Preface

INTRODUCTION

An Overview of Globalisation and Development Administration

Development is a contested and politicized concept that challenges the situation of developing nations within the scope of the global world order. For example, much of the post-war development aligned with economic growth, increasing Gross Domestic Product (GDP), accumulation of wealth, and exploitation of the resources or human communities. In the context of a global order and concerns about the wave of communism, emphasis was placed on connecting development with modernisation. This was barely unexpected given that post-war global institutions such as the United Nations (UN), the World Bank (WB) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) were vastly controlled by the main industrial powers who regarded economic growth and modernisation as fundamental to the realization of development and the prevention of further communist interference. As a result, there was a little concern for human or social development in terms of social justice.

Nevertheless, by the 1960s the political stability of the United Nations changed as a result of decolonization and the establishment of newly independent nation-states with far-reaching programs committed to education, health care, land reform, gender equality and social welfare. This movement in developing countries led to the manifestation of a more significant conception of development which was based on the redistribution of wealth and the realization of social equality. However, the movement did not involve the renunciation of the commitment to economic growth. Undeniably, ensuing discourses from the 1970s to the new millennium about the meaning of development continued to revolve around the relationship between economic growth, social development and the role of the nation-states in development (Chenery et al., 1974; Turner & Hulme, 1997; Fine, 1999; Leftwich, 2000). More importantly, Seers (1969) redefined the meaning of development to include the reduction of poverty and inequality and the expansion of employment through his work for the International Labour Office (ILO) and its World Development
Programme. This led to the understanding that development is all about meeting ‘basic needs’—food, clothing, housing, basic services (e.g. education, water, healthcare and transport), participation in decision-making, human rights and productive employment (ILO, 1976). Therefore, there was a need for development cooperation that is people-oriented and community-driven, sustainable, equitable and culturally sensitive (Grindle, 2004; World Bank, 2005).

Modern definitions of development consider the pivotal role of public administration in realizing the goals of national development. Generally, public administration refers to the way of administering cooperative human effort in a political setting in order to achieve predetermined national development goals. Therefore, public administration is political in nature because it can occur in a wide variety of institutional frameworks and is concerned with the making, analysis, implementation and termination of public policies and reforms. While development administration also refers to the way of administering cooperative human effort in a political setting in order to achieve national development goals, it tends to differ in the sense that development goals are often characterized and implemented by international actors (outsiders) such as International Non-Governmental Organisations (INGOs), the Washington Nexus and other international donors.

The peculiarity of this difference is the process of globalization, through which worldwide integration occurs. This suggests at least two different rational responses. On one hand, there are those who argue that the growth of global institutions (because of their state-indifferent nature) and the spread of global capitalism have rendered the state irrelevant (Ohame, 1995). Other scholars argue that global capitalism has resulted in the establishment of international agencies that are supplementing, if not supplanting, the fundamental roles of the nation-states (Cox, 1993; Tomlinson, 1999). Still, some scholars believe that this trend has eroded the sense of community, cultural dimension and power structure (Mele, 1996; Knox, 1997). There was also a warning that the merging of the international agencies has increased the dependency of developing nations, increased their fiscal crises and even generated a serious problem of governability in the developing world (Kregel, 2004).

On the other hand, some scholars in public administration and public policy have predicted that international corporations will create a world order beyond nation-states (Reich, 1991), that is, a ‘global village’ (Garcia-Zamor & Khator, 1994), a ‘world government’ with ‘global management’ (Wilson, 1994). However, other scholars have loudly refuted the universal idea of the end of the state and have argued for the persistence of the nation-states with all the related implications for development administration. For example, Hirst and Thompson (1996), Zysman (1996) and Boyer and Drache (1996) have argued that globalization has been overstressed and that nation-states remain strong in the fundamental functions of governance as against the liberal democratic model, western bias and colonial legacy. Similarly, sociolo-
gist and political scientist like Mann (1993) and Skocpol (1985), who ‘brought the state back in’ to their fields during the 1980s, considered the disappearance of the state from history as a questionable idea.

In spite of this, the latter group of public administrators and public-policy analysts recognizes that globalization has changed the nature of the development administration. The globalized economic structure, with its several superstructural changes and supraregional power structures, has led to profound implications for development administration (Dwivedi & Nef, 1982; Farazmand, 1999; Jabbra & Dwivedi, Khator & Nef, 2007). In addition, there were also debates about the transitional nature of the state from the welfare state to the competition states, as governments attempt to respond to, shape and control growing political and economic interpenetration (Cerny, 1989) to ‘the hollow state’ (Milward & Provan, 2000) or ‘the corporate state (Farazmand, 2000).

This collection of chapters treats the concept of globalization as an idea produced by historical and dialectical developments of late capitalism, as well as the products of the dynamic nature of the capitalist political economy in its latest development which have shifted from national to global capitalism. Global changes are dialectical features of the development of social and economic systems. The changes of the last few decades, which started after World War II and have accelerated since the 1970s, have altered capitalist economic systems and their respective configurations, as well as the organizational structures of development administration and governance. In this way, the book illustrates that the core of the state and development administration persists in the broader sense but major changes have occurred as a result of globalization which has altered the character of the nation-states and development administration from the traditional welfare administrative state to a market-oriented administrative state. Consequently, this has made the developing countries to witness significant changes in the structures, systems and culture of administration over the past two decades.

The trends shown in Table 1, many of which are globalised in character, can be divided into four major categories of administrative reform: collaborative networked governance, market-oriented reform, participatory reform and deregulatory reform.

First, collaborative governance can be described as an increasing way through which public services and public goods are jointly delivered by the state and non-state actors. A few examples are:

- Participatory rural appraisal supported by NGOs;
- Community Development Councils supported by NGOs;
- Public Private Partnerships (PPPs)—formal relationships between government agencies, corporations and sometimes voluntary organisations to manage a specific initiative or to deliver a policy on health care or education.
Second, market-oriented reform basically entails the use of internal markets and separating purchasers from providers within public sector to create quasi-markets. Other market-oriented reforms include:

- Use of performance contracts and pay-for-performance;
- Programme Review (systematic analysis of costs and benefits of individual programs);
- Privatization of state assets and certain services;
- Co-provision (services delivered in partnership);
- Competitive tendering;
- The use of ‘One-stop-shops (coordination of programs through one delivery system to eliminate duplication for regulatory and/or social service programs.

Third, participatory reforms basically deal with expected quality levels for the services rendered by public organizations (for example, Citizen Charters—a statement of the rights of citizens or consumers). But they also comprise decentralization initiatives such as moving responsibility for programs from central government to provincial or local governments; E-Governance initiatives that largely involve web-based information about governmental activity, and so on.

Four, deregulatory reform focuses on personnel and purchasing deregulation. For personnel, there is introduction of open competition in recruitment, performance related pay and elimination of civil service controls, firing, promotion and so on. Purchasing deregulation allows individual organisations to make decisions about procurement rather than using centralized purchasing organizations.

Taken together, the assertion then is that new governance implies a change in the meaning, process, method and condition by which development programs and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structures</th>
<th>State-centred, bureaucratic, hierarchical, centralized</th>
<th>Minimal state, international policy agendas, decentralization of functions, centralization of key power instruments, steering not rowing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>Central ‘hands-on’ control, detailed oversight exercised through multiple tiers, bureaucratic mechanisms for allocating resources</td>
<td>New Public Management, Entrepreneurial Government, market mechanisms for allocating resources, harnessing of public, private and voluntary sectors, key role for networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Cultures</td>
<td>Keynesian demand management, welfarism, pursuit of full employment, interventionary state.</td>
<td>Neo-liberal, managing the network environment and beyond, increasing the productive capacity of the state</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Development administration: From government to new governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional Government</th>
<th>New Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structures</td>
<td>State-centred, bureaucratic, hierarchical, centralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>Central ‘hands-on’ control, detailed oversight exercised through multiple tiers, bureaucratic mechanisms for allocating resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Cultures</td>
<td>Keynesian demand management, welfarism, pursuit of full employment, interventionary state.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
society are managed and controlled. Some of the contributions in this book deal with how we can look at the ways in which development administration is now being studied and practiced across different levels.

**Cultural Change and Development Administration in Modern World**

Globalization deals with complexly related processes in the realm of economy, politics, administration, culture, technology and so forth. This multidimensionality suggests that globalization involves all sorts of contradictions, resistances and countervailing forces (See Tomlinson, 1999; Stiglitz, 2007). In this way, globalization could be understood as an idea that involves ‘dialectic’ of opposed principles and tendencies (the local versus the global; universalism versus particularism). Based on these contestations, globalization is particularly in accounts which foreground cultural issues (Giddens, 1990; Axford, 1995). One cannot disclaim the significance of the economic ideologies in the process of globalization. At least, the effects of global capitalism on each of its periods of the production, circulation and consumption of goods are profoundly weighty with implications for our increasing interconnectedness. Nonetheless, this does not indicate that the economic analysis of global capitalism is the best pathway to grasping globalisation. However if we insist on the complex and multidimensional nature of globalization, what does this imply for culture and development administration?

The total scale and complex nature of the reality of global interconnectedness is something we can only understand by cutting into it in various ways. This implies that if we follow a one-dimensional account of globalization, it is possible for us to lose some of its complexities in any feasible account of it. An awful way would be to begin from the basis that the dimension under consideration is the master discourse. A better way would be to recognize a particular way of depicting the entire globe that is contained within a political, a social, an economic, a political or a cultural discourse, and to attempt to draw out an understanding of globalization within these dimensions. This kind of analysis should make us sensitive to the points at which different dimensions interconnect and interact. Cultural dimension plays a major role in this regard. Since the cultural dimension is so encompassing that it can easily be taken as the crucial level of analysis—isn’t everything in the end ‘cultural’? The answer is no. This is because it can only get us to think of culture as ‘total way of life’. For Geertz (1973), this leads to ‘po-au-feu’ theorising (p.4)—the flinging of anything and everything into the conceptual bubble. That is the complex whole of human existence. Cultural dimension needs to be made more specific but this has proven problematic since culture is a complex and elusive concept (Clifford, 1988; Thompson, 1990; Tomlinson, 1999; Afolayan, 2011).
This book, however, does not deal with the problems of definition. There are some reasonably widely accepted characterisations of ‘the cultural’ which we can build upon to get a logical sense of what suitably aligns with the cultural dimension of globalization. First of all, culture can be understood as the ordering pattern of peoples’ lives in which meanings are constructed through practices of symbolic representation. Broadly speaking, if our discussion is purely economic we are concerned with practices by which people produce, exchange and consume goods. If we are talking about the political we are concerned with the practices through which power is concentrated, distributed, and given in various societies. Then, if we are discussing culture, we mean the ways in which humans make their lives, individually and collectively, meaningful through mutual communication. But we must be cautious here because human beings do not turn from ‘doing economic’ to ‘doing the cultural’ (Tomlinson, 1999). This line of thought is strongly engrained in logical views of culture that revolve around practices and products of art, literature, music and so on. All these ideas are essential routes in which certain meanings are produced but they cannot wholly define the cultural dimension. Instead, we need to decipher the complexly entangled practices of the cultural, the economic and the political, that is making life meaningful.

Furthermore, many of the symbolic representations found in the way we use novels or films, while having ultimately an instrumental (economic) end, are cultural. This is because they provide narratives of how life may be lived; appeal to self image; offer references to shared ideas of identity; offer pictures of ideal human relations; provide versions of human fulfilment, happiness and so on. My intention is not to accentuate the problem of existence as developed either in the ontological anxieties of existentialist philosophy, or in the range of formal religious responses to the human condition. But what is important here may be for the way many people interpret their lives—in spite of the importance of globalization for religious institutions (Beyer, 1994). Williams’ dictum that ‘culture is ordinary’ (Williams, 1989) is relevant here. He used this dictum in opposition to the elitist sense of culture as a puzzling special form of life available only to the few through the way particular sensibilities are cultivated. Simply put, the dictum describes a whole way of life. It is inclusive of all manner of everyday practices. But for Williams, these sensibilities co-existed with a sense of culture as providing personal meanings. Of course, I am concerned about our general and common purposes, including deep personal meanings, which culture brings to the fore. As Williams notes, “culture is ordinary, in every society and in every mind” (1989, p.4).

For the purpose of this book, culture is viewed as all the social practices that directly contribute to peoples’ ongoing life-narratives: the stories through which we, persistently, interpret our existence in what Heidegger calls ‘thrownness’ of the human situation (for further details on Heidegger’s concept of thownness, see
Käufer, 2001). When we connect all these together, what we are concerned with is how the context of meaning construction is altered by globalization: in particular, how globalization affects peoples’ sense of identity, the experience of place and of the self in relation to place; how it impacts the shared understandings, values, desires, myths, hopes and fears that have developed around locally situated life. The cultural change therefore spans through what Giddens has called “out-thereness” and the “in-hereness” of globalization: that is, the connection between vast systemic transformations, and transformations in our most local and intimate worlds of everyday experience (Giddens, 1994b, p.95).

The foregoing tells us more about the reciprocal relationship between globalization and culture. This is not to claim that the politics, economics and technology of globalization yield to a cultural account which takes conceptual precedence. However it is to maintain that the vast transformative processes of our age that globalization describes cannot be appropriately grasped until they are understood through the conceptual vocabulary of culture. Added to this is the fact that these transformations change the very fabric of cultural experience and affect our sense of what culture actually is in the contemporary world—that is what I mean by ‘cultural change’. Certainly, this collection of essays does not aim at an exhaustive analysis of globalization and culture but it modestly tries to explore how development administration is enthralled with globalization and cultural change.

On the other hand, much has been written in the last three decades on development administration (Dwivedi, Khator & Nef, 2007; Olowu, 2002; Adamolekun, 2002; Turner & Hulme, 1997; Dwivedi & Nef, 1982; Esman, 1988). Although beneficial, a few of these works has taken a self-consciously cultural approach to questions of global dynamics and cultural change in development administration. This collection of essays seeks to place this discourse in its cultural context. The most important aspect of the context is the culture at large within which development administration is practiced and researched. In the modern age, cultural change may be characterised as one of modernity (Afolayan, 2015; Turner, 1990). Modernity tells more about the results of long process of modernization that reach back to sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. But as the defining feature of our own culture in developing world, modernity perhaps coalesced only with the past centuries. It describes an economic, a political and technological world increasingly characterised by “.....secularization, the universal claims of instrumental rationality, the differentiation of the various spheres of the life-world, the bureaucratization of economic, political and military practices and the growing monetarization of values” (Turner, 1990, p.6).

Cultural change in the modern world has its own technical rationality. Technical rationality, in this sense, is seen as a way of thinking, believing and living a life that emphasizes the scientific-analytical mindset and progress. In Africa, the cornerstone of technical rationality was laid down by the colonialists to attain capital at the centre
towards the end of nineteenth century and twentieth century (Bayart & Elis, 2000; Amin, 1972). Technical rationality in Africa involves elements peculiar to Western industrialisation and colonialism for which substitutes are not easily found. The culmination of the colonial trade and ruling system unleashed a flood of ideas and practices into Africa’s economic, social and political world. In particular, it comprised the technological progress of the period of industrialisation and colonialism with their technological developments.

In this collection of essays, we aim to increase our understanding and to explore, and explain, how global dynamics and cultural change have shaped the practice of development administration over the past decades. Given the cultural context of each society in the modern world and the prospects for development administration, ways in which cultural dimension can offer renewed perspectives on the field of development administration are suggested.

**SYNOPSIS OF THE BOOK**

It is not an easy task to put together the contributions on a broad area of intense activity like development administration. The first major dilemma that a prospective contributor will have to surmount is that of choice. In view of the serious crisis of incompatibility hovering around the field of development administration, each contributor will have to answer this challenging question: What areas should I address, and which ones should I discard?

The countless efforts that have been previously made to publish learned articles, basic texts, edited volumes and monographs in the field have yielded different results and incompatible perspectives. Depending on the bias of each contributor, it is very certain that the scope of study in development administration has been broadened considerably in recent times but it still combines analysis of old and new forms bureaucratization that manifests itself in greater complexity. In other circumstances, development administration is equated with different areas such as politics, governance, public and private sector, public policy, NGOs, civil society, civil service, international development agencies, social justice, human rights, intervention programs, organisational behaviour, human resource management, public reforms, public finance, administrative laws, local government and rural development, gender equality, among others. Recent changes in the field of study have made it possible for students to specialize in some emerging areas so as to be able to enhance their own marketability. All these confirm the multidisciplinary and complex nature of development administration.

The approach adopted in this collection of essays is more general as it covers some countries in Africa, Asia and a few European countries. This collection of
essays presupposes that the cultural context in which development is practiced or projects implemented is very important. This book does not cover all the areas in the field but it is our belief that further research will trace the relationship between cultural and global processes in contemporary development administration. This statement is particularly relevant from the viewpoint of development administration in developing nations.

In addition, this edited volume does not pretend to be the leading authority on a specific arm of development administration. In fact, the purpose of this volume would have been defeated by such a restricted effort. Rather, the intention in treating the field of development administration in a global and cultural manner is to identify crucial themes and key concepts which would form the basis of fresh dialogue among international development partners, donors, policy-makers, public policy analysts, practising administrators, researchers, government, NGOs and students of development and public administration.

Chapter 1, an introductory chapter, provides conceptual ideas and constructs upon which the edited volume is based. It also describes the aims of the edited volume and provides some concluding remarks. Chapter 2 provides a discussion on two major diversity issues in India and then highlights some important diversity management principles that can be beneficial to Indian organizations in the long-run. Chapter 3 provides analyses on how the incorporation of best practices can facilitate cybersecurity in a globalized business environment. It further analyses the implementation of ISO27000 family of standards and how it can enhance cyberprotection and provoke cultural change with the organisation.

Chapter 4 argues for re-centering of culture as an important element of administration of development in Africa, and it therefore advocates for culture in development practice. Chapter 5 looks at how cultural and educational parameters shape entrepreneurship. Chapter 6 investigates the relevance of indigenous knowledge (IKS) for African development. Chapter 7 identifies the perception that gainfully employed Higher Education Institution (HEI) alumni have towards values. Chapter 8 examines the role of government and volunteerism and offers a comparative analysis between the Communist Subbotnik and the practices of charitable organizations in the United States. Chapter 9 investigates the nexus between migration, crime and development. It provides descriptions from empirical data on the rationale behind peoples’ migration, as well as the predictive effect of migration and crime on development in Lagos Metropolis.

Gbenga Emmanuel Afolayan
Murdoch University, Australia
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ENDNOTES

1 Adapted from the table showing ‘New Governance’. http://www.onlinelibrary.org/pluginfile.php/35691/mod_resource/content/0/2DevelopmentAdministrationTheNewGovernanceApproach/8DevelopmentAdministrationFromGovernmenttoNewGovernance.htm

2 Amoah’s article (2012) qualifies as an exception but it is rather narrowly focused on the new public administration rather than development administration per se.