

# **IDPM DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES**

Paper No. 72

## **What Has Happened to Development Administration? Some Critical Reflections**

**Farhad Hossain  
University of Manchester**

**June 2007**

**ISBN: 978 1 904143 96 3**

Further details: Institute for Development Policy and Management  
Published by: University of Manchester  
External Affairs Office  
Harold Hankins Building, Precinct Centre,  
Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9QH, UK  
Tel: +44 (0)161 275 2814  
Email: [idpm@man.ac.uk](mailto:idpm@man.ac.uk) Web: <http://idpm.man.ac.uk>

# **WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION? SOME CRITICAL REFLECTIONS**

**Farhad Hossain**

## **ABSTRACT**

This article provides a critical analysis of the evolving role of the concept of 'development administration' in the discipline of public administration. Since its inception in the 1950s, development administration has helped scholars in public administration to advance theoretical and empirical understanding of their discipline in industrialized, transitional and developing countries. Research on development administration weakened during the 1980s in many OECD countries, consequently causing it to lose its momentum in the field but since the turn of the century it has shown signs of revival in the administrative science discourse largely in response to emerging challenges and opportunities created by globalization. The concept is gaining increasing utility in emerging research areas such as social capital, economic globalization, governance and administrative decentralization, development NGOs, ICT and e-governance.

## **INTRODUCTION**

This article argues that despite its practical applicability to and theoretical relevance in international development management, the concept of development administration has been weakening in the discipline of public administration since the early 1980s. The aim of the article is to advance academic understanding of development administration and its applicability to

contemporary international development management. In doing so, the article presents a theoretical overview of development administration, and highlights the theoretical gap that emerged in the 1980s between public administration and development administration. Management problems in international development initiatives are also discussed. With thematic analyses of economic globalization, social capital, good governance, administrative decentralization, sustainability of development NGOs and the challenges of e-governance, the article identifies four emerging research agendas for contemporary development management. The article suggests that academic study of the above issues related to 'development administration' and 'international development' has vital importance for the current academic discourse in public administration.

## **THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

Since the 1950s, the study of 'development administration' has been viewed as part of the study of public administration (Siffin 1991, 7), though research on development administration has diminished since the 1980s. Siffin seems escapist about development administration, as in his view, it focuses on matters outside the boundaries of conventional public administration (Siffin 1991, 11-12). He comments on the problem of development administration, arguing that 'there really isn't much of a problem, inasmuch as there isn't much of a field' (1991, 8). Development administration is a term that implies a question: how can the ideas and mechanisms of public administration be used as instruments of social and economic development? Riggs similarly asks: 'how does the study of development administration differ from the study of public administration in general, or even from the study of comparative administration? No clear answer to this question can be given...' (1977, 3). The comparative view of 'public administration' and 'development administration' can be understood further from the following table (Hussain 1994, 13-14):

**Table-1**

**PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

**DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION**

Public Administration looks after the public policy at large including law and order and other services like health, housing, sanitation, etc.

Development Administration is a branch of Public Administration.

Its structure is centralized with top-bottom hierarchy. Bureaucracy is its modus operandi and rules are mostly rigid and non-flexible.

It actively revolves round targets and widens up to villages (lowest level of habitations).

People's participation is not binding and imperative.

Its implementation needs technical and trained personnel rather than traditional bureaucracy. It calls for flexible rules and regulations.

This is continuous and never ending.

It is occasional and activity ends when the target is achieved.

The above comparative view highlights the scope of public administration and development administration. However, the claim that 'development administration is occasional...' is arguable and cannot be theoretically justified because it is constantly evolving.

Jreisat (1991, 19-20) is more optimistic about the concept than Siffin. He claims that the field of comparative and development administration constitutes a rich heritage of scholarly

contributions that include studies of numerous countries, cultures, organizations, and groups. Katz has, rather, identified the borders between development administration and public administration (1977, 120-121). In his opinion, development administration differs from traditional public administration in its objectives, scope, and complexity. He argues that

'development administration is innovative, since it is concerned with the societal changes involved in achieving developmental objectives. In its quest for change, government becomes concerned with a wide scope of activities. No longer is it limited to the maintenance of law and order, the provision of some limited public services, and the collection of taxes; rather, it is specifically involved in the mobilization of resources and their application to a great variety of development activities on a massive scale' (Katz 1977, 120).

Despite these analyses and arguments, it is obvious that the context and scope of development administration remains central to public administration. The concept of development administration emerged in the post World War II era of nation-building and administrative reforms in post-colonial states in the developing world. The concept often refers to 'the two fields of *public administration* and *development*, which can be combined under the heading of "development administration" or administrative aspects of development' (Riggs 1978, 1, italics added). Since its inception, the concept of development administration has mainly been employed in studying 'administration' and 'development' in developing countries. Development administration is most often treated as a facet of comparative public administration. In his most widely used book, 'Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective', Ferrel Heady (1966) discusses public bureaucracy as it exists within different types of political systems. He sketches five general features of public administration in developing countries, and carefully examines the interplay of bureaucracy and politics (Siffin 1991, 8).

As explained by Riggs (1977, 3; see also Handerson 1971, 234), the Comparative Administration Group (CAG) of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) played a significant role in the emergence of the concept of development administration in the 1960s. Administrative problems in developing countries at the time were significant concern of CAG, ASPA. Thus, under the auspices of comparative studies of national public administration, development administration became more prominent as an independent concept in public administration studies in developing countries. One significant change in the 1967 version of the US Agency for International Development (USAID) administrative doctrine, as embodied in the agency manual, is the emphasis on 'development administration', curiously without once using that popular term at all (Abueva 1969, 554). Despite its growth as an independent area in public administration since the 1950s, development administration, as an academic discipline, began losing its momentum in the 1980s in industrialized countries and it would not experience a revival until the turn of the century (see for example, Hossain 2001, 37; Collins 2000, 3).

### **PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE 1980s: EXPLORING THE GAP BETWEEN RICH AND POOR COUNTRIES**

Throughout the 1980s, theoretical concerns of public administration in the USA and other developed countries started to differ from the concerns of the poorer countries in the South. During the 1970s, administrative reform in developing countries was an influential catchword (Siffin 1991, 9) – which was usually understood as a subject matter of development administration. However, Hussain (1994, 11) argues that developing the capacity of bureaucracy did not help much. Training imparted to bureaucracy did not correspond to the needs of the developing countries because training techniques and contents remained Western or American. A reflection of Hussain's view also could be found in the recent American literature on public administration. For example, after several decades of scholarly contribution to the field of

comparative and development administration, Professor Fred W. Riggs in his recent (2001, 1) writing concluded that American public administration is truly exceptional and has limited relevance to the solution of administrative problems in other countries. Nevertheless, it is so widely imitated and viewed as a model that anyone studying Public Administration needs to understand why the American system is exceptional and why its practices are so often irrelevant in other countries. Such an understanding requires a comparative analysis of different regimes based on the same constitutional principles, that is the separation of executive, legislative and judicial powers -- and the identification of the peculiarly American structure of a hybrid bureaucracy.

In the 1980s 'privatization' was labeled as the subject matter of public administration (Siffin 1991, 9) – which covers a limited sphere of the organizational landscape in developing countries, as compared to the developed world. The best-known academic forums of public administration like the Minnowbrook I (in 1968) and II (in 1988) concentrated their theoretical focus on US administration and suggested reforms in that system. The 1968 theoretical discussion was mainly on

'ethics, social equality, human relations, reconciling public administration and democracy, and concern for the state of the field. However, several 1988 themes were not as prominent in 1968, notably leadership, constitutional and legal perspectives, technology, policy, and economic perspectives' (Frederickson 1989, 100).

Thus, the discussion in both of the Minnowbrook forums naturally was far from the central concerns of public administration in developing countries. Over the decades, the operational landscape of organizations had become complex internationally due to the widening gap between the economies of rich and poor countries. As a result, 'development administration' was left behind on the journey of public administration sometime in the 1980s – although the

subject matter of development administration is not a separate discipline from public administration.

However, like Collins (2000, 3), many scholars in public administration feel that the turn of the century is an appropriate time to reflect on the impact of public administration on development and, in turn, the impact of facets of development on administration. The issues confronting those in the field are serious, and include the failure of existing systems to cope with growing gaps between rich and poor within and between countries, with environmental degradation, frequent conflict between and within states, and growing distrust of government generally.

### **MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

Paul (1986, 1) has argued that administration or management has always been identified as a neglected factor in development project activities. Even in recent years, in practice, theories of development administration have been infrequently applied in planning and implementing development projects and programs in developing and transitional countries. The World Bank has found that some 51 per cent of its rural development area projects during the period of 1965 to 1985 failed to achieve the Bank's minimum acceptable rate of return of 10 percent (Turner and Hulme 1997, 140). Therefore, there is a general concern that most of the failed development programs could not reach their developmental goals only because stakeholders focused too little attention on the administration of development programs. Certain scholars (e.g. Turner and Hulme 1997, 141-144) also claim that the challenges of development, particularly in rural areas, are not 'well structured' problems as project planning methodologies assume, but are rather 'ill structured' or simply 'a mess'. Orthodox project planning methodologies demand large amounts of reliable data. In most developing countries, such data are not available and so planners have to make assumptions. Another feature of project management in developing countries is



uncertainty and instability. Separation of planning from management causes serious problems. Belatedly, in the 1980s, project planners began to recognize problems related to implementation. The lack of beneficiary participation also causes serious problems. All of these factors make development projects vulnerable to the long political processes of which aid agencies, political parties, local élites, politicians, bureaucrats, and other interest-groups are a part. As a result, critics (for example, Quibria 1994) have argued that the extent of rural poverty has not been reduced – or may have worsened over the years.

It is against this background that Werlin (2003, 329-342) argues that 'the inadequacy of governance rather than resources is the primary reason for the gap between poor countries and rich countries'. Werlin is also sympathetic and convinced of the need to pursue a research agenda where scholars find a way out of the confusion associated with our inability to know whether governance is helped or hurt by the dichotomies of centralization and decentralization. Such dichotomies can also be found, for example, between bureaucratization and debureaucratization; regulation and deregulation; more control or less control; privatization and public management; downsizing and rightsizing; strict guidelines and flexible guidelines; and more expertise and greater public input. He attributes this to the limitations of *Organizational Theory* (rational – a finely ordered system of super-ordination and subordination in which higher offices supervise lower ones), *Cultural Theory* (semi-feudalistic and tradition-bound governance theories and its failure to incorporate politics), and *Structural-Functional Theory* (success of political systems in maintaining political support has failed). He propounded what he calls the *Political Elasticity Theory*, which attempts not only to reduce confusion in public administration, but also to link comparative administration to comparative politics and development studies.

Theoretically, the study of development from the administrative science perspective diminished since the 1980s because public administration in developed democracies, that is, in the richer parts of the world, has dealt with some other aspects relevant to their everyday business. Therefore, advancing scientific studies on development administration has vital importance for fostering better understanding both academically in higher educational

institutions, and practically in the field, where development programs are carried out. In order to address these issues, academic understanding of existing theories must be advanced, which will improve conceptual understanding of development administration so that the challenges of present day development assistance programs and international development can be better tackled.

### **MANAGING INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY: SOME EMERGING RESEARCH AGENDAS**

The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) spends billions of dollars every year on a wide variety of development cooperation initiatives in more than one hundred countries around the globe (USAID 2006a). The organization has nine different areas of development cooperation, one of which is “promoting democracy and good governance” in 23 different countries in Africa, 17 in Asia/Near East, 21 in Europe and Eurasia, and 15 different countries in Latin America and Caribbean (USAID 2006b). Similarly, the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) is currently engaged in promoting governance and development in their 25 partner countries around the world (CIDA 2006).

Across the Atlantic, United Kingdom’s official development assistance alone will rise to almost £6.5 billion (\$11.20) by 2007/08 (DfID 2006). Similarly, other European Union (EU) member states also spend billions of dollars every year in their development cooperation initiatives across the globe. The OECD member states’ collective efforts to tackle global poverty and attain the United Nation’s Millennium Development Goals have gained momentum. The scope of these activities does not include the developmental initiatives of other private stakeholders, such as non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and trans-national agencies. In practice, development management has never featured prominently in the field of development aid. Therefore, the importance of academic discourses in development administration is growing.

Scholarly research should try to bridge the theoretical gap between development administration and public administration – which developed during the 1980s and 1990s in both developing and industrialized countries. Theoretically, research on development administration should be carried out by taking a broader perspective, with the intention of making conceptual contributions to administrative science. Due to its strong roots in development studies, development administration itself is a multi-disciplinary area of study. That is why the research agenda should be thematically in-depth and designed to cover the central issues of the contemporary international development discourse (see also Collins 2000, 3-14). The multi-disciplinary orientation of development studies should in no way be lost in the study of development administration. However, the aim should be to make theoretical contributions in the area of administrative science, and practical contributions in the area of development management. For example, scholarly work on the following emerging thematic issues has vital importance in the contemporary development administration and international development discourse:

- 1.) The harmony and tension between economic globalization and social capital
- 2.) Challenges with good governance: administrative decentralization and local development in developing countries
- 3.) Alternative development strategies: exploring the comparative advantage of NGO-led development initiatives
- 4.) Digital divides and applicability of ICT-led e-governance in developing countries

Careful selection of theoretical approaches in addressing these research topics are of vital importance in carrying out any study on the above topics. Each of the above topics is very large in scope and requires a thorough understanding of these issues and themes reflected in each of the topics. The thematic discussion of the above topics is further discussed below.

## **The harmony and tension between economic globalization and social capital**

Economic globalization has mostly been studied by scholars in development economics, history, sociology and anthropology. Despite the economic advances achieved (World Bank 2000) in many parts of the developing world, Korten (1996, 127) argues that globalization has rendered many of the political roles of government obsolete. Companies with globalized operations routinely and effortlessly sidestep governmental restrictions on the basis of old assumptions about national economies and foreign policy.

'Renato Ruggiero, ex-Director of the World Trade Organization stated: "We are creating a single global economy" (quoted by Harawira 1999). 'Embedded within this new single global economy is a set of liberal European epistemologies which define human beings as economic units and the free market as a rationally operating framework within which perfect competition exists. This framework has its roots in the mercantilism of the earliest forms of imperialism, and is ideologically flawed. Economic liberalism and free trade are the linchpins [sic] of the new economic order designed to carry humankind on a wave of economic triumph into the new millennium.' (Harawira 1999)

The recent protests against economic globalization in many parts of the world make us re-think its dynamics and drawbacks. However, the study of economic globalization is largely lacking in the public administration literature.

'Social capital' refers to stocks of cultural elements such as social trust, norms, and values that people can draw upon to solve common problems for mutual benefits (Li 2001, 130). Professor Putnam of the J. F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard argues that 'analogous to notions of physical capital and human capital--tools and training that enhance individual productivity--social capital refers to features of social organization such as networks, norms, and

social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit' (Putnam 1995, 67). Studies on social capital have been produced by several scholars in administrative science (Putnam 2000 and 1995, Harisalo and Miettinen 1997). Putnam's study reveals a competing scenario between social capital and modernization in the US and examines America's declining social capital over the last three decades or so.

Economic globalization and modernization help each other to survive and at the same time affect social capital. Development aid promotes modernization in the developing world. The mission of most development projects is to modernize traditional societies; such societies are also referred to as 'prismatic societies' by Riggs (1978). Dor Bahadur Bista (1994) has empirically presented the consequences of modernization and development aid, and his study on fatalism and development bears commenting on at some length in this regard.

A well planned research agenda that addresses the findings presented by Korten (1996) on economic globalization and Putnam (2000) on social capital could contribute an in-depth theoretical contribution to the study of international development by improving understanding of the inter-linkages between these two influential areas in social science.

### **Challenges with good governance: administrative decentralization and local development in developing countries**

'Governance' is a word that is so ubiquitous and so debased that, like Humpty Dumpty in *Alice in Wonderland*, we can use it to mean almost anything we like (McCourt 2006). By referring to Kaufmann, McCourt provides the definition of governance as 'the set traditions and formal and informal institutions that determine how authority is exercised in a particular country for the common good'. He rightly identified a number of elements of governance, including democracy and political governance, economic governance, corporate governance and socio-economic governance where he highlights the arenas of democratic and political governance in civil society, political society, government, bureaucracy, economic society and the judicial system. Kaufmann

et al (2005, 5) constructed measures of six dimensions of governance indicators and these are: a.) Voice and accountability – measuring political, civil and human rights; b.) Political Instability and violence – measuring the likelihood of violent threats to, or changes in, government, including terrorism; c.) Government effectiveness – measuring the competence of the bureaucracy and the quality of public service delivery; d.) Regulatory burden – measuring the incidence of market-unfriendly policies; e.) Rule of law – measuring the quality of contract enforcement, the police, and the courts, as well as the likelihood of crime and violence; and f.) Control of corruption – measuring the exercise of public power for private gain, including both petty and grand corruption and state capture.

However, the notion of 'good governance' had already been introduced to the international development co-operation agenda in the late 1980s, following discussions in mainly World Bank circles on the outcomes of structural adjustment policies. It developed into a somewhat confusing and controversial term (Kruiter 1996). Theoretically, the scope of governance is wide and covers larger issues such as administrative reform, national development policies, democratization, decentralization, corruption, partnerships between the public, private and the third sector, and other areas of public affairs (Turner and Hulme 1997). Among the above, research on administrative decentralization has a tradition and direct relevance to the study of comparative and development administration. Including administrative decentralization, the other issues of governance mentioned above have a growing importance in the contemporary international development discourse and cover the central aspects of development administration.

A major obstacle to the effective performance of public bureaucracies in most developing countries is the excessive concentration of decision-making and authority within the central government. Decentralization within the state involves a transfer of authority to perform some service to the public from an individual or an agency in central government to some other individual or agency closer to the public to be served. However, in practice, the challenges to good governance through decentralization are numerous. In most developing countries, there

has been a tendency of independent governments to favour the delegation of power within public services rather than through locally elected authorities. Furthermore, the capacity of local and regional authorities has remained generally weak. There has been significant rhetoric about participation and local autonomy, but central governments have jealously guarded their power. (Turner and Hulme, 1997) Similar findings have also been reported by other researchers (see Khan and Zafarullah, 1991; Siddiqui, 1992; Seppälä, 2000) in their work on central and local governance. In general, governance has thus remained far from being referred to as “good”.

It is true that academic research in public administration and international development covers the central issues cutting across traditional sub-fields of international relations, political science and public administration. However, research on good governance and administrative decentralization is more central to public administration than any other fields in social sciences. Therefore, there is scope for scholars in administrative science to make contributions in the areas of good governance and the search for local capacity building in developing countries.

### **Alternative development strategies: exploring the comparative advantage of NGO-led development initiatives**

The role of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in managing development initiatives in developing countries has been central to the contemporary development aid discourse. Development projects run by NGOs are assumed to be flexible, innovative, participatory, cost-effective, and directed at the poor. Several social, economic, political and cultural arguments exist to justify the advantages of NGOs (Hulme 1994; Tvedt 1995 and 1998b; Vartola et al 2000; Hossain 2001). ‘Market failure’ and ‘government failure’ are considered by many to be the leading reasons for the growth of NGOs (Anheier and Seibel 1990, 1). Scholars argue that this growth is a reflection of dissatisfaction with both the state and the market. On the other hand, the use of NGOs has been consistent with both the New Right aid policies of governments in the USA and UK and the ‘alternative’ aid policies of the donor community in the Nordic countries and the

Netherlands. (Hulme 1994, 251 and 265) The restructuring policies of the World Bank and other influential donor institutions (e.g., in OECD countries) led to a planned reduction of the role of the state in developing countries and increased space for development NGOs (Tvedt 1998a, 62).

However, the sustainability of NGO-led development initiatives is questioned in the social science literature. A development program is considered sustainable when it is able to deliver an appropriate level of benefits for an extended period of time after major financial, managerial, and technical assistance from an external donor is terminated (OECD 1989, 7). Among others, a recent study (Hossain 2001, 11) argues that despite the said comparative advantages of NGOs, their development projects remain unsustainable in many developing countries. Research also suggests that the comparative advantage that NGOs are generally assumed to have in the literature on NGOs in development has been falsified (Tvedt 1997, 1). Despite these arguments, NGOs have rapidly grown in the OECD and developing countries since the 1970s. Due to a lack of reliable data, the number of development NGOs, their total aid volume, and the number of beneficiaries cannot be stated precisely (Tvedt 1998b, 10). It is also difficult to estimate their number and volume of aid they provide because the distinction between the traditional welfare organizations and the modern development NGOs connected to international aid system is not clear. However, it is estimated that about 4,000 development NGOs in OECD member countries, dispersing billions of dollars a year, are working with approximately 10,000 to 20,000 'Southern' NGOs (based in developing countries), assisting between 100 and 250 million people (Tvedt 1998b, 1).

Therefore, in-depth and thematic empirical studies on the topic are needed to examine the sustainability and the comparative advantage of NGOs in developing countries. Such studies would enrich the literature on development administration and bring valuable insight to the actors involved in international development in carrying out development assistance to developing countries.



## **Digital divides and applicability of ICT-led e-governance in developing countries**

Once properly managed, Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) and e-governance can add tremendous dynamism in reforming public administration and can change the mode of interaction between the state and its citizens. However, concerns regarding digital divides and the challenges of e-governance in the developing states of Africa, Asia and Latin America are growing. If the factors contributing to digital divides are not carefully identified and properly solved, there is a growing risk that in the coming years, digital resources might become the preserve of the 'haves', while ignoring the plight of the 'have-nots' as they seek access to resources in developing countries. Technology can exclude people, but governance should not. As a matter of fact, the moral foundation of good governance is democracy and the inclusive nature of the state. The performance of governance should be measured not by the selection of technologies the state uses, but by the participation that the state promotes in its operations. This is indeed a matter for the dynamic interplay between ethics and economics.

Compared with the possibilities, the present challenges in promoting e-governance in developing countries are many. The relatively low rate of literacy, computer literacy and lack of proficiency in English in developing countries are major challenges that e-governance is facing. Purchasing power is almost always connected to the socio-economic status of individuals: if people with an average income can even buy a computer, how would they bear the operational costs related to computer and Internet services? Even though someone has all of the required skills, the necessary economic basis and a computer, it still depends on the availability of the basic infrastructural support to gain access to the computer and the Internet. This support includes electricity, availability of Internet services, and even in some cases, telephones. The purchasing power of the poor should not be difficult to guess. It can also be hard for a growing number of the poor in the present world to justify the use of a computer in their everyday lives as even the basic services (i.e. housing, healthcare, education) are not secured.

However, e-governance can bring the central government closer to people by bypassing unnecessary bureaucratic interference by local authorities or oligarchic regimes. At the same time, local governance operations can be made more transparent by initiating e-governance. The developmental challenges of the present world and the division between the rich and the poor also bring about an ethical perspective on the subject. An in-depth and empirical exploration is required to explain the current status, challenges, and the possibilities of people-centered grassroots-based e-governance in developing countries. Whatever the obstacles to e-governance might be, the local, national and transnational stakeholders in development management must constantly promote, and ensure citizen participation in e-governance by making use of various meaningful channels. In order to make e-governance sustainable, people living at the grassroots level of the developing world should be given the right to share their concerns with the local, national and international governmental agencies.

Research on social capital, economic globalization, governance and administrative decentralization, development NGOs, ICT and e-governance can bring valuable insight and can make significant theoretical contributions to the administrative challenges of international development. Academic understanding of these important topics can be advanced by the existing theories of administrative science and at the same time, these theories can further be tested, widened and strengthened by applying them to the emerging contexts of development management.

The socio-economic development of developing countries directly depends on how these countries are governed. Therefore, by ignoring the present day's challenges of good governance and administrative decentralization, no development initiative is guaranteed a sustainable future in developing countries. Since the 1970s, the performance of development NGOs as alternative development organizations has been generally appreciated by the aid donors – despite the fact that most of their development initiatives are heavily dependent on foreign aid and the projects are not sustainable. Sustainability of NGO-led development projects can be ensured by improving the managerial capacity of the NGOs. It is also true that e-governance can add tremendous

dynamism in reforming public administration and can change the mode of interaction between the state and its citizens. However, if the factors contributing to digital divides are not carefully identified and properly solved, there is a growing risk that in the coming years, digital resources might become the preserve of the 'haves', while ignoring the plight of the 'have-nots' in developing countries. The above topics are central to the contemporary international development discourse and need to be researched from an administrative perspective.

## **CONCLUSION**

Theoretically, it is challenging to solve all the problems development administration faces today as a sub-field of public administration. Every day, bilateral, multilateral and other international donors are confronted with new challenges in their development efforts. Nevertheless, over the decades, development aid has been playing an important role in the development process of least developed countries. Generalizing the drawbacks of development aid and efforts could be misleading. Generalizing the merits of development aid could also be misleading. Certainly, performance of development aid and efforts can be improved by strengthening the management capacity of the development stakeholders in the OECD and developing countries.

Therefore, academic study on the above issues related to 'development administration' and 'international development' has vital importance for the current academic discourse in public administration. In addition to the academic community, the main user groups of the information produced by academic research on these topics are the stakeholders (for example, authorities, political decision-makers) involved in international development both in the South and in the North. Theoretically, identifying the dynamics and drawbacks of development administration and, practically, searching for better ways to carry out international development effectively, largely depends on the future interest and ability of academics and practitioners to study the subject properly. In this context, the leading forums of public administration like the American Society for

Public Administration (ASPA), National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), International Association of Schools and Institutes of Administration (IASIA), International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS), European Group of Public Administration (EGPA) and other national and international academic institutions and forums in the discipline can play an important role.

## REFERENCES

- Abueva, José V. 1969. Administrative Doctrines Diffused in Emerging States: The Filipino Response. In *Political and Administrative Development*, edited by Ralph Braibanti, 536-587. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Anheier, Helmut K. and Seibel, Wolfgang. Eds., 1990. *The Third Sector. Comparative Studies of Nonprofit Organizations*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bista, Dor Bahadur. 1994. *Fatalism and Development. Nepal's Struggle for Modernization*. Calcutta: Orient Longman.
- CIDA. 2006. Canadian International Development Agency. Available at <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/index-e.htm> Accessed March 10, 2006.
- Collins, Paul. 2000. The Last Fifty Years and the Next Fifty Years: A Century of Public Administration and Development. In *Applying Public Administration in Development – Guideposts to the future*, edited by Paul Collins. 3-14 Chichester: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
- DfID. 2006. Department for International Development [U.K.]. Available at <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/> Accessed March 10, 2006.
- Frederickson, H. George. 1989. Minnowbrook II: Changing Epochs of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*. 49(2): 95-100.
- Handerson, Keith M. 1971. New Comparative Public Administration? In *Toward a New Public Administration – The Minnowbrook Perspective*, edited by Frank Marini. 234-250. New York: Chandler Publishing Company.
- Harawira, Makere. 1999. *Economic globalisation, indigenous peoples, and the role of indigenous women*. Paper presented at the Hague Appeal for Peace Conference, May 1999, The Hague, Netherlands. Available at <http://www.converge.org.nz/pma/Mak.htm> Accessed on February 21, 2006.

- Harisalo, Risto and Miettinen, Ensio. 1997. *Trust Capital. The Third Force of Entrepreneurship*. Tampere: University of Tampere
- Heady, Farrel. 1966. *Public Administration, A Comparative Perspective*. New York: Marcel Dekker
- Hossain, Farhad. 2001. *Administration of Development Initiatives by Non-Governmental Organizations. A Study of Their Sustainability in Bangladesh and Nepal*. Tampere: University of Tampere.
- Hulme, David. 1994. Social Development Research and the Third Sector. NGOs as Users and Subjects of Social Inquiry. In *Rethinking Social Development. Theory, Research and Practice*, edited by David Booth. 251-275. Essex: Longman.
- Hussain, Motahar. 1994. *Development Administration in Bangladesh*. Dhaka: Hasan Publishers.
- Jreisat, Jamil E. 1991. The Organizational Perspective in Comparative and Development Administration. In *Handbook of Comparative and Development Public Administration*, edited by Ali Farazmand. 15-23. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.
- Katz, Saul M. 1977. Exploring A Systems Approach to Development Administration. In *Frontiers of Development Administration*, edited by Fred W. Riggs. 109-138. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Kaufmann, D., A. Kraay and M. Mastruzzi. 2005. Governance matters IV: Governance indicators for 1996-2004, Washington, D.C.: The World Bank. Available at <http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/pubs/govmatters4.html> Accessed on March 31, 2006.
- Korten, David C. 1996. *When Corporations Rule the World*. London: Earthscan Publications Ltd.
- Kruiter, Anje 1996. *Good Governance for Africa: Whose Governance?* Maastricht: ECDPM. Downloaded on February 21, 2006 from: <http://www.oneworld.org/ecdpmpubs/govahk.htm#int>
- Li, Ning. 2001. Social Capital and International R&D Collaboration. *Administrative Studies*. 20(2): 130-143

- McCourt, W. 2006. *The human factor in governance: Managing public employees in Africa and Asia*. London: Palgrave Macmillan
- OECD. 1989. *Sustainability in Development Programmes: A Compendium of Evaluation Experience. Selected Issues in Aid Evaluation - 1*. Paris: OECD
- Paul, Samuel. 1986. *Strategic Management of Development Programmes*. Geneva: International Labour Office (ILO)
- Putnam, Robert. 1995. Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy*. 6(1):65-78. Available at [http://muse.jhu.edu/demo/journal\\_of\\_democracy/v006/putnam.html](http://muse.jhu.edu/demo/journal_of_democracy/v006/putnam.html) Accessed on November 5, 2002.
- Putnam, Robert. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Quibria, M. G. Ed., 1994. *Rural Poverty in Developing Asia*. Volume 1. Manila: Asian Development Bank.
- Riggs, Fred W. 1977. Introduction. In *Frontiers of Development Administration*, edited by Fred W. Riggs. 3-37. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Riggs, Fred W. 1977B. The Context of Development Administration. In *Frontiers of Development Administration*, edited by Fred W. Riggs. 72-108. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Riggs, Fred W. 1978. *Applied Prisms – A Development Perspective*. Kathmandu: Center for Economic Development and Administration, Tribhuvan University.
- Riggs, Fred W. 2001. *Public Administration in America: The exceptionalism of a hybrid bureaucracy*. Available at <http://www2.hawaii.edu/~fredr/ampa.htm> and at <http://webdata.soc.hawaii.edu/fredr/welcome.htm#pa> Accessed on June 18, 2002.
- Seppälä, Pekka. 2000. *Towards Local Partnerships. The Social Interfaces of Aid in Rural Tanzania*. Helsinki: Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland.

- Siffin, William J. 1991. The Problem of Development Administration. In *Handbook of Comparative and Development Public Administration*, edited by Ali Farazmand. 5-13. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.
- Turner, Mark and Hulme, David. 1997. *Governance, Administration & Development. Making the state work*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Tvedt, Terje. 1995. *Non-governmental Organizations as Channel in Development Assistance. The Norwegian System*. Oslo: Royal Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- Tvedt, Terje. 1998A. NGOs' Role at 'The End of History': Norwegian Policy and the New Paradigm. In *NGOs Under Challenge: Dynamics and Drawbacks in Development*, edited by Farhad Hossain and Susanna Myllylä. 60-83. Helsinki: Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland.
- Tvedt, Terje. 1998B. *Angels of Mercy or Development Diplomats? NGOs and Foreign Aid*. Oxford: James Currey Ltd. and Trenton: Africa World Press, Inc.
- USAID. 2006a. U.S. Agency for International Development. Available at <http://www.usaid.gov/> Accessed on March 10, 2006.
- USAID. 2006b. Democracy and Governance, U.S. Agency for International Development. Available at [http://www.usaid.gov/our\\_work/democracy\\_and\\_governance/](http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/democracy_and_governance/) Accessed on March 10, 2006.
- Vartola, Juha et al. Eds., 2000. *Development NGOs Facing the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Perspectives from South Asia*. Kathmandu: Institute for Human Development
- Werlin, Herbert H. 2003. Poor Nations, Rich Nations: A Theory of Governance. *Public Administration Review*, 63(3): 329-342
- World Bank. 2000. *Global Economic Prospects and the Developing Countries 2000*. Washington DC: The World Bank.