

## Administration and Society in New Nations: Principles and Practices

AHMED SHAFIQL HUQUE\*

*Understanding public administration in new nations presents a particularly strong challenge. The ideas developed in the West serve as useful purposes in the new nations, too, where administration is conducted in an entirely different situation. The colonial tradition, complexity of administrative processes, attitude of mutual "distrust" between officials and the public, corruption and ineptitude give rise to doubts about the applicability of the principles developed under circumstances prevailing in the West. In new nations, the process of administration is based on different assumptions and is primarily aimed at the preservation and promotion of self and group interests by the rulers and officials in societies afflicted with acute shortage of personnel and resources. The scalar and functional principles are faithfully followed, while unity of command is often violated. POSDCORB functions are performed, but they are influenced by local forces and features.*

### Introduction

Efforts to conceptualize the process of administration in new nations have, so far, yielded several striking revelations. Public administration is no longer restricted within the confines of government offices, but permeates several areas of the society. The scope of administration is expanded or narrowed down depending on the nature of the society. Attempts by political scientists to achieve an accurate understanding of political and administrative processes in developing countries reached new dimensions in *The Politics of Developing Areas*. The Comparative Administration Group (CAG) of the American Society for Public Administration was founded in 1960, and succeeded in initiating a number of intensive investigations into the nature of administration in new nations and in laying the foundations of an empirical base upon which theories could be built subsequently.<sup>1</sup> Among the stalwarts of the CAG, Fred Riggs has emerged as the most striking for his concept of prismatic societies and the "sala model" in his *Administration in Developing Countries*. Riggs' ideas have continued to stimulate and intrigue students of public administration for over two decades and is still considered to be a model that is of closest approximation of the prevailing situation in developing countries.<sup>2</sup>

---

\*Associate professor, Department of Political Science, University of Chittagong, Bangladesh.

Current ideas on administration in new nations are in agreement on a number of issues. It is evident that transplanted administrative structures borrowed from the developed world cannot produce similar administrative excellence in new nations. Social forces which influence the process of administration, exert greater pressure than those in developed countries. The paucity of resources presents a formidable barrier to efficient administration and remains a basic problem that cannot be overcome by excellence in other areas. Given these considerations, public administration in new nations entails an entirely different set of activities based on assumptions distinctly separate from ideas held by scholars at present.

This paper attempts to explore some of the assumptions underlying the process of public administration and its principles in the light of the situation prevailing in new nations. An overview of the evolution of the study of public administration shows that, at one stage, it was concerned with the determination of a set of principles which were essential for good and efficient administration.<sup>3</sup> It is necessary to consider the applicability of these principles in the context of the new nations. A realistic approach to public administration in new nations must emphasize the need for indigenous models based on modifications of existing patterns and principles of administration. Rethinking on the problems of making administration more effective in new nations has become imperative as current views and assumptions have failed to contribute significantly to the improvement of the process. Actually, the quality of administration continues to deteriorate, and there is no sign of overcoming the inherent problems that infest public administration in new nations. Administration is carried on in entirely different situations based on different assumptions. Hence, the need for, and applicability of the principles and practices of public administration followed in the developed world to the new nations must be assessed.

### Principles of Administration

Administration was initially regarded as activities concerned with the performance of the routine functions of supervising, housekeeping and the maintenance of records. However, the recognition of administration as a field of study and research was inevitably followed by attempts to establish administration as a science. Interestingly, the first attempt in this direction originated not from scholars in the fields of Political Science or Public Administration, but by an engineer, Frederick W. Taylor. His *Principles and Methods of Scientific Management* dealt mainly with production on the assembly line and not public administration as we know it, but the merit of the contribution lies in the emphasis on "one best way" of accomplishing tasks in the organizations. F. W. Willoughby's *Principles of Public Administration* seemed to have taken note of the trend and emphasized that "in administration, there are certain fundamental principles of general application analogous to those characterizing any science which must be observed if the end of administration, efficiency in operation, is to be secured, and that these principles are to be determined . . . only by the rigid application of the scientific method to their investigation."<sup>4</sup>

A similar streak could be noticed in Henri Fayol's views in *Industrial and General Administration*, which were clearly described by Robert Lorch. "Fayol tells us that the first thing one does to rationalize an organization is (1) establish the purpose of the organization; (2) pinpoint the functions necessary to reach that goal; (3) subdivide those functions into certain sub-categories; (4) further subdivide those subcategories into individual tasks; and finally, (5) group these tasks in the one best way to get the job done economically and efficiently."<sup>5</sup> The development of a set of principles applicable to administrative organizations was considered necessary.

The combined inputs from a number of scholars including Henri Fayol, Luther Gulick and Lyndal Urwick have generally been accepted as the principles of administration. The structure of the organization had to be coordinated by administrators, and human beings had to be put into designated areas. The organizations are to be set up with special attention to the purposes served by them and the processes followed, as well as the people affected, materials used and the place where work is performed. There should be unity of command, i.e., directions should originate from only one source. Coordination of the various activities would culminate in unity of action directed toward a number of goals that administration strives to attain.

Taking the pyramidal structure of administration as inevitable and attaching a considerable amount of importance to the concepts of division of labour, coordination, scalar and functional processes, span of control and unity of command, Gulick and Urwick presented public administration as consisting mainly of seven types of activities — planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting. POSDCORB — came to be a familiar term to every academician interested in public administration and represented the epitome of the principles of public administration.

Peter Self summarized Fayol, Gulick and Urwick's approach. A comprehensive picture of administration is presented in the following manner.

- a) The central problem is one of coordinating an elaborate system in which full opportunity ought to be taken of the advantages of specialization.
- b) To assist effective specialization, principles must be drafted for breaking down and allocating the tasks of government among different departments or agencies.
- c) To ensure effective performance, responsibilities must be defined and clarified and 'unity of command' must be secured. This implies that the whole system will follow a clear hierarchical pattern, whereby subordinates will take orders from only one superior and the 'span of control' will be rationally settled.
- d) To assist planning and coordination, 'staff services' have to be inserted at appropriate points in the hierarchy, particularly at the top of the structure. These staff services have to be properly defined and reconciled with the principle of unity of command.<sup>6</sup>

Herbert Simon detected a number of contradictions in the principles of public administration which, ostensibly, were aimed at the improvement of administrative efficiency. He noted that 'span of control' and 'unity of command' came into conflict with the principles of 'flat hierarchical structure' and 'specialization of tasks.' Simon called these principles "the proverbs of administration." Proverbs are often found in contradictory sets. However, Lorch points out that even proverbs have their relative advantages and disadvantages. To justify the principles, it can be said that if one is contemplating a reduction in hierarchical levels in one's organization, it does no harm to think that 'span of control' should be narrow, nor is there harm in remembering simultaneously the contrary principle that organizations work better when the number of hierarchical levels is few.<sup>7</sup>

Robert Dahl exposed another dimension of the problem by highlighting the incidence of competition among values in organizations. Conflicts among personalities and the variation in the nature of societies across cultures act as formidable obstacles in the way of developing a set of principles of administration that could be applied to public administration in general. Dwight Waldo concentrated on the methodological problems in developing a set of general principles along with the restricted scope offered by the values of economy and efficiency that were popular among scholars.

Although the search for a set of principles of public administration has faltered as a result of the criticisms directed at the previous attempts, an alternate set has not been developed to replace them. The critics have pointed out the futility of previous attempts, exposed the possible pitfalls in such exercises and, to some extent, diverted the attention of scholars to more lively debates on the "concern for developing a pure science of administration" as opposed to a "concern for prescribing public policy."<sup>8</sup> Nevertheless, these concerns have not succeeded in resolving the contradictions prevalent in the principles of administration. Public administration is still designed and executed largely on the basis of the principles of the scalar and functional processes, unity of command, unity of action, coordination and the activities encapsulated in POSDCORB.

The inherent contradictions within the principles of administration have, so far, not given rise to major problems in the execution of administration activities. The principal concern of public administration include the continuation of the system with special attention to the functions of the maintenance of law and order, the collection of revenue, providing services to the people, and public welfare in general. These functions are generally performed through administrative structures established for specific purposes on the basis of the principles of administration. In most cases, the principles serve the purpose, although some conflict and inconsistencies appear to be inevitable. The search for an immutable set of principles of public adminis-

tration may still continue among the academicians, but the process of administration seems to be fairly effective in spite of the fact that it rests on the presently known principles which are open to question.

### Administration and the Society in New Nations

Robert Dahl noticed a third problem in the study of public administration. He found that (1) generalizations derived from the operations of public administration in the environment of one nation-state cannot be universalized and applied to public administration in a different environment; (2) there can be no truly universal generalizations about public administration without a profound study of varying national and social characteristics impinging on public administration, to determine what aspects of public administration, if any, are truly independent of the national and social setting; (3) it follows that the study of public administration inevitably must become a much more broadly based discipline, resting not on a narrowly defined knowledge of techniques and processes, but rather extending to the varying historical, sociological, economic, and other conditioning factors that give public administration its peculiar stamp in each country.<sup>9</sup>

Obviously, studies of administrative institutions and behavior in new nations reveal a picture quite different from that anticipated by administrators and theoreticians. The apparent ideals, objectives and procedures of administration in the developed world bear little relevance to public administration in the new nations. Administration must be viewed in the context of life in such societies. In all societies, there exists an indigenous way of life, not entirely void of activities approximating administration. The pattern of such activities grow out of the society itself and is not, generally, a collection of counterproductive or meaningless rituals. It serves useful purposes for the members of the society and reflects its nature in the administrative system.

Colonizing powers brought their own patterns of public administration and superimposed them on totally different societies. The indigenous population, not used to these practices, were unable to understand or accept them completely. But there was no choice because the colonial powers imposed their systems on these unwilling and confused societies. On the other hand, the rulers were confronted with their own problems, since a network of public administration had to be established and maintained in order to continue their domination over the colonized territories. Their attitude towards the natives was shaped by distrust and contempt. The colonial rulers considered themselves to be a superior group, coming from what they believed to be a civilized world and the belief was strengthened by their ability to overpower local rulers. The distrust kept on surfacing at any action that could, however remotely, be construed as attempts to overthrow or undermine the colonial power. Thus, all efforts by the natives to retain or take advantage of indigenous practices were opposed by the foreign rulers who claimed their own methods to be superior and insisted on their application. With the introduction of colonial rule, administration in these societies began to be characterized by conflicts, confusion and distrust.

The continuation of colonial rule resulted in several changes in attitudes, expectations and practices. In spite of their conscious endeavours to keep the natives at a distance, the intention to continue domination compelled the foreign rulers to come into contact, however minimal, with the people. As a result, the natives were exposed to external ways of life and thinking. In addition, some welfare measures had to be undertaken to appease the local citizens. The natives were lured into the educational system, so they would be able to secure jobs in the colonial administrative set-up. At the same time, the access to educational facilities and the exposure to outside influences gave rise to increased awareness of their position as well as a desire to participate in the affairs of the system. The effect was a number of alterations in the behavior patterns and reaction to the process of administration among the natives. For the first time, they viewed public administration as a positive process, one which could be used to further the well-being and progress of life. Public administration was no longer considered to be just a medium or tool of exploitation, always working in favor of the rulers.

The natives were able to realize the vast potentials of public administration and were eager to participate in the process. But the colonial rulers viewed this eagerness as a threat to their position, and tried to keep the people at a distance. Minor changes were introduced under the nomenclature of administrative reforms, and token representation were granted to the natives. These reforms were rarely implemented.<sup>10</sup> However, a section of influential natives reaped the benefits and were elevated to a status higher than that of their fellow inhabitants. Colonial powers tended to reinforce this division in the society and the purpose of public administration was directed at preserving the interest of the foreign rulers and their local associates.

Nationalist movements for independence were built upon criticisms of colonial rule and every institution associated with it. Nationalist leaders discredited such institutions and administrative practices as "anti-people," and repeatedly asserted their intention to abolish colonial administrative institutions. They propagated a nationalist administrative system that would be consistent with the norms and attitudes of the indigenous society, where public administration would be directed at the welfare of the people. But due to their lack of experience in handling large scale operations of administrative organizations, the leaders were unable to suggest alternate patterns of administrative practices. In the absence of concrete, realistic plans to overhaul the system of public administration, the institutions established by the colonial rulers are allowed to continue. Moreover, the nationalist rulers were overwhelmed with problems infesting almost all areas in the new nations, and the task of re-designing the administrative system was relegated to the background.

Thus, new nations started off with an immensely complex administrative system, with no definite shape, boundary and direction. The process was imposed on an alien culture intended to preserve the interest of foreign rulers. Ironically, the same system was allowed to continue in a completely

different situation where public administration had to be carried out with almost opposite intentions. The same process that was used to exploit the colonies and the natives, was still in operation after the colonies became independent, but the intention was popular welfare and public service. Moreover, new nations were seldom able to reorganize their administrative systems without external assistance, which was obtained invariably in the form of loans and expertise to direct the reorganization. The result was a strengthening of the colonial legacies in the administration of new nations.

Comprehending the process of public administration in the new nations presents a challenge because of its intriguing nature. The systems of administration reflect the pattern of their evolution where different sections bear remnants of impressions left behind by various foreign rulers and also indigenous traditions. It is extremely difficult to blend the diverse, often contradictory, sections into a single operation. It can only be conceived as a collection of various patterns that do not fit well with one another. A consensus can never be reached about the legitimacy of the policy makers, and rules are formulated by groups who back up their claim to legitimacy by coercion. Their actions are always open to question. Policies and rules are formulated by the group in power, and are manipulated to uphold the interest of the rulers. Public administration can not be executed impartially and efficiently as the rules are applied with the interest of the rulers and their supporters in mind. Administration becomes an extremely complicated process as it endeavours a number of different and often, contradictory functions. Routine tasks of administration must be performed and the system must be maintained to bring about peaceful changes which will invariably come into conflict with the objectives of the existing administrative system. Public administration must strive to, at least, display as its purpose the welfare of the citizens while upholding the interest of a particular powerful group in practice. A vague goal of "development" is pursued without defining the term clearly with reference to the needs and capacities of the society, thereby taxing the administrative system tremendously. It leads to the creation of numerous "development-oriented" agencies and managing their personnel becomes an excessively expensive and cumbersome task. Public administration ends up directing all its energy and resources to the resolution of conflicts that flare up among various groups operating within the political systems of the new nations.

An essential distinctive feature of public administration in the developed countries and the new nations is the outlook and attitude of the public and the administrators. Since public administration is concerned with the well-being of a large number of people, in the developed countries, it is merely a means of achieving certain objectives — "economy and efficiency" and "peace, order and good government." The administrators are eager to ensure that all activities of public administration are conducted in a uniform manner, where deviations are unusual. The majority of the people should not suffer due to the dishonesty or faults of only a few. Deviations are looked upon as accidents and the public receive the benefit of doubt. The public view administrators as generally honest in their duties, and believe that the system will function without extralegal inputs from the clients. Occasional devia-

tions are not considered as the general practice, and the public have faith in the effectiveness of administration. In other words, public administration is based on mutual "trust" in developed countries. A few cases of unusual behavior or decisions do not infect the entire system. Both the administrators and the public believe that one or the other will not sabotage the system, and that vast numbers of people should not be subject to tedious scrutiny because of deviations which occur rarely. Although the degree of "trust" has diminished over recent times, the system works so long as the stakes involved are not exceedingly high or the issues at hand are not too controversial.

Public administration in new nations is characterized by a feeling of "distrust." The distance between the public and the administrators is so vast that one do not trust the other group. The administrators are suspicious that the people might take advantage of the loopholes in the system. Interestingly, the loopholes are created deliberately to ensure more power to the rulers. Several checks are introduced to detect attempts to break rules, and these result in innumerable obstacles to smooth administration. The administrators are constantly on the lookout to prevent deviations. Consequently, a large number of people are subjected to complicated scrutiny and suffer, although it does not reduce the tendencies to evade the law.

The public learns through experience that the laws, apparently meant for their well-being and maintenance of order in the system, are actually used to promote the interests of the rulers and their supporters. A look at the administrative system from a distance reveals a simple set-up. In most cases, the structures do not differ much from their counterparts in the developed world. The objectives of public administration are the same everywhere — providing services and looking after the welfare of the citizens. Rules and procedures are printed and distributed among officials appointed by following methods of recruitment established by the colonial powers that ruled these countries before independence. But there is a wide gap between the structures and their designated functions, and the actual process of administration!<sup>1</sup> The structures are imitated without relevance to the setting in which they operate, and cannot respond to the needs of the new nations. The framework of institutions which form the core of efficient and productive administration in the developed world result in inefficient and counterproductive instruments of public administration in new nations. The combined effect makes the administrative machinery in the Third World politicized, corrupt and inept.<sup>12</sup>

The public discovers the facade of an institutional framework for administration, and learns to play along with the administrators in the game of mutual patronage. There are ways in which the officials may be persuaded to perform or, in certain cases, abstain from performing their duties, whichever suits the purpose of the client. The bending of rules, when not requested by the public, often leads to extortion by threatening potential victims. Clients in need of essential services are sought out by the officials who offer to provide utilities or services for a fee. The amount of the fee depends on



the demand for such services among the people as well as the urgency of the client.<sup>13</sup> Even after the deal is concluded and services have been established, the client is frequently subjected to extortion by threats to cut off the services or exposing the illegally obtained services. Since the chain of extortion is usually quite extensive, the officials do not anticipate any hazard in exposing their clients. The clients suffer, and more avenues for extortion are opened up. The public, on their part, develop a feeling of "distrust" towards the officials and realize that they are at the mercy of the administrators who can make life extremely difficult in the already trying conditions under which they live.

Thus, the public and the administrators in the new nations operate under a situation of mutual "distrust." Each is suspicious that the other may try to break rules and acquire services or graft without honouring a deal. Under such circumstances, it is only natural that the pattern of administration regarded as efficient and normal in the developed world is not to be found in the new nations. Deviations from the expected pattern of behaviour are so frequent that they create a separate pattern which may be considered as "administrative behavior in new nations."

New nations are usually characterized by instability both in the political system and the administrative sector. The process acquires an immensely complex nature as social forces exert a predominant influence on the political and administrative process. Administrators face the almost impossible task of accommodating the various forces in their decisions. Consequently, problem-solving efforts result in the multiplication of problems. The administrative process entails a choice between various ways of solving a problem. Different groups press for solutions which reflect their own interests, and are generally aimed at ends that would ultimately undermine the interests of rival groups. The groups that have strong supporters within the administrative institutions are successful, and decisions are made in favor of the ruling group and its associates. Public administration loses its relevance, and service to the public remains as mere rhetoric to legitimize administration. The entire process is conducted by a handful of high officials and serves only the rulers. The public is reduced to merely an unfortunate group in the society, ever vulnerable to the exploitation of the powerful rulers.

#### Principles of Administration in New Nations

The vast difference between the nature, setting, assumptions, purpose and procedures between public administration in the developed and developing worlds points to the need for reconsidering the utility of the principles of administration in the new nations. Administrative structures are established on the patterns introduced by the colonial powers because the rulers of new nations do not have ready alternatives for the institutions established during colonial rule. Moreover, the success of administrative institutions in the West acts as an important determinant of the shape of such institutions in new nations. The principles of administration, too, are adopted without modifications in the light of the changed circumstances, and these form the

basis of the system of administration. The principles are affected by a number of features of the society, as well as personalities and assumptions that determine the nature of administration in new nations.

The scalar and functional processes do not reflect the actual power structure and flow of information, orders and advice within the administrative institution. Administrators rise to prominence not on the basis of their merit and ability to perform tasks within the organization. Efficiency does not contribute to the advancement of an administrator in his career, and is seldom related to the position occupied in the organization. Since rise in the hierarchy depends, to a great extent, on the nature of links with the rulers and connections with the group in power, even undeserving personnel can climb easily to the top, and occupy positions that endow them with a considerable amount of influence. The positions also involve the responsibility of performing a number of vital administrative functions. These functions are complicated in nature and require a high degree of skill because good administration depends on the efficient execution of these responsibilities. Since the personnel in key administrative positions do not rise to the top on the basis of merit, they do not acquire adequate skills and experience in their trip up the hierarchical ladder, these administrators fail to do justice to the responsibilities assigned to them.

Appointment to important positions entitle an administrator to a considerable amount of power. The power is vested in order to enable the administrator to perform his duties effectively. In new nations, administrative power is a potent weapon because ignorance, poverty and the absence of a normal political structure tend to make administration irresponsible and accountable to no one. The powerful administrator directs his efforts mainly at the retention of his position and manipulation of other personnel to create a network of loyal followers. The quality of administration assumes secondary importance, and the maintenance of the administrative structure which is considered as a tool for the pursuit of group and personal interests becomes the principal concern. In the developed world, on the other hand, the scalar and functional processes are directed toward the maintenance of the entire system and the fulfillment of its objectives. The narrow outlook and selfish intentions result in the non-performance of the vital functions in the new nations. Thus, the scalar and functional principles are frequently violated in practice, although they form the base on which administrative institutions are designed and put into operation.

Command and advice are expected to originate from a single source in order to maintain uniformity throughout the administrative organization. The basic assumption is that the person at the top of the hierarchy will have achieved that position after a lengthy period of association with the organization, and during the time the person's skill has developed to such an extent that the capability to serve the purposes expected of the position has been acquired. When the position is filled upon consideration of social position and linkages, and a person without the required skill, expertise and

experience is put in charge, the commands that are issued from the top are often far from effective. Lack of efficiency and experience compels the administrator to become dependent on the subordinate officials who are put in charge of various sections of the organization. Unity of command cannot be maintained when various officials are awarded the responsibility of making decisions on their own, and the top administrator is unable to direct all activities in the organization.

For the same reasons, the result is often "diversity of action," and the principle of unity of action cannot be followed in such circumstances. Power is not distributed according to a prescribed pattern and functions are not performed uniformly by all the parts of the organization. Administrative organizations demonstrate uneven degrees of accomplishment across various sections. Unity of action remains unattained as a consequence of the lack of unity of command.

A related problem is the observance of the coordinative principle. Coordination demands comprehensive knowledge about the various parts of the administrative organization and their activities. The interrelationship between various sections and the functions performed must be understood and the coordinator has to be skilled in the art of combining the efforts of different groups and individuals. Coordination, too, suffers not only because the top administrators are not qualified for the job or lack the required skills and experience, but also because the intent to coordinate is neglected and preceded by other objectives. The personal interests of the administrator take precedence over the interests of the organization. The foremost objective of the administrator is to maintain the organization as well as his/her position in it. In the process, efficiency is encouraged only to the extent that the existence of the organization is not threatened. Facilities are provided to strive for a minimum standard of excellence. At the same time, care is taken to ensure that subordinate officials do not achieve high levels of excellence and emerge as threats to the top administrator. The easiest way of ensuring this is to promote officials who are likely to remain loyal to the top administrator, and who are unlikely to achieve high degrees of excellence. The quality of administration is diminished along with the poor standard of coordination of the various administrative activities:

Planning is an extremely difficult task in new nations. Lack of adequate information and the expertise required for analyzing problems, combined with the absence of effective political direction and sufficient resources result in tentative and disoriented planning and decision making.<sup>14</sup> Budgeting, too, emerges as another formidable problem. The exact amount of available resources is never ascertained, and priorities for allocating resources to specific activities and organizations are not determined with rationality and care. Therefore, administrators tend to draw up lists of their own priorities which do not always coincide with those of the organization. Massive amounts of resources may be invested on relatively unimportant areas, or those projects in which the administrators will take personal interest. Essential services may be affected due to (mis)allocation of funds and the absence of an efficient system of planning and budgeting.

The staffing process is dominated by personal favors, group interests and links with the ruling groups.<sup>15</sup> Officials are recruited in order to extend help to needy relatives, appease discontented groups in the society, or build up a group of loyal supporters in favor of the recruiters and the rulers. The process of selecting personnel for specific jobs is retained, but the assumptions are altered totally. Performance of the job, goals of the organization, efficiency of officials, and the "ends" of administration are neglected. Officials are recruited merely to occupy specific positions in the organization. They are expected to perform their tasks, but there are no attempts to ensure that these functions are performed well by efficient administrators.

Reporting involves "keeping those to whom the executive is responsible informed as to what is going on, which thus includes keeping himself and his subordinates informed through records, research, and inspection."<sup>16</sup> Officials are primarily motivated by personal interests, and several exaggeration and suppression of information may take place in administrative organizations. Only the information favorable to the administrator and his group are recorded and transmitted to other officials, while failures are never acknowledged or placed on record.<sup>17</sup> Any communication or decision that may be criticized later are expunged from the records. All records and reports are directed toward furthering the goals of the group in power and building its image. This principle of administration, too, acquires a different meaning when applied in the context of the new nations.

### Concluding Observations

Public administration has come a long way from the inception of its study as a separate discipline by Woodrow Wilson. In the course of its evolution, several issues and objectives have come into prominence, only to be overshadowed by subsequent emergence of new issues. At one stage, principles of administration occupied the central place in discussions on public administration. All efforts were directed towards the discovery and recognition of a set of principles which would provide the key to the improvement of administrative activities. The principles could be applied to all organizations at all times, and would lead to the development of a process that would ensure best administration.

The principles of administration were developed by scholars in the West based on the administrative setting and experience of the developed world. Critiques of the principles of administration appeared later and inconsistencies and contradictory assumptions in the principles have been pointed out. But the methods and strategies underlined in the principles have withstood the test of time, and continue to be followed in administrative organizations all over the world. Variations in the circumstances under which administration takes place and the nature of human beings who participate in the process as well as improvisations on the existing patterns are recognized. Nevertheless, the initiation of the process of administration requires the establishment of an administrative structure, a pattern of scalar and functional pro-

cesses, and unity of command and action. All administrative activities must proceed on the lines of planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting. In spite of criticisms, revisions and rethinkings on the principles of administration, these ideas, developed over a half century ago, have survived essential elements in the process of public administration.

Administration in new nations presents an entirely different picture. The process is based upon assumptions that vary widely from those prevalent in the developed world. Administration takes place in a chaotic setting where political power struggles blur the vision of administrators. Born out of colonial traditions and trying to respond to the demands of changed times, administrative systems encounter tremendous pressure. The paucity of qualified personnel and resources prohibit rulers from attempting to overhaul the system. The administrative system is used to further narrow interests of the rulers and privileged groups, and the public is alienated from administration. A feeling of mutual "distrust" between the public and the administrators becomes prominent. Administration becomes extremely complicated as new states have to undertake additional functions and responsibilities.

Even in the entirely different situation prevailing in new nations, the same principles of administration are applied. Administrative organizations are designed and operated on the basis of scalar and functional processes, unity of command and action, following the ideal span of control and the POSDCORB ideas. These principles cannot be expected to contribute to the same results in both developed and developing countries as the backgrounds, attitudes, objectives and procedures are different. The scalar and functional principles appear to be unavoidable, while the principle of unity of command and action is perhaps being constantly violated. The POSDCORB functions are essential and pursued in the developed world. But each is tinted by local trends and considerations although they contribute, in some way, to the establishment and continuation of administrative systems in new nations. It can be said that the principles of administration, notwithstanding the criticisms and questions raised about them, have proved to be applicable to all types of administrative organizations and have, indeed, established claims to be considered as a vital contribution to the understanding and improvement of the process of administration.

### Endnotes

<sup>1</sup>F. Heady and S.L. Stokes (eds.), *Papers in Comparative Public Administration*, (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1962). See also Schaeffer, "Comparisons, Administration and Development," *Political Studies* Vol. XIX, No. 3 (1971), pp. 327-337; P. Savage, "Optimism and Pessimism in Comparative Administration," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. XXXVI, No. 4 (1976), pp. 415-423; F. W. Riggs, "The Group and the Movement: Notes on Comparative Development Administration," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. XXXVI (1976), pp. 648-654; and F. Heady, *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, Third Edition (New York: Marcel Dekker Inc. 1984).

<sup>2</sup>R.T. Daland, *Brazilian Planning: Development Politics and Administration* (Chapel

Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1967). See also E.H. Valsan, "Positive Formalism: A Desideratum for Development," *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. XXII, No. 1 (1968), pp. 3-6; R.S. Milne, "Differentiation and Administrative Development," *Journal of Comparative Administration*, Vol. 1 No. 2, 1969, pp. 213-233; N. Kasfir, "Prismatic Theory and African Administration," *World Politics*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (1969), pp. 304-311.

<sup>3</sup>W.F. Willoughby, *Principles of Public Administration* (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1927). See also H. Fayol, transl. Stors, *General and Industrial Management* (London: Pitman, 1949); L. Gulick and I. Urwick (eds.), *Papers on the Science of Administration*, (New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937); J.D. Mooney and A.C. Reiley, *The Principles of Organization* (New York: Haper Bros., 1939).

<sup>4</sup>Willoughby, *ibid*, p. ix:

<sup>5</sup>Robert Lorch, *Public Administration* (St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Co., 1978), pp. 58-59.

<sup>6</sup>Peter Self, *Administrative Theories and Politics: An Inquiry into the Structure and Processes of Modern Government* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1972), p. 21.

<sup>7</sup>Lorch, p. 66.

<sup>8</sup>N. Henry, *Public Administration and Public Affairs*, Second Edition (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1980), p. 36.

<sup>9</sup>Robert A. Dahl, "The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. VII, No. 1, pp. 1-11.

<sup>10</sup>M.M. Khan, *Bureaucratic Self-Preservation: Failure of Major Administrative Reform Efforts in the Civil Service of Pakistan* (Dacca: University of Dacca, 1980).

<sup>11</sup>Fred W. Riggs, *Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964), pp. 15-19.

<sup>12</sup>K. R. Hope, "Politics, Bureaucratic Corruption and Maladministration in the Third World," *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, Vol. IV, No. 1 (1985), pp. 1-6.

<sup>13</sup>M.Y. Akhter, "Styles of Administration Corruption: The Case of Bangladesh Organization," *Politics, Administration and Change*, Vol. XXII, No. 1. (1987), pp. 61-76.

<sup>14</sup>Ahmed Shafiqul Huque, "On Decision Making Models for Developed and Developing Countries," *Hong Kong Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. IV, No. 1, (1982), pp. 51-58.

<sup>15</sup>Riggs, pp. 275-276 and 299-300.

<sup>16</sup>L. Gulick, *Notes on the Theory of Organization*, pp. 64-89.

<sup>17</sup>Anthony Downs, *Inside Bureaucracy*, (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1967).