

DEVELOPMENT WITH AN EMPHASIS ON CHANGE*

Patom Manirojana**

The extreme complexity of contemporary social change as indicated by a vast magnitude and a tremendous rapidity has frequently been observed and documented. This pattern of change certainly has a significant implication for an administrative system in highly developed and less developed countries (LDCs) alike. In most affluent societies the rapid and turbulent change is understandable in terms of such factors as industrialization, urbanization and technological advancement. The complexity of change is of course not as much dramatic in most LDCs. However, the threatening problems in those countries are by no mean less critical. The major reasons, among others, are the scarcity of human as well as financial resources, the inadequacy of managerial capability and technical know how, and the lack of experience.

A major purpose here is to explore the role of developing administrative systems in the turbulent environment. Since the practices of public administration have long been viewed to be intertwined with the academic public administration in many significant ways, their close relation is thus firstly reviewed. The following part considers the emergence of development administration as an intellectual response to the demanding reality. Both theoretical and operational considerations of administrative change are finally scrutinized with a concluding note about certain significant problems and prospects of the enterprise.

THE TRANSFORMATION OF IDEAS AND REALITIES IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The maturation process of an administrative system over time and the complexity of its rapidly changing environment affect not only the easily perceptible structural, procedural and technical aspects of administration, but also have an impact on ideas, concepts, or philosophical bases underlying the entire social system. The examination of the development of public administration made from different perspectives are naturally varied and serve quite different purposes. For instance, Herbert Kaufman conceptualizes changing doctrines of public administration in terms of three major values: representativeness, politically neutral competence, and executive leadership.¹ Dwight Waldo, in attempts to explore the scope of the theory of this area, identifies

*This paper is originally prepared for delivery at the Conference on Development Administration at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York, April 18-19, 1974. Reprinted with kind permission from Irving Swerdlow Marcus Ingle (eds.), *Public Administration Training for the Less Developed Countries* (Syracuse: The Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, 1974).

**Patom Manirojana, Lecturer, School of Public Administration, NIDA. The author wishes to thank the Maxwell School for a generous grant in the preparation of this paper.

¹ Herbert Kaufman, "Emerging Conflicts in the Doctrines of Public Administration," *American Political Science Review*, L, 4 (December, 1956).

two theoretical concerns. Regarding value problems, public administration is viewed to be confronted with problems of personal ethics, political power, constitutional status, law, and jurisprudence, public policy, political theory and philosophy. In a larger circle of theoretical concerns, public administration is considered to be associated with another set of problems dealing with external and internal security, justice, education, government by osmosis and symbiosis, science and technology, urbanism, and development.² Also, at a very abstract level, American public administration is seen by Richard Page to have been associated with two major ideologies (liberalism and capitalism) and two modern philosophies (pragmatism and existentialism).³

The following series of propositions are designed to reflect both the ideas and realities in the two worlds of academic and practical public administration beyond the contextual characteristics of any specific culture or setting. However, since the issues and problems included are arbitrarily selected and the emphasis is placed on the common concerns of LDCs, they cannot claim to be universal or comprehensive. Rather, they may provide a general background for further research on development administration and administrative change.

1. Attention must be given to the diversity among administrative systems and the uniqueness of each system as well as their similarities. This can be characterized by the expanding recognition of an ecological approach to public administration.⁴

² See Dwight Waldo, "Scope of the Theory of Public Administration," in James C. Charlesworth (ed.), *Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods* (Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1968), pp. 14-24. These ideas are later on revised and extended in his more recent and perhaps more comprehensive assessment of a set of major concerns of current public administration which includes: centralization and/or decentralization, participation, politics and/or administration, efficiency versus inefficiency, rationality and/or effect, stability and/or change, rising and/or lowering expectation etc. See his "Some Thoughts on Alternatives, Dilemmas, and Paradoxes in a Time of Turbulence," in Dwight Waldo (ed.), *Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence* (Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971), pp. 258-79; see also Herbert A. Simon, "The Changing Theory and Changing Practice of Public Administration," in Ithiel de Sola Pool (ed.), *Contemporary Political Science: Toward Empirical Theory* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), pp. 86-120.

³ Richard S. Page, "The Ideological-Philosophical Setting of American Public Administration," in Waldo (ed.), *ibid.*, pp. 60-67. For earlier ideas about the ideological framework of American Public Administration, see Waldo, *The Administrative States: A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration* (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948), pp. 12-21.

⁴ See John M. Gaus, *Reflections on Public Administration* (University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1947), pp. 8-9; Fred W. Riggs, "Trends in the Comparative Study of Public Administration," *International Review of Administrative Science*, XXVIII, 1 (1962), 9-15; Fred Riggs, *The Ecology of Public Administration* (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1961). The central concerns of Riggs' concepts is very well summarized by Joseph LaPalombara that "... we must know more about the 'ecology' of administration before we can either reach a full understanding of administrative patterns or provide realistic prescriptions about affecting administrative change." See his "Public Administration and Political Change: A Theoretical Overview," in Charles Press and Alan Arian (eds.), *Empathy and Ideology: Aspects of Administrative Innovation* (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1966), p. 93.

2. The increasing recognition of the influence of ecological factors accentuates the decline of the already unpopular politics-administration dichotomy.⁵

3. The ideal of governmental legitimacy, premised solely on the Western democracy, tends to give a distorted picture of many LDCs.⁶

4. The more complex the administrative environment has become, the more government has been required to shift its philosophy from passive and limited role to a more active and comprehensive role.⁷

5. The decline of the politics-administration dichotomy plus an expanding role of a big and active government contribute to an increase in the policy-making role of public bureaucrats, in addition to the previously emphasized policy-implementing role.⁸

6. This has meant that a public bureaucracy in the LDCs has become a necessary, powerful and frequently the only leading force in the society to achieve the developmental goals.⁹

⁵ In relation to this idea, an interesting review of the old Wilsonian concepts is made by Fred Riggs in his "Relearning an Old Lesson: The Political Context of Development Administration," *Public Administration Review*, XXV, 1 (March, 1965), 70-79.

⁶ See Harold F. Alderfer, *Public Administration in Newer Nations* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967), p. 2; Lucian W. Pye, *Politics, Personality and Nation-Buildings: Burma's Search for Identity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962), pp. 10-14; see also his *Aspects of Political Development* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966), pp. 9-11; and Fred Riggs, "Administration and a Changing World Environment," *Public Administration Review*, XXVIII, 4 (July August, 1968), 348-61.

⁷ This fact has frequently been observed in almost every textbook in public administration. In the U.S., the Great Depression seemed to have marked the decline of the earlier beliefs that the government is a necessary evil or the government that governs the best does govern the least. These, thus, give rise to the emerging rationale for the big and active government.

⁸ See W. Henry Lambright, "The Minnowbrook Perspective and the Future of Public Affairs: Public Administration is Public Policy Making," in Frank Marini (ed.), *Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective* (Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971), pp. 332-45.

⁹ This point has been documented and discussed by several writers. See for example Joseph LaPalombara, "An Overview of Bureaucracy and Political Development," in LaPalombara (ed.), *Bureaucracy and Political Development* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), pp. 23-25; Fred Riggs, *Thailand: The Modernization of Bureaucratic Polity* (Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1966), p. 131; Leslie L. Roos and Noralou P. Rous, *Managers of Modernization: Organization and Elite in Turkey* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971), pp. 1-15; and United Nations Public Administration Division, *Public Administration in the Second United Nations Development Decade*, Report of the Second Meeting of Experts, January 16-26, 1971. New York, 1971, ST/TAO/M/57, p. 36.

7. Each individual public administrator tends to serve in a wide range of multifunctional capacities. His roles transcend the traditional policy execution and the newly emerged policy-making to include even several political "input" functions.¹⁰

8. The expanding policy-making role of a public administrator calls for a set of normative guidelines for exercising discretion over a variety of policy questions. Outstanding among the proposed values is the doctrine of 'social equity' which has recently been emphasized (if not reemphasized) in the United States, and which is clearly a relevant and valuable guidance in most LDCs as well.¹¹

9. A public administrator, to meet his expanding commitments, depends substantially on the relevant progress achieved in the social science disciplines in general and in academic public administration in particular. This imperative places pressures on the contemporary social scientists to reevaluate the "relevance" of their contributions to societal needs in addition to their traditional primary concerns with the advancement of their scientific disciplines.¹²

10. Developing administrative systems, undergoing no less pressure than their more developed counterparts, have another major source of assistance, the many forms of foreign aid. Here too, the "relevance" doctrine remains significant to both the donor and receiving parties.

¹⁰ Civil servant administrators serving in a changing political context have been found to play a wide variety of roles including policy maker, policy adviser, program formulator, program manager, program implementer, interest aggregator, interest articulator, agent of political socialization, adjudicator and agent of political communication. See Richard L. Harris, *The Role of Administrator Under Conditions of Systematic Political Change*. CAG Occasional Paper (Bloomington, Indiana 1967).

¹¹ H. George Frederickson, "Toward a New Public Administration," in Marini (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 309-28. For further elaboration of the concept of social equity, see a symposium on Social Equity and Public Administration, *Public Administration Review*. XXXIV, 1 (January/February, 1974).

¹² For some recent literature advocating a careful reconsideration of the significance of the "relevance" of the current academic enterprise, see Gerald E. Caiden, *Administrative Reform*. (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969), pp. 1-3; Todd R. La Porte, "The Recovery of Relevance in the Study of Public Organization," in Marini (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 17-74; Warren F. Ilchman and Norman Thomas Uphoff, *The Political Economy of Change* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971), pp. 8-11; and their "The New Political Economy," in Uphoff and Ilchman (eds.), *The Political Economy of Development* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972), pp. 1-22; Avery Leiserson, "Realism and Commitment in Political Theory," in George J. Graham, Jr. and George W. Carey (eds.), *The Post-Behavioral Era: Perspectives on Political Science* (New York: David McKay Company Inc., 1972), pp. 168-70; David Easton, "The New Revolution in Political Science," *American Political Science Review*. LXIII, 4 (December, 1969), 1051-61; and Raul P. de Guzman, "Achieving Realism in Public Administration Academic Programs," *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, XVI, 3 (July, 1972), 371-81.

11. In affluent societies, a more dynamic, participatory, development-oriented and less structured form of organization has gained support against the existing static, hierarchical, formal, and rigid bureaucratic organization. In most LDCs, however, although the need for a more dynamic and change oriented organizational system has long been apparent, a generally agreed upon alternative to bureaucracy is still non-existent. The universal applicability of a largescale participatory model, which seems to be theoretically sound, is still practically questionable.¹³

12. Change-oriented administrative system--however designed, organized or reformed--must be manned by qualified personnels who are properly trained to possess certain values and attitudes in addition to professional skills or competence. This undoubtedly calls for a critical examination and reorientation of the orthodox public administration training.

These propositions are listed in order to delineate or "map" certain significant elements of changes in theory and practice of public administration. A more detailed exploration of a change-oriented administrative system and some of the related issues will examine the nature of a "relevant" response of an academic community to the need for emphasizing change.

DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION: A RELEVANT RESPONSE TO REALITY

It is useful to regard development administration as having two identities: a focus of study and an activity or process. Academic development administration is a study or an inquiry of development administration as an activity or a process. Further questions, then, may be raised: What does development administration as an activity mean? and How does it differ from the usual public administration?

The difficulty in defining development administration lies in the ambiguity of the term "development" itself. And in the course of examining and clarifying the term, it seems convenient to answer the second question first. "Development" is very close to the term "change." It seems paradoxical, however, to say that it is a change in the style, pace and magnitude of "change" itself that marks the distinction between development administration and the usual public administration. Actually, change has always been one of many supporting actors in an administrative drama. When change is routine, piecemeal, incremental, evolutionary and gradual, it can be easily absorbed

¹³ See for example Herbert G. Wilcox, "Hierarchy, Human Nature and the Participative Panacea," *Public Administration Review*, XXIX, 1 (January/February, 1969), 56; Orion F. White, Jr., "The Dialectical Organization: An Alternative to Bureaucracy," *Public Administration Review*, XXIX, 1 (January/February, 1969), 32-42; Maryin Meade, "'Participative' Administration--Emerging Reality or Wishful Thinking?" in Waldo (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 169-87; Warren G. Bennis, *Changing Organizations: Essays on the Development and Evolution of Human Organization* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), p. 192; and Larry Kirkhart, "Toward a Theory of Public Administration," in Marini (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 143-64.

or accommodated by a traditional static structure of public bureaucracy. But once change earns a "star" title as it becomes drastic, rapid, episodic, dynamic, revolutionary, and turbulent; it must be highlighted as an urgent need to be dealt with immediately.

This is why the spirit of "development" has gained ground so rapidly in the area of public administration, a major part of which is then transformed into development administration. This comes very close to what Irving Swerdlow points out when he compares the management styles of two different organizations, an urban renewal program and a water department. To him, development administration involves the tasks of a more "pioneering" nature compared to the routine tasks operated in a long established organization or regular public administration.¹⁴

There is no simple and generally acceptable way to define "development" and there is no need to go into a detailed definitional discussion. A brief observation can be made about certain common ideas drawn from several writers. Although overt economic concern is common in most definitions, development plan by no means include only economic elements. They also involve many noneconomic aspects as determined by each particular country. On the other hand, most writers tend to agree at least on one point, that by "development" they do not mean haphazard or laissez-faire type of change. Rather, change or development has to be guided, directed, organized, planned, designed, engineered, or managed.¹⁵

Development administration, a major derivative of development, finds itself with similar identity confusion. The definitions given by a number of prominent writers such as Riggs, Fainsod, Swerdlow, Meadows, Landau and Ramos, show meanings of development administration that range from its broad sense as a sector (or sectors) in a public administrative system engaged in conscious effort to achieve a set of developmental goals to its narrower sense as "public administration applied to developing countries."¹⁶ It would not be of much help to add another definition

¹⁴ See Irving Swerdlow, "Introduction," in Irving Swerdlow (ed.), *Development Administration: Concepts and Problems* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1963), p. x.

¹⁵ This is based on the conclusion I made before in my earlier work. See Patom Manirojana, "Comparative and Development Administration: A Survey of the Literature," *Thai Journal of Development Administration*, XIV, 1 (January, 1974), 26.

¹⁶ See Fred Riggs, "Introduction," and "The Context of Development Administration," in Riggs (ed.), *Frontiers of Development Administration* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1971), pp. 6-7 and 73; Swerdlow, "Introduction," Merle Fainsod, "The Structure of Development Administration," and Paul Meadows, "Motivation for Change and Development Administration," in Swerdlow (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. x, 2 and 86; Edward Weidner, "Development Administration: A New Focus for Research," in Ferrel Heady and Sybil L. Stokes (eds.), *Papers in Comparative Public Administration* (Ann Arbor: Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan, 1962), 98; Carlos P. Ramos, "Development Administration: Its Role and Tasks of Training Institutes," *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, XIII, 1 (January, 1969), 3; and Martin Landau, "Development Administration and Decision Theory," in Weidner (ed.), *Development Administration in Asia* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1970), p. 74.

here which will fall somewhere between these two poles. However, it may be enlightening to make a number of general observations. Because most countries today have undergone a turbulent change in many sectors of the society, their public administrative systems--engaged in either traditional or modern type of activities--are well aware of the impact of their changing environment. The changing environment is an imperative for an administrative system that need to develop, reform, restructure or reorganize itself (i.e. to change within the system). It becomes increasingly difficult, if not impossible, for any administrative system to keep isolated and contented with a few traditional functions or to generate change only within a system. Most public administrative systems, whether they like it or not, have to be partially or entirely transformed into development administration of some form or other. There has been ample evidence indicating that a country that openly subscribes to the idea of free competition and is philosophically allergic to the concept of planning or intervention does in reality manage or regulate its economy or engineer changes in the society much more effectively and systematically than many LDCs formally committed to costly written national economic development plans.

Although the identity problem of development administration remains unsolved, it is clear that academic development administration did emerge as a response to real needs.¹⁷ Whatever were the varied motives of the people or institutions who took part in the inception of the field--be they executives, university professors, the Ford Foundation, the CAG, or AID officials--one general and common interest can be detected. They felt the presence of certain strange elements or variables in the development tasks overseas that could not be explained by orthodox public administration. Consequently, some "relevant" contributions from the academic community are badly needed in the forms of new perspectives and new theoretical or conceptual frameworks that might, in turn, give rise to new administrative strategies, approaches, procedures, or techniques.

CHANGING ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS TO COPE WITH CHANGING ENVIRONMENT

A Theoretical Overview of Administrative Change

The so-called "identity crisis" of public administration as a focus of study can be attributed to two disciplines: political science and administrative science (or management science). The transformed features of these two disciplines now constitute two sub-areas of greatest

¹⁷ Dwight Waldo regards comparative administration and development administration as "two active centers of scholarly and professional interest and activity. Both are important in orienting public administration toward change and development. They may in fact be the most important source of ideas; certainly they will be major channels for the conveyance of ideas." See his "Public Administration and Change: Terra Paena Incognita," *Journal of Comparative Administration*, I, 1 (May, 1969), 108.

theoretical development in an academic public administration: comparative public administration and organization behavior.¹⁸ These two sub-areas are quite discrete and can be easily distinguished.

First, the distinction can be made on the basis of their intellectual orientation. A large portion of the literature developed in comparative public administration is characterized by a strong political orientation and emphasizes environmental factors that can "... take politics out of political science."¹⁹ On the other hand, theories and concepts of organization behavior are in the most part non-political in their orientation. They are substantially based on such other disciplines as sociology, psychology, social psychology, and economics. Moreover, these two sub-areas can also be distinguished in terms of the scope or level of their coverage as macro and micro levels of administrative systems. It is this latter distinction that will be employed in this section as an analytical scheme of administrative change.

The term "administrative change" is used here in a very broad sense and not all aspects or forms of change are scrutinized. It is thus necessary to use some framework to differentiate the many types of change and identify their focal concerns. The distinction between change, revolution and reform pointed out by Caiden is found useful. To him *changers* (in a narrow sense in this paper, of course) administer the changes within the established framework but resist innovations that they believe do not have support or that threaten the established framework and their positions within it; *revolutionaries* seek substantial and speedy changes in the established framework and institutionalized values and will not compromise on this objective; and *reformers* work within the established framework while eventually aiming to replace it.²⁰

Although it is dramatically suggested in one of the U.N. publications that "... what is required in many developing countries is an 'administrative revolution,'"²¹ the term is not used as a central concept in this paper. For one thing, the concept is novel and still in search of a valid supportive theoretical or conceptual basis. Moreover, the change of an established framework can be accomplished by not only administrative revolution, but also, in the long run, by an administrative reform. Thus, an administrative reform which is sound theoretically and feasible practically tends to be more acceptable for the purpose of this analysis. Administrative reform is defined by Caiden as "the artificial inducement of administrative transformation against resistance."²² It is the presence of resistance that marks the difference between administrative reform and routine administrative change.²³ Further clarification is made by Caiden:

¹⁸ Philip S. Kronenberg, "The Scientific and Moral Authority of Empirical Theory of Public Administration," in Marin (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 193-94.

¹⁹ LaPalombara, "Public Administration and Political Change....." *op. cit.*, p. 93.

²⁰ Caiden, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

²¹ United Nations Public Administration Division, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

²² Caiden, *op. cit.*, pp. 1, 8, and 65-66.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 48.

It is artificial because it is manmade, deliberate, planned; it is induced because it involved persuasion, argument, and the ultimate threat of sanction; it is not universally accepted as the obvious or true course. It is an irreversible process. It has moral connotations; it is undertaken in the belief that the end results will always be better than the status quo and so worth the effort to overcome resistance.²⁴

However, Caiden's definition indicated just the "what" and "how" of a reform, but not the "why." It is therefore necessary to look into few other definitions to learn what administrative reform is for. Hahn-Been Lee, for example, defines administrative reform as "an effort to apply new ideas and combination of ideas to an administrative system with a conscious view to improving the system for positive goals of national development."²⁵ For yet another definition, Siagian defines the terms as "any consciously planned change sought and brought about within an administrative system for the purpose of facilitating the implementation of development plans through a higher degree of performance level."²⁶

Hahn-Been Lee also defines administrative development as "the growing capability of the administrative system to cope continuously with problems created by social change toward the goal of achieving political, economic, and social progress."²⁷ For another definition, according to Abueva, administrative development is "the increasing ability of the political system or polity of any country to implement its collective decisions."²⁸ It is apparent that these two concepts have much in common. Both of them refer to administrative systems with respect to "improving the system" or "a higher degree of performance level" or "growing capability" or "increasing ability" of the system to achieve some kind of national or societal goals. Although Abueva uses the term "political system" rather than "administrative," his focus is on the ability "to implement the decisions" which evidently implies a substantial administrative concern. It is notable that they refer approximately to the same thing, but have different emphases or foci of interest. While the concerns of administrative development involve questions of basic philosophy such as the causes or consequences of administrative change, the concerns of administrative reform go a step further, to the "how" question--the strategy and process of bringing about administrative change.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

²⁵ Hahn-Been Lee, "The Concept, Structure and Strategy of Administrative Reform: An Introduction," Hahn-Been Lee and Abelardo G. Samonte (eds.), *Administrative Reforms in Asia* (Manila: Eastern Regional Organization for Public Administration, 1970), p. 7.

²⁶ Sondang P. Siagian, "Improving Indonesia's Administrative Infrastructure: A Case Study," in *ibid.*, p. 96.

²⁷ Hahn-Been Lee, "The Role of the Higher Civil Service Under Rapid Social and Political Change," in Weidner (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 108.

²⁸ José Veloso Abueva, "Administrative Culture and Behavior and Middle Civil Servants in the Philippines," in Weidner (ed.), *ibid.*, p. 132.

Macro-Administrative Change

Macro administrative change refers to the change in a large scale, usually national, administrative system which is one of many major dimensions of national development in which social, economic, cultural and political development are also included. Changes in these social sub-structures, as supported by some research finding, are usually viewed as being interrelated.²⁹ On the basis of this idea, a national development effort may take the form of either "balanced" or "unbalanced" social growth.³⁰ The contradictory ideas about administrative development in relation to political development reflect a basic similarity to those of the balanced-unbalanced dispute.

An administrative system is viewed in a broad perspective as one of several powerful substructures in the society. Assuming a close interrelationship between these substructures, accelerated administrative development will affect, positively or adversely, the development in some other substructures. Fred Riggs, along with some other writers, advocates the idea that an overpowering public bureaucracy tends to slow down, if not impede, political development.³¹ Accordingly, any decision to strengthen bureaucratic growth should take into consideration the probable impact on other substructures.

On the other hand, there is another stream of ideas running against this balanced politico-administrative development doctrine. This follows a classical "axiom" advanced by Charles Beard over three decades ago that the continuous and efficient discharge of governmental functions

²⁹ For instance, Hagen, Coleman, Pye, Lipset and Dahl note the correlations between socio-economic variables and political variables. See Everette E. Hagen, "A Framework for Analyzing Economic and Political Change," in Robert E. Asher et. al. *Development of the Emerging Countries: An Agenda for Research* (Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1962), pp. 1-38; James S. Coleman, "Conclusion: The Political Systems of the Developing Areas," in Gabriel A. Almond and James S. Coleman (eds.), *The Politics of Developing Areas* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960), p. 538; Lucian W. Pye, "The Political Context of National Development," in Swerdlow (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 42; Robert A. Dahl, *Modern Political Analysis* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970), p. 69; and Seymour M. Lipset, *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Company, 1963), ch. 2.

³⁰ According to Ferrel Heady's observations, the idea of "balanced" growth is advocated by Fred Riggs, Henry F. Goodnow, Lucian Pye, S.N. Eisenstadt and Joseph LaPalombara; and "unbalanced" growth doctrine is supported by Ralph Braibanti and Milton J. Esman. See Ferrel Heady, "Bureaucracies in Developing Countries," in Riggs (ed.), *Frontiers . . . op. cit.*, pp. 465-69; see also Warren F. Ilchman, "Rising Expectations and the Revolution in Development Administration," *Public Administration Review*, XXV, 4 (1965), 314-28.

³¹ See Fred Riggs, "Bureaucrats and Political Development: A Paradoxical View," in LaPalombara (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 120-67. Some other writers who support this idea, and also support the doctrine of "balanced social growth," include Eisenstadt, Pye, Inayatullah and LaPalombara.

is a necessary condition for the existence of any great society.³² It is facilitated by popular recognition of the extremely significant role of a public bureaucracy as an indispensable mobilizing force for attainment of developmental goals.³³ Thus, this latter idea simply maintains that the administrative development effort designed to enhance the administrative capacity or performance is necessary for any society, particularly a LDC, in order to achieve its goals regardless of the contemporary stage or phase of development in other substructures. Among the prominent advocates of this thesis are Ralph Braibanti and Milton Esman. LaPalombara, although he had earlier pointed out the dilemma of administrative vs. political development, later recognized the needs for developing the capacity of an administrative system and also proposed a country profile analysis as an alternative strategy.³⁴

Once an administrative system is committed to initiate administrative development, for whatever reasons, there is yet another dilemma ahead. This concerns the alternative development strategies to be followed which, in turn, will determine the course of action to follow. According to Ichman, there are two broad strategies of administrative development: "balanced administrative growth," and "unbalanced administrative growth." As he elaborates:

The first, the "balanced administrative growth" strategy, is very much like its counterpart in development economics. It suggests that piecemeal changes in administration are inadequate and often self-defeating. What is needed are extensive and complementary centers of productive rationality--personnel systems, budgetary and fiscal procedures, planning processes, organization and methods -- which "buy" each other's external economics. A "Big Push" is necessary to overcome tradition-bound administration.....

The second strategy, a more cautious one, also has its counterpart in development economics. The advocates of "unbalanced administrative growth" argue that if a country had the skills and resources to build a "modern" administrative system, as the balanced administrative growth people suggest, it would probably not be underdeveloped at all. There is also insistence that the scarcest factor of all is the capacity to make rational productivity-oriented decisions.³⁵

³² Cited in Gaus, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

³³ This point has been noted by many writers. For example Max F. Millikan and Donald L. M. Blackmer (eds.), *The Emerging Nations: Their Growth and United States Policy* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1961), p. 80; Donald C. Stone, "Public Administration and Nation-Building," in Roscoe C. Martin (ed.), *Public Administration and Democracy* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1965), p. 258; and LaPalombara, "An Overview of . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 5.

³⁴ See Ralph Braibanti, "External Inducement of Political-Administrative Development: An Institutional Strategy," in Ralph Braibanti (ed.), *Political and Administrative Development* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1969), p. 3; Braibanti, "Administrative Reform in the Context of Political Growth," in Fred Riggs (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 227-46; Milton Esman, "CAG and the Study of Public Administration," in *ibid.*, pp. 41-71; and LaPalombara, "Alternative Strategies for Developing Administrative Capabilities in Emerging Nations," in *ibid.*, pp. 171-226.

³⁵ Ichman, "Rising Expectations and . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 316.

Even after the choice on an administrative development strategy is made, there are still further questions regarding the pattern or style of decision-making. A careful examination of this issue requires an intensive review of the ideas of such prominent analysts as Charles Lindblom and Yehezkel Dror which cannot be undertaken here. It is quite apparent that Lindblom's "muddling through" and Dror's "rational comprehensive" doctrines differ in the sense that they reflect the tone of the familiar "conservative vs. radical" or "incremental vs. revolution" models. Although both of them have mutually shifted their positions while working their way to compromise, they have not yet met at the halfway point and still belong in the usual contradictory categories. Naturally, strengths and weaknesses are found in both sides. Nevertheless, since it is suggested that a measure of "administrative revolution" is needed in many LDCs, the momentum tends to be in favor of Dror's ideas. Lindblom's "muddling through" and its derivatives assume the presence of a pluralistic structure of a political system that is usually not present in most LDCs. In addition, the more an administrative system moves toward the adoption of administrative revolution, the more it moves away from the conservatism, incrementalism and gradualism doctrines. The decision-making style just cannot stay untouched amidst the turbulent environment.³⁶

Micro Administrative Change

A micro-administrative system here refers to a well known sub-system of public administration, i.e. a public organization.³⁷ The employment of an organization concept to explore the problem of micro administrative change involves both some advantages and some disadvantages. Organization concepts can be said to help narrow the theory-practice gap. Evidently, the term "organization" can serve as more appropriate unit of analysis in an intellectual inquiry in the place of the formerly employed "department," or "agency," or "bureau," which are obviously more legal and institutional oriented. Even though these terms sound adequate for the practitioners, they are of limited value for academic research. In addition, because of the emphasis on "change" which characterizes development administration, the study of micro development agencies is likely to benefit by the enriched body of theory and research focused on such topics as or-

³⁶ See Charles E. Lindblom, "The Science of 'Muddling Through'" *Public Administration Review*, XIX, 2 (Spring, 1959); Yehezkel Dror, "Muddling Through--'Science' or Inertia?" *Public Administration Review*, XXIV, 3 (September, 1964); see also Wolf Heydebrand, "Administration of Social Change," *Public Administration Review*, 3 (September, 1964), 163-65.

³⁷ Terms like "micro-public bureaucracy" or simply "micro bureaucracy" may be differently employed to serve specific purposes of each writer. For instance Garcia-Zamor employs "micro-bureaucracy" to refer to "small and informal organizations of bureaucrats who have the broad common aim of wishing changes that would benefit the entire social and political system." See Jean-Claude Garcia-Zamor, "Micro-Bureaucracies and Development Administration," *International Review of Administrative Science*, XXXIX, 4 (1973), 417-18.

ganization environment, organizational change and development, planned change concepts and strategies, innovation, change agents etc.³⁸

But organization theory and concepts do not provide the answer for all the questions posited in the area of micro-administrative change. One cannot assume that most of the strategies, methods and techniques developed in these areas are applicable to public management in LDCs. William Eddy, for example, points out several reasons for the minimal utilization of organization development in public administration; that the older methods for improving organizational performance are more consonant with the legal-rational bureaucratic approach; that applied behavioral science and OD have "natural enemies" in the fields of political science and public administration; that the behavioral sciences are felt to be proposing a "tender-minded approach" to organization which overplays the need to have workers happy and satisfied and underplays the emphasis on productivity; that there is a certain degree of misunderstanding and lack of information regarding some of the basic ideas involved in participative management; and that the basic assumptions and values of OD may be inappropriate in public organizations.³⁹

The "public" aspect of public organizations itself is troublesome. The term has a long tradition of being vulnerable for its value-laden and culture-bound connotation. Possibly the line of argument might appear similar to the old debate over the demarcation line between generic and public administration. Most, if not all, organization theorists have sought to develop generalizations or to construct theories concerning the organizations in general on the basis of the conceptual frameworks, models, typologies or classification schemes that seem to suit their purposes or look meaningful. So far, most organization theorists have not yet convinced that the "publicness" of organizations is a meaningful separate category. While the field of public administration does welcome the study of organization as a firmly established sub-area, most organization theorists have neither taken into consideration the progress made in the study of public organization by public administrationists nor developed an interest to study it themselves. Unless some organization theorists turn their attention to an intensive inquiry of "public organization," the weakness in theoretical and conceptual frameworks of the area will continue to exist. Wamsley and Zald seem to elucidate this point well when they say:

³⁸ The literature in this area is voluminous and still continues to grow consistently. To mention some: Ronald Lippitt, Jeanne Watson and Bruce Westley, *The Dynamics of Planned Changes: A Comparative Study of Principles and Techniques* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1958); Warren Bennis, *Changing Organization.....op. cit.*; Victor A. Thompson, *Bureaucracy and Innovation* (University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1969); Paul R. Lawrence and Jay W. Lorsch, *Organization and Environment* (Homewood, Ill.: Richard D. Irwin, 1969); Warren Bennis, Kenneth Benne and Robert Chin (eds.), *The Planning of Change* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961); Jerald Hage and Michael Aiken, *Social Change in Complex Organizations* (New York: Random House, 1970); and James Q. Wilson, "Innovation in Organization: Notes Toward a Theory," in James D. Thompson (ed.), *Approaches to Organizational Design* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966).

³⁹ William B. Eddy "Beyond Behaviorism?: Organization Development in Public Management," *Public Personnel Review*, (July, 1970), 173.

A consensus approach to theory building is needed that can integrate knowledge not only within the field, but from different disciplines; one that focuses on the study of *public* rather than general administration, and therefore has organic links to political science and policy analysis, as well as to organizational sociology.⁴⁰

Administrative Reform: Operationalizing Administrative Change

Administrative capacity (approximately interchangeable with "administrative capability" in this paper) has acquired much recognition in national and international development and has almost become a panacea for any kind of social ill. Its significance has been frequently documented.⁴¹ The evidently deteriorating and pervasive administrative deficiencies in most developing administrative systems amidst the rising demands and challenge from the changing environment seem to substantiate this point. Some generalizations about administrative problems are:

- The primary obstacles to development are administrative rather than economic, and not deficiencies in natural resources.
- Countries generally lack the administrative capability for implementing plans and progress.
- Countries share in common most of the same administrative problems and obstacles.
- Most persons with planning and other development responsibilities in individual countries, as well as persons made available under technical assistance programs, do not have adequate knowledge or adaptability in designing and installing organizations, institutions, and procedures suitable for the particular country.⁴²

⁴⁰ Gary L. Wamsley and Mayer N. Zald, "The Political Economy of Public Organizations," *Public Administration Review*, XXXIII, 1 (January/February, 1973), 62. In fact, the term "public organization" might have been employed before in many works without any serious conceptual or theoretical concerns. In this article, the term is focused on as a selected concept of central interest. See also, Todd R. la Porte, "The Recovery of Relevance in the Study of Public Organization," *op.cit.*

⁴¹ For example, LaPalombara, "Alternative Strategies", *op. cit.*; David S. Brown, "The Key to Self-Help: Improving the Administrative Capabilities of the Aid Receiving Countries," *Public Administration Review*, XXIV, 2 (June, 1964), 67-77; and Gerald E. Caiden, "Development, Administrative Capacity and Administrative Reform," *International Review of Administrative Science*, XXXIX, 4 (1973), 327-44.

⁴² Donald C. Stone, "Government Machinery Necessary for Development," in Martin Kricsberg (ed), *Public Administration in Developing Countries* (Washington D.C. : The Brookings Institution, 1965), p. 53. For some other observations of administrative problems in LDCs, see Fainsod, *op. cit.*, pp. 6-20; Jey B. Westcott, "Government Organization and Methods in Developing Countries," in Swerdlow (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp. 45-55; Caiden, *Administrative Reform . . . op.cit.*, pp.99-100; and Ferrel Heady, *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966) ,pp. 69-72.

With particular respect to administrative capacity, Caiden notes that there are two major ways other than administrative reform to increase administrative capacity in general: innovation and development byproduct. However, these two other ways are found to be unsuccessful in LDCs for a variety of reasons. Reform, therefore, is left as the only alternative.⁴³ The concept of administrative capacity itself needs reconceptualization and redefinition, but it is still useful to consider "administrative capacity" on the basis of an existing framework consisting of three major variables: performance, structure, and environment.⁴⁴

Undoubtedly, one of the best strategies to understand concepts such as these is to rely on the systems framework. Performance certainly has something to do with the functions of an administrative system and, quite natural, involves such elements as goals, inputs and outputs. To consider the performance level, Chi-Yuen Wu finds it useful to differentiate among four inter-related terms, i.e., productivity, efficiency, profitability and effectiveness.⁴⁵ As for the structural aspect which is defined to consist of both "people and nonhuman resources," it can be highlighted by an examination of a "reorganization" which is a major aspect of administrative reform. However, reorganization effort is hardly confined to just a structural aspect, but also includes effectiveness, personnel and environment.⁴⁶ The environment of an administrative system can be simply defined as "the surroundings of an organization; the climate in which the organization functions."⁴⁷ However, the term can be otherwise defined if a critical analysis is to be done. Basically, environment "... conditions, legitimizes and provides or denies resources to organizations and larger systems. Performance is vitally affected by relations with the environment and even definition of the environment."⁴⁸

The significance of environment is also pointed out by Victor Thompson in his effort to determine the administrative objectives for development administration which may be used as a set of operational guidelines of administrative reform. These guidelines include: an innovative atmosphere, the operationalizing and wide sharing of planning goals, the combining of planning

⁴³ Caiden, "Development, Administrative Capacity . . .," *op.cit.*, p. 334.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 329-30.

⁴⁵ Chi-Yuen Wu, *Nature and Significance of Performance in Public Administration*. An article based on the paper presented to the Seminar on Factors of Administrative Productivity, organized by SEADAG in New York, March 22-24, 1973.

⁴⁶ See Frederick C. Mosher, "Some Notes on Reorganizations in Public Agencies," in Roscoe C. Martin (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 137-39.

⁴⁷ William R. Dill, "The Impact of Environment on Organization Development," in Sidney Mailick and Edward H. Van Ness (eds.), *Concepts and Issues in Administrative Behavior*. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1962), pp. 95-96.

⁴⁸ Caiden, "Development, Administrative Capacity . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 330.

(thinking) with action (doing), a cosmopolitan atmosphere, the definition of influence, the increasing of toleration of interdependence, and the avoidance of bureaupathology.⁴⁹

The fact that "administrative capacity" is regarded as a short-run goal of administrative reform, probably still convinces many people that the reform effort involves nothing more than the restructuring of an organization, the strengthening of certain procedures or the introduction of some new methods or techniques. It is necessary to emphasize that the scope of reform is actually much wider than this. As classified by Caiden, administrative reform fall into regular patterns of: structural overhaul, attitudinal change, policy-making improvements, technical aids, administrative methods, finance, functional areas, and new machinery to handle citizen grievances.⁵⁰

With such a wide range of commitments, some thoughts should be given to reform strategies. Choices must be made between "balanced" and "unbalanced" administrative development,⁵¹ between "wholistic" and "partial" approaches,⁵² or between "comprehensive" and "incremental" strategies.⁵³

CONCLUSIONS

In light of the extremely perplexing and complicated situations under which developing administrative systems have to function, they have to be manned by personnel with a set of desirable attributes, many of which cannot be trained by ordinary formal education. Thus, orthodox academic public administration will have to be drastically overhauled. The purpose of this education is not just to provide the trainees with intellectual knowledge and skills. An atmosphere has to be generated to encourage the trainees to internalize a set of desirable attitudes, values, and philosophies in addition to the regular intellectual exercise. Also, flexibility should be allowed for each trainee to design a study program that suits his needs most. While there have been discussions about an expanding policy making role of public administrators, there has not been any serious effort to prepare administrators to assume this additional

⁴⁹ See Victor A. Thompson, "Administrative Objectives for Development Administration," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, IX, 1 (June, 1964), 94-101.

⁵⁰ Caiden, *Administrative Reform . . . op. cit.*, pp. 101-102.

⁵¹ Ilchman, "Rising Expectation and . . ." *op. cit.*

⁵² Albert Waterston, "Public Administration for What?" *Finance and Development*, IV, 3 (September, 1967), 177-79.

⁵³ Lee, "The Concept, Structure and Strategy . . ." *op. cit.*, pp. 14-17.

task in most training programs. A sense of equality cannot be said to be novel in the LDCs. Its presence has always been in the form of vague ideology or abstract value that has little direct relation to reality. Such conditions as mass poverty, malnutrition, sickness, illiteracy, and poor housing have long been pervasive in most LDCs, but their remedies have often been delayed by the priority given to economic growth. If the doctrine of "social equity" is institutionalized in the reform strategy of developing administrative systems, a realistic approach to the urban and rural poor will be underway.

In addition there are some administrative problems that are not automatically confronted when administrative reform is introduced. These include corruption and bribery, institutionalized formalism or ritualism, and pervasive nepotism. These cannot be assumed away or overlooked and the remedy of these problems may be a prerequisite for a successful development administration. These and many similar problems point to the need for additional commitment to research and for close collaboration between social scientists, public administrators and politicians.
