

DAI 1433-242

**MANAGING DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS
CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHANGE**

by

Louise G. White

George Mason University

for

The Development Project Management Center
and
The International Development Management Center

and supported by
Bureau of Science and Technology
Office of Rural and Institutional Development
United States Agency for International Development

January 1987

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This article is based on a study commissioned by the United States Agency for International Development as part of an extensive research project on management concepts and technology. In 1982 the Office of Rural and Institutional Development in the Bureau of Science and Technology (ST/RD) embarked on the Performance Management Project. A series of overview papers were commissioned, of which this study was one. The Project has been carried out through cooperative agreements with the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) and through the Development Project Management Center (DPMC) located within the U.S. Department of Agriculture. DPMC in turn contracted with the International Development Management Center (IDMC) at the University of Maryland to oversee this particular study. The complete study is being published by Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 1987.

Many individuals have reviewed a number of drafts of the study and I am very grateful for the time and care they invested in their comments. They include Ken Kornher and Jeanne North, representing ST/RD; Merlyn Kettering and Morris Solomon of DPMC (Dr. Kettering guided the drafts through several different review processes, and his comments were particularly helpful and supportive); Marcus Ingle, Derack Brinkerhoff, Barton Sensenig, all representing IDMC; Louis Picard and Elizabeth Shields - now with the World Bank, representing NASPAA. Other reviewers include Samuel Paul, of the World Bank; Merilee Grindle of the Harvard Institute for International Development; Annemarie Walsh of the Institute of Public Administration and Jim Lowenthal of the Agency for International Development. Others whose ideas have been seminal include Coralie Bryant, of The American University and the Overseas Development Council; David Korten, Asia Regional Advisor on Development Management; Larry Cooley of Management Systems International; Ed Connerley, NASPAA; Haven North, Director of the Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE), USAID; Irving Rosenthal, formerly with CDIE; Gerald Hage and Kurt Finsterbusch, Sociologists at the University of Maryland; Rick Huntington, of the International Science and Technology Institute; and Judith Gilmore of AID's Bureau for Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance (FVA). While all contributed immeasurably, I am fully responsible for the following presentation.

I. INTRODUCTION

At different times development studies center around particularly salient concepts such as economic growth, meeting basic needs, participation by the poor. Currently there is a major interest in the issue of sustainability, in whether or not interventions to bring about change in Third World nations will last over time. Sustainability takes us beyond the traditional concerns with the design of interventions or the amount of resources to allocate to them. It reminds us to pay attention to how interventions are managed and organized. If we ignore these questions, economic benefits are apt to be diverted from intended clients, resources may be wasted, opportunities to mobilize additional support will be lost, and perhaps most critical, activities are less apt to be sustained.¹ Thus concern for sustainability reminds us that good will and economic resources are not enough to produce lasting results, that management is a critical factor.

Management is often discounted, however. A number of development studies document the reality of heavy handed bureaucracies, the inappropriateness of interventions patterned on western models, and the difficulties of bringing about societal changes in impoverished and traditional societies. They demonstrate that interventions often fail and may even exacerbate problems. Partly as a result of this line of reasoning, there is a growing interest in trying to change the public policies in Third World nations so that governments rely more on the private sector to accomplish their goals. Policy dialogue and privatization it is argued, have greater potential for promoting development than improvements in the management of traditional public programs.

Rather than leading us to discount management, however, these are reasons for rethinking it. The field of development management begins with studies of management problems and takes them one step further. It proposes ways to intervene that can promote developmental change, drawing on examples of success, and theories of change, as well as on generalizations about problems and failures. Further it stresses that managers can potentially play a major role in exploring policy options and in designing new institutional patterns for implementing programs. Even when program responsibilities are diverted to private organizations, public managers continue to play a role in coordinating activities, providing directions or developing incentives. In fact one could argue that management issues become particularly important as we explore mixes of public and private institutions (Lamb, 1986).

Management, however, is not a straightforward subject, for as one reviews the many studies and evaluations of development activities, one is struck by the variety of assumptions about what constitutes good management and the number of different

prescriptions. The purpose of this study is to review these studies as well as the broader literature on management to classify the major theories and approaches which seem relevant to development managers. A second purpose is to apply these theories to a particular group of managers, those related to ongoing agencies in host countries and responsible for public programs. A number of observers are showing more interest in programs as opposed to autonomous project units, and argue that improvements at the program level may have more lasting effect, than project interventions. Programs also open up opportunities for promoting sustainable change which are not always present for managers of specific project activities.²

Section II proposes a framework for considering how program managers can enhance sustainable development. One dimension of the framework consists of management functions relevant to development programs. A second dimension consists of several theories or approaches to management. Section III describes these approaches in more detail, with an emphasis on the variations and developments within each approach. The concluding section explores how managers can compare and use the several approaches to bring about developmental change, and ends with implications for management training.

II. A FRAMEWORK FOR MANAGING DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Definitions

Program management is not a "bag of tricks," or set of technocratic skills to be pulled out for any and all occasions. To be successful it has to be tailored to the specific opportunities presented by programs, and the specific demands raised by development. The management functions included in the framework are drawn from the characteristics of programs, development and management, and therefore we begin by defining these terms.

Programs. While the term "program" is often used imprecisely, it is used here to describe systems of varied activities and organizational units, designed to accomplish some substantive purpose, and under the responsibility of existing program agencies. For example, consider the following description of programs by Paul:

(I)n a health program, the service is not the set of individual health services, ... but the system designed to assemble and deliver them at the village, sub-district, or district level, whichever is the appropriate unit of operation. Similarly, it may be misleading to define the output of a dairy development program as the supply of milk. Its service might well be the interrelated system which has been developed to integrate the set of services for the production, processing and marketing of milk for the benefit of specified client groups (Paul, 1982, 10).

For our purposes, programs have the following characteristics:

1. Connected to an ongoing host country organization.
2. Continuity over time.
3. Ongoing systems for delivering services.
4. System designed for different settings.
5. Combination of different activities and services.

These features mean that program managers will have to take account of existing procedures and patterns of incentives, and that it will often be necessary to change both the structures of organizations and the attitudes of those within them. Similarly because programs are systems of activities, manager will usually be working with and through a variety of organizations at a number of different levels, and will often have to adapt activities to varied local conditions.

Development. While development has been defined in various ways ranging from economic growth to participation, we begin with a fairly minimal definition. A development program is one which is:

1. Designed to carry out a nation's development goals insofar as those goals:
2. Introduce change to increase productive or organizational capacity;
3. Improve the quality of peoples' lives, including the poorest.
4. Carried out in a hostile and difficult environment.³

Development defined as capacity building means that assistance should consider what people can do for themselves rather than simply provide services to them. It means that development deals both with processes for improving capacity and with the substance of improving the quality of life. Finally, the emphasis on the nature of the setting means that implementation problems will often reflect the fact that development managers are always working under problematic conditions. Whereas economists tend to ignore such complexity and think of implementation as the problem, Moris reminds us that often it is "the system [that] is problematic" (1981, 8).

The Scope of Management. Based on these definitions, development places special demands on managers, and programs afford them particular opportunities not always present when one is managing a relatively autonomous project. Further, management itself has a broader scope than many appreciate. Whereas the term administrator suggests people who carry out tasks designed by others, the term "manager" implies a broader range of activities and "carries overtones of initiative and flexibility" (Warwick, 1982, 41-2). Similarly, it is important to recognize that managers work both within and outside of their immediate organizational units. Bryant, for example, suggests that

management should be more broadly conceived than it often is, and observes that we need to emphasize ways in which managers can be influential outside of their immediate arenas (Bryant, 1985; Smith, Lethem and Thoolen, 1980; Rondinelli, 1986).

Five Functions of Program Management.

The management functions described below were selected because they are particularly salient to development programs as defined above, and to the potential scope that managers can play:

Contribute to Policy and Program Design. This function points to ways in which managers can shape and influence the content of policy and the programs they are called upon to manage.

Develop the Capacity of Implementing Organizations. This function refers to the need to enhance the structural and operational capacity of implementing units to carry out programs. Capacity is important both to implement programs and to have the continuing ability to sustain them over time.

Develop Resources: Financial and Political. A third function refers to the need to develop resources, and notes that these are broader than financial resources, that they include personal commitment and political support.

Focus on Performance in Improving Quality of Life. The fourth function emphasizes that managers need to focus on whether they are effectively accomplishing results which promote development.

Work With and Through Multiple Organizations and Groups. A final function underscores the need for managers to spend much of their time working in an interorganizational arena.

Approaches to Management.

When we review the literature on development management and apply it to these functions, it becomes clear that observers and practitioners differ about which functions are most important, and what they look like in practice. A second dimension of the framework, therefore describes the major approaches and theories about management.⁴

Goal Directed Approach. This approach begins with the goals of the program and how best to accomplish them. From this perspective the most important task for managers is an analytic one - - to define the problem, set goals, design strategies, adjust and monitor these.

Anarchy Approach. A second approach emphasizes the limits on what managers can accomplish. Even supporters of a program have a number of other concerns to deal with and pursue activities which may or may not contribute to program goals.

Bureaucratic Process Approach. A third approach focuses on the bureaucratic procedures for delivering the credit and technology packages, and the kinds of incentives offered to different parties to gain their support.

Institutional Analysis Approach. A fourth approach emphasizes the need to develop appropriate institutions for carrying out a program, and often turns to private organizations and community organizations.

Social Learning Approach. A fifth approach stresses the need to involve the community directly in the program, by working through local organizations, and reorganizing the bureaucracy so that it can work effectively with these organizations.

Political Influence Approach. Yet a sixth approach emphasizes the political dimensions of the task, and the fact that program goals emerge from bargaining among different interests.

The approaches emphasize different strategies for dealing with the five functions listed above. Each is based on a description of how managers function, and contains prescriptions for improving the process. Table 1 describes the assumptions each makes, and their major prescription for improving management. We have chosen these particular perspectives because they shed light on critical aspects of managing development programs, and are helpful devices for organizing the literature, and understanding differences among observers. It is also true that while they share a common set of assumptions, the approaches have been developed and applied in a variety of ways. Robert Chambers had a similar thought in mind when he proposed using terms such as "networks" and "discourses," because they can "accommodate shifts of meaning and content" (1985, 4). As we will see, the approaches are really clusters of propositions and recommendations, many of which are richer and more refined than their original statements. Classifications which deal only with their earliest formulations tend to overlook their most important contributions.

TABLE 1 Approaches to Program Management

ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT MANAGERS	PRESCRIPTIONS
<p>1. <u>Goal Directed</u>: Management is an effort to achieve program goals; it emphasizes the setting of appropriate objectives and monitoring results.</p>	<p><u>Rational Analysis</u>: Improve decisions by making analysis and actions more rational.</p>
<p>2. <u>Management as Anarchy</u>: Managers have far less ability to anticipate or control what is done than many assume. Participants have many items competing for their attention.</p>	<p><u>Control/ Flexibility</u>. Strengthen and broaden reactive capabilities to maximize both control and flexibility.</p>
<p>3. <u>Bureaucratic Process</u>: Managers need to coordinate members and sub-units in their organizations, and they establish procedures and routines to do so.</p>	<p><u>Incentives</u>: Provide sanctions and incentives to members and sub units to cooperate.</p>
<p>4. <u>Institutional Analysis</u>: Shifts the unit of analysis from the implementing organization to the set of institutions suitable for carrying out a program.</p>	<p><u>Economic efficiency</u>: We need institutions which will lower the costs of decision making and make them more responsive.</p>
<p>5. <u>Social Learning</u>: Management is a process in which all stakeholders have a role. Involving others elicits their assistance, gives them a power base, and reorients organizations.</p>	<p><u>Involvement</u>: Managers should organize beneficiaries and involve them directly in design and implementation.</p>
<p>6. <u>Political Interests</u>: Managers work in an arena of many different interests; program objectives and strategies reflect patterns of influence.</p>	<p><u>Influence</u>: Managers need to use their influence to mobilize support; show leadership; broker interests</p>

III. APPROACHES TO PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Goal Directed Approach

The best way to understand what managers do is to look at the goals of the programs they are responsible for. Managers are primarily goal oriented problem solvers and decision makers. Their roles center around analysis, around translating goals into strategies and designing organizational structures to accomplish them. Prescriptively, they need to formulate clear objectives, control information and resources and orchestrate them to achieve goals as efficiently as possible. The approach values expertise and professionalism, and looks for ways to improve managers' decision making and analytic skills and enhance their ability to be rational.

It also recognizes that managers have what Simon calls "bounded rationality." Whereas economic man maximizes, administrative man can only deal with a small number of options. As a result he considers only the more likely alternatives and determines which is satisfactory. Hence Simon's word for decision making under these conditions -- satisficing. This important concept shifts the emphasis away from skills of individual managers to organizational structures for handling information. Since managers cannot handle sufficient information to make optimal choices on their own, it is necessary to design the organization to improve the rationality of decision making. Typically this is done by giving managers the authority to set limits on the agenda, and establish rules to control the factors which members take into account (March and Simon, 1958).

There are three characteristics of management in the Third World context which affect how this approach is applied in practice. First, analysis is usually interpreted in very technocratic terms; second, it is often applied to development issues which are complex and have multiple dimensions; and third, it is often carried out as a separate activity rather than as an integral part of the total management process. Partly because of these realities, the goal directed, analytic approach has many critics. In general they charge that it produces the well-known and discredited long range plans and blueprints. By definition, these ignore many social and organizational realities, but once formulated are difficult to alter or adapt (Korten, 1980).

Those concerned with the uses and improvement of analysis have responded to these critiques by proposing a number of adaptations which have moved the approach far beyond its original emphasis on rigorous analysis.

Useful and Appropriate Analysis. The general trend within the goal directed approach is to select analytic procedures according to how appropriate and pragmatically useful they are in accomplishing program goals, rather than select them according to

their methodological rigor. From this perspective one would ask under what situations systems models or economic techniques are useful, rather than promote any technique solely because of its methodological rigor (Folton, 1981).

Collaboration. To develop appropriate techniques, it is helpful to collaborate with users. Their involvement, insures that the techniques will be relevant and increases the likelihood they will be used. Involvement in fact, may be as important as the objectivity and rigor of the techniques. Thus we move from an emphasis on purity and scientific rigor to an appreciation for involving people in using and applying analytic techniques.

Integrated or Results Oriented Management. Integrated management emphasizes organizational procedures for collecting and reporting information and using feedback as a basis for decisions and implementation (Wholey, 1983). We can even say that rationality is more a function of how effective these procedures are, and less a characteristic of the substance of the decisions (Springer, 1985, 484, 486).

Flexible Data Gathering and analytic Techniques. To be useful, techniques for gathering and analyzing data should be flexible and tailored to the particular situation. One example is the variety of techniques associated with "rapid rural appraisal" (Honadle, 1982, Chambers, 1974). Often program performance can be analyzed using proxy measures, rather than ones which rely on statistical precision. If the proxy measures tell managers what they need to know, then more time consuming approaches may waste resources and provide little additional information.

Participatory and Inclusive Data Gathering. Several versions of the approach acknowledge that experts have a limited perspective and that other points of view need to be taken into account. Since political processes reflect the ideas of those with most influence, they are less likely to supplement the views of elites. Managers, therefore, need to incorporate a broader range of viewpoints into analysis. One reason is to improve the decision itself. Another is to insure that relevant parties have an investment in the decision. A number of structured techniques have been developed to elicit ideas from relevant interests and aggregate them into a set of priorities for decision makers to review. They include the Nominal Group Technique and Delphi (Delbecq et al, 1975). Others propose more open ended techniques for incorporating alternative views such as lateral thinking and brainstorming (Mintzberg, 1976).

Strategic Planning and Strategic Management. A cluster of practices associated with strategic planning and management combine the purposiveness and future orientation of long range planning, with collaboration and utilization. Strategic planning has three key elements: One is to establish measurable objectives and priorities in distinction to the broad goals associated with long range planning efforts. A second is to make planning more

flexible and responsive to changes in the environment. And the third is to look to the future and promote change rather than merely improve productivity.

Performance Management. This technique wedds strategic thinking to organization development techniques. The central hypothesis is that managers can increase capacity by successfully performing some task. Instead of stressing analytic and planning techniques in and of themselves, it uses work teams to involve members directly in the planning process, assuming this will improve the analysis and gain their commitment.⁵

Goal Directed Approach and Program Management. Those working within this approach to program management have developed what was often a very control oriented approach into one that is far more flexible and adaptive. Their main concern is to use analytic techniques that are appropriate to the situation and which incorporate a broader range of opinions. They are more aware of the human dimensions of the organization and concerned with finding ways to involve members and to gain their support.

Decision Making As Anarchy

In the last ten years a body of literature has developed which challenges many of the assumptions in the goal directed model. It argues that decision making and analysis are neither as rational nor as orderly as they may appear. A major spokesman is James March, who claims that organizations are better characterized as anarchies than as goal directed bodies. Particularly when managers are dealing with the kinds of ambiguous goals associated with development programs, individuals behave in often unpredictable and even random ways, rather than follow rationally defined objectives. Goals and objectives in fact, are more apt to emerge during the implementation process, rather than drive that process as assumed in the goal directed approach (March and Olsen, 1976).

According to the anarchy approach, traditional analytic tools such as systems analysis have serious limitations in helping managers set priorities and design solutions to problems. The reason is that decisions reflect the interaction of different people and events rather than problem solving techniques and logic (Springer, 1985, 498). Just as there are cognitive limits on the process of rational analysis, there are limits on the way managers and organizations learn from experience. The goal directed approach assumes that managers learn by adapting to feedback about their performance. According to the anarchy approach, however, goals and performance measures are ambiguous and the causality of events is seldom clear. As a result, experience is often ambiguous, and "learning" produces many false conclusions.

While most of the writing within this approach analyzes how decisions are made, several works have begun to take the next

step and ask how managers should deal with anarchic situations. One strategy is to bring more order, to make an effort to set agendas, to regulate and structure what is done. Another proposes more flexibility to generate new solutions.⁶ While authors differ in their emphasis on order and flexibility, generally they prescribe that managers need to find a balance between ordering the anarchy and being open and flexible to unanticipated events (Johnston and Clark, 1982).⁷ The approach makes several very important contributions. It captures much of the reality within organizations. It adds a human dimension to discussions of organizational structure and procedure. It checks the tendency of observers and researchers to assume that what goes on in an organization makes sense, and to provide explanations and rationalizations even when they are not warranted.

Bureaucratic Process Approach

Whereas the goal oriented approach brings people together around properly defined goals, the bureaucratic process approach assumes that individuals and sub-units have their own interests and perspectives. The anarchy approach attributes this disorder to the complex nature of program situations, while this approach assumes that what appears to be anarchy results from everyone pursuing their own agendas.

Since managers cannot rely on shared objectives to coordinate participants, they have to enable members to simultaneously pursue their own interests while satisfying program needs. Instead of promoting rational program decisions, they spend their time supervising and managing people to gain compliance.⁸ Further, when staff do not follow through on a job assignment, managers should not worry about poor attitudes or inadequate training. Instead they should address the structure of their organizations, and particularly the system of incentives. Because members become attached to existing routines, they tend to undermine any development goals which require new procedures (Heaver, 1982, 20; Blair, 1978; Heginbotham, 1975).

While the model has primarily been used to diagnose why implementation is difficult and how to circumvent the difficulties, it has been amplified in a number of ways. Just as proponents of the goal directed model have come to appreciate that rationality is consistent with more flexible and open-ended processes, proponents of the bureaucratic process approach have come to appreciate the limits on control and are exploring alternative strategies to coordinate staff. The common element in all of the proposals is to move beyond simple models of hierarchical control, and explore a variety of incentives and ways to include staff in defining performance criteria (Leonard, 1977; Chambers, 1974; Honadle and VanSant, 1986). Many of the strategies stem from economic models which accept peoples' values and preferences and steer them in a different direction. Others try to avoid a relatively narrow economic calculus, and draw from a wider variety of social needs for status and belonging, and

develop new values. These other incentives incorporate consultations, work teams, and routinized procedures in order to protect members from the excesses of personal authority.

Institutional Analysis Approach

Whereas the above approaches take existing organizations for granted, there is a growing interest in exploring different institutional arrangements for implementing programs. In general terms, institution refers to the rules and norms for selecting and allocating values in a society. Institutions encompass organizations, rules for assigning responsibilities to them, and expectations about how organizations should function and relate to each other.⁹ Until recently observers have assumed that institutions are a product of cultural and social forces, and that we need to work within and improve those which exist. Recently, however, observers have been more willing to evaluate, compare and design new institutions rather than accept existing ones uncritically (March and Olsen, 1984). How do people behave in different institutional settings, and what influence do they have on policy and programs? The result is a broad interest in analyzing, shaping and designing institutions (Perrow, 1986).

The approach raises a whole new set of issues for managers. Instead of focusing on internal organizational activities, it leads them to examine different ways to organize a program. To appreciate what impact this shift has, consider the institutional choices facing managers of a farm credit program. One option is for the host program agency, such as a Ministry of Agriculture, to implement the program on its own. Another option is to explore alternative strategies for handling credit. These include:

state agricultural banks, supervised credit agencies, national and regional development agencies, area pilot projects, crop purchasing authorities, various kinds of farmers associations and cooperatives, credit unions, commercial and rural banking systems, private processors and exporters, suppliers, distributors and dealers, village merchants, etc. (Gonzalez-Vega, 1979).

A major source for this approach has been micro economics, particularly a body of literature known as public choice theory. It uses concepts borrowed from micro economics to analyze the ways in which choices are made through traditional political institutions, and compares them with choices made through market institutions. Since public institutions are often very inefficient, we need to compare public and private options, rather than simply turn to public bodies whenever there are problems with market arrangements (Kiser and Ostrom, 1973). Alternatively, economic theory is used to propose ways to reform public institutions to make them more market like and hence more efficient (Lamb, 1982). The theory is appealing because it begins with specific assumptions about how individuals make choices, and builds a predictive, testable model. The lure of a deductive

theory is even greater since neither sociology nor public administration offers a comparable methodology.

While public choice theory continues to dominate institutional analysis, a number of other economists not identified with public choice theory have begun to participate in this discussion (e.g. Nelson, 1977). They question whether efficiency and preference satisfaction are the only or primary criteria for evaluating institutions. For example, some say we need institutions which encourage innovation and change, and feedback as well as competition. Others stress that we need institutions to accomplish agreed on social goals. Some emphasize that since preferences can change and develop, we need institutions which can accurately reflect these changes. These analysts generally recommend that managers decentralize responsibilities but are more interested in how they facilitate the work of other units and hold them accountable, and are less apt to urge that managers simply turn activities over to the private sector.¹⁰ Like public choice theorists, these analysts concur that managers need to go beyond thinking simply of performance or service delivery issues. They need to analyze the best institutions for designing and implementing programs, rather than assume that program agencies are the only, or best vehicle for bringing about development goals.

Social Learning Approach

While the approaches described above have generally become more inclusive, and looked for ways to consult with others to supplement their limited information, the changes they propose are designed to correct what is otherwise a rational process. The social learning model, by contrast, views the limits on rationality and the need to incorporate additional views as an opportunity rather than a way to compensate for poor methods. It asserts that development involves transformations in peoples' lives, transformations which can only take place if the individuals themselves are intimately part of the process, shaping it and being transformed themselves.¹¹ It is not enough for managers to learn by adapting to demands from the community, or by consulting with clients as is done in the other models. Direct involvement in program design and implementation by community groups and beneficiaries is essential, and the role of managers is to design and oversee a process that promotes such involvement.

The social learning approach can be thought of as a continuation of the debate over different kinds of institutions. Like public choice theory, it is skeptical about the ability of traditional, large bureaucracies to bring about development, and it is interested in making public organizations more responsive to local communities. It differs in several major respects, however. Instead of relying on a method of analysis to prescribe institutions, it urges that managers need to establish processes whereby community members and groups become closely involved in

the management process. Often this will mean turning over responsibilities for program design or implementation to local organizations, but the purpose is to learn and change the governing units, as much as it is to accomplish the most efficient result.¹² There are four reasons for involving the community in management: To gain essential information; To create a momentum for changing governing organizations; To increase the capacity of program agencies to contribute to development; and To change the participants and increase their capacity for being effective.

Like the other approaches this one has been amplified in practice. Observers and practitioners have gone beyond an earlier stress on community organizations, and propose ways to link community groups with program agencies rather than rely simply on informal interaction, or on organizing the community. It requires changes in management practices and organizational procedures. Learning is not just done by individuals. It has to become part of the structures and procedures in an ongoing institution or program unit. The result is what David Korten refers to as a "strategic organization" and goes beyond the kinds of strategic planning and strategic management which fit with the goal directed approach (1984).

Studies which have applied this approach suggest the following management strategies:¹³

1. Learning involves pilots and experimentation, "embracing error" and learning from it. Mistakes are opportunities for exploring alternative strategies rather than an occasion for identifying who is at fault (Michael, 1973).
2. It is important to stimulate local organizations, to promote indigenous leadership and help them build a functioning organization with widespread participation.
3. To encourage learning, data and the techniques for collecting them have to fit the needs and capacities of all those involved.
4. Managers can best learn from their experiences by keeping a running record of the process. Based on action research, clients and researchers collaborate in observing, reporting and reflecting on activities.
5. Because they are less visible, the poorest members in society are often ignored by programs, even programs presumably targetted at the poor. Special attention needs to be paid to learning about these poorest.
6. The learning process requires a new set of norms, that clients should be taken seriously and that professional expertise is limited.

The approach captures the social dimensions of development, and offers specific prescriptions for establishing linkages between organizations and the community. It emphasizes that beneficiaries have an important role to play, primarily in

providing information and in collaborating with administrators to design and maintain development activities. It is realistic about the fact that organizations frequently are not structured to carry out development, and therefore that they need to radically alter their processes.

Political Influence Approach

There is a dilemma at the heart of this approach. While it is obvious that political interests are involved in any development activity, acknowledging the political dimensions of development is often a signal that there is little one can do, that dark forces of political will and chicanery are more determinative than any actions that managers can take. According to this approach, program goals are not right or wrong, so much as they are successful or unsuccessful in accommodating relevant interests. Instead of asking whether an organization is effective, or is accomplishing its goals efficiently, one should ask "effective for which group" or "for which interests." Since development programs emerge from the give and take among different interests inside and outside of the implementing agency, knowing program goals is less useful than understanding the interests and power resources of various stakeholders. It is aware that often those in power collude in order to keep competing interests from being expressed, and often use programs to support the status quo.¹⁴

While most observers of development activities agree that politics is endemic, they usually think of management in apolitical terms. Since political interests are seen as obstacles to development, it is natural to think of programs in apolitical terms and focus on strategies based on scientific management or reorganization (T. Smith, 1985; Yates, 1985). Studies find it difficult to lay out specific strategies or interventions to deal with political interests. Management as a political enterprise is an art and not a science, and therefore there "is no real set of management techniques on how to do most parts of this job" (Leonard, 1986).

While two observers of development have observed that ascribing development failures to politics is "one of the truest but least useful observations that can be made" (Johnston and Clark, 1982), the political influence approach has been amplified around some very specific and useful strategies. Politics is not only an inevitable part of a manager's arena, but it suggests some useful and positive ways to function within that arena. The prescriptions encourage managers to look for ways to develop and use their influence, to develop their bargaining skills, and to consider the value of mobilizing alliances in the community to build support for their programs. There have been three major developments in the approach. First, proponents are trying to be more systematic in analyzing political dynamics. Second, there is an emphasis on the value of developing political strategies to influence program design and implementation. Third, an

increasing number of observers stress that managers need to be leaders as well as effective administrators.

Systematic analysis includes the following concepts:

1. Transactions. Management is an effort to transact with other interests, to take their point of view into account, to rethink and recast programs, to persuade and convince where possible.
2. Political Rationality. Managers should design their transactions around the assumption that other parties will do what seems politically rational from their perspective.
3. Politics or "Voice" as a Source of Information. The economist Hirschman asks how organizations can learn about the reasons for poor performance (1970, 31). The traditional answer of economists is that customers who do not like a product simply exit by choosing an alternative. When people exit, however, managers do not necessarily learn anything about the reasons for their dissatisfaction, and what they do learn may come too late. If people used "voice" instead of "exit" they could communicate their preferences or persuade managers to address their problems.

Political strategies include the following:

Negotiating, Bargaining The approach prescribes a variety of strategies for working directly with different interests, and brokering among them.

A Power Strategy. Another political strategy distinguishes among three aspects of a manager's environment and suggests an appropriate strategy for each, based on the power resources of relevant groups (W. Smith, 1986).

Political Analysis. A similar strategy is proposed by Lindenberg and Crosby. Managers, they write, need to learn how to diagnose a situation politically, how to negotiate and build coalitions, how to mobilize support for their programs. They need to ask, "What do I want?" "Who has it?" and "How can I get it?" (1981, 25).¹⁵

Influence and leadership strategies. In addition to focusing on systematic concepts and political strategies, the political interests approach emphasizes the value of leadership. This concept goes beyond traditional views of managers as supervisors or negotiators and lifts up their potential ability to persuade others, to bring new vision, to change peoples' values and priorities. Instead of simply assessing opinions and developing strategies, managers can use personal appeals to shared values, and can try to alter and shape preferences.

The political interests model is a useful reminder that we cannot take program goals at face value. They often mask elite interests, and groups will usually view them differently. This perspective is important for two reasons: First, it is a realistic description of the development arena, and sensitizes observers to the ways in which managers in the Third World do exercise political influence and leadership every day. Western models of management which ignore these can undermine one of the major resources which these managers possess. Second, managers can improve their performance by developing political strategies to increase their influence, and to gain important information, resources and supports. While the strategies cannot be packaged or put into training packages as precise technologies, they can be used as models.

IV. USING THE FRAMEWORK TO EXPLORE OPPORTUNITIES FOR CHANGE

An implicit theme throughout is that program managers have a variety of opportunities for promoting developmental change in a society. They do far more than simply administer mandates from policy makers. Potentially, they contribute to program content, they affect the capacity of their organizations to implement programs, they expand their resources, they monitor the outcomes of programs, and they interact with a variety of organizational units throughout the political and social systems. Further their opportunities go beyond even this array of functions. They can draw on a variety of perspectives and theories about management, each of which emphasizes different opportunities for bringing about change. This emphasis is important because much of the literature on management takes a limited view of their role, and fails to explore the variety of ways in which they can introduce and promote change. Exploring different functions and perspectives is one way to correct these limitations.

Opportunities Presented by Management Functions and Approaches

The opportunities for promoting development vary according to the several functions and the perspectives in the framework. These are represented in Table 2. The rest of this section summarizes the implications of the various approaches for the functions.

TABLE 2. A Framework for Studying Program Management

	THEORIES OF MANAGEMENT					
	Goal Directed	Anarchy	Bureau- cratic Process	Institu- tional Analysis	Social Learn- ing	Political Influence
MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS						
Contribute to policy and program design	■	■		■		■
Develop capacity of implementing organizations	■	■	■	■	■	
Expand resources: financial and political			■		■	■
Focus on performance	■		■			
Work with and through multiple organizations			■	■	■	■

Contribute to Program and Policy Design. Decisions about policy content provide an important opportunity for managers to influence and shape program content. There are many policy issues for which policy makers have limited information and where they may be open to the expertise and experience which managers can offer. Five of the approaches suggest opportunities for contributing to program design. These include an emphasis on analysis and strategic planning (goal directed); a warning that goals may rationalize what organizations do for other reasons (anarchy); an emphasis on designing appropriate institutions for providing program services (institutional analysis); the need to involve beneficiaries in design (social learning); and that managers need to design programs to build a coalition of supporters (political influence).

Develop the Capacity of Implementing Organizations. It is not enough to design a program and provide it with ample funds. Designing appropriate organizational procedures and assigning responsibilities to various units offer further opportunities for promoting development. Five of the approaches suggested ways to deal with organizational procedures. Organizational procedures can improve information flow and communications and thus compensate for the bounded rationality of individuals (goal directed); organizations should reward risk taking (anarchy); incentives can replace controls over personnel (bureaucratic process); delivery systems can be designed to encourage efficiency or innovation (institutional analysis); procedures are needed to involve beneficiaries in design and implementation (social learning).

Develop Program Resources: Financial and Political. An emphasis on scarcity and the need to develop resources offers a number of important opportunities. It encourages managers to define resources broadly, to include both financial support, and less tangible political support. It also encourages them to look to the community for contributions, and to explore a variety of institutions in the public and private sectors. Three of the approaches deal with this function. Community organizations, users and those in the private and voluntary sectors can contribute to programs (institutional analysis and social learning); resources include expertise and contributions of time (social learning); persuasion and negotiation are important management tools (political influence); a lack of resources can be an opportunity to work more closely with beneficiaries (social learning).

Focus on Performance in Improving Quality of Life. This function is a reminder that we are not interested in improving management and organizational capacity as ends in their own right, but as means to increase development in a society. Two of the approaches deal with this function. Clear objectives can be very useful in evaluating organizations and holding them accountable (goal directed); staff need to know that they are being evaluated according to their performance (bureaucratic process).

Work with and Through Other Organizations. This function reminds managers that their role extends beyond their organizational boundaries, and that this broader arena greatly increases their opportunities for promoting change. Four of the approaches deal with this function. Managers can greatly expand their opportunities by working through community organizations and non governmental groups (social learning and institutional analysis). Such expansion will make coordination both more necessary and more difficult. Since managers have few sanctions in this arena they will have to rely primarily on exchange of benefits and special incentives (bureaucratic process) and political persuasion (political influence).

Signs of Convergence.

While different approaches are frequently presented as alternatives, the above descriptions of their applications suggest that as they have been amplified in practice, the approaches have developed in many similar ways:

Inclusiveness. Several of the approaches are paying more attention to different perspectives. Instead of assuming there is a consensus, or that experts can arrive at a satisfactory definition of a situation, they acknowledge that views on development differ, that a program which benefits some may hurt others. They are taking beneficiaries more seriously and accept that they have their own perspectives which need to be taken into account, and which may open up new opportunities.

Informal and Interpersonal aspects of management. A number of the approaches have come to appreciate that formal procedures are not the only way to encourage change. Managers need to appreciate that attitudes, commitments, and interpersonal relations also determine how people respond and that they offer opportunities for promoting development.

Interest in a Variety of Institutional Strategies. While the institutional analysis approach argues that policy makers and managers should consider different strategies, other approaches are also exploring this issue. Most obviously, the social learning approach looks for opportunities to directly involve community organizations in program responsibilities. In fact, the institutional analysis and social learning approaches, so different in many respects, share a profound appreciation for the creative energies of voluntary and self help organizations. The political influence approach is interested in different institutions for encouraging beneficiaries to register their interests, particularly those which encourage them to support activities rather than veto them.

Managers Can Shape and Change Preferences. Managers should explore ways to educate and inform others. Models which urge them to simply reflect preferences and adapt to opinions are very shortsighted.

Need for Flexibility. As they are being amplified, virtually all of the approaches are placing more emphasis on the need for managers to be more flexible, and warn that controlling and technocratic management styles have limitations, particularly in developing a capacity for dealing effectively with environmental changes.

Leadership. Several of the approaches define management more broadly than they formerly did, and are looking for opportunities for managers to be leaders, rather than simply carry out mandates in an effective manner.

Value of Experience and Experimentation. Finally, developments in several of the approaches emphasize the need to design organizational procedures to learn from experiences rather than assume that managers can anticipate problems and develop adequate designs ahead of time.

Different Emphases Among the Approaches

The similarities noted above point to important developments that transcend particular theories or approaches. At the same time the approaches retain important differences. Because they are grounded in different assumptions and emphases, we can get a purchase on a wider range of opportunities by acknowledging these differences and exploring where they lead us, rather than ignoring them.¹⁶ For example, consider different prescriptions offered to a manager facing the prospect of reducing the number of staff. The goal directed approach would determine how large the reduction should be, what skills are needed in the organization and which staff have these skills. It would then recommend cuts among those who do not have the required skills. The political influence approach, however, would warn that personnel decisions are usually made on political grounds and that the prescriptions described above simply rationalize a decision made for political reasons. In addition it would predict that a move based on rational analysis would generate excessive controversy and conflict. It would therefore recommend applying political rationality and making the cuts across the board. This strategy would prevent any single group from feeling they were being unfairly treated.

The implication is that managers should review the analyses of each approach, and then develop their own strategy. In the above example, they would note that the second option, an across the board cut, would mean the loss of many of their best workers. They would then weigh this result against estimates of the amount of political opposition that would be generated and the relative power of different groups. The point is that there is nothing inherent in either theory which makes it superior, and therefore managers are better off if they recognize both of these options and compare their implications, than if they merely proceed according to a single perspective. This section reviews the unique opportunities posed by each of the approaches.

According to the goal directed approach, managers should focus on defining appropriate goals, objectives and strategies. It proposes a variety of techniques and skills to better equip managers to translate goals into objectives, and collect and analyze needed information. But the core of the approach is more profound. It affirms that program substance and goals do make a difference, and that analytic techniques have to be tailored to the substance of the program. Managers who simply apply generic skills in any and all situations will overlook an important opportunity for building on the unique substance of a particular program. Ideas and goals can be important motivators, and

managers can use them effectively to nourish commitment and enthusiasm.

The anarchy model offers a reminder that if managers are going to be in a position to take advantage of any opportunities that arise, they will often find themselves in what can only seem like pure anarchy, with few clear guidelines. Even when they carefully identify an appropriate strategy, staff and relevant stakeholders may be preoccupied with other issues that seem more pressing. The approach is a call to modesty and patience, and a warning not to be immobilized if events seem disorganized. It reminds managers that there is little reason to expect everyone else to accept your priorities or time frame. Some distance and perspective may be useful, and managers need to learn to function in a very open and unpredictable setting. By not trying to impose too much control, and by being open to follow up on opportunities as they arise, they may make far more progress than by following earlier charted courses.

The bureaucratic process approach focuses on the need for managers to establish rules and procedures to coordinate those involved in implementing a program. It is a reminder that goals do not have an automatic claim on managers or members, and appreciates that managers need to provide incentives to those involved in implementation. Careful analysis has its place, and hiring and training the best people can also be very valuable. Structural variables such as bureaucratic procedures and incentives are critical however, and managers who ignore these, who assume that persuasion and commitment are sufficient inducements, will often be disappointed. This approach is a reminder that carefully designed routines can often defuse conflict by depersonalizing it, and can reassure people by bringing some order and predictability into an insecure situation.

The institutional analysis approach urges managers to address a broader question than they normally do. Instead of simply asking how to improve implementation and management, they need to ask how best to design institutions to carry out programs. Direct government provision by program agencies is not the only possible strategy. Governments can decentralize and delegate activities to other public bodies, they can turn activities over to non-governmental units, they can develop a number of strategies such as providing loans or grants. By raising such questions the approach offers a far greater range of opportunities for managers to bring about change. This approach has relied heavily on economic analysis and norms of economic efficiency for designing and selecting institutions. Other models are available which suggest selecting institutions according to whether they encourage innovation and change.

The social learning approach expands the meaning of development to include increases in peoples' capacities to influence their future. This increased capacity will only come

about if beneficiaries are directly involved in designing and implementing programs. Such involvement expands the perspectives and confidence of community members, and is also useful to managers because it provides a mechanism for gathering relevant information. In addition, community members are often able to assume some of the responsibilities and burdens of funding and implementing programs. The approach therefore erases the boundaries between those within an organization and groups in the community affected by the program, and by directly including community groups, reorients the attitudes and procedures within the program agency.

The political influence approach is particularly sensitive to the different interests in a policy arena, to the ways in which they can subvert and skew programs. Its major contribution stems from this emphasis on the potential power which different interests have. Strategically it proposes ways to mobilize the support of those with necessary resources or claims on program benefits, and to neutralize the power of those who can subvert program goals. The different interests exist both within the organization, and in the wider political arena. Instead of consulting, coordinating or involving them, this approach proposes ways to either negotiate with them, or use influence to change them.

Using the Approaches to Diagnose Management Situations

Managers should use the approaches outlined above to analyze the constraints and opportunities in their situations, and design a package of strategies which takes advantage of their immediate opportunities.¹⁷ Recall the earlier example of the manager faced with the prospect of reducing the staff in an organization. The traditional approach applies a rational goal directed analysis -- set an objective for the number of staff to be cut, determine needed skills, test existing staff, retain those with the needed skills, remove the remaining staff. Based on the review of approaches in this study the manager could also ask if any of the other approaches indicate important factors to be taken into account. The political influence approach serves as an important reminder to be sensitive to what is politically rational in this situation. An appreciation of the political dynamics of the situation might suggest that across the board cuts would be less damaging in the long run. The bureaucratic process approach asks whether it would be possible to design incentives to encourage some staff to leave voluntarily. The social learning approach suggests that some of the political heat could be taken off management staff by including community members in evaluations.

The point being made, and a major thesis of this study is that it is useful for managers to be aware of all of these approaches, that potentially each provides relevant insights for carrying out programs, and can serve as useful correctives to each other. A cluster of approaches with their differing emphases, can sensitize managers to a variety of variables and

aspects of their problems, and direct them to different opportunities.

Conflicts among views help practitioners as well as organization theorists to recognize their biases, to discover their implicit premises, and to perceive different aspects of reality ... Dissension gives perceivers the courage to look in unorthodox directions and to say what they see (Starbuck and Nystrom, 1981, xvii).¹⁸

In effect we are encouraging managers to be pragmatic, to pick and choose among several approaches. The approaches enable them to assess opportunities and design ways to take advantage of those opportunities.

Implications for Designing Management Training

We have argued that managers can use the approaches to diagnose the opportunities present in their particular situations and to correct for the weaknesses in any single approach. What are the implications of this emphasis for training managers?

First it is clear that there is no single repertoire of skills to serve as the basis for a training package. Managers need to be exposed to a variety of skills and techniques drawn from all of the approaches. Further they need experience in using them to diagnose their situations to see what opportunities exist. This means that training should be closely integrated with the actual management situation, and deal with job related problems and issues.

It may seem from the descriptions that it would be easier to train people in the analytic skills than the techniques associated with the other approaches. Some would argue that because they rely more on interactive processes, the social learning, political interests and anarchy approaches do not offer specific and transferable techniques. Models based on systems analysis and economic models, by contrast, are easier to use in training because these techniques are more readily communicated, their assumptions are clear and they can be tested in a fairly straightforward manner. As emphasized in the descriptions, however, proponents of the anarchy, social learning and political interests approaches, have each become more systematic in their analyses, and have proposed rather specific intervention techniques. The social learning approach, for example, has developed a strategy for bringing beneficiary and agency staff together. Similarly, a number of those who pursue the political interests approach have proposed specific ways to develop political awareness and skills through training.

The discussion also emphasized the importance of program content and design, and noted that an important management function concerns the contributions they can make to program content. Training teams, therefore, should include some with

program specific skills and experience with health or forestry or agricultural research, whatever programs are being dealt with. Often the most compelling opportunities for developmental change are suggested by adaptations in program content: rather than by simply applying generic management skills.

Program content is important in another respect. Leonard notes that a major characteristic of successful managers is their commitment to program goals and to the values associated with development (1986, 66). While training cannot produce commitment, he proposes bringing managers together with others who share similar values. The meetings can be used to socialize managers and staff to an appreciation of the goals and purposes of a program, and reinforce their commitment. Studies of private voluntary organizations attribute their success in development activities to the strong value commitments of their leadership (Tendler, 1982). It is also the case that many of the international donor groups who sponsor and support private voluntary groups have placed a high priority on developing and reinforcing values in their training and consultations (White, 1986b).

In developing training materials, more research needs to be done on indigenous models of management and leadership. Recent studies of management in the southern African countries, reported by Montgomery (1986) illustrate the kind of work that can be done to document the realities of management in Third World settings, and to reduce the common reliance on models based solely on western experiences. As Leonard reminds us, we often shy away from indigenous models of leadership because they appear to be hopelessly mired in political connections (1986). This prevents us from exploring and using some of the strongest models of leadership we have. More could also be done to mine the wealth of evaluations that have been done on various projects and programs to develop models of successes.¹⁹

Finally, the emphasis throughout on programs, on activities of ongoing host institutions, suggests that the management training institutions already existing in the developing nations have an important role to play. Studies confirm that they have a very uneven record, that they are very oriented to classroom teaching, and that typically they train people in very narrowly defined skills. As donors turn their attention to programs and policy reforms, they need to also challenge and better equip these training institutions.²⁰ One strategy would be to fund the institutes to do original research on management problems and experiences in their own countries.

CONCLUSION

This study has addressed managers as participants in a broad governing process rather than as narrow technicians. Its emphasis on a broad range of roles and several different approaches fits with Morris' distinction between administration and management:

"Administrative skills are in large part routine. Managerial responses consist of diverse actions taken to meet changing demands" (1981, 119). It would add that managers do not only "meet changing demands," they can also try to change the demands, and they can draw on a variety of theories to create opportunities for promoting developmental changes in a society.

This broad scope may seem to encourage inconsistency or a greater variety of skills than most managers are capable of. In reality, however, studies suggest that managers are fairly complex beings, that they simultaneously are committed to program goals, want to empower groups in the society, desire to expand their turf, and are wary about sharing any of their meager powers. A one dimensional model of management behavior which ignores their ambivalence and glosses over evident failings and difficulties will ignore some of the tensions they experience. We also need descriptions which appreciate a variety of potential resources for bringing about change. In this sense the various models can supplement, inform and correct each other. While the approaches do complement each other, they also disagree and pose issues which can only be resolved by managers themselves as they cope with particular situations. Taken as a cluster, the approaches can sensitize managers to issues they will inevitably confront, and provide a number of different strategies for bringing about change.

NOTES

1. For an interesting recognition of the importance of management see the 1983 Annual Report of the World Bank.

2. The growing interest in programs is welcome because it directs attention to the ongoing institutions in a country rather than to separable donor funded interventions (Morgan, 1983; Honadle, Gow and Silverman, 1984). Others who stress programs include Korten (1980), Paul (1982), Rondinelli (1986).

3. Compare Morss' definition of development -- concerned with the development goals of a country, oriented to changes and innovation, concerned with linkages to institutions and communities, and answerable to groups (1977, 18).

4. For two particularly interesting comparisons of approaches see Allison (1969) and Elmore (1978). For comparisons related specifically to the development arena see Ingle (1979); Brinkerhoff, 1986; Bryant and White (1982), Kiggundu et. al., (1983).

5. This theory has been developed by practitioners from the Development Project Management Center (DPMC), jointly funded by the US Department of Agriculture and US/AID; and the International Development Management Center, funded by US/AID and associated with the University of Maryland. The basic theory is described in Solomon, Ingle, Kettering and Countryman (1981); Kettering (1985) and evaluated in Brinkerhoff (1986).
6. Work on intuitive management cited as a development within the goal directed model would also fit with this model. See for example, Cates (1979) and Mintzberg (1976).
7. While these authors do not cite this literature, their important study of development captures many of the insights and prescriptions of this approach.
8. Montgomery describes how common this tendency is among African managers (1979).
9. For example, see Ruttan and Hayami, 1984; Connerley, 1985; and Kiser and Ostrom, 1982.
10. Nellis (1986) offers a very interesting analysis of the performance and inefficiency of public enterprises in several African nations, and proposes some specific ways to reform them.
11. Even though this approach is closely linked to the third world, some refer to an emerging paradigm that is far broader than development management. For example, Chambers (1985), Thomas (1985), and D. Korten (1981).
12. While this is the emphasis throughout this literature, it is particularly stressed in Korten (1984); Johnston and Clark (1982, 164-199); Montgomery (1979). For other important statements of this approach see Michael (1973), Gran (1983), Friedmann (1986).
13. See especially cases described in Korten (1984); Uphoff (1985); Charlick (1984); Cernea (1983).
14. Major sources include Grindle (1980, 1981), Lindenberg and Crosby (1981), Bates (1980), Pammergren (1983).
15. Their analysis is based on Ilchman and Uphoff (1969).
16. Compare the conclusions of Allison (1969) and Johnston and Clark (1982).
17. The economist Albert Hirschman has developed a particularly interesting approach to managing development activities around the concepts of constraints and opportunities (or "latitudes"). Managers need to have flexibility so that they will be able to take creative advantage of unforeseen opportunities (1967).

18. Others argue that it is valuable to retain a plurality of perspectives. See Allison (1969), Mitroff and Pondy (1974), Burrell and Morgan (1979), Harmon and Mayer (1986). All of these studies argue for keeping and comparing several models, but all worry that the rational model is frequently held up as a standard against which the other models are compared.

19. For example see the series of studies which looked at evaluations of AID funded projects in Africa to determine what lessons they held for managers (Rondinelli, 1986; White, 1986a).

20. Peter Quennell of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) strongly advocates that donors do more to assist host country management training institutions.

REFERENCES

- Allison, G. T. 1969. Conceptual models and the Cuban missile crisis. American Political Science Review 63 (3), 689-718.
- Bates, R.H. 1980. States and political intervention in markets: A case study from Africa. Social Science Working Paper 345. Pasadena: California Institute of Technology, mimeo.
- Blair, H.W. 1978. Rural development, class structure, and bureaucracy in Bangladesh. World Development 6, 65-82.
- Brinkerhoff, D. 1986. The evolution of current perspectives on institutional development: An organizational focus. In Brinkerhoff, D. and Garcia-Zamor, J.C. Eds. Politics, Projects and People: Institutional Development in Haiti. New York: Praeger.
- Bryant, C. 1985. Development management and institutional development: Implications of their relationship. Washington D.C.: Agency for International Development.
- Bryant, C. and White, L. G. 1982. Managing Development in the Third World. Boulder, Colorado: Westview.
- Burrell, G. and Morgan, G. 1979. Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis. London: Heinemann.
- Cates, C. 1979. Beyond muddling: Creativity. Public Administration Review 39 (6), 527-32.
- Cernea, M.M. 1983. A Social Methodology for Community Participation In Local Investments: The Experience of Mexico's PIDER Program. World Bank Staff Working Paper No.400. Washington D.C.:World Bank.
- Chambers, R. 1974, 1986. Managing Rural Development: Ideas and Experiences From East Africa. Hartford: Kumarian.
- Chambers, R. 1985. Normal professionalism, new paradigms and development. Brighton, England: Institute of Development Studies.
- Charlick, R.B. 1984. Animation Rurale Revisited: Participatory Techniques for Improving Agricultural and Social Services in Five Francophone Nations. Washington D.C.: Agency for International Development.
- Connerley, E. 1985. Developing effective resource management institutions: The search for an improved theory base. Paper presented at annual meeting of American Society for Public Administration, Indianapolis.
- DelBecq, A.L., Van de Ven, A.H., and Gustafson, D.H. 1975. Group Techniques for Program Planning. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman.
- Elmore, R. F. 1978. Organizational models of social program implementation. Public Policy 26 (2), 185-228.
- Friedmann, J. 1986. From Knowledge to Action: The Dialectics of Planning. Princeton: Princeton University.
- Gonzalez-Vega, C. 1979. Invierno: Innovation In Credit and In Rural Development. Washington D.C.: Agency for International Development.
- Gran, G. 1983b. Development by People: Citizen Construction in a

- Just World. New York: Praeger.
- Grindle, M. 1980. (Ed.) Politics and Policy Implementation in the Third World. Princeton: Princeton University.
- Grindle, M. 1981. Anticipating Failure: The implementation of rural development programs. Public Policy 29, 51-74.
- Hammergren, L.S. 1983. Development and the Politics of Administrative Reform: Lessons From Latin America. Boulder: Westview.
- Harmon, M. and Mayer, R. 1986. Organization Theory for Public Administration. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Heaver, R. 1982. Bureaucratic Politics and Incentives in the Management of Rural Development. World Bank Staff Working Paper No. 537. Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Heginbotham, S. 1975. Cultures in Conflict. New York: Columbia.
- Hirschman, A.O. 1967. Development Projects Observed. Washington D.C.: Brookings.
- Hirschman, A.O. 1970. Exit, Voice, Loyalty. Cambridge: Harvard.
- Honadle, G. 1982. Rapid reconnaissance for development administration: Mapping and moulding organizational landscapes," World Development 10 (8), 633-649.
- Honadle, G. H., Gow, D., and Silverman, J. 1984. Technical assistance alternatives for rural development: Beyond the bypass model. Canadian Journal of Development Studies 4 (2).
- Honadle, G.H. and VanSant, J. 1986. Implementation for Sustainability. Hartford: Kumarian.
- Ilchman, W. and Uphoff, N. 1969. The Political Economy of Change. Berkeley: University of California.
- Ingle, M.D. 1979. Implementing Development Programs: A State of the Art Review. Syracuse: Syracuse University.
- Johnston, B.F. and Clark, W.C. 1982. Redesigning Rural Development: A Strategic Perspective. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins.
- Kettering, M. 1985. Synthesis of lessons and guidelines for development management in Africa. Washington D.C.: Development Project Management Center, U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- Kiggundu, M. N., Jorgensen, J.J., Hafsi, T. 1983. Administrative theory and practice in developing countries: a synthesis. Administrative Science Quarterly 28 (1), 66-83.
- Kiser, L.L. and Ostrom, E. 1982. The three worlds of action. In E. Ostrom (Ed.), Strategies of Political Inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Korten, D. C. 1980. Community organization and rural development: a learning process approach. Public Administration Review 40 (5), 480-511.
- Korten, D. C. 1981. Management of social transformation. Public Administration Review 41 (6), 609-618.
- Korten, D. C. 1984. Strategic organization for people-centered development. Public Administration Review 44 (4), 341-352.
- Lamb, G. 1982. Market-surrogate approaches to institutional development. Washington D.C.: Bureau of Science and Technology, Agency for International Development, mimeo.

- Lamb, G. 1986. Institutional dimensions of economic policy management. Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Leonard, D.K. 1977. Reaching the Peasant Farmer: Organization Theory and Practice in Kenya. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Leonard, D. K. 1986. The political realities of African management. Report of a Preparatory Evaluation Workshop on the Management of Agricultural Projects in Africa. AID Evaluation Special Study No. 33. Washington D.C.: Agency for International Development.
- Lindenberg, M. and Crosby, B. 1981. Managing Development: The Political Dimension. West Hartford: Kumarian.
- March, J.G. and Olsen, J.P. 1976. Ambiguity and Choice in Organizations. Bergen, Norway: Universitets Forlaget.
- March, J.G. and Olsen, J.P. 1984. The new institutionalism: Organizational factors in political life. American Political Science Review 78 (3), 734-749.
- March, J.G. and Simon, H. 1958. Organizations. New York: Wiley.
- Michael, D. N. 1973. On Learning to Plan and Planning to Learn. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mintzberg, H. 1976. Planning on the left side and managing on the right. Harvard Business Review (July), 54-57.
- Mitroff, I. and Pondy, L. 1974. On the organization of inquiry: A comparison of some radically different approaches to policy analysis. Public Administration Review 34 (5), 471-79.
- Montgomery, J.D. 1979. The populist front in rural development. Public Administration Review 39 (1), 58-65.
- Montgomery, J.D. 1986. Bureaucratic politics in Southern Africa. Public Administration Review 46 (5), 407-413.
- Morgan, E.P. 1983. The project orthodoxy in development: Reevaluating the cutting edge. Public Administration and Development 3 (4), 329-339.
- Moris, J. R. 1981. Managing Induced Rural Development. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, International Development Institute.
- Morss, E. R. et. al. 1976. Strategies for Small Farmer Development. Vols. I and II. Boulder, Col.: Westview.
- Nellis, J. 1986. Public Enterprises in Sub-Saharan Africa. World Bank Discussion Papers, No. 1. Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Nelson, R. 1977. The Moon and the Ghetto. New York: Norton.
- Nicholson, N. K. 1981. Applications of public choice theory to rural development -- a statement of the problem. In Public Choice and Development, Russell, C., Nicholson, N.K. (eds).
- Patton, M. 1981. Utilization-Focused Evaluation. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Paul, S. 1982. Managing Development Programs: The Lessons of Success. Boulder, Colorado: Westview.
- Perrow, C. 1986a. Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay. 3rd ed. New York: Random House.
- Rondinelli, D. 1986. Development Management in Africa: The Experience With Implementing Agricultural Development Projects. AID Evaluation Special Study No. 44. Washington

D.C.: Agency for International Development.

- Ruttan, V. and Hayami, Y. 1983-84. Toward a theory of induced institutional innovation. Journal of Development Studies 20 (4), 203-223.
- Smith, T. B. 1985. Evaluating development policies and programmes in the Third World. Public Administration and Development 5 (2), 129-144.
- Smith, W.E., Lethem, F.J., and Thoolen, B.A. 1980. The design of organizations in rural development projects - a progress report. World Bank Staff Working Paper No. 375. Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Smith, W. E. 1986. Power in the design, management and evaluation of organizations. Mimeo.
- Solomon, M.J. Kettering, M., Countryman, P., and Ingle, M. 1981. Promising approaches to project management improvement. Washington D.C.: Development Project Management Center, Department of Agriculture.
- Springer, J. P. 1985. Policy analysis and organizational decisions: toward a conceptual revision. Administration and Society 16 (4), 475-503.
- Starbuck, W.H., Nystrom, P.C. 1981. Handbook of Organization Design. Vol. I and II. New York: Oxford.
- Tendler, J. 1982. Turning Private Voluntary Organizations into Development Agencies: Questions for Evaluation. AID Program Evaluation Discussion Paper, No. 12, April. Washington: USAID, Bureau of Food and Voluntary Assistance and Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination.
- Thomas, T. 1985. Reorienting bureaucratic performance: A social learning approach to development action. In Garcia-Zamor, J. Public Participation in Development Planning and Management, 13-30. Boulder: Westview.
- Uphoff, N. 1985. People's participation in water management: Gal Oya, Sri Lanka. in Public Participation in Development Planning and Management, Garcia-Zamor (ed.), 131-178. Boulder: Westview.
- Warwick, D. I. 1982. Bitter Pills. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- White, L. G. 1986a. Managing Development Programs: Management Strategies and Project Interventions in Six African Agricultural Projects. AID Evaluation Special Study No. 38. Washington D.C.: Agency for International Development.
- White, L. G. 1986b. PVO assistance and institutional development. Washington D.C.: International Science and Technology Institute.
- Wholey, J. S. 1983. Evaluation and Effective Public Management. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Yates, D. 1985. The Politics of Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.