

Development administration : Toward an approach model

by Metin HEPER

Associate Professor at the Department of Social Sciences,
Bogaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey,

and Ümit BERKMAN

Department of Political Science and Public Administration,
Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

★

During recent years it has become increasingly difficult to subscribe to the assumption that there are universally valid Public Administration principles (1), and that in order to improve public administration in a developing country all that one has to do is to graft the procedures derived from those principles onto the existing administrative structures. Even the technical aid experts such as those in the United Nations, for whom an ideal *institutional* model of public administration would be very handy, now occasionally admit that there is no one best way to organize the public services, because each public administrative system has its uniqueness due to different environmental characteristics (2).

It is not our purpose here to negate completely the utility of general principles of Public Administration as used by the technical assistance experts. Such general principles, however, have limited utility. Under many circumstances an insistence on those principles turns out to be dysfunctional for both « development of administration » and « administration of development ». It is patent, however, that an evaluation of the relevance and realism of the conceptual theory and methodology of Development Administration in a country requires that one should operate

(1) Capital letters are used when reference is made to the discipline itself, and small letters when reference is to the practice.

(2) United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, *Public Administration in the Second United Nations Development Decade*, New York, 1971, p. 47, and *Idem*, *Development Administration: Current Approaches and Trends in Public Administration for National Development*, New York, 1975, p. 23.

with some sort of a (probably ideal) model. The model suggested here is not an *institutional* one. Instead an *approach* model is proposed. The approach model would spell out the basic contours of the « paradigmatic theory » (3) that should be adopted.

In order to assess the relevance and realism of the conceptual theory and methodology of Development Administration vis-à-vis a specific country, one should explore the extent to which an effort is made to adapt the foreign models to the local situation, and to what extent an indigenous and creative scholarship of Development Administration had developed ; in short, one should determine whether an appropriate conceptual theory has been adopted. In doing this one should ask : what are the lessons one can derive from the traditional Public Administration and from « Comparative Public Administration for Development » that would be useful in delineating an appropriate conceptual theory for Development Administration in developing countries ?

Legacy of traditional public administration.

Basic values behind the teachings of traditional Public Administration were efficiency, rationality, responsibility and, sometimes, effectiveness (4). Its units of analysis consisted of work group, the agency, or the whole government (5). Emphasis was on tool orientation. The goal of public administration was conceived as obtaining instrumental efficiency in implementing policies made elsewhere through a set of techniques. The techniques in question were taken to be universally applicable to the pursuit of economy and efficiency in government (6).

Emphasis was also placed on organization and structure. Max Weber's bureaucratic model (corresponding to the legal-rational authority type), an utopian summation of one line of industrial evolution, was converted

(3) We use this concept as in T. KHUN, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago : Chicago University Press, 1962.

(4) William J. SIFFIN, « Two Decades of Public Administration in Developing Countries », *Public Administration Review* (January-February 1976), p. 63. As examples, see, *inter alia*, Luther Gulick and L. Urwick (eds.), *Papers on the Science of Administration*, New York : Kelley Publishers, 1937, and Leonhard WHITE, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, New York : Harper and Bros., 1926.

(5) H. George FREDERICKSON, « The Lineage of New Public Administration », *Administration and Society* (August 1976), p. 158.

(6) Milton J. ESMAN, « Administrative Doctrines and Developmental Needs » in E. Phillip Morgan (ed.), *The Administration of Change in Africa : Essays in the Theory and Practice of Development Administration in Africa*, New York : Dunellen, 1974, pp. 5-7 ; SIFFIN, « Two Decades of Public Administration in Developing Countries », p. 62.

into a prescription. Although Weber did not consider the ideal type as a theoretical model, that is as a set of interconnected hypotheses which can be validated or refuted by empirical research (7), it is beyond doubt that, while he was building this ideal type of bureaucracy, he was particularly impressed by the structure of the public bureaucracies of societies at their maturing, industrializing stages (8). Thus, the basic bureaucratic norm was that of « formal » rather than « substantive rationality » implying subordination of the public bureaucracy to the political executive. The legal-rational, Weberian model fitted the vision of administration as a tool. Tool-oriented public administration could be viewed as non-political.

The contextual orientation of Public Administration was in line with such conceptualization. Economically, the role of public administration was viewed as limited. Societally, the public agencies were not conceived to be the chief source of middle-class status and employment. Politically, legislative oversight, political leadership, and popular involvement in limited and orderly competitions for a share in the control of government, as well as an assumption of policy-administration dichotomy, were taken for granted. Intellectually, little relation was assumed to exist with Political Science, and even less with Political Theory. Education for administration consisted of indoctrination in the values of efficiency, rationality, responsibility, and neutrality along with training in tools and techniques (9). The vision of an explicitly elitist administrative class was rejected. The units of analysis already noted did not allow for studying the interactions between the administrative system and its political, economic, social and cultural environment. The emerging « optimistic idealism theme » in Public Administration led to a frantic lending and borrowing of Western, particularly American, public administration practices and blue-prints (10).

(7) Nicos P. MOUZELIS, *Organization and Bureaucracy: An Analysis of Modern Theories*, Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1967. See also Alfred DIAMANT, « The Bureaucratic Model: Max Weber Rejected, Rediscovered and Reformed », in F. Heady and S.L. Stokes (eds.), *Papers in Comparative Public Administration*, Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute of Public Administration, 1962, pp. 69-96.

(8) A. GIDDENS, *Politics and Sociology in the Thought of Max Weber*, London: Macmillan, 1972, pp. 35 ff.

(9) SIFFIN, *Two Decades of Public Administration in Developing Countries*, p. 63.

(10) Abdo BAAKLINI, « Comparative Public Administration: The Persistence of an Ideology », *Journal of Comparative Administration* (May 1973), p. 121; A.R. HOYLE, « Some Deficiencies in the Training of Senior Administrators in Developing Countries », *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 15 (1974), p. 331; Shou-Sheng HSUEH, « Technical Cooperation in Developmental Administration in South and South East Asia », in Edward Weidner (ed.), *Development Administration in Asia*, Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1977, pp. 339-365; and Delwin A. ROY, « Development Administration in the Arab Middle East », *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 41 (1975), p. 135.

Should the « optimistic idealism theme » be discarded altogether ? Does not traditional Public Administration have any utility at all for Development Administration ? Some designers of the administrative blueprints for development opt for administrative structures unlike that of the Weberian legal-rational bureaucracy. They aim to create administrative systems capable of administering change. Emphasis is placed on the ability to assume new tasks, cope with complexity, subsume conflict, solve novel problems, mobilize resources, learn from experience and uncertainty, and manage crisis and turbulence (11).

Such substitute models are based upon close scrutiny of the legal-rational bureaucracy vis-à-vis the developmental efforts (12). In this context some students of Public Administration find certain specific features of the legal-rational bureaucracy dysfunctional. For instance, the practice of sending matters for decision up the hierarchy through a large number of intervening levels is one such characteristic that was often deplored. Others find some aspects of personal relations resulting from bureaucracy unsatisfactory. For example, they disapprove of the ways in which status differences encourage paternalism, reduce accessibility levels, and encourage resistance to innovation. Still others assert that legal-rational bureaucracy as a whole is not suitable for developing countries, and that it should be rejected as a model or guide. In this vein, it was pointed out that the tasks to be performed are not often sufficiently well defined and routine, and that in the legal rational bureaucratic model emphasis is on controls and stability, and not on programmatic achievement as it should be, and that legal-rational bureaucracy tends to over compartmentalize and simplify operations and decisions.

Some students of Public Administration, however, remind their colleagues that the need to be responsive, adaptive, and changeable does not lessen the need to be well-organized, predictable, and stable (13). Separate and supplemental administrative systems for handling development functions will fail if « maintenance administration », a fundamental predecessor, is deficient. These reminders are in line with the view that

(11) Gerald E. CAIDEN, « Development, Administrative Capacity and Administrative Reform », *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 39 (1973), p. 327 ; G.E. MILLS, « The Environment of Commonwealth Caribbean Bureaucracies », *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 39 (1973), p. 16 ; and David S. BROWN, « Modifying Bureaucratic Systems in the Developing World », *Asian Forum* (January-March 1974), p. 8.

(12) For the following discussion, we draw heavily upon R.S. MILNE, « Bureaucracy and Development Administration », *Public Administration* (London), (Winter, 1973), pp. 411-426.

(13) H. George FREDERICKSON, « Public Administration in the 1970 s : Developments and Directions », *Public Administration Review* (September-October 1976), p. 566. See also ESMAN, « Administrative Doctrines and Development Needs », p. 3.

administration is both a plural and complex phenomenon. Different parts of the bureaucracy are different. Thus, hollistic prescriptions for administrative problems are likely to be deceptive and useless (14).

A different line of approach is adopted in a perceptive essay by Milne (15). Milne subsumes the criticisms directed at the legal-rational bureaucratic model under two headings: 1° that the activities and duties in an organization arranged in a fixed way on the principle of a hierarchy of superior and subordinate levels is inappropriate, and 2° that emphasis on general rules is dysfunctional. He then goes on to argue that there *is* a need for hierarchy and for rules vis-à-vis both routine and developmental functions. His argument runs as follows. Bureaucracy in developing countries is almost anarchic in the sense that it is difficult to prevent officials from pursuing their own interests. One way of trying to secure greater control of officials who are inclined to follow their personal ends is to attempt to increase coordination by stressing hierarchy. Also, in developing countries, while an ethos of professional administration emerges it is usually less than fully developed, and thus there may be a case for building elitist, hierarchical values for encouraging « pride of service ». Milne further points out that some of the arguments against hierarchy in the developed countries hardly apply in the developing countries. Although the proportion of highly educated and skilled employees in organizations may be increasing in the developing countries, there is nothing like the concentration of them that there is organizations in the developed countries. Nor is there an increase in the tendency for them to value personal development more and material rewards less; on the contrary, Western influences urge them to become increasingly motivated to seek material rewards.

Concerning the emphasis on rules, Milne counters the objection to bureaucracy by pointing out that one may better satisfy the clients in developing countries through bureaucratic arrangements. The objection to bureaucracy in question runs as follows: A client is unaccustomed to the notion of forming a 'queue' in order to have rules applied to him which do not take into account what he perceives as being the unique feature of his own situation, but rather reflect the official's desire to bring a case within the scope of a rule by ignoring the total human situation. An increasing number of the students of Public Administration see bureaucracy as the tool of the middle classes to oppress the poor. They argue that the impersonal rationale that is congenial to middle class

(14) ESMAN, *Administrative Doctrines and Developmental Needs*.

(15) *Bureaucracy and Development Administration*, pp. 411-425.

clients gives the latter an advantage in dealing with the governmental agencies. From this perspective legality is seen as institutionalization of economic injustice and bureaucratic repression (16).

According to Milne, on the other hand, the case is not that simple ; in fact a dilemma exists. There is a contradiction between measures for making regulations more simple and more expeditious on one hand, and measures for making them more personal, and tailored to the particular human situation on the other. Potentially, bureaucracy is well designed to deal with a large number of cases, providing a large degree of certainty, although not absolute equity in its solutions. Any system which deals with individual cases so as to take full account of the individual human situation, however, will almost inevitably be slower and more complicated. By losing impersonality, it will also run the risk of encouraging spoils and corruption. Viewed from this perspective, politicians' intervention for their individual « clients » is not helpful in securing a more « just » or « human » application of the law. While individuals may receive a more favorable treatment through a bending of the rules as a result of appealing to a politician, there is no evidence that on balance such intervention is beneficial in improving efficiency or in even relieving distress. Those who are helped may not necessarily be the most deserving ones.

While Milne makes a strong case against those who see a rigid contradiction between legal-rational bureaucracy and development, some of his premises would not be tenable in certain contexts. Kasfir, for example, maintains that in the African context the assumption that lack of political control will mean pursuit of private interests is not a necessary truth, but a testable hypothesis. Indeed, he thinks it is equally likely that the bureaucrats *may* be the guardians of the interests of the State (17).

(16) Orion F. WHITE, Jr, « The Dialectical Organization : An Alternative to Bureaucracy », *Public Administration Review* (January-February 1969), p. 34 ; and Jorge I. TAPIA-VIDELA, « Understanding Organizations and Environments : A Comparative Perspective », *Public Administration Review* (November-December 1976), pp. 632 ff. ; Brian LOVEMAN, « The Comparative Administration Group, Development Administration and Anti-Development », *Public Administration Review* (November-December 1976), p. 620 ; Gideon SJOBERG, Richard A. BRYMER, and Buford FARRIS, « Bureaucracy and the Lower Class », *Sociology and Social Research*, 50, (1966), pp. 325-337 ; Gideon SJOBERG, « Ideology and Social Organization in Rapidly Developing Countries », in Fred W. Riggs (ed.), *Frontiers of Development Administration*, Durham, N.C. : Duke University Press, 1971, pp. 400-401 ; and Dennis A. GOULET, « Development Administration and Structures of Vulnerability », in Morgan (ed.), *The Administration of Change in Africa : Essays in the Theory and Practice of Development Administration in Africa*, pp. 27-53.

(17) Nelson KASFIR, « Prismatic Theory and African Administration », *World Politics*, 21 (January 1969), p. 312 ; Idem, « Development Administration in Africa : The Balance between Politics and Administration », in Norman N. Miller (ed.), *Rural Research in Africa*, East Lansing, Michigan : The African Studies Center, 1969, p. 95 ; and Idem, « Theories of Administrative Behavior in Africa », *African Review* (January 1972).

As such, at least for some of them, opportunism may not be the sole value to be pursued. Heper found that the new political elite who came to power after the « ruralizing elections » did not succeed in quickly and immediately rendering the Turkish public bureaucracy into an institution with « formal rationality » (18). And, studying fifty-seven countries at different stages of modernization, Sigelman found that bureaucratic development does not necessarily lead to under-participation in governmental and political functions, and questioned the view that bureaucratic development in modernizing contexts leads to an imbalanced political development (19). Besides, in many contexts, emphasis on rules will not prevent their nonapplication or slow application. The practices of so-called « speed payments », « distortive payments », and « extorsions » are rife also in those countries where undue emphasis is placed on rules and regulations (20).

The basic legacy of the traditional Public Administration then is that there are unlikely to be any easily identifiable structural remedies for administrative defects in developing countries. Similar relationships do not have similar consequences in different contexts. Sole emphasis upon intra-organizational variables without an awareness of the larger context within which the administrative structures operate leads to generalizations which would not be valid in other contexts. Most important of all, borrowed « maxims » are not necessary truths but testable hypotheses, or what is the same thing, *empirical* problems.

Gradually increasing awareness of these points led to the analyses of administrative structures in their societal contexts. Thus, Comparative Public Administration seeks to explain in what way the different societal contexts impinge upon the administrative structures. Some students of public administrations reverted to attempts at explaining what *is* rather than what *ought* to be. While such orientations were emerging, attempts at improving administration in the developing countries have not, of course, come to a standstill. Developments in Comparative Public Administration,

(18) Metin HEPER, « Political Development as Reflected in Bureaucratic Change : The Turkish Bureaucracy and a 'Historical Bureaucratic Empire' Tradition », *International Journal of Middle East Studies* (October 1976); *Idem* « The Recalcitrance of the Turkish Public Bureaucracy to 'Bourgeois Politics' : A Multi-Factor Political Stratification Analysis », *The Middle East Journal* (Autumn 1976); and *Idem*, « Negative Bureaucratic Politics in a Modernizing Context : The Turkish Case », *Journal of South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies* (September 1977).

(19) Lee SIGELMAN, « Do Modern Bureaucracies dominate Underdeveloped Politics : A Test of Imbalance Thesis », *American Political Science Review* (June 1972).

(20) For a summary of literature on such practices, see Ümit BERKMAN, « Corruption in Administration in the Developing Countries », *METU Studies in Development* (Ankara), n° 10 (Winter 1976), pp. 1-18.

however, soon imposed a new sophistication upon such efforts, despite the fact that that discipline even to this day has never progressed beyond « getting ready to get ready » (21). The result was a marriage between Development Administration — the new name in itself implying a dissatisfaction with the traditional Public Administration — and Comparative Public Administration.

We now turn to these developments since a review of them would furnish us with additional clues concerning appropriate orientations and themes of the paradigmatic theory of Development Administration.

Comparative public administration for development.

The earliest criticisms concerning the universal validity of the precepts of traditional Public Administration came from Robert A. Dahl and Dwight Waldo : « No science of Public Administration is possible unless : 1° the place of normative values is made clear ; 2° the nature of man in the area of public administration is better understood, and his conduct is more predictable, and 3° there is a body of comparative studies from which it may be possible to discover principles and generalities that transcend national boundaries and peculiar historical experiences » (22). « Despite occasional claims that Public Administration is a science with principles of universal validity, American Public Administration has evolved political theories unmistakably related to unique, economic, social, governmental, and ideological facts... (Things) are efficient or inefficient for given purposes, and efficiency for one purpose may mean inefficiency for another » (23).

Dahl's and Waldo's views induced efforts to make Public Administration more *scientific*. Consequently, empirical, nomothetic and ecological studies were substituted for normative, idiographic, and non-ecological ones (24). Thus, the emergence of the so-called « Optimistic Realism Theme » (25). It was assumed that theoretical statements involving the systemic variables

(21) Lee SIGELMAN, « In Search of Comparative Administration », *Public Administration Review* (November-December 1976), p. 622.

(22) Robert A. DAHL, « The Science of Administration : Three Problems », *Public Administration Review*, 7 (1947), p. 11.

(23) Dwight WALDO, *The Administrative State : A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration*. New York : Ronald Press, 1948, pp. 3, 202.

(24) Fred. W. RIGGS, « Trends in the Comparative Study of Public Administration », *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 28 (1962), pp. 9-15.

(25) BAAKLINI, *Comparative Public Administration : The Persistence of an Ideology*, p. 121.

and the interrelations among them would lead to more intelligent prescriptions to inform the choices of the political decision-makers (26).

Comparative Public Administration studies public administration as a dependent variable. As such, there has been an effort to gauge the influence of political socio-economic, cultural, and historical factors upon public administration structures. While the study of public administration as a dependent variable developed useful insights, it never developed into a comprehensive theory. First and foremost, the field suffered from a conceptual confusion. A melange of idiosyncratic, theoretical formulations and organizing perspectives emerged. The theoretical constructs multiplied, unconnected to each other. Not surprisingly, the field produced little in the way cumulative research literature. As the field has not reaped the benefits which accrue from the interaction of theory and data, the underdevelopment of Comparative Public Administration has taken on aspects of a vicious circle (27).

The normative underpinnings of the Comparative Public Administration Theory, too, increasingly came under attack. In this context it was noted that attempts at exportation of political values, if successful, would lead to implanting of irrelevant value systems (28). Still more critically, it was asserted that the way development was conceived in fact led to much human suffering in the developing countries. The proponents of this view pointed out that to the Comparative Public Administrationists, development meant expansion of a government's capabilities to reshape its physical, human and cultural environment. « Administration of Development » and « Development of Administration » came more and more to mean expanded state control and manipulation of human beings (29).

Given the emerging normative concern, the following questions raised by Waldo are significant :

1. « Is the expert in Comparative Public Administration to regard himself as governed solely by technical-professional norms ? What are these norms, and to what extent are they defined by the particular

(26) Peter SAVAGE, « Optimism and Pessimism in Comparative Public Administration, *Public Administration Review* (July-August 1976).

(27) Keith HENDERSON, « Comparative Public Administration : The Identity Crisis », *Journal of Comparative Administration* (May 1969).

(28) A.R. HOYLE, « Some Deficiencies in the Training of Senior Administrators for Developing Countries », *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 40 (1974), pp. 331-333.

(29) LOVEMAN, « The Comparative Administration Group, Development Administration and Antidevelopment », pp. 617-619. See also Fred W. RIGGS, « Administration and a Changing World Environment », *Public Administration Review*, 28 (July-August 1968), pp. 348-361.

culture of the expert ? How much can and should these be altered when studying another culture ? »

2. « Ought the expert to care, or to what extent and how should he care, about the political nature of the government he is studying ? Should he ignore such considerations as the ideology of the regime (and therefore face charges of political blindness or immorally aiding « dictatorship ») ? Or should he commit himself to a policy of research only when it « forwards democracy » (in which case he is open to the charge of playing politics with human misery, national selfishness and cultural imperialism) ? »

3. « Should the expert try to influence administrative and political development in the 'right direction' as part of his research ? If so, who determines the 'right direction' ? » ((30))

It follows that the theme of responsiveness is a significant aspect of present-day Comparative Public Administration. One cannot make the assumption that the elites of a developing country do not really have a wide variety of choices, and that they will eventually make those decisions functional to a developmental process which, at this time, we know is desirable. A recent argument by Bendor is relevant here. Bendor shows that for a long time we have been working with a set of ideas that one might call « development cluster ». We assumed that development was an unidirectional, cumulative, irreversible process, evinced in sequential stages. The later stages were more complex, or structurally and functionally differentiated, than the earlier ones. The multilinear development version of this model, which admitted that there were many paths to development, was not a theoretical replacement of the unilinear model, but only a restatement of the empirical difficulties which the older model encountered. Bendor proposes that the development model should be replaced by an « evolutionary » model which contains a strong random component that is not present in the development theory. Randomness enters in two ways. First, new variants presented for environmental inspection are randomly generated. Second, many changes in the environment of the adapting entities are not predicted by the theory, although such changes are often crucial to the process of natural selection. The evolutionary theory has a lower predictive value than the developmental model. If the development hypothesis is wrong, however, then deriving precise but inaccurate predictions from it does us little good. Furthermore, predictive capacity is not the only criterion of theoretical merit. There is also explanatory

(30) Dwight WALDO, « Reflections on Public Administration and National Development », *International Social Science Journal*, 21 (1969).

power, and what we lose in the former we may gain in the latter if we switch to an evolutionary theory (31).

The evolutionary theory would widen the horizons of Comparative Public Administrationists. It would induce these students toward an awareness of the possibility of a number of things. First, in some countries there may be crucial environmental factors not usually found in others. Second, one may come across certain societal functions in a particular country (and therefore bureaucratic structures) which are rarely encountered in other societies. Some but not all functions may be universal; or at least, some functions may be more important than others. Third, similar groups or social classes may not play the same role in all countries. It is not appropriate to attribute sociologically universal functions to all such groups and classes.

One important implication of the above argument is the methodological strategy that should be adopted. One should particularly avoid the oversimplification of empirical indicators. It is necessary to be aware of their contextual variability. The basic institutions like the bureaucracy, the political party, and the like, cannot be taken as monolithic. The behavior of administrators in one agency may have very different « causes » (individual or contextual) from their behavior in another. There is a need to place greater emphasis on « intensive » rather than « extensive » research. The extensive research in Comparative Public Administration has been guided by theories of environmental influence at the systemic level or by theories focusing on administrators as exchange agents between traditional cultures and modern bureaucracies. One consequence has been the neglecting of the organizational variables. There is, therefore, a need to look at large numbers of variables. There is also a need for case studies focusing on a series of events through time for understanding the particular development of individual institutions (32).

It follows that Comparative Public Administrationists should adopt nomothetic *and* idiographic, and empirical *and* normative approaches. It is imperative that ecological studies should continue, but care should be taken when generalizing from them.

So far in this section an effort has been made to trace the recent developments concerning works aimed at *explaining* the public administrative structures. The studies in question take these structures as dependent

(31) Jonathan BENDOR, « A Theoretical Problem in Comparative Administration », *Public Administration Review* (November-December 1976), pp. 626-631.

(32) J. Fred SPRINGER, « Observation and Theory in Development Administration », *Administration and Society* (May 1977), pp. 21, 37.

variables. As they are development-oriented, they are concerned with « development of administration ».

An equally important concern of Comparative Public Administrationists has been the « administration of development ». It was noted earlier that where development was the overriding concern, dissatisfaction with the « legal-rational » bureaucratic model had led to some blanket formulae for improving administrative structures for development. Among such devices for improvement, decentralization, « uncontrolled communication », *ad hoc-ism*, and so on, were suggested. Then, an important step was taken : « Development administration in government refers to the process of guiding an organization toward the achievement of progressive political, economic, and social objectives that are authoritatively determined in one manner or another » (33). The significance of this reorientation was that now the reorganization efforts would have been informed by the particular goals in mind. As Thompson put it, « there is not one form of public administration but several. The tasks of each — and therefore the training and experience necessary, as well as the models which establish norms (would be) varied » (34). What is needed is perhaps « structural dynamics » approach as proposed by Frederickson : « In structural dynamics (one would operate with) an arsenal of organizational models, with any one model or combination of models ready for use when needed » (35).

In fact, there have been efforts to conceptualize structures which emerge in given environments, and which are appropriate for given tasks. Cohen, for instance, makes a distinction between « paternalistic organization », « classical bureaucratic organization », and « organic-adaptive organization ». The paternalistic organization is characterized by arbitrariness, concentration of authority at the top, strong loyalties to the superordinate, and rewards based on leader-subordinate relations rather than merit or position. According to Cohen, this organizational structure is well-suited to environments where traditional types of social relationships create tasks which are not complex, and do not frequently change. The classical bureaucratic organization is similar to Weber's legal-rational bureaucracy that emphasizes control and predictability. It is a form suited to environments and tasks which are relatively stable and slowly changing,

(33) Edward WEIDNER, « Development Administration : A new Focus for Research », in Ferrel Heady and S.L. Stokes (eds.), *Papers in Comparative Public Administration*, Ann Arbor, Michigan : The University of Michigan Press, 1962, p. 98.

(34) James D. THOMPSON, « Social Interdependence, the Polity and Public Administration », *Administration and Society* (May 1974), p. 20.

(35) FREDERICKSON, *Public Administration in the 1970s : Developments and Directions*, p. 573.

though requiring large organizations. The organic-adaptive organization is distinguished by widely shared influence, a de-emphasis on hierarchy, collaboration between experts working on projects, shifting leadership determined by expertise rather than by position, awareness and acceptance of informal relationships, and greater flexibility and adaptiveness. It is an organizational form best suited to changing environments (36). Cohen's distinctions between organizational forms are similar to that of Ilchman, who makes a distinction between « patrimonial », « legal-rational », and « rational-productive » bureaucraties (37).

Still, concerning the state of our knowledge on the functionality of certain structures for given tasks, a distinction made by Guerreiro-Ramos is quite relevant. This is the distinction between « self-conscious or learned ignorance ». The self-conscious or learned ignorance « is the ignorance, Guerreiro-Ramos notes, that we must not be ashamed to recognize as ours at this point in the history of our field. In contrast, the unguessed ignorance is the ignorance of the man who does not realize the obsolescence of his intellectual schemes and structures in relation to new circumstances. His commitments to an episodic frame of reference makes him insensitive to the uniqueness of unprecedented situations (38).

It follows that the « new Public Administration » needs to be non-prescriptive. This is why Kurt Levin's idea of action-research is becoming increasingly popular. Particularly within the framework of efforts in « administration of development », thinking must descend from the heights of systemic theory to « the open country of *praxis* ». The notion of learned ignorance gives to the contemporary model of action-research its specificity in relation to the Hegelian-Marxian conception of *praxis*, in the sense that today's action-research oriented practitioners no longer support the idea, as the Hegelians and Marxians did, of a unilinear social development (39).

This issue is implicit in Bennis' quest for « theories of changing ». The « theory of changing » aims at discovering independent, *manipulable*

(36) Allen COHEN, « The Human Dimensions of Administrative Reform : Towares More Differentiated Strategies for Change », *Development and Change*, II (1970), pp. 66-70.

(37) Warren F. ILCHMAN, « Productivity, Administrative Reform and Antipolitics : Dilemmas for Developing States », in Ralph Braibanti (ed.), *Political and Administrative Development*, Durham, N.C. : Duke University Press, 1969.

(38) Alberto GUERREIRO-RAMOS, « The New Ignorance and the Future of Public Administration in Latin America », in Clarence E. Thurber and Lawrence S. Graham (eds.), *Development Administration in Latin America*, Durham, N.C. : Duke University Press, 1973, p. 383.

(39) *Ibid.*, p. 385.

variables and the probable implications of manipulation (40). This requires the adoption of a trial and error method.

All this does not mean that the « administration of development » cannot at all be informed by theoretical knowledge. As one of the present authors noted elsewhere (41), the diffusion of models from the developed to the developing countries is not entirely redundant. They would be a source of inspiration, expand vision, and multiply alternatives. The foreign-developed typologies of goals and of organizational environments within which they will be pursued would be initial starting points for analysis.

An approach model for development administration.

The approach model of Development Administration rejects the notion that it is possible to develop a body of knowledge that would be valid for all places and times. Instead, its major premise is the assumption of « learned ignorance ».

This assumption is based upon the view that « evolutionary » rather than « developmental » approaches to social change are more appropriate, that it is not proper to attribute sociologically universal functions to agencies, groups and social classes, and that similar relationships do not have similar consequences in different contexts.

The structures of public administration are ecologically-influenced institutions. In each context, a particular configuration of ecological factors impinges upon these institutions. There is an ongoing interaction both within and between the intra-institutional (individual group, agency) and extra-institutional (political, economic, social, cultural, physical) factors. Interdisciplinarity is indispensable.

Each administrative structure (the whole bureaucracy, individual agencies) is functional for one set of goals, and not for others. Each such structure reflects a particular value system. A national bureaucracy usually evinces a plurality of structures with different characteristics. Sweeping generalizations and blanket prescriptions should be avoided.

It is easier to *explain* a bureaucratic structure than to *predict* its evolution in the future. Prediction is particularly difficult and hazardous if one draws solely upon nomothetic studies. The models developed elsewhere should be viewed as sources of likely questions to be raised, and as testable hypotheses, rather than as uncontested truths. The nomothetic

(40) Warren BENNIS, *Changing Organizations: Essays on the Development and Evolution of Human Organizations*, New York: McGraw Hill Book, Co., 1966, passim.

(41) Metin HEPPER, « Notes on Public Administration 'Training' for the Potential Bureaucratic Elites of the Transitional Societies », *International Social Science Journal*, 27 (1975), p. 165.

studies should be coupled with idiographic studies based upon indigenously developed and/or adapted theoretical constructs.

Efforts to « develop » administrative structures must be based upon indigenous research, action-research and trial and error methods as well as upon the experiences of other countries. A careful review of factors that impinge upon the administrative structures need to be made in order to determine which of those factors can be taken as variables, which can be manipulated, and which ones are constraints and should be taken as such.

The students of Development Administration in each country should develop an indigenous « theory of changing » based upon an indigenous « theory of change ». The shift from « theory of change » to « theory of changing » entails both scientific endeavor and an element of art.

An indigenous and creative scholarship is required. The scholarship in question needs to be sensitive to the value implications of the « scientific » prescriptions and to the close relationship between the particular administrative structures, on the one hand, and the welfare of the citizens on the other. Development Administration teaching should impart « relative knowledge ». The research in this field should place emphasis upon critical study of foreign models, adaptation of those models, and perhaps most important of all, efforts to create indigenous models of public administration structures. The teaching of Development Administration should also aim at developing a sense of creativity, an innovational orientation, and a motivation and commitment for changing. It should emphasize creative scholarship and empirical research based upon relevant conceptual frameworks.

Summary : Development administration : Toward an approach model.

The institutional model as delineated by classical Public Administration has limited utility for public administration in the developing countries. There are unlikely to be any uniform structural remedies for administrative defects in those countries. Similar relationships do not have similar consequences in different contexts. An increased awareness along these lines led to the emergence of Development Administration — an effort to relate structures to goals — and Comparative Public Administration — analysis of administrative structures in their own societal contexts. The basic argument of the present articles is that despite our increased sophistication on these matters the relevance in Development Administration cannot be obtained if one relies only on theoretical knowledge. It is noted that in Development Administration thinking must descend from the heights of systematic theory to the open country of praxis.

