radical and reformist positions thus co-exist, although with substantial differences and considerable mutual suspicion of each other. The literatures and research communities that each side engages with are almost always distinct. If reformists view radicals as excessively nihilistic, radicals perceive reformers as unjustifiably naive. These differences and mutual suspicions are at the root of the fundamental cleavage between scholars of development management. Nevertheless, it is a central argument for this paper that the breakdown is both mis-specified and problematic. There exists within the theoretical core of CDM the possibility of a reformed development practice. By ignoring this possibility, CDM partially represents critical management studies as well as unnecessarily polarizes the radical and reformist positions in development management. Identifying this limitation should not be taken as denigrating the strength and incisiveness of the criticisms coming from CDM, particularly given reforms have often only tinkered at the margins of development practice. The

remainder of this paper is an attempt to demonstrate why a radical-reformist position is both theoretically and ethically defensible.

MANAGERIALISM AS DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

Critical development management rests on a singular and foundational assumption, namely that all development management is intrinsically and exclusively managerial. But what exactly is managerialism? A number of scholars have suggested it is an ideology with immediate consequences (Edwards, 1998; Pollitt, 1990; Terry, 1998). It is described as 'a mindset held by many which glorifies hierarchy, technology, and the role of the manager in modern society' (Edwards, 1998: 555). It is planning that pursues maximum output with minimum inputs, exhibits faith in homogeneous, neutral and abstract technologies of management science and relies on the power of a class of managers. Managerialism separates the science of administration from political contamination (Edwards, 1998: 561, 572; Wilson, 1941). It is often seen to be the source of private sector success and thus increasingly introduced into the public sector (Terry, 1998). Ultimately, managerialism is supported by reformist values that assume management is beneficial because it is a source of progress and enhanced performance.

If we were to accuse CDM of simply constituting another colonizing discourse (Cooke et al., 2008: 3), we might say that it portrays all development as governed by an institutionalized managerialist logic.[4] This managerial logic expresses the theory of development management in terms of economic, bureaucratic and technocratic modernization and the practice of development management as technical fixes that are disembodied and disembedded. This singular representation of all management, including development management, as managerial belies the existence and possibility of alternative representations that

[4] An institutional logic is both a practice governed by supra-organizational patterns of activity and a symbolic system by which humans infuse activities with meaning (Friedland & Alford, 1991).

may be less destructive and insidious, even whilst such a possibility exists within critical management studies. For the sake of clarity, I label this alternative simply 'development practice.' This is because the term 'management' seems to be so closely associated to managerialism that it obviates reference to a non-managerial development management (Parker, 2002).[5]

What grounds are there to believe CDM has institutionalized a particular representation of all management as managerial? The 'new' development management recognises the connection and expansion of the modernization project of the post-WWII developmentalist era (Cooke et al., 2008: 10). New development management is equated with the goals of economic, bureaucratic and technocratic modernization. A line of continuity is drawn between the aims of colonialism to bring modernization to 'natives' and those of development administration and development management that economically modernize 'countries,' their administrations and increasingly a variety of non-state actors in the image of neo-liberalism (Cooke, 2003; Cooke, 2004). Modernizing interventions that bring the poor into contemporary processes of globalization on the grounds of the West's security are also manifestations of modernizing desires of development management (de Vries, 2008: 150). The theory of modernization that underpins development management is linked to a dominant conception of modernity, where the latter has become a synonym for certainty, bureaucracy and oppression (Corbridge, 2007: 144).

Managerialism in development is more than simply the drive towards modernization, however. It is also related to the manner in which modernization is supposed to be achieved. Managerialism is the application of 'technocratic ideas and practices' that promise control, stability and progress (Cooke et al., 2008: 6, 11). Critical management scholars describe this as an *abstract* form of management, by which is meant one that is disembedded and disembodied. As abstract technocratic practice, management becomes a portable technology of

[5] For example, Parker abandons the term management in favour of organization (Parker, 2002: 10, 209).

control that is divorced from detailed experience and/or local knowledge, and that can be applied to both the public and private sectors in any context. This practice places value on scientific neutrality and the pursuit of an efficient ordering of people and things so that collective goals can be achieved (Edwards, 1998; Townley, 2001: 303-304). Context-independent management can introduce distortions by simplifying and reifying highly complex processes in such a way that potentially strips away nuance, differences in social context and political content.

What propels the construction of development management as managerial? Managerialisation is a trend that extends well beyond the domain of development management. Western public service provision (Covaleski & Dirsmith, 1988; Kitchener, 2002; Townley, 1997), traditional craft-based industries (Thornton, 2004; Thornton, 2002) and non-profit ventures (Lewis, 2008; Lohmann, 2007) have all been subject to modernization via the introduction of abstract management practices. At one level, corporate mentalities and values infuse our understanding of the best ways to organize and coordinate across a variety of sectors as a result of institutional pressures emanating from business schools and the private sector (Parker, 2002). Yet, critical management studies explore a deeper driver for managerialisation, namely the dominance of modernity and Enlightenment understandings of rational science (Townley, 2002a). The fact that management is predominantly associated with managerialism is a reflection of the continuing dominance of seventeenth century Enlightenment thinking in contemporary society. This ideology constructs all modern knowledge as focused on 'rationality, validity, truth and objectivity' (Townley, 2008: 23).

Four major characteristics of the methodological style of Enlightenment ideology are identifiable (Bloor, 1991: 62-63). First, it incorporates an individualistic and atomistic assumption that sees collectivities and wholes as unproblematic equivalents to individual units, unchanged when brought together. It has a static approach to thought that subordinates historical variation to timelessness and universality. It adopts an abstract deductivism that assumes

specific cases can be related to abstract general stylized principles. Finally, its prescriptive and moralizing tendencies assume the possibility and righteousness of reform. The methodological style of the Enlightenment is the basis for a concept of modernity anchored in the cosmology of rational science. Modernity is structured as a 'holy trinity' that includes calculative rationality, methodological individualism and instrumental causal relations (Townley, 2002a: 561). Managerialism is largely inspired by this construction of modernity as causal, universal, disembedded and disembodied that seeks control over nature, people and organisations (Parker, 2002). A managerial logic reflects this social understanding of modernity at the same time as it is also a situated social practice. It provides the basis for development management as specialized science possessing simplified and generalizable tools with universal relevance and applicability (Edwards, 1998: 558). It privileges large organisations, aggregate collectivities of rational humans without identity, culture and history, as instrumental causal mechanisms (Edwards, 1998: 559; Townley, 2001). It embraces values of efficiency and impartiality and tends to establish system-wide constraints that often act as substitutes for democracy rather than ensuring local controls that are relevant to daily realities (Edwards, 1998; Townley, 2001). Development management, to the extent that it is linked to the social ideology of the Enlightenment, is unquestionably a managerialist affair.

What is questionable, however, is whether all forms of organisation and coordination will be exclusively colonized by Enlightenment understandings of modernity from which managerialism derives. In fact, this is rejected by a number of critical management literatures that underline the dual epistemologies, or theories of knowledge, that underpin management knowledge. Modern management is never exclusively comprised of a social ideology anchored in Enlightenment philosophy. The dual epistemology of management is the legacy of 'old debates about causation, equilibrium and reductionism. It reflects battles fought out over the last few centuries substituting rationality for God. Management and the debates within it are yet one branch, or one manifestation, of a continuing post-Enlightenment dialogue' (Townley, 2002a: 561). The theoretical

possibility of a non-managerial development practices is opened up by the presence of another style of thinking about society. This alternative social ideology does not privilege an exclusive understanding of management as managerial. It is to this Romantic social ideology that we now turn.

ROMANTIC POSSIBILITIES FOR DEVELOPMENT

It is noteworthy that one of the founding fathers of post-developmentalism recognises that it is the underlying concept of modernity that crafts a limited conception of development management (Escobar, 2008: 201). Nevertheless, while CDM makes a name for itself by criticizing and deconstructing the dominant Enlightenment understanding of modernity that sustains managerialism, a discussion of alternative modernities has been much less central to their exposition. It is in this sense that CDM has presented a partial view of critical management studies as the latter has considered the possibility of an alternative modernity. Barbara Townley, the noted critical management studies scholar whom Cooke and Dar refer to in the first page of their book as sharing continuities with post-developmentalism, extensively entertains the possibility of an alternative modernity that underpins a more ethical management (Townley, 1999, 2002a, b, 2004, 2008). If management is 'predicated on a very large story about social progress,' it is clearly not the only story of progress in town (Parker, 2002: 5).

Townley references Bloor in stating that there exists a widespread ideological opposition between longstanding social ideologies that forms a 'foundation and a resource' for thinking about society (Bloor, 1991: 75; Townley, 2002a: 555). These two paradigmatic theories of knowledge are reflections of two dominant social ideologies—Enlightenment and Romantic. All knowledge, including management knowledge, will have 'unconsciously embedded' structures that derive from these pervasive social ideologies that shape how we think and live (Bloor, 1991: 76). A Romantic social ideology is presented in its archetypical

format with four key methodological characteristics that rival those of Enlightenment thought (Bloor, 1991: 63-4). Unlike the individualistic and atomistic understanding of individual units, here social wholes are not mere collections but the result of local conditions and contexts that are only problematically aggregated. Secondly, it is a dynamic understanding that privileges locally conditioned variation of responses and adaptations anchored in concrete historical realities. Thirdly, Romantic social ideology rejects abstract principles in favour of concrete cases. Finally, it adopts defensive and reactionary positions where prescriptions can never be independent of descriptions, blended values and facts. Overall, a Romantic social ideology cultivates an understanding of modernity that stresses the wholeness, intricacy and inter-connectedness of social practices (Townley, 2002a: 555). This methodological style is the basis for a concept of modernity anchored in the cosmology of practical rationality (Townley, 1999, 2002a; 2008: 216).

Table 1. Methodological characteristics of Enlightenment and Romantic Social Ideologies

Enlightenment rational science	**Romantic practical rationality**
Atomistic aggregation	Embedded social wholes
Static universality	Dynamic histories
Abstract deductivism	Concrete cases
¨Prescriptive and moralizing	Descriptive and factual

A Romantic understanding of modernity provides a basis for theorizing a non-managerialist development. While a seventeenth century scientific modernity provides the dominant contemporary construction of management as managerial, it

is neither a singular nor totalizing ideology.[6] To some degree, CDM recognises that managerialism is simply one kind of 'representation of management as a neutral, technical means-to-an end set of activities' (Cooke, 2003: 48). And yet, the tendency is nonetheless to assume the governmentality of managerialist forms of organisation and control in development (Cooke et al., 2008: 6; de Vries, 2008: 153). In doing so, CDM positions itself squarely in the camp of radicals that denounce and de-construct without proposing alternatives. If CDM is truly attempting to bridge the critical sub-fields of development and management, it must recognise at least the possibility within the latter to theorize a non-managerialist development practice. Yet the question remains, what would such a non-managerialist development practice look like? With a reformulated Romantic understanding of modernity, we may yet open up a space to challenge the ends of development management as an unproblematic economic, technocratic and bureaucratic modernization and its means as disembedded and disembodied practices.

The methodological characteristics of Romantic social ideology can recognise that modernization is a site of contestation deriving from its inherently pluralistic and political nature. The division between administrative science and political dynamics has long been rejected as a false dichotomy, even if a belief in their possible separation has held sway in development management (Svara, 2001, 2006; Waldo, 1948). Management always occurs in the fractured social orders of a polis (Friedland et al., 1991; Townley, 2002a: 568), and as the quotation at the start of this paper suggests, it is always and everywhere a struggle for power. To acknowledge as much must move us beyond a mere reflective modernization that reiterates that development is a politically embedded process shaped by interests and influences (Bowornwathana, 2000; McCourt, 2008; Unsworth, 2008). For

[6] Enlightenment social ideology may be losing its relative dominance however as advances in quantum physics robustly reject the potential for linear and predictable causal relations (Townley, 2002b). In the social sciences, such theories have led to the growth of complexity theory, a body of scholarship that embraces the possibility of progress even in the face of unpredictable, uncertain and ambiguous situations (Mowles, 2009; Mowles, Stacey, & Griffin, 2008).

example, a recent World Bank evaluation of public sector reform projects asks for greater 'realism about what is politically and institutionally feasible' and recognises that 'technology is not enough by itself' (Independent Evaluation Group, 2008: xv-xvi). Yet, it continues to blame the failures of civil service reform on poor strategic planning and diagnostics without problematizing these instruments and the uni-dimensional understanding of social reality they capture. Development management is more than ensuring embedded understandings of political dynamics for more efficient and effective planning. Development management must begin to see the modernization project and its instruments as political creatures that sustain hierarchies, conflicts, resistances, disjunctures, inequalities and power asymmetries (Crewe & Harrison, 1998; de Vries, 2008; Mosse, 2005; Townley, 2001; van de Berg & Quarles van Ufford, 2005). A non-managerialist development practice must be an exercise in political activism, an effort to re-politicize modernization efforts without resorting to the extreme CDM positions that radically denounce Western capitalist forces (See de Vries 2008: 166). A contested, pluralistic, disorderly and politicized practice need not be feared for its lack of coherence and closure but embraced as a source of creative and productive solutions to the problems of under-development (Gulrajani, 2006; Pritchett & Woolcock, 2004; Quarles van Ufford, Kumar Giri, & Mosse, 2003).

A non-managerialist development practice will also sustain embedded and embodied practices. An exclusive reliance on the abstract and universalist tools and techniques is rejected in favour of reliance on practical reason that is embodied in humans and contextually bound (Townley, 2002a: 568). Practical reason borrows from Aristotles' concept of *phronesis* that recognises a localized rationality that applies knowledge in concrete cases that deal with actual problems. A non-managerialist management is thus about coping with daily situations, resolving mundane problems and holding onto some definition of final objectives despite unertainties (de Vries, 2008: 153; Parker, 2002: 183, 5-7; Scott, 1998: 327).

> [Phronesis] is an instrumental rationality in the sense of being practical in its orientation of getting things done, but is balanced by the recognition that rationality encompasses context, judgment, experience, common sense, and intuition (Townley, 2008: 215).

Practical reason is not simply embedded and embodied, however; it also is able to judge issues on the basis of case histories of what has gone before, and is thus also guided by some understanding of general principles and a desire to provide a unified picture. It uses incremental rational assessments to make reasonable inferences and decisions based on information available and relevant at the time via a series of successive limited comparisons that build on one another in order to 'muddle through' (Lindblom, 1959). It is in this sense that practical reason can also be disembodied as it has 'keen grasp of the particulars in the light of more general principles and goals' (Forrester 2000 as quoted in Townley 2008: 215-216).

Taking practical reason to heart will require three things from development management. First, development management will need to become anchored in experiential realities of all those involved in the planning relation (Townley, 2008). This requires us to place value on experience that may require support from different kinds of organisation, including ones that are deconcentrated, decentralized, smaller, democratic, more responsible and less bureaucratic (Parker, 2002: 202-209). Secondly, it will require an understanding of development management as performance art, by which is meant an improvised, flexible, contingent, intuitive and sensitive practice (Escobar, 2008). This reflects the uncertainty and unpredictability that exists in all development practice. Lastly, it will require the professional reflexivity of those taking part in the development that can provide a basis for a planning that is continuously revised and re-examined (Abbott, Brown, & Wilson, 2007; Eyben, 2003; Mowles et al., 2008). This can provide the basis for an "emergent ethics" as those involved in development at all levels reflect on their place in the contradictory social orders sustained by their engagement (Quarles van Ufford et al., 2003: 23; Townley,

2008: 216). Overall, this suggests a reconceived development practice will accept a place for non-prescriptive problem-solving anchored in local experiences, where means matter as much as ends, where there exists a space for reflection as much as action and where uncertainty and unpredictability are par for course.

THE DESIRABILITY OF A NON-MANAGERIALIST DEVELOPMENT

CDM is a relatively new and radical perspective on development management. By linking post-developmentalism to critical management studies, CDM highlights the inequality, violence and power of development management over subalterns in the Global South. The hegemonic tendencies of development management are thus made visible in such a way that a sense of complacency is never allowed to emerge regarding its failings and its problems. Like the post-developmentalism that inspires it, the aim of CDM is largely to add to debate and put forward new ways of thinking, rather than to consider practical policy-based solutions (Corbridge 2007: 199-200; Quarles van Ufford, Kumar Giri, & Mosse, 2003: 11). As this paper has suggested, however, the critical appraisal of development management may be unjustifiably one-sided. Development practice need not necessarily be constituted by the pernicious effects of managerialism. It may also be desirable that CDM begin to consider the possibility of a non-managerial development practice. In doing so, it may go some way to resolving the fundamental radical/reformist impasse that characterises development management and ultimately hampers efforts to build a more ethically and politically engaged development practice.

A non-managerialist development practice can incorporate the radical critique of managerialism without abandoning the possibility of intervention in the name of social progress. It can accept the limitations of development but also recognise that achieving a post-development world is more utopia than feasible. Unlike CDM, a non-managerialist development practice does not dismiss the value

of second best solutions, the world of practical policy-making and reformist modes of engagement (Corbridge 2007). It builds on radical understandings of development management, yet also moves debates forward in a critically constructive enterprise. This can incrementally, if imperfectly, build societies where equality, sustainability, empowerment and justice are all valued and cultivated.

Why is it important to hold onto the possibility of intervention in the space of international development? As mentioned, for post-developmentalism and the radical CDM scholarship that is inspired by it, development is pernicious and needs to be rejected outright. Notwithstanding the force of this argument, the desirability of such nihilism is limited (Corbridge, 1998, 2007). In the first place, it leaves radical development management at the level of a disengaged and de-constructive critique that implicitly sustains the status quo of under-development (Pieterse, 2001: 106). Uncovering the hegemony of development discourse does not necessarily allow the poor to practically escape its power; more often it leaves them in an attenuated state of marginalisation with their dreams of development left unfulfilled (de Vries, 2008: 160). While CDM defends deconstruction as a correction of sorts given the dominance of mainstream reformist thought in development (Cooke et al., 2008: 17), it explicitly shies away from theorizing different ways to address the real, practical and tangible challenges of under-development. Its stated focus is exposing the violence and power of development management in order to open up spaces for dissent, give voice and make the concerns of the poor visible (Willmott, 2008). Critical analysis is the format for CDM's ‘permanent revolution' (Corbridge 2007: 200). Notwithstanding its validity, it does seem to come at the cost of both action and alternatives, thereby implicitly sustaining the conditions of under-development.

An additional reason to consider the desirability of a non-managerial development practice derives from the fact that it can re-establish connections and redouble efforts to create plausible actions and practical alternatives across the radical-reformist spectrum. Radical suspicion of all development interventions

currently limits productive possibilities for recovery and reconstruction and thus sustains the fundamental cleavage characterising development management (Quarles van Ufford, Kumar Giri, & Mosse, 2003: 17). A non-managerial development practice represents an opportunity to reinvigorate development management scholarship into a critically reflective and politically engaged enterprise. This is not to say that radicals and reformists will necessarily see eye to eye on every issue. Rather it suggests that we need to accept and embrace the normality of tensions and disjunctures in development at all levels. Development management needs to exploit these tensions by creating meeting points for them and harnessing them as forces for experimentation and productive creativity (van de Berg & Quarles van Ufford, 2005; Pritchett and Woolcock 2004). Without the reconstitution of development management, the risk is that right-wing radical approaches that recommend the substitution of the failing development industry with market forces and private capital flows may gain ground and actually worsen the status quo of under-development.

Lastly and perhaps most importantly, the desirability of a non-managerial development practice derives from the fact that it embraces the principle of responsible critique (Corbridge 2007; van de Berg & Quarles van Ufford, 2005: 4). This responsibility requires that criticism consider the consequences of thinking and acting in certain ways and take steps to mitigate the effects of the uncomfortable truths that are raised. It is arguable that CDM represents an abrogation of this responsibility as it embraces reflection without action in such a way that actually preserves or deteriorates the conditions of under-development. A non-managerial development practice is an attempt to bridge the worlds of action and reflection and begin the process of creating a language and mobilization effort underpinned by a global moral ethic.

In conclusion, CDM has tended to equate development management to managerialism and reject the high modernism that underpins it. This has provided the basis for a contemporary debate between radical and reformist development management scholars, a debate that both can and should be reconciled. CDM has

yet to consider a theory of alternative modernity that can sustain a different kind of development practice. If we accept an alternative concept of modernity derived from Romantic understandings of practical rationality, we can robustly challenge an understanding of development management as straightforward modernization exclusively achieved via disembedded and disembodied practice. An alternative modernity is the basis upon which development can be undertaken as an ethical, experiential and pluralistic political engagement. Radical-reformist development practice is thus both theoretically plausible and ethically desirable and can uncover new horizons for both research and action. It can recognise the power and knowledge effects of development management and simultaneously seek to translate this knowledge into a commitment to reforms that can achieve greater equality, sustainability and justice. It has the possibility to theorize alternative forms and formats of intervention that can embrace uncertainty, ambiguity and complexity and still maintain a moral and political commitment to ending under-development. To be against managerialism does not require us to be against modernity, or indeed to be against development management.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, D., Brown, S., & Wilson, G. 2007. Development Management as Reflective Practice. *Journal of International Development*, 19(187-203).

Academy of Management. 2009. Critical Management Studies: Domain Statement.

Bloor, M. 1991. *Knowledge and Social Imagery*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Bowornwathana, B. 2000. Governance Reform in Thailand: Questionable Assumptions, Uncertain Outcomes. *Governance*, 13(3): 393-408.

Brinkerhoff, D. W. 2008. The State and International Development Management: Shifting Tides, Changing Boundaries, and Future Directions. *Public Administration Review*, 68(6): 985-1001.

Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Coston, J. M. 1999. International Development Management in a Globalized World. *Public Administration Review*, 59(4): 346-361.

Cooke, B. 1997. From process consultation to a clinical model of development practice. *Public Administration and Development*, 17: 325-340.

Cooke, B. 2003. A new continuity with colonial administration: participation in development management, *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 24: 47.

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

Cooke, B., & Dar, S. 2008. Introduction: The New Development Management. In B. Cooke, & S. Dar (Eds.), *The New Development Management: Critiquing the Dual Modernization*. London: Zed Books.

Corbridge, S. 1998. 'Beneath the Pavement Only Soil': The Poverty of Post-Development. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 36(6): 138-148.

Corbridge, S. 2007. The (im)possibility of development studies. *Economy and Society*, 36(2): 179-211.

Covaleski, M. A., & Dirsmith, M. W. 1988. An Institutional Perspective on the Rise, Social Transformation and Fall of a University Budget Category. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33: 562-587.

Craig, D., & Porter, D. 2003. Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers: A New Convergence. *World Development*, 31(1): 53-69.

Craig, D., & Porter, D. 2006. *Development Beyond Neoliberalism? Governance, Poverty Reduction and Political Economy*. Oxford: Routledge.

Crewe, E., & Harrison, E. 1998. *Whose Development? An ethnography of aid*. London: Zed Books.

de Vries, P. 2008. The Managerialization of Development, the Banalization of Its Promise and the Disavowal of 'Critique' as a Modernist Illusion. In B. Cooke, & S. Dar (Eds.), *The New Development Management: Critiquing the Dual Modernization*: 150-177. London: Zed Books.

Development Assistance Committee. 2005. Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, Vol. 2005.

Easterly, W. 2006. *The White Man's Burden: Why the West's Efforts to Aid the Rest Have Done So Much Ill and So Little Good.* New York: Penguin Press.

Easterly, W. (Ed.). 2008. *Reinventing Foreign Aid*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Edwards, J. D. 1998. Managerial Influences in Public Administration. *International Journal of Orgnaizational Theory and Behaviour*, 1(4): 553-583.

Escobar, A. 1993. Planning. In W. Sachs (Ed.), *The Development Dictionary*: 132-146. London: Zed Books.

Escobar, A. 1995a. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Escobar, A. 1995b. Imagining a Post-Development Era. In J. Crush (Ed.), *Power of Development*: 211-228. London: Routledge.

Escobar, A. 2008. Afterword. In B. Cooke, & S. Dar (Eds.), *The New Development Management: Critiquing the Dual Modernization*: 150-177. London: Zed Books.

Esteva, G. 1993. Development. In W. Sachs (Ed.), *The Development Dictionary*: 6-25. London: Zed Book.

Eyben, R. 2003. Donors as political actors: fighting the Thirty Years War in

Bolivia. *IDS Working Paper No. 183*: 1-32.

Ferguson, J. 1994. *The Anti-Politics Machine*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ferguson, J. 1997. Anthropolgoy and Its Evil Twin: "Development" in the Constitution of a Discipline. In F. Cooper, & R. Packard (Eds.), *International Development and the Social Sciences: Essays on the History and Politics of Knowledge*: 150-175. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. 1991. Bringing Society Back In: Symbols, Practice, and Institutional Contradiction. In W. W. Powell, & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*: 232-267. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gulrajani, N. 2006. The art of fine balances: the challenge of institutionalizing the Comprehensive Development Framework inside the World Bank. In D. Stone, & C. Wright (Eds.), *The World Bank and Governance: A Decade of Reform and Reaction*. Oxford: Routledge.

Hirschmann, D. 1981. Development or Underdevelopment Administration: A Further Deadlock. *Development and Change*, 12(3): 459-479.

Hirschmann, D. 1999. Development Management versus Third World Bureaucracies: A Brief History of Conflicting Interests. *Development and Change*, 30(2): 287-305.

Hughes, O. E. 2003. *Public Management and Administration: An Introduction* (3rd edition ed.). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Independent Evaluation Group. 2008. Public Sector Reform: What Works and Why?

An IEG Evaluation ofWorld Bank Support. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Kerr, R. 2008. International Development and the New Public Management: Projects and Logframes as Discursive Technologies of Governance. In B. Cooke, & S. Dar (Eds.), *The New Development Management: Critiquing the Dual Modernization*. London: Zed Books.

Kitchener, M. 2002. Mobilizing the Logic of Managerialism in Professional

Fields: The Case of Academic Health Centre Mergers. *Organization Studies*, 23(3): 391-420.

Lewis, D. 2008. Nongovernmentalism and the Reorganization of Public Action. In B. Cooke, & S. Dar (Eds.), *The New Development Management: Critiquing the Dual Modernization*. London: Zed Books.

Lindblom, C. 1959. The Science of 'Muddling Through'. *Public Administration*, 2: 78-88.

Lohmann, R. A. 2007. Charity, Philanthropy, Public Sevice, or Enterprise: What Are the Big Questions of Nonprofit Management Today? *Public Administration Review*: 437-444.

McCourt, W. 2008. Public Management in Developing Countries. *Public Management Review*, 10(4): 467-479.

Minogue, M. 2001. The internationalization of new public management. In W. McCourt, & M. Minogue (Eds.), *The Internationalization of New Public Management*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Moore, M. 1995. *Creating Public Value: Strategic Managmenet in Governmet*. Cambridge: Harvard Univeristy Press.

Mosse, D. 2005. *Cultivating Development: An Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice*. London: Pluto.

Mowles, C. 2009. *Evidence emerges*. Paper presented at the NORFACE Conference, Lewis, East Sussex.

Mowles, C., Stacey, R., & Griffin, D. 2008. What Contribution Can Insights From the Complexity Sciences Make to the Theory and Practice of Development Management? *Journal of International Development*, 20: 804-820.

Moyo, D. 2009. *Dead Aid: Why Aid is Not Workig and How There is Another Way for Africa*. London: Penguin.

Parker, M. 2002. *Against Management*. Cambridge: Polity.

Pieterse, J. N. 2001. *Development Theory: Deconstructions/Reconstructions*. London: Sage Publications.

Pollitt, C. 1990. *Managerialism and the Public Service: The Anglo American Experience*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.

Pritchett, L., & Woolcock, M. 2004. Solutions When the Solution is the Problem: Arraying the Disarray in Development. *World Development*, 32(2): 191-212.

Quarles van Ufford, P., Kumar Giri, A., & Mosse, D. 2003. Interventions in Development: Towards a new moral understanding of our experiences and an agenda for the future. In P. Quarles van Ufford, & A. Kumar Giri (Eds.), *A Moral Criitque of Development: In search of global responsibilities*. London: Routledge.

Rist, G. 2002. *The History of Development: From Western Origins to Global Faith* (P. Camiller, Trans.) (2nd ed.). London: Zed Books.

Scott, J. 1998. *Seeing like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Humna Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Svara, J. 2001. The myth of the dichotomy: Complemntarity of politics and administration in the past and future of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 61(2): 176-183.

Svara, J. 2006. Complexity in Political-Administrative Relations and the Limits of the Dichotomy Concept. *Administrative Theory and Praxis*, 28(1): 121-139.

Terry, L. 1998. Administrative Leadership, Neo-Maangerilaism and the Public Management Movement. *Public Administration Review*, 58(3): 194-200.

Thomas, A. 1996. What is Development Management? *Journal of International Development*, 8(1): 95-110.

Thomas, A. 2007. Policy Arena: Development Management--Values and Partnerships. *Journal of International Development*, 19(3): 383-388.

Thornton, P. 2004. *Markets from Culture: Institutional Logics and Organizational Decisions in Higher Education Publishing*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Thornton, P. H. 2002. The Rise of the Corporation in a Craft Industry: Conflict and Conformity in Institutional Logics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1): 81-101.

Townley, B. 1997. The Institutional Logic of Performance Appraisal.

Organization Studies, 18(2): 261-285.

Townley, B. 1999. Practical Reason and Performance Appraisal. *Journal of Management Studies*, 36(3): 287-306.

Townley, B. 2001. The Cult of Modernity. *Financial Accountability and Management*, 17(4): 303-310.

Townley, B. 2002a. Managing with Modernity. *Organization*, 9(4): 549-573.

Townley, B. 2002b. The Role of Competing Rationalities in Institutional Change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45(1): 163-179.

Townley, B. 2004. Managerial Technologies, Ethics and Managing. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(3): 425-445.

Townley, B. 2008. *Reason's Neglect: Rationality and Organizing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Turner, M., & Hulme, D. 1997. *Governance, Administration and Development: Making the State Work*. West Harford, CT: Kumarian Press.

Unsworth, S. 2008. *Is Political Analysis Changing Donor Behaviour*. Paper presented at the Development Studies Association Conference, London.

van de Berg, R., & Quarles van Ufford, P. 2005. Dijuncture and Marginality: Towards a New Approach to Development Practice. In D. Mosse, & D. Lewis (Eds.), *The Aid Effect*. London: Pluto.

Waldo, D. 1948. *The administrative state : a study of the political theory of American public administration.* New York: Ronald Press.

Willmott, H. 2008. Foreward. In B. Cooke, & S. Dar (Eds.), *The New Development Management: Critiquing the Dual Modernization*. London: Zed Books.

Wilson, W. 1941. The Study of Administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 56(4): 481-506.