AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20523

BIBLIOGRAPHIC INPUT SHEET

FOR AID USE ONLY
Batch 69

1. SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION

A. PRIMARY: Development and economics — DC00-0000-0000

B. SECONDARY: Development assistance

2. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

Meeting the administrative needs of developing countries; role of American universities,A.I.D., and others

3. AUTHOR(S)

(101) Am.Soc.for Public Administration,Washington,D.C.

4. DOCUMENT DATE	5. NUMBER OF PAGES	6. ARC NUMBER
1967	263p.	ARC

7. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS

AID/TA/DA

8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES *(Sponsoring Organization, Publishers, Availability)*

9. ABSTRACT

10. CONTROL NUMBER

PN-AAE-524

11. PRICE OF DOCUMENT

12. DESCRIPTORS

AID
Technical assistance
Public administration
Developing countries
Management
Universities

13. PROJECT NUMBER

14. CONTRACT NUMBER

AID/TA/DA

15. TYPE OF DOCUMENT

AID 590-1 (4-74)

PN-AAE-524

MEETING THE ADMINISTRATIVE NEEDS OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

ROLE OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES, A.I.D. AND OTHERS

Report on a Project Conducted by the American Society for Public Administration

Under Sponsorship of the Agency for International Development

WASHINGTON, D.C.

JULY 1967

Contents

Section	
I	PROJECT BACKGROUND
II	HIGHLIGHTS OF CONCLUSIONS
III	COMMISSIONED PAPERS
IV	OTHER MATERIALS
V	CONFERENCE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS
VI	CONTRIBUTORS TO PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Section I

PROJECT BACKGROUND

PROJECT BACKGROUND

by

Don L. Bowen

To say that much has been done but that much remains to be done is a commonplace summation of the work of AID and its predecessor agencies over the past 20 years.

It is a generalization, however, that holds special interest for overseas public administration technical assistance efforts because until a few years ago the view was widely observed that AID activity in this sector was more characterized by the second part of this evaluation than the first. But this observation was a "still" picture. The seeds sown by AID were in incubation. Now the sprouts are beginning to show, and AID can take great pride in the virtual revolution it has wrought in administration of the public service in the lesser-developed nations of the world.

And for that matter, the same can be said of the state-side impact of AID programs, particularly in university education and research. Few would argue that this aspect of American university activity is what it should be. Most all would agree, however, that we probably would have been worse off had it not been for the contribution of interest, ideas, financial, and other support AID programs have brought with them to the campuses of American universities.

That these conclusions must allow for wide variation in the character and quality of this contribution, both abroad and at home, detracts but little from their validity. Much more relevant is that all concerned wished that what has been achieved could have been more and needs to be more in the future. It was in this setting that AID and ASPA representatives began discussions resulting in a Society contract with the Agency "to explore and set forth prospective roles to be played by American universities working with the Agency for International Development (as well as other government agencies and private foundations) in meeting the administrative needs . . . in the developing countries over the next decade."[a]

In pursuit of this objective, and in accordance with an AID-ASPA contract provision, plans were made to (1) prepare a series of background papers to bring to bear in summary fashion representative and best thinking on issues involved, (2) test and add to these ideas through convening a highly knowledgeable action-oriented conference, and (3) record the judgments of those involved in the project for whatever use such conclusions might be, especially to AID and university officials. To this end conference papers were commissioned by the Society in the fall of 1966, conferee invitations extended, and a conference conducted January 11-14, 1967, at the Center of Adult Education, University of Maryland. Subsequently, conference deliberations were summarized and recommendations developed. Documents resulting from this process constitute this report.

Commissioned papers[b] appear in the order in which their substance was reflected in the conference agenda:

(1) Edward W. Weidner's statement, drawn largely from his earlier unpublished and published materials, deals with the scope and tasks of development administration including problems universities have experienced in transferring what they can do to non-Western cultures.

(2) G. W. Lawson, Jr., outlines the nature and extent of needs for assistance of various kinds from universities and others in the field of development administration including training of AID staff and host-country participants, overseas education projects, AID-university advisory service projects, research, etc.

(3) Ralph H. Smuckler reviews the different kinds of education, training, research, service, and consulting projects in the field of development administration in which universities have engaged, including a commentary on those that seem appropriate for universities to expand in response to AID needs and those which seem less appropriate for universities or better done by other agencies.

(4) Optimizing university capabilities--statements of the steps AID (and where appropriate with reference to the government more generally and private foundations as well) and universities can take to create university capabilities of value to AID consonant with overall university objectives, including methods of financing--are the subjects of two papers, one prepared by Henry Reining, Jr., from the university viewpoint and another by Carroll K. Shaw from the standpoint of AID interests.

(5) Ray D. Pethtel, assisted by Curtis H. Barker, outlines potential support of university programs under recently amended AID legislation,

particularly the possibilities, limitations, and development of 211(d). Coverage also includes the projected role of HEW under the International Education Act.

(6) How specialized aspects of development administration of concern to other professional schools or specific disciplines can be related to a broad multi-disciplinary approach to development initiated by a school or institute of public administration and how these various fields of knowledge can be effectively utilized are discussed by Ferrel Heady.

(7) James J. Heaphey undertakes a review of preceeding conferences and reports with objectives related to those of this project. His paper (including an annotated bibliography) is built around two principal focal points: (a) a summary of organizational arrangements tried and proposed--university consortia, advisory councils, etc.--designed to help AID and universities maintain effective cooperative relationships. In particular the review deals with ways of feeding information about AID needs and resources to universities (both large and small) with expressed interests in public administration technical assistance and for channeling university views and information on capabilities to AID; and (b) the kinds of research in development administration proposed by various predecessor conferences and individuals in light of known AID needs and policies and the potential of universities in the conduct of such research.

Other materials a part of this report include: (1) excerpts from extensive post-conference notes prepared by Fred W. Riggs developing the

importance of research in AID-university endeavors, and (2) a 1961 memorandum, prepared by Jack Koteen and Donald C. Stone, since it deals so directly with the principal project recommendation for a "consultative council."

James M. Mitchell served as conference chairman. His contribution in this role and as a friendly adviser in a great many other project organizational and substantive matters was by any standard far beyond any call of duty.

In all project activity the Society was the beneficiary of a resourceful and energetic steering committee. Specifically, the committee helped in refining the project mission, selecting paper writers, preparing the conference agenda, identifying conference participants, and reviewing the summary of conference discussions and project recommendations.

Steering committee members and other contributors to project activity are identified in Section VI of this report. All have the Society's warmest thanks. Each and every one gave most generously of his time and talent.

ASPA was pleased to be in this joint endeavor with AID. The project provided one more way of fulfilling the Society's mission of "advancing the science, processes, and art of public administration." No part of this report, however, should be taken as an official statement of either sponsoring organization. Views expressed are those of document authors, who accept customary responsibility for them.

Footnotes--Project Background

(a) Project (especially conference) objectives as adopted by steering committee June 27, 1966. Here it should be noted that the terms "public administration," "Development administration," and their variant forms (e.g., "government administration," "overseas administration") are used interchangeably throughout this report. All were generally taken by paper writers and conferees alike to mean "how to get something done through other people" or "what the administrator does" with special reference to the public sector in the environmental context of the lesser-developed countries.

(b) These papers were not conceived as definitive essays on topics involved. Rather their function, as noted above, was to provide a base, sometimes in checklist fashion, for thoughtful discussion to advance the project mission.

Section II

HIGHLIGHTS OF CONCLUSIONS

HIGHLIGHTS OF CONCLUSIONS

This report identifies public service management needs of lesser-developed countries and sets forth prospective roles for AID and universities in meeting these needs. Project recommendations, based largely on deliberations of a Conference of especially knowledgeable AID and university representatives, are highlighted below in order of priority. Conclusions are discussed further in Section V of this report and in nearly every case are subjects of prepared Conference papers or other documents made a part of this volume.

1. Effective collaboration among AID, university public administration interests, and other development-oriented organizations requires a better information system than now exists. Strategic at this juncture is a simple and continuing means of communication and consultation among those concerned. To meet this need, formation of a Consultative Council on Development Administration is proposed, to be established with AID encouragement and support but to function with a large measure of autonomy from the Agency and other participating groups. The Council would serve as a focal point to consider and propose solutions to the large number of policy, planning, and operating problems bound to be a part of any enterprise of the scale and diversity of foreign aid activities in public administration. The new organization should also be designed to serve as a data collection and dissemination center for such efforts. It should not, however, supplant or duplicate the normal functions of AID or the universities.

2. Continuity and stability are vital factors to success of the development process. Further, these elements must be established in an environment in which capacity to adapt to the changing needs of countries receiving assistance as development proceeds is equally important. This means commitment to long-range support but not necessarily through a projection of existing programs. AID should evolve policies and encourage actions that recognize this fact. Objectives include funding assurances substantially beyond current two- or three-year arrangements and provisions for contract flexibility enabling adjustment to development needs as they appear. Universities must review their institutional commitments in overseas technical assistance and recognize public

administration as of sufficient academic concern to formulate a permanent and systemic framework for development administration activities. This requires recognizing the interdisciplinary intellectual base of public administration and, in most cases, establishing its curricula and related activities on a professional-school level. Other university adjustments needed are new ways of measuring the value of faculty participation in overseas development activity and stronger efforts to maintain ties with the host-country institution the university had a hand in launching.

3. Administrative concerns should be made an integral part of other AID and university technical assistance activities. AID should require a public management component in all its development programs--agriculture, health, education, etc. This means more attention by public administration specialists to recognized problems of program managers and more willingness on the part of these managers to accept such help. Criteria for determining whether appropriate administrative expertise is adequately built into such programs should be established by recognized experts outside the sectoral field involved. University public administration programs must develop the capacity to work effectively with other professional schools. Also, management concepts and practices, to the degree they are relevant, should be made a part of every overseas development activity in which the university engages. Realization of this latter goal would be greatly facilitated by university-wide coordination of all international development activities.

4. Knowing more about the development process, especially its cross-cultural and interdisciplinary aspects, is a first priority in making overseas development administration activities more effective. AID should recognize the importance of research in its own operations and in the value systems of the universities it works with. Among other things, this requires financial support and improvement of the research environment within the Agency (e.g., greater access to data and liberalization of publication policies). Universities, in AID-related research activities, should take note of the total context in which overseas developmental investigations take place and that some long-standing views as to what constitutes applied and basic research and the role of the university are due for modification. Traditional ways of "dividing the ground" may no longer be relevant. Better identification of research areas in which universities can most effectively function is an essential first step in AID-university research relationships and one best initiated by the universities.

5. Effectiveness of overseas development resources has often been reduced by the diffusion with which they have been employed. Public administration technical assistance efforts should begin to stress a strategy of working from strength, with particular attention given to developing indigenous resources in host countries. AID and the universities must be willing to move from a phase of institution building to institutional enhancement prior to withdrawal of assistance. Moves in this direction will help secure gains made

in host countries and enlarge the potential for reproductive and multiple effects. Stateside activities should be aimed at strengthening existing university public administration programs with recognition of the need for specialization by geographic area or program field--health, education, agriculture, etc. Shifts in both AID and university commitments will be a part of the process. Especially helpful will be allocation of AID resources through programs such as those envisioned by Section 211(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act.

In public administration, as in all sectors of overseas development activity, there are interests and goals held in common by AID, other development-oriented organizations, and universities. Each organization should maintain an independence of viewpoint, direction, and general purpose, but much can be gained by strengthening common pursuits. AID and the universities have a solid and long-standing basis for joint endeavor, a relationship of high productivity in the past and one that promises to be even more so in the years ahead.

Section III

COMMISSIONED PAPERS

THE SCOPE AND TASKS OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION: RECAPITULATION OF VARIATIONS ON A THEME

Edward W. Weidner

This is the sixth stock-taking conference in development administration in less than six years. Many of us have participated in all of them. I have personally written papers for four (October, 1962; November, 1963; April, 1964; January, 1967).

Most of what was said in 1961, and again in 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965 can be said once again in January 1967 with equal cogency, especially relative to the problems or tasks of development administration.

As I look back on my own writing of the last 10 years, I would make only three major changes if I had it to do over again:

(1) As a result of our many discussions and the large amount of our research during the last 10 years, I would broaden the approach to and definition of development administration (as I did in a paper prepared for the East-West Center seminar conducted in July 1966 at the University of Hawaii by ASPA's Comparative Administration Group).[1]

(2) A marked change has taken place in the attention that development administration gets at our own colleges

and universities. It is now an established part of the curriculum at most large universities.

(3) I would take a somewhat more optimistic view of the ultimate impact of technical assistance in public administration abroad, especially regarding development administration and administrative theory. This change would be less a reinterpretation of the impact of particular projects than a heavier weighing of the impact of cross-cultural contacts as a whole. (This line of reasoning is reflected in an article appearing in the November 1966 issue of The Annals.)[2]

Only three changes--but the significance of them is substantial, producing a different environment and new opportunities for development administration.

The Tasks of Development Administration

The need for development administration has remained surprisingly constant during the last five or six years. The following somewhat edited statement was written by me for the October 1962 meeting sponsored by the Ford Foundation.[3] With slight modification, such as updating statistics, it is surprisingly relevant today.

Pre-Meeting Statement--The Task Ahead

Number of Specialists Abroad. At present, there are some 108 public administration specialists abroad among the employees of AID. There are nearly this many abroad under American university contracts. Consulting firms, foun-

dations, and the UN are the other three major sources of public administration personnel sent abroad. All told, between 400 and 500 Americans serving overseas are more or less designated to "public administration." Another 200 or thereabouts are not officially so designated but could properly be considered as performing duties primarily falling into the category of development administration.

The major responsibilities of these American specialists are not known exactly, but a reasonable estimate might be as follows:

general administration of technical assistance or aid programs	200
formulation or direction of public administration programs and projects	100
advice to host country administrators	175
substitute administration	75
advice to host country teachers of public administration	50
substitute teaching	75
research	25

However, development administration is not the monopoly of public administration experts. It is something in which all functional specialists abroad are likely to engage or with which they are concerned. Viewed in this manner, there are about 4,000 development administration specialists abroad for AID alone.

Three categories of persons can be distinguished, based upon the nature of their concern with development administration: (a) those whose primary concern is to help with the improvement of the administrative system of the host country; (b) those whose primary concern is to make a contribution

to the improvement in the functional services of the host government or of the private sector; (c) those whose primary concern is with the administration of the foreign aid program as such. Different preparation in development administration, both in amount and kind, would seem appropriate for each of the three groups.

American Agencies and Institutions. The main agencies financing the Americans abroad in development administration are AID, the Ford Foundation, and the UN, although others have also participated such as the Rockefeller Foundation and the Fulbright program. In a few instances, the host countries themselves have financed development administration advisers directly.

The UN directly administers the program it finances, while the Ford Foundation and AID directly administer in some instances and contract for services in others. Universities have been favorite contractors. Eleven universities have been involved in 13 countries in connection with 16 substantial-sized programs in public administration. In addition, public administration has been a part of several multi-purpose contracts or contracts in closely related fields.

Public administration contracts with profit and non-profit consulting firms have been equally numerous. Public Administration Service and the Governmental Affairs Institute are among the latter; Louis J. Kroeger and Booz, Allen, and Hamilton are among the former.

The contracts in public administration of AID are but a fraction of the total. In the university field, only 8 of more than 100 are in public administration. The proportion is even more extreme if the more than 450 group contracts of AID be considered, including commercial and non-profit organizations as well as universities. Ford Foundation contracts are primarily designated

in fields other than public administration; only two fall in the latter category.

Thus in regard to institutions, there is the same kind of specialization as is reflected in the individual sent abroad. Some approach development administration through public administration. Most approach it through interest in a functional-type program. All financing and contracting organizations approach it through a concern for foreign aid or technical assistance in general or through a project-wide concern.

Shortcomings of Personnel and Organizations. The shortcomings of personnel abroad in regard to development administration are primarily professional in nature. They are:

a. A lack of knowledge about the development aspect of their assignment abroad. Even among the more sophisticated professionals sent abroad, there is often a lack of awareness of international development as a subject matter. Public administration experts are sent abroad, not development administration experts; education specialists, not specialists in development education; agriculture professionals, not professionals in development agriculture.

b. A lack of competence in the advisory role that most are asked to play when abroad. At home, public administrators administer and professors teach. Abroad, they both predominantly advise and play the role of change agents (or at least they are supposed to view their assignments in this manner). Consequently, they tend to be fish out of water--often going back to the kind of operations in which they engaged at home, whether or not appropriate abroad.

c. A failure to adjust professionally to the overseas assignment. Specialists sent abroad have experienced severe difficulties in fitting an overseas assignment or series of assignments into a meaningful career pattern. Often there is career maladjustment, or fears of such. Professional isolation may be real enough, with all its consequences for getting "behind" in the latest professional knowledge and out of the mainstream of professional advancement.

There is great variation in professional adjustment. Using universities with early public administration contracts as examples, it would appear that the great majority of them recruited personnel with traditional public administration or state and local government backgrounds, plus, occasionally, area specialists. On the other hand, many of the persons they recruited have found permanent careers in fields related to development administration as a result of serving abroad. Of Michigan's four chief advisers in the Philippines, two have kept career interests in comparative development, or foreign aid administration (Heady and McHargue), and two have followed essentially other interests (Leaderle and Peak). Of Michigan State's first four political scientists in Vietnam, all have followed career patterns in development administration or technical assistance (Dorsey, Smuckler, Fox, and Weidner). Of the first six political scientists connected with Indiana's program in Thailand (Sutton, Kingsbury, Shor, Wit, Wilcox, and Siffin), at least half have continued such interests. On the other hand, those connected with the NYU Turkey program and the Pennsylvania Pakistan effort have drifted away from interests relevant to their overseas assignments more often than not, although there are some note-

worthy exceptions, which also illustrate how some individuals have put together careers with different technical assistance employers: Mauck, who went from Brazil (AID) to Turkey (NYU) to Korea (Minnesota); and Hall who served AID in Uruguay and Pennsylvania in Pakistan.

The adequacy of agencies, organizations, and institutions administering these programs has been found wanting more often than not during the first 15 years of experience with large-scale technical assistance. There are many reasons for this, but primarily it has been a matter of inexperience, political interference, failure to develop long-range programs, and lack of country-by-country adaptation. As for the university contractors, they have usually not related the overseas contracts to permanent university intellectual interests, although a growing number of institutions are now beginning to do so. There has often been no permanent commitment on the part of other contractors in regard to overseas work, either. Under such circumstances, quality personnel is not particularly attracted to overseas posts.

Training and Educational Facilities. The text written in 1962 is not applicable in this area today. In 1962, it was accurate to observe that for the most part, training and educational facilities in development administration did not exist. Of the various development sub-fields, development economics was the only one that has a truly national and international base. None of the others were significant in size. Development agriculture, development public health, development education, and development administration were all just phrases, not real sub-fields. Only five institutions had major interests in development administration: Southern California, Indiana, Pittsburgh, Syracuse, and Harvard. Seven others had more moderate (one or two-man) interests: California, Oregon, Hawaii, Michigan, Michigan State, Vanderbilt, and

Boston.

(We have come a long way since 1962, due to an important extent to CAG and the generosity of the Ford Foundation and AID. Development administration is now an important part of the curriculum of a dozen or more major universities, and a sizeable supplemental program at perhaps two dozen others. We are at last prepared to move ahead in this area in research, education, and training programs.)

Need for U.S. Personnel Overseas in Development Administration. In order to estimate the requirements for U.S. personnel abroad in development administration, some program assumptions are necessary. First of all, it is necessary to estimate the demand for such personnel by the host countries concerned. Over the past 15 years, most countries that have received technical assistance have not been very development-minded. If we assume that political changes can and must come in the direction of development-minded governments during the next two decades, a significant increase in the demand for U.S. personnel will be encountered. A doubling and even a tripling in demand could easily take place if political changes were effected in many countries. However, a markedly smaller increase seems likely in the decade ahead.

Sending personnel overseas is expensive, and substantial means to finance such an enterprise are necessary. In terms of the amount of financial support, it would appear that a plateau has been reached; the large increases occasioned in the late 1940s and during the 1950s are not likely to be repeated. At the outside, it seems unlikely that support levels in the United States in the private and public sectors will be increased beyond 25 per cent of the current level, and it may be that the level will taper off modestly if more interest in development is not shown in most countries. On the other hand,

sending American advisers abroad has never been a major portion of foreign aid costs, so that additional demands for advisers could be met within present support levels, if necessary.

Even if the demands for and support of U.S. personnel were to remain substantially as they are today, substantial personnel requirements would exist. There is a constant turnover in personnel serving abroad, and consequently the need for newly qualified personnel continues. Contractor personnel currently turns over almost completely every four years. Second assignments abroad are still infrequent for university contractor personnel.

Apart from turnover, there is the challenge of upgrading the quality of personnel serving abroad, particularly in regard to knowledge and skills relative to development administration. Upgrading would involve both separating the less desirables from the service and retraining the better personnel in development administration.

A further assumption is necessary relative to the roles that American personnel are to play abroad. Specifically, the most important issue is whether American specialists sent abroad are to be substitute administrators and substitute teachers for the host countries, or whether they are to confine their roles to general planning, advice, and research. The latter would seem to be the sounder course of action. For example, the UN OPEX program gathers greater momentum annually. So does the Peace Corps.

While any estimate of needs must be somewhat of a guess, a proposed minimum education and training program for U.S. personnel might be as follows:

40-50 Ph.Ds each year with theses in development administration

150-200 MAs each year in development administration

1,000-1,500 MAs each year in functional fields with development administration exposure

100-150 trainees (in case of lateral entry) or retrainees (in the case of personnel overseas currently) in development administration yearly

1000 trainees or retrainees in functional fields with exposure to development administration yearly

In considering these numbers, it is well to remember that there is considerable "loss" in education and training programs, as the individuals concerned take jobs in other fields or leave the labor market (e.g., married women). In addition, the United States itself needs development administrationists at home for its own purposes, as well as sending specialists abroad.

Need for Agencies and Institutions. From time to time, voices have been raised in favor of a single, all-encompassing technical assistance agency that would carry out its entire program by itself. Some have argued for this at a bilateral level, others at an international level. This view has be now become generally discredited.

On the other hand, the positive notion of trying to get many groups and organizations in the United States actively participating in the technical assistance program has not been affirmatively embraced. There are several reasons why such a policy is highly desirable:

--organizations such as AID have severe career problems with specialists who serve abroad

--high quality people can be obtained in this way

--technical assistance does not become an isolated operation if many groups participate in it

--an additional national resource can arise with each contractor involved if appropriate steps are taken to assure his long-range interest

--contractors can frequently do a superior job

If quality personnel on the scale indicated above are to be obtained,

additional sources of recruiting and supervising such personnel will be needed by the foundations, AID, and the UN. There are a number of alternatives, so that precise figures are not possible in regard to the demands upon any one agency or set of contractors.

Need for Training and Educational Programs. If the personnel required for effective work in development administration is to be made available, training and educational programs that do not exist at this point in time will be launched. Specifically, there is need for:

--development administration at the MA level

--development administration at the Ph.D. level

--development administration as a supplement at the MA level

--development administration in a three to six-months training program

--development administration as a supplement to a three to six-months training program

The variety of needs as well as their extent makes it apparent that no single comprehensive training and/or educational center can begin to be an adequate solution. In the past, suggestions for such a center have been put forth in several different forms--a government institute, a university institute, or a chosen instrument created independently just for such a purpose.

The question remains, however, whether or not a model institute could and should be created, even though it is not the exclusive device for training and education. It could handle a large portion of the training and retraining and, if attached to a university, a good portion of the degree work as well. It would have the advantage of economy of scale as well as being a dependable source of trained personnel.

Another alternative is to encourage the creation of 8 or 10 major

centers for development administration training and education at as many universities, together with 8 or 10 supplementary centers on a somewhat more modest scale, plus a general competence in development administration at all important graduate and law schools. This would have the advantage of permitting widespread experimentation with different kinds of training and education in a field that is still quite new and largely uncharted. It would also maximize the integration of development administration into regular university work throughout the country.

Other possibilities include various combinations of the model center and supplementary centers, with general competence at universities being a common goal; completely uncharted and unplanned action, with the demand for development administration training and education presumably being an attractive stimulus for academic entrepreneurs; and splitting training and education, with special chosen instrument(s) or government institute(s) handling the training and one or more universities handling the education. A further combination or specialization could involve participant training in development administration--there will always be a substantial amount of this even though maximum stress is placed upon host country training of host country personnel and/or maximum utilization of third country training.

No single curriculum would seem desirable. Rather, there should be a generous amount of variation and individual adaptation. Some programs could be country or regionally-focussed. They could include area and language training and some kind of field experience--internship, observation, or research. Others could be topically specialized.

Closing the Gaps. How can we get from where we are to where we should be? This requires concerted action by many different parties and the

marshalling of additional financial resources and personnel.

The basic requirement for rapid progress is general consensus of the direction that should be taken among the persons that consider development administration their intellectual and administrative "home." Such consensus can be more or less general, but some agreement on direction is a requisite for expeditious action.

A continuing national advisory panel on development administration education and training could be established, which financing organizations and training and educational agencies could use or not as they saw fit. Such a panel might be especially useful in pointing up needs, serving as a liaison and source of information, and helping toward an orderly expansion of existing resources.

AID, the foundations, and the UN must increasingly realize that if they are to find adequately trained personnel for assignment overseas, they must assume some responsibility for seeing that adequate educational and training facilities are established and appropriate fellowships made available. Each will have to do so in its own way, but a national advisory panel could help give general meaning to the efforts of individual agencies and foundations. In addition, the Fulbright program, the activities of the East-West Center, and similar efforts could profit from general advice and liaison in development administration.

As universities identify strong intellectual interests in development administration, they should assume responsibility for spelling these out and making them known. However, it is unrealistic to assume that development administration is something for which universities can use other people's money and not their own. If a university is unwilling to commit some of its

own resources to such an intellectual interest, its commitment cannot be a very serious one. What is needed is long-range institutional commitments, not short-range applications for outside money. There will be some universities whose major interests lie in other intellectual fields. This is as it should be. But the main objective should be clear: an identification of deep intellectual interests and the creation of long-range and continuing programs of training, education, collections of library materials, and research.

In terms of teaching, universities will find that an interest in development administration may require an extra seminar or two, but mostly it will be a restructuring of and the introduction of content to existing instructional courses.

In terms of institutional services overseas, a system of positive contracting on the part of AID and the foundations would encourage a number of additional contractors to take on such programs (AID has taken steps in this direction although these steps have not always been understood by those in the field). On the other hand, these programs should be also related to the permanent interests of the contractors.

A special problem facing universities in regard to development administration programs is that of lack of administrative support for their efforts overseas. If universities are greatly to expand their development administration activities, there will be all the more need for such administrative support. For example, universities need administrative support for their technical assistance contracts abroad, as well as for sending American students abroad for internships, observation, or research purposes. They could use appropriate field services for screening foreign graduate student applicants in development administration, and for identifying and collecting research

materials related to development administration. Americans going abroad need reception, briefing, and orientation services in host country development administration.

Such a group of services might be provided by an open-ended consortium of American universities working cooperatively with certain host country academic groups, looking toward the establishment of facilitating field offices.

Reception and briefing services in United States development administration could also be established for the benefit of foreign participants, scholars, and other visitors. One or more American universities could take on such an assignment.

Required Research. There should be no underestimation of the lack of our knowledge about development administration. Relatively little research has been carried out on any aspect of it. The need for research is, basically, for enquiry into how different administrative systems and techniques are related to the maximization of progress in national development under certain conditions. Primary interest in efficiency or economy or neat administrative patterns may lead to fruitless or even negative consequences for national development.

There needs to be a country-by-country approach to research. Initially, there is less need for broad generalizations as to how a country maximizes national development through administrative means than for a more pragmatic approach. There are vast differences, country to country and ministry to ministry.

Attention needs to be given to the relation of an administrative system to different levels of political, economic, and social development. Certain administrative methods may work at one stage of growth but not at another.

One of the early priorities is to examine how the entire education and training system of a country relates to the administrative system and to progress in national development. Educational systems help shape values and determine patterns of access to the bureaucracy.

National planning is one part of development administration, but only one. Among the more fundamental topics to tackle is the interplay between development administration and development politics, which is so important where support for development may be lacking in one sector or another.

Universities can play an important role in pushing back the frontiers of knowledge. Government agencies and foundations should make certain that research in development administration is an important part of the overseas activities of American universities that they finance in this field. Stimulation of research by host country nationals is also essential.

The Scope and Meaning of Development Administration

The definition of and approach to development administration has broadened considerably during the last six years. The following discussion which illustrates this is adapted from a paper of mine presented at the 1966 CAG-East-West Center Development Administration Seminar (cited in footnote 1).

Much of the literature on development approaches the subject in far too simple terms. One group of scholars has equated development with growth. Another group has thought of it as system change. A third school of thought has argued for goal orientation, especially modernity, nation-building, and socio-economic progress. Still another popular approach to development has been to consider it to be planned change. Certain combinations have also been popular, the most comprehensive of which has led some observers to look upon

development as planned growth in the direction of modernity, nation-building, and socio-economic progress involving substantial differentiation and coordination. There can be no doubt that much that is understood to be included in the term development by administrators, politicians, businessmen, or scholars is included in such a several-faceted definition. At the same time, much goal achievement in the direction of modernity would fall outside the definition for the very reason that it prescribes so many different characteristics that must adhere to change if it is to be considered development. It excludes much of what goes on in rapidly developing situations.

The recent intensive activity in development administration has not brought unanimity among scholars as to the meaning of the term. In fact, the last 10 years have been characterized by more than the usual groping for terms and by substantial semantic debates. What is necessary for action and research in development administration in not precise agreement on what each word should mean, but rather general agreement on some of the major concepts that are central to practical and analytical work in this area. Within such agreement, each administrator and scholar has a responsibility to make clear how he proposes to use labels and terms. Increasingly, the first of these requisites is being met.

Far more attention has been given to the word "development" than to the word "administration." Contributions to the discussion of development have come from many sources, often outside the confines of public administration, such as from those interested in the economic, educational, or agricultural aspects of development. Always active and occasionally acrimonious, the discussion has nonetheless served to emphasize three major facets of change that need to be taken into account by any practitioner or student of development

administration.

First, a general distinction is now made between change in the output of a system and change in the system itself. Changes in the output of a system that are in the direction of greater quantity are frequently labeled growth; and those that are in the reverse direction, lack of growth or decline. Growth is essentially a quantitative concept. It does not make a qualitative distinction. Thus we may speak of growth of police or military forces, growth of controls on prices or housing, increases in government reports, and so on. Still, growth is not a simple concept. What is growth from one point of view may be decline from another. The growth in income of one business may necessarily result in a decline in another (a zero-sum game). The growth of public services in one society may be twice as slow as similar growth in another. A $50 per-capita growth may have entirely different consequences if it is from $500 to $550, rather than from $2200 to $2250. The rate or time period of growth, its extent, and whom and what it concerns are all important aspects.

A number of scholars of development administration have focused their attention on changes in the social system, and particularly on changes in the administrative system of a developing country as a crucial variable. Riggs, Diamant, and Eisenstadt are among the members of this group. Two similar formulations have been set forth. Riggs has emphasized differentiation plus coordination as system characteristics that represent the essence of development. Diamant and Eisenstadt have suggested that system capability in handling change is the essential attribute. A choice does not have to be made between these formulations since they are basically different ways of saying the same thing. In the first formulation, differentiation plus coordination equals capacity. In the other, capability in handling change requires a differentiated and cen-

tralized system. However, in neither case is output invariably related to system capacity or differentiation. Capacity can be merely potential and unused. Thus four possibilities emerge: growth with system change; growth without system change; lack of growth with system change; and lack of growth and no system change.

Second, distinctions have been drawn among the different goals or outputs of an administrative system. Of course, no two societies and perhaps no two persons or groups have identical goals or emphases. General directions are discernible. Modernity is a cluster of values that are avidly sought by the less developed societies, and undoubtedly the process of modernization continues even in the most modern country. Daniel Lerner has suggested certain phases of modernity: urbanization, literacy or education, and media production and consumption, which may be considered indices of geographic, social, and psychic mobility. These lead, in turn, to greater economic and political participation with possible indices such as per capita income and voting participation (Lerner, 1958, pp. 43-75). An alternative formulation is that of Shils, "Among the elites of the new states, 'modern' means dynamic, concerned with the people, democratic and equalitarian, scientific, economically advanced, sovereign and influential" (Shils, 1962, p. 7). Other combinations of values have been suggested for modernity. While unanimity on the use of the term is not found, the definitions are substantially compatible with each other. The values they identify may be considered the ultimate goals of development, the ultimate dependent variables in research schemes. There are a number of useful indices of these values of modernity that can be of important potential assistance in research.

As a term, modernity is rather all-inclusive. Other formulations

of goals in the developing process have been more selective. Two deserve special attention because of their ultimate, end-product, or consumption aspects. Nation-building is one such cluster of outputs sought in development. Esman defines it as "the deliberate fashioning of an integrated political community within fixed geographic boundaries in which the nation state is the dominant political institution."[4] There are several aspects of nation-building among which national identity or solidarity, structuralization, and participation are among the more important in the less developed countries. The formula for nation-building varies to some extent in each country, and there are extremely wide variations if the entire spectrum of the less developed countries be included. Still, the important and most relevant fact for the present analysis is that each of the developing nations do have such a formula.

Socio-economic progress is another label for a cluster of values of outputs of a modernizing administrative system. Esman suggests that such progress is "the sustained and widely diffused improvement in material and social welfare."[5] Most of the elements of material and social welfare are rather self-evident and measurable, such as a rise in per-capita income, greater number of students completing secondary school and college, and more physicians per-capita. Still, there may be substantial disagreement as to what constitutes socio-economic progress among two or more groups or individuals within a country or among leaders or dominant factions of different countries. There is great variation in the strategies pursued in regard to the relative balance between consumption and production, and there are many positions on the continuum which has as its poles laissez-faire capitalism and socialism.

Thus in common usage of the term, a rapidly developing country is a goal-oriented country, headed in the direction of modernity, with special

emphasis on nation-building and socio-economic progress. This definition accords with the announced objectives of leaders of these nations. While specifics will vary and even be in dispute, the general direction is evident.

Returning to a consideration of the definition of development, we can now attempt a more comprehensive statement. A more complete description of the development process would be growth, whether under conditions of system change or not, in the direction of modernity, or nation-building and socio-economic progress. It is a reasonable hypothesis that in order for growth to proceed in this direction very far, system change in the form of increased differentiation and coordination, together with appropriate accompanying specialization, would be required. Such changes would be only intermediate dependent variables for the scholar of development administration, however. The ultimate dependent variables would be the goals themselves, the "pay-off" in the society. Thus differentiation and coordination would be development-related to the extent that they led to the accomplishment of these goals sooner or later.

Third, there is an inherently manipulative aspect to the term development. It is commonly understood that those engaged in development work are consciously trying to bring about change in a particular direction. An assumption lies behind this common understanding: man can affect the environment of which he is a part as well as be affected by it. A deterministic view of man in relation to environment is thus rejected in favor of a reciprocal view. Fred A. Riggs and Hahn-Been Lee have compared an environmental approach with an ecological one. The former approach is defined as unidirectional, the latter approach as reciprocal. Environmental factors in general and cultural factors in particular are important to those who attempt to bring about major

change in a society. Such factors condition the outcome of any governmental program or other innovation. Therefore, changes in man's culture and environment are among the goals of highest priority in the countries most committed to change.

An assumption underlying the selection of goals in planning for national development that achievement of modernity, nation-building, and socio-economic progress can be furthered by man through one means or another. Study of and action concerning development administration proceeds on the same assumption, of course. At the same time it is entirely possible that some growth in the direction of modernity, nation-building, and socio-economic progress can come about without being specifically planned or even intended.

Many of the accomplishments of any large organization such as government are clearly not planned or even intended--at least by the authorities that be. And the underlying motivations for actions are normally very diverse and are by no means exclusively developmental or anti-developmental. It would be unduly restrictive to impute to any government or bureaucracy complete rationality and singleness or duality of purpose. There are almost no occasions where both the power and task elites, much less the bureaucracy, as well, are developmentalist-minded, i.e., single-purpose oriented in the direction of development. Decision making involves both facts and values and there may be ignorance of the one, disagreement concerning the other, and avoidance of the consequences of either. Some change is planned, other change is largely unplanned. There are intended and unintended aspects to all planned change. Some change involves growth in the direction of modernity, other change does not. Some planned change may result in more modernity quite accidentally. And not all growth in the direction of nation-building and socio-

economic progress necessarily requires major system change.

Development administration, as a part of the policy sciences, could legitimately focus on some of the end-results of the policies or goals of the political and administrative systems, such as modernity, nation-building, and socio-economic progress. The programs or innovations introduced in developing countries would then be among the principal independent variables, the outputs or goal-accomplishment the ultimate dependent variables, and environmental or cultural factors intervening or intermediate dependent variables. These would be tendencies, and of course, would not necessarily be true of every development administration program.

If the necessary condition for development administration is identification of the circumstances under which modernity, nation-building, and socio-economic progress take place, a variety of situations can be imagined, each of them possible routes to the end-result. The six most likely are: (1) Planned directional growth with system change. (2) Planned directional growth with no system change. (3) Unplanned (or just planning of environmental change) directional growth with system change. (4) Unplanned (or just planning of environmental change) directional growth with no system change. (5) Planned system change with no directional growth. (6) Unplanned system change with no directional growth.

The Role of Universities

Development administration has come of age in American universities during the last six years. It is now an established part of the curriculum at most large universities. Thus the summary paper, written after the October 1962 meeting in New York City, has had to be extensively altered to make it

relevant as of 1967 (see footnote 3).

Post-Meeting Statement--The Role of Universities

Responsibility of Universities for Education and Training. The extent of the facilities needed in the United States in development administration is conditioned heavily not only by our own training needs but also the extent to which host country participants are to make use of them. Most education and training programs would be enriched by the presence of host country nationals even though additional facilities would have to be present to accommodate them. On the other hand, the main emphasis must remain on training the trainee in their own countries as much as possible.

A healthy pluralism should prevail in constructing educational and training programs to meet the needs in development administration. However, certain facts need to be taken into account in framing any program. First, there is much in our own development that is not relevant. Some have expressed the view that administration plays a role in most underdeveloped countries that it did not play in the United States during our most rapid period of development. There was not over-all national planning or very substantial conscious acceleration of development in our experience. One school of thought is that the United States developed brilliantly and then the science of administration came along. Up to now, reforms have been largely forced upon American administrators. An alternative reading of American history had substantial cogency, also. Both state and national governments had been concerned with development since the founding of the Republic, from the time of Hamilton, Jefferson, and Madison on. And many a development-minded administrator was to be found among those who played an active role in the growth

of the country.

A second fact that must be understood by those who construct an educational and training program in development administration is that the subject is interdisciplinary in character. None of the traditional disciplines completely encompasses the topic. A single interdisciplinary approach for all universities is not appropriate. Among the possibilities are:

--beginning with an emphasis on development and developers and bringing in administration or, alternatively beginning with an emphasis on administration and administrators and bringing in development.

--relating development administration to other sub-fields of development or, alternatively, having a development administration program by itself. The former presents many possibilities. For example, cooperating with development economics in a joint approach to development can prove fruitful, as at Williams or Pittsburgh. A marriage between development administration and one of the functional sub-fields such as development public health or development agriculture might be helpful. Some universities or centers may desire to launch educational and training programs in all or nearly all development sub-fields.

--a world-wide approach to development or, alternatively, an area or even a country approach. There is an inadequate relation between area studies programs and programs in the development sub-fields. Too many of the programs concentrate solely on traditional historical, legal, and humanistic topics.

Universities are needed to shoulder the major responsibility in education and training in development administration. Such activities should include M.A. and Ph.D. programs, short-term training, retraining or "retreading" courses, and orientation programs. Retreading courses in development are especially needed for advanced professional people who go abroad, including

professors themselves, private executives, public executives, and other professional personnel. In general, orientation in development administration is needed for all personnel going abroad to participate in technical assistance work.

The approaches of the several universities to such education and training should be different, in accordance with their special interests and strengths. Thus there would be different "developmental complexes" at the several universities. Various "clusters of strength" would be built up that would include development administration plus something else or development administration with a special approach.

Responsibility of Universities for Overseas Commitments. Should university responsibility in regard to development administration go beyond education and training in the United States to include sending professors abroad and/or accepting institutional responsibility for overseas technical assistance programs in these fields? Those attending the October, 1962, New York meeting were emphatically agreed that these, too, were functions that universities must undertake.

Institutional responsibility for overseas technical assistance need not divert universities from their essential domestic tasks. That they may have done so in some instances is more a defect in the procedures and concepts of a particular contract or program rather than an inherent difficulty.

Quite apart from the important contributions that universities and university personnel can make abroad, the experience abroad can be a major device for improving or "retreading" faculty competence in this area. It gives them a kind of experience, knowledge, and insight they cannot get in any other way. The major question is not whether careers are in jeopardy when professors

go abroad. Rather, the major question is whether there is a feed-back from overseas contract operations to the home campus. Only if there is impact at home as well as abroad can a contract be said to be truly successful. And if there is, careers will not be in jeopardy. Quite the reverse; careers will be furthered.

For example, development economics matured first as a sub-field and most universities came to include it in their offerings. Development administration is now about to reach the same point. Such a goal would have been unattainable unless professors went abroad and sought competence and experience in these sub-fields. Going abroad in an advisory or technical assistance position probably has as much value in helping a professor strengthen his competence in a development sub-field as it does in furthering the host country's development.

It must be remembered that universities are educational institutions and, therefore, certain conditions should be present in all overseas contracts which they undertake:

--A teaching component must be included.

--A research component must be included.

--Long-range contracts are essential if educational objectives are to be attained.

--Universities should be given an advisory role in developing the projects they are asked to undertake.

--The contract should include a grant for resource development at the universities back home.

Should universities take on consulting assignments abroad, that is, advisory responsibilities to government or other operating agencies? One view is that

this is inappropriate to the nature of a university. Another is that many universities and professors accept consulting assignments at home continually, and their extension overseas is most natural and desirable. The same differences of opinion obtain relative to in-service training activities abroad. At the least, universities and professors should confine themselves to undertaking abroad the kinds of activities in which they engage at home. It was recognized this would vary from institution to institution and individual to individual.

As for consulting, those professors and institutions who engage in it should realize that traditional academic freedom concepts do not apply in this realm. Consulting involves a confidential relationship between consultant and client. In all other activities universities and professors have a right and an obligation to maintain traditional academic freedom if they are to be true to their major mission.

There are many ways in which the resources of universities at home can be built up through devices in overseas or related contracts. Provision can be made for Ph.D. candidates to accompany professors who go abroad. They not only could get their own overseas experience, but could carry on research for their theses, also. Another alternative would be to provide a more general overseas experience on a supervised basis for students at a master's level.

Collections of research materials can be added to the university library and research on development administration can be supported. AID and the foundations can improve their files and make them available to professors for research purposes. Specialized courses or seminars may also be needed to add to institutional resources at home.

One of the most serious problems of adding to university resources

arises in regard to tenured faculty. As a university expands its faculty in order to staff overseas projects, a problem arises of a shortage of tenured posts. If the foundations and AID are to ask universities to take on overseas assignments, they should also be willing to agree to underwrite the risks involved in a university's expanding the number of its tenured posts accordingly. The "risk" would occur in those years in which a university does not have enough overseas grants or contracts to cover the costs of the added tenure posts. The Ford Foundation has assisted Harvard in meeting such risks in regard to a number of such posts. Another Ford Foundation experiment has been to pay for a new tenure professorship in a development field for seven years. After that, the university assumes the cost. This permits more rapid expansion of a university's resource base.

AID is supporting American university research in development fields both at home and abroad rather substantially. One of the recent manifestations of this is the program administered through SEADAG (Southeast Asia Development Advisory Group).

The number of university contracts abroad is likely to continue at a high number. Current AID policy is to have the primary technical assistance job abroad undertaken by contractors. Ford Foundation policy has been in the same direction for some years. However, institutional relation or contract may on occasion be inadvisable. Frequently a single individual can complete an assignment just as well as or better than a group. This may well be true in the very early or the very late stages of institution-building.

Formerly, some observers felt that a "wastage" occurred when an American professor went abroad for a personal experience or host country students were recruited by an American university largely at random. Such

activities are not related to institution-building objectives and therefore do not have a substantial spread effect, they believed. It is now evident that both professors and universities that engage in non-institution-building activities, whether at home or abroad, contribute to useful experimentation and even to reinforcement of institution-building in the long run. One reason why some faculty members and universities do not institution-build, whether at home or abroad, is that they have not seen their task this way. The importance and even the urgency of specific institution-building objectives, especially in the short run, should be more fully understood.

Two Difficult Choices. The proposed assumption by universities of major roles in regard to development administration raises two very difficult questions.

(a) Balancing versus Programming. Within each university a kind of balance is considered desirable among the different disciplines and, within each discipline, among the several sub-fields. At the same time, a cutting edge is important. No university can afford to specialize or concentrate on anything.

A few universities may be reaching the point where they cannot go much farther in development administration and technical assistance. They may have to concentrate on other aspects of the social sciences and marshall resources for them before expanding their development interests. However, the majority of universities have treated development administration lightly, and could well afford to program or channel their activities into this new area. Indeed, it is urgent that they do so. Failure to act means that the ignoring of an important new sub-field of study will continue in many institutions.

At the same time, just as some universities place great emphasis on their medical schools, or law schools, or engineering colleges, others should come (and have come) to excel in development administration. Several institutions heavily emphasize development administration, a somewhat greater number have important intellectual interests in them, and all should achieve at least the status of competence in this area.

(b) University versus Inter-University Action. If there is to be a major increase in the attention given to development administration at American universities, it can be furthered by individual universities acting alone, by some group taking the leadership, or by a combination of individual and group action.

The defenders of action by individual universities fear that the organization of a group might interfere with necessary experimentation and pluralism of approaches to development administration. Every institution is different, and consequently group action would not necessarily have much meaning for a given university. Consequently, not too much could be expected from a group approach. There also are technical objections: Who would organize such a group? Who would select its members? Would only the centers of strength in development administration be represented?

Despite these reservations, consortia are increasing in number, giving leadership in development administration. A number of examples of group action are to be found; the Indiana-Michigan State, Wisconsin-Illinois effort in Thailand is a recent example. Many different forms of group action are possible. An informal group, a periodic research conference, a "light consortium," and a rather extended consortium are among them. Among the possible areas for cooperation are the exchange of research ideas, policy

leadership, liaison with AID and foundations, joint education or training programs--perhaps even joint degrees, joint orientation or retreading programs, cooperation in educational exchange and the building of personnel rosters.

Overall Impact of Development Administration

Technical assistance and educational exchange activities in development administration have had an impact that is impressive. While individual efforts or projects have often appeared to be unsuccessful, and this was evident in 1961 and 1962, the weight of cross-cultural contacts has been great in the longer run, and this was not so evident. Promising new patterns have emerged. The following discussion is adapted from a recent article of mine in The Annals.[6]

Emerging Patterns

Behind all the going and coming of international educational exchange in development administration--indeed, almost obscured by the impressive statistics of how many professors go abroad--lie some important developments that are gradually changing the nature of such exchange. It is true that many a project under which American professors have gone abroad has not been an outstanding success. The same is true of other kinds of educational exchange projects. However, the cumulative effect of all kinds of educational exchange is beginning to have an impact far broader than that of an individual project. The educational systems of the less developed countries are being strengthened substantially, and, most important of all from the standpoint of the American professor going abroad, groups of highly competent staff members,

admittedly small at first, are beginning to form in one host university after another. Just as in the United States, some of the Ph.D's of the newly developing countries do not remain at universities, being attracted to nonuniversity assignments. Still, the number of Ph.D's remaining within higher education is beginning to be noticeable, and their quality high. This process is more advanced in some countries than in others, of course. Speaking broadly, in development administration Asia is well ahead, Africa is far behind, and Latin America in between. What is true of the Philippines or Korea today may well be true of many other countries a decade hence.

From one point of view, the strengthening of the educational elite of the less developed countries is a major justification of the several programs of educational exchange. On closer examination, its progressive achievement challenges the basic assumptions behind continuing such programs in their present form. The American professor going abroad in the future will be faced with entirely different conditions from those he has been used to encountering in the 1940's, 1950's, and 1960's. As a result of the several educational exchange programs of the last two decades, there will be an educational elite in development administration at host universities roughly equal in quality if not in quantity to that in the United States. Since major programs promoting the scientific exchange of information are also being, and will continue to be, effective, this elite will have access to the latest scientific information.

How will these conditions affect American professors as they go abroad in the 1970's? First of all, some of the roles they have been playing will be drastically altered. Little by little, administrative roles will decline in number, since host-country and host-university administrative

positions will be filled by host-country nationals. Administrative positions in connection with American university projects abroad will still be numerous, even though the nature of these projects will change substantially.

Technical assistance projects will decline in numbers and importance and will gradually be replaced by technical co-operation undertakings. There will be greater stress on mutual approaches to mutual problems, with each party benefiting roughly equally by the experience. Within the last year a group of Asians considering projects in public administration formally registered its unhappiness with the term technical assistance and urged that technical co-operation be substituted. Its reasoning was that the problems encountered in Asia were of an order that was similar to those in many countries, even those of relatively advanced countries such as the United States. Furthermore, it observed, almost every Asian country was already a donor as well as a recipient of technical assistance. In the future, American professors serving on technical co-operation missions abroad can expect to co-operate with highly competent and specialized host-country nationals. They will not be giving advice to those who have had little or no experience in their respective professional fields. Then, on return, they can rely on knowledge and experience gained abroad in contributing to development efforts at home.

Major changes are imminent in research carried out by American professors overseas. With an established and growing educational elite in more and more countries, new patterns of co-operation have become possible and necessary if the boundaries of knowledge are to be pushed back effectively and rapidly. Every regionally relevant field of study needs to test the applicability of its stock of generalizations to the different conditions

found in the several countries of the world. In this endeavor, the new educational elites have as large or larger a stake than professors from the United States. Their members will fulfill important roles in group research enterprises in the years ahead. They will take the initiative and leadership in some of them and play co-operating roles in others. The excellence of their training in scientific, empirical research will be beyond question, and their standards will be as rigorous as any.

In the realm of research, the development of educational elites in the less developed countries opens up many new possibilities for American and host-country professors alike. In particular, opportunities abound for comparative studies being carried out in several different countries in a quasi-replicated form. The American professor going abroad in the future can extend the theoretical and practical usefulness of his research by being a part of such undertakings, along with professors from several countries in the region.

As both American and host-country professors become more experienced at the task of dealing with developmental change, new opportunities of combining research and projects of technical co-operation projects will arise. Technical co-operative projects are experiments on how to bring about change. If they were conceived adequately, they could serve as research laboratories, leading to important additions to the theory and practice of developmental change. This would require more than mere evaluation research. It would require experimental and control situations, with careful analysis of the situation before and after the project as well as continuing analysis during the life of the project.

In the years ahead, the professor going to a less developed country

will encounter fewer role problems than his colleagues have in the last two decades. His assignment will be clearer and more limited. He will be brought in either for cultural enrichment purposes or on a two-way exchange basis. As knowledge in the disciplines and professions related to development administration becomes the possession of all countries rather than just the few, he need not be especially concerned with varying the subject matter he presents, except for using local examples to make his points more understandable. But the gulf in teaching methods will continue long after the knowledge gap has been closed or nearly so. Systems of higher education will not become identical and will prove especially impervious to change.

The new world is not some far-off utopia. It is coming about today, spottily it is true, but nonetheless surely: a university or country here and there, one profession rather broadly, another perhaps regionally. While a generation or more may pass before some of the less fortunate countries can fully achieve such standards in higher education, the picture is changing rapidly in many places. It is changing so rapidly that the approach of American professors and their financial sponsors will be outmoded in a number of instances unless major adjustments are made. The so-called less developed countries are not all of one kind, certainly not in higher education. To adjust to the circumstances of this environment, universities, professors, and financial sponsors need to give immediate consideration to new educational exchange activities. Regional committees or professional associations composed of specialists from and on regions or subregions could play important roles in teaching, research, and technical co-operation projects and exchanges. The regional professional association would likely be overly formalistic and hence not as good a change agent as regional specialized

professional committees or groups. The latter could help channel resources into experimentally designed technical co-operation projects and assist in organizing comparative research projects in two or more countries of the region. They would provide effective vehicles whereby the scholars of the region could take the initiative in assessing priorities in teaching, research, and action programs of higher education. The scholars could then exercise leadership in inviting Americans and other outsiders to participate with them in meaningful undertakings. In turn, American scholars could approach such groups or committees when they needed assistance in carrying out a project. This type of co-operation is already a fact in Asia with the Development Administration Group of EROPA (Asians) and the Asia Committee of the Comparative Administration Group (Americans).

There is much that is new in the less developed countries that alters the conditions of American professors going abroad. The most important element of newness is that in terms of university educational elites, a number of countries in a number of disciplines and professions are no longer "less developed" whatever the state of their economies. Adaptation to this fact is an immediate imperative for professors and fund-providers from the United States.

Footnotes

[1]Edward W. Weidner, Development Administration: An Appraisal, Comparative Administration Group, 1966.

[2]Weidner, "The Professor Abroad: Twenty Years of Change," The Annals, American Academy of Political and Social Science, November 1966, pp. 60-70.

[3]A conference on development administration held in New York and convened by the Ford Foundation.

[4]Milton J. Esman, "The Politics of Development Administration," in Montgomery and Siffin, eds., Approaches to Development: Politi Administration and Change, New York, 1966, p. 59.

[5]Ibid, pp. 59-60.

[6]Weidner, "The Professor Abroad," op. cit., pp. 67-70.

THE PROBLEMS WE FACE

G. W. Lawson, Jr.

The idea for this conference was born in 1960 on the occasion of a meeting of the ASPA Council on Graduate Education for Public Administration at Lake Arrowhead, California. Since then we have had six more years of experience. It is time to think through where we have been and where we are going. What have we done in the past 10 years? What have we learned from what we have done? Where are we going in the next 10 years? What are our targets? What are the tools? How can we measure our progress? How do we relate schools of public administration to needs for technical assistance? How do we help technical assistance identify its needs for public administration? Why should we be trying to do anything about technical assistance when it is such an ill-defined area, and when we have so many problems here at home and so few people to work with them? The Agency for International Development is interested enough in these questions to sponsor this conference in the hope of getting some partial answers.

What Have We Done?

We have obligated $182 million in the last 10 years to public administration technical assistance. We have averaged over 150 projects in each of

the years, in upwards of 60 countries. The projects have ranged in subject matter from accounting in Trinidad to zoning in Thailand. In 1956, there were 365 Americans working overseas for Uncle Sam in projects labeled public administration. Ten years later there were 519--either on U.S. payrolls or working for contractors, including the universities.

In the United States we have been training foreign officials and scholars in public administration at the rate of over 500 a year. Some have returned to good or better jobs in government. Others have become professors. A few have gone into business, and too many are still here. (The U.S. government has a reasonably good record of sending its so-called participants home.)

We have finished the job in Europe, and a few of the developing countries have reached a stage of self-sustaining growth and can pay their own way--Taiwan and Israel, for example. A few have struck oil and no longer need rely on concessional aid for their technical assistance.

What Have We Learned?

Since the early university contracts--the University of Michigan in the Philippines, the University of Tennessee in Panama and Bolivia--we have made some progress. The ground rules for effective cooperation between government and the educational institutions have been defined and refined--and hopefully improved. There is, understandably, still some debate. We have learned that a successful technical assistance project must have clearly defined objectives. The universities have recognized that one important ingredient for a successful overseas involvement in technical assistance is a firm institutional commitment. We have acknowledged that to attract good scholars,

technical assistance projects must contain an element of research. Some of the characteristics of a successful professional overseas have been identified and classified. We have come to understand that institution-building takes time. Continuity is a must--an AID as well as a university conviction.

Where Are We Going?

What can we expect in the next decade and beyond? The number of countries reaching a stage of self-sustaining growth will not be large, certainly not in the first half of the decade. Their rate of economic, social, and political growth will continue to be conditioned by the quality and effectiveness of government institutions. There is little foreseeable shortening of the long lists of administrative deficiencies impeding development.

Three fields have been singled out by the executive branch for special emphasis in foreign assistance activities over the next few years--agriculture, education, and health. The current rate of world population growth threatens a number of the goals to which all nations are committed--adequate food, good health, literacy, education, and gainful employment. At present rates, world population is likely to double in the next 35 years, resulting in a population of 6 billion by the year 2000 and 12 billion by 2035. These rates surpass present and prospective rates of increase in economic development, placing a heavy burden on man's efforts to improve human welfare.

There is a growing spread between population and food supplies. Better health services that lower infant mortality and death rates, and higher incomes that increase the demand for food, contribute to this spread. On a per capita basis, food production is declining in most of the less-developed countries. Food production must be doubled and trebled in many countries if

there is to be real progress. The food problem can be met over the next decade and beyond through a short-run food surplus program, but major emphasis must be given to adaptive research to develop, test, and apply new materials and production practices and to the building of an indigenous base of science and technology to furnish a sustained flow of innovations for continued growth in production. Persons with management skills will be needed to apply the innovations. They will have to build and run the agriculture ministries and local organizations to plan, staff, finance, and operate the research, education, extension, irrigation, reclamation, conservation, marketing, and other supportive services required. The schools of public administration may well focus attention on this critical world problem.

Nearly every issue to be met by public administrators in the U.S. must be faced by their counterparts in the developing nations. Urbanization is an example. We have social tensions; housing shortages; transport snarls; unemployment; pollution; and inadequate education, water, and health facilities in our cities. Developing nations have "urban homesteaders" in their favellas, along with all the other ills of rapid urbanization. Not only in the metropolitan centers but also in the smaller cities, towns, and villages there are problems to be solved. Our city managers are finding that efficiently run police, fire, and health departments are not enough to demonstrate that they are effective administrators. They must be capable of grappling with the complexities of economic growth and broad social issues. So far in our foreign aid programs we have had very few local government projects.

Legal institutions in the emerging countries pose another challenge to those who would promote economic, social, and political development. The

workings of court systems, commercial codes, land tenure, tax systems, voting procedures--all can promote or impede development. Lawyers, sociologists, economists, and political scientists as well as public administrators will have a part in strengthening these elements. There is not, to the writer's knowledge, any institution in the United States training personnel to work broadly on the legal problems of the developing countries.

A recent study of the tax system of a Latin American country revealed that the combined deficits of three government enterprises amounted to 18 per cent of the total tax revenues of the country.[1] The author of the study was able to make a number of constructive suggestions to strengthen the tax system, but not much attention was paid to the three enterprises producing the deficits--railroads, the postal system, and the merchant marine. The governments of the developing countries will for the foreseeable future be heavy shareholders in utilities and basic industries. Yet few U.S. institutions have taken an interest in the role of government enterprises in the developing countries.

As a part of the self-help drive under the Alliance for Progress, a good deal of effort is being directed to the strengthening of revenue systems. Several U.S. institutions are devoting attention to tax policy in the developing countries. But relatively little study of the administration of revenue systems overseas is under way, except for the pragmatic work of the Internal Revenue Service and the Bureau of Customs under their agreements with AID. A center of excellence in comparative tax administration, preferably in close proximity to a center for the study of tax policy, could make a significant contribution to economic and social development.

What Are The Tools?

One of the essential tools of technical assistance is research into the causes and effects of development. Recognition of this need has come belatedly in the U.S. aid program. In the past four years AID has mounted a research program of nearly $37 million, and $8 million more will be added in fiscal year 1967. Only a small fraction of the research has been in public administration. A symposium on research needs regarding administrative capabilities in emerging countries was conducted by the Brookings Institution in 1965. A number of research targets were identified, including the nature of training required for U.S. advisors and for foreign officials, the methods of providing technical assistance, and administrative profiles of developing countries.

The 89th Congress provided new directions and new tools from which invigorated research and training programs should emerge. AID was authorized to spend up to $10 million, which "may be used for assistance, on such terms and conditions as the President may specify, to research and educational institutions in the United States for the purpose of strengthening their capacity to develop and carry out programs concerned with the economic and social development of less developed countries."[2] No specific funds were appropriated for the purpose. AID intends to use this authority to make grants for such purposes as: the addition of faculty members who will engage in professional careers related to foreign cooperation programs; the promotion of specialized curricula and programs of study oriented to the problems of technical assistance in a foreign culture; the establishment of graduate fellowships designed to furnish depth of understanding of foreign cultures

and problems of economic and social development; and the planning and pursuit of research to support the systematic generation and organization of knowledge relevant to national growth processes.

In the International Education Act of 1966, Congress authorized activities to strengthen American educational resources for international studies and research at both graduate and undergraduate levels. The research and training may include the international aspects of professional and other fields of study. The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any federal agency and of other public or nonprofit agencies or institutions. Although authorization of appropriations for $1 million in 1967, $40 million in 1968, and $90 million in 1969 is included in the Act, Congress adjourned without appropriating the funds authorized for 1967. A National Advisory Committee on International Studies is to be established. The programs established under Section 211(D) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the International Education Act can be made mutually supportive.

Congress also authorized the Department of Agriculture to use $33 million to make grants or contracts for education, research, and training in tropical and subtropical agriculture. The Department is "to coordinate the program with the activities of the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, and other agencies of the U.S. . . . "[3]

Congress added a new direction to the AID program in a section of Title 9 of the Foreign Assistance Act, which is brief enough to quote in its entirety: "Sec. 281. In carrying out programs authorized in this chapter, emphasis shall be placed on assuring maximum participation in the task of economic development on the part of the people of the developing countries, through the encouragement of democratic private and local governmental

institutions."

Thus, in four separate actions, Congress in 1966 laid the legislative foundation for strengthening of this country's capability to cope with the problems of the emerging nations. The sums devoted to this effort can be very large indeed. The carrying out of these acts will require close cooperation between the federal government and the universities. They will require the creation of new units within the government, and the institutions receiving grants will have to declare themselves in principle to reorder or create curricula, recruit and train personnel, and engage in pertinent research. They must be willing to organize programs and faculty to guarantee a sustained institutional effort. This is the sort of support many of us would hardly have hoped for 10 years ago.

The government can furnish money, ideas, and general direction. The universities must produce the faculty and the practitioners. A world affairs involvement must be injected into both education and research. A 1950 survey by Ward Stewart for the Office of Education identified 145 graduate, degree-granting programs in public administration in 83 colleges and universities in the United States.

The U.S. schools award from 450 to 500 master's degrees in public administration per year. No estimate is available for those in the less-developed countries. The harsh fact is that the output of trained public administrators in the U.S. is far short of even the domestic need--one tenth of the annual requirement is one estimate.

Local government employment grew from 5 million to 8 million from 1955 to 1965. Federal civilian employment grew by 200,000 in the same period.[4] Research, education, and training on the international front must compete for

trained personnel in this hungry labor market.

When we look at the task in the developing countries, the prospect is no brighter. A recent selective survey by the International Institute of Administrative Sciences lists approximately 175 institutions in the developing countries training for public administration. It would appear that there will be a need to train something over 170 million government employees for service in the approximately 101 underdeveloped sovereign nations of the world (excluding mainland China) over the next 10 years.[5] The current output of adequately prepared graduates at all levels is small. Many of the institutions are poorly financed and have few, if any, full-time faculty. If the U.S., with a population of 190 million, is producing 500 graduate degrees in public administration per year, how many should the schools in the 101 sovereign developing countries be producing to administer the affairs of their 1.6 billion people?

How Do We Relate the Public Administration Schools to the Need?

What should the public administration schools in the United States be doing to meet the needs for technical assistance to the developing countries? Much of the administration taught in American schools has little relevance to the emerging countries. Do we know what is relevant? The literature on the subject is growing, but it is still scarce.

Is it enough to concentrate on the staff services of government in teaching administration? How do we influence the school system, from primary through graduate school, to produce capable managers for both government and business?

How do we inject management competence into the graduates of technical schools--the agriculturalists, educators, health workers, population

planners, engineers, and businessmen who will be conducting the nation-building enterprises? Have we aimed our educational efforts at too high and too narrow a segment of managers? If so, what are the implications for the training of Americans for service in technical assistance abroad?

Have we paid enough attention to the development of political institutions? How can we approach this touchy subject? Very little of our technical assistance has been aimed at the management of legislatures, the judiciary, or local government. Are we prepared to provide relevant advice to these segments of governments? Will we be asked for the advice?

Even though we can discover what should be taught, will there be enough professors to teach it? And will there be students for them to teach?

Why Get into the Act?

Given the enormity of the task, the uncertainty of the sources of funds, the lack of definition of the field, the reluctance of the professions to recognize administration as a respectable and relevant discipline, and the great need for trained administrators here at home, why should we concern ourselves with training persons for careers in technical assistance in public administration? And why should we concern ourselves with training managers overseas?

The United States has declared itself in support of the goals of the free nations--adequate food, good health, education, and the dignity of the individual. These goals are threatened by the gap between development plans and accomplishments. Inadequate administration was identified as one of the most important reasons for the lag in development in 20 recent country-assistance programs drawn up in AID country missions. Hopefully, this conference

will point the way to the production of a more adequate supply of administrative manpower for the developing nations.

Footnotes

[1]Carl S. Shoup, The Tax System of Brazil, Fundacao Getulio Vargas, Rio de Janeiro, 1965.

[2]Section 211(D) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. (Both this section and the International Education Act are more fully discussed in Potential Financial Support for Development Administration: 211(D) and the International Education Act of 1966, by Ray D. Pethtel.)

[3]Section 406 of the Food for Peace Act of 1966 (P.L. 89-080). No funds were appropriated for the fiscal year 1967.

[4]Statistical Abstract of the United States, U.S. Bureau of Census, Washington, D.C., 1966, Table 598.

[5]This figure is derived by applying the U.S. average of 1 in 24 persons engaged in civil government to the 1.6 billion population of the emerging sovereign countries. Assuming a 25 per cent annual turnover in the resulting 68 million government employees produces a training requirement of 17 million per year, or 170 million over 10 years. This is a gross estimate--the reader may make his own. The size of the task will still be shocking.

DEVELOPMENT OF ADMINISTRATION ABROAD: UNIVERSITY EXPERIENCE AND APPROPRIATE ROLE

Ralph H. Smuckler

Improvement of administration has been a target of serious attention since the very beginning of our nation's postwar foreign assistance programs. The mission sent to aid the Greek government in 1947 included a section which worked to strengthen public administration. At least some of the observers and critics of that relatively successful Truman Doctrine aid mission felt that crucial public administration problems existed and were not being adequately met by the Greeks.

Today, almost 20 years later, we are still trying to strengthen public administration, although in more remote parts of the world and under vastly differing circumstances. We are still attaining less success than we would like, although from one country to another we are faced with strikingly similar, frequently recurring problems.[1] We are still searching for answers through the accumulation of insights derived from experience and, more recently, through research of a still rather limited nature.

Universities and university people were enlisted very early in these assistance efforts. In the early 1950's, the first university contracts with

a predecessor of the Agency for International Development took agriculturists to Columbia and Ethiopia, business administrators to Brazil, and public administrators to the Philippines, Iran, Vietnam, and Pakistan. Since those days there has been a constant university involvement internationally. What lessons have been learned by the universities through these years of working with aid programs abroad? What can this experience suggest to those of us in public administration who seek to bring vital administrative improvement to the developing countries? What does it tell us about the appropriate role of universities and about the strengths and limits of the university's participation abroad, particularly in public administration?

An attempt at answering these questions must be prefaced by a disclaimer, one borne of the principal lesson learned in working with overseas development tasks--the lesson of humility. The university's response to the development task is, indeed, a sobering and humbling experience. There are no easy answers and not many proven shortcuts to the complex problems of development now facing most of the world; and there are no single, straightforward answers to the broad questions posed above. There are apparent "fads" and high-priority "strategies" and targets which rise to the surface from time to time, receive full public and professional attention, and then, unfortunately, sink back to become part of a series of frustrations to those who seek simple answers and panaceas.

The very nature of the development task causes one to disclaim any monopoly or certainty of insight. It also suggests that problems of development will be our concern for a long time to come and that a solid start is still just in the making. Those of us who are within universities

and in the field of public administration should look at where we now are and where we ought to be in the decades ahead as we confront the challenge of the developing areas of the world.

In seeking to answer these questions of experience and role, let us differentiate between the university, on the one hand, and the individual professor or graduate of our institutions, on the other. Experiences have differed; and limits are clearly not the same. Institutions have taken on a great variety of responsibilities in working with aid agencies of the government and with foundations. But the range of choices open to the individual professor--through consultation, research grant, or direct hire arrangements--has been and should continue to be far broader. Our concern here is mainly with institutional experience and alternatives, not with choices open to individuals or the responsibilities of the field of public administration as a whole.

Variety and Focus of University Experience

Institutional experience in public administration includes training, research, consultation, and service--all aimed at assisting administration within developing countries. The experience is characterized by its great variety and the diversity of cultures within which it has occurred.

Universities have trained administrators in special programs at home and abroad. They have drawn into these programs personnel from all levels of bureaucracies in developing countries which represent a wide range of points on the spectrum of development. Programs have covered skill improvement, administrative techniques, human relations, sensitivity training, management and supervisory skills, planning concepts, project design, elementary and

advanced economics, and an array of other types of content. Regular academic degree programs for foreign participants have also been an important part of the experience, including certificate and degree programs ranging to the doctorate. Research under university contracts has included some studies of the administration of aid programs, descriptions and analyses of selected aspects of administrative systems abroad, manuals of government organizational structure and function, case studies of administrative decision making, and analyses of institution-building efforts in developing countries. Consultation and service efforts by university public administration contracts have yielded advice to governments abroad on such diverse matters as civil service reform, budget administration, organization and methods, governmental reorganization, inventory control, and development planning.

By far the most extensive and significant experience has been gained through institution-building projects abroad. In fact, many of the other types of activities have come as a by-product of contract programs principally aimed at developing, modifying, or revitalizing a training or educational institution. The usual pattern for these university programs has been to ally an American school or department with an institute of public administration in Manila or Bangkok or Zaria, with the goal of reorienting or greatly strengthening the effort abroad. As a part of this process of institution building, the U.S. institution has engaged in special training, degree programs, research, and consultation. It is in this very broad area of institution building, therefore, that U. S. universities working under contract programs have gained most of their experience in the developing areas.

Public administrators have not held a monopoly of the institution-building efforts abroad. Agriculturists, business administrators, educators,

engineers, and others have been similarly involved, usually quite apart from public administrators. The strategies of institution building, a subject about which modern public administration is seemingly concerned, have been evolved or carried out by people in all of these fields. Furthermore, agriculturists and others frequently engage in administrative consultation abroad, specifically on problems of administration relating to one of the "substance" or functional fields. In this sense, "development administration"--broadly, the application of modern administrative practice and knowledge to aid economic and social development--has been within the domain of numerous technical assistance personnel outside of public administration itself.

This last point is worth clarifying with a specific illustration. At Comilla in East Pakistan, the Academy for Rural Development has evolved a pattern of organization and communication which, on a pilot basis, has been highly successful at experimenting with and introducing technical innovation in rural areas. Evidence exists that social and economic development is occurring. Administrative processes at the local level in East Pakistan are being effected. Over the years, however, public administrators have sometimes had a difficult time viewing this experimental work as falling within the domain of public administration. The work has been a combination of efforts originating in the thinking of agricultural economists, cooperative specialists, extension sociologists, and public administrators. Neither the input nor the result fits traditional academic categories. Clearly, "development administration" at the rural level in Comilla has not been the monopoly of public administrators either in origin or in lessons learned.

The experiences gained in international efforts have varied greatly from one U. S. institution to another. In the public administration field some

schools such as Southern California, Syracuse, Pittsburgh, and Indiana have been heavily immersed in international endeavors. There are others with little or no experience and, unfortunately, little or no interest. In reviewing lessons learned from experience of the last decade, we should bear in mind the partial exposure which has occurred. However, the widespread membership of the Comparative Administration Group, a group within the American Society for Public Administration seriously concerned with research and training in public administration as it applies to development, is some indication that pockets of interest and insight are widespread--individually, if not institutionally.

Institution-Building Experience

Universities have cooperated with the American aid program to help develop institutes and schools of public administration in the Philippines, Vietnam, Thailand, Pakistan, Brazil, Nigeria, Taiwan, and other countries. These efforts, as mentioned above, have been the principal vehicle for university public administration experience, and through these projects have come numerous products and lessons. The most notable products are the training and educational institutes themselves, which are now in existence in many of these countries. They vary greatly in tone, quality, and level of significance within the development pattern in these countries. Some include an in-service training, research, and consultation function in addition to their traditional training and educational roles. In the Philippines a graduate school of public administration has evolved, and in Thailand the institute has become the solid base for a unique attempt to organize a graduate-level National Institute of Development Administration, encompassing business administration, economics,

and statistics as well as public administration. Largely as a result of the efforts of these new institutes in Asia, the Eastern Region Organization for Public Administration, a new regional professional organization, has struggled into being with membership stretching westward from Korea and Japan to Turkey. Scholars within these new institutes are beginning to contribute to public administration literature. The existence of these new public administration institutes is a success story of a sort, best told perhaps 10 years from now when we will see more clearly in what form they survive and contribute. Institution-building efforts within public administration continue, but are now less numerous. New phases of institution strengthening and institution building in other fields also continue.

These institution-building efforts by our universities in cooperation with people abroad and with American aid agencies have been far from simple and smooth endeavors, and experience in public administration when compared with other fields has been more similar than different. Taken together these efforts both in public administration and other fields have been characterized by conceptual and operational difficulties, especially in the early years.[2]

Strategy Problems

There have been numerous problems of institution-building strategy posed for the university contractor. One group of these problems clusters around the initiation of the cooperative project. How far can or should the initial technical assistance team go in specifying conditions and goals for the joint effort? Critics have pointed to nebulous or contradictory goals as a major failing. But operating realities frequently prevent a gradually and

carefully drawn statement of goals at the outset. The long period of initial discussion and negotiation during which a firm meeting of the minds occurs is not always possible, though highly desirable. U. S. budget-year problems have complicated the picture, as have university academic-year deadlines. Furthermore, the very characteristics of underdevelopment do not permit the host country, however well intentioned, to fulfill its end of a carefully delineated bargain once the project has proceeded a few years. Firm agreements reached at the beginning may well have to be adjusted as changes in governments and leadership occur, as they almost invariably do during the life of contract projects abroad.

Another group of strategy problems clusters around questions of phasing and time span of the project. Successful building of new institutions is rarely a short-term process, although various pressures make it necessary to restrict the time allotted. Institutions are never fully developed until the day they begin to wither or disappear. Therefore, it becomes a matter of strategy and skill to phase in and out an appropriate volume and type of assistance over a rather long period of time, perhaps eight or ten years at a minimum. Contracts rarely permit necessary flexibility in this regard, although the pattern in recent years is far better than in the past. The understandable pressure to complete the job results, too often, in self-defeating deadlines.

There are strategy problems related to cultural differences and adaptation. Of all the difficulties, these may be most severe, especially if local leadership is not enlightened and vigorous. Americans on the scene have been equipped with a package of traditional American values and wisdom blended with folklore peculiarly suited to the United States. Institution

building in another culture demands the adaptation of this experience to the local situation. The strategy questions posed, therefore, are those which seek ways of adapting. Processes must be set in motion within and around the institution which will hold down rigidities and permit change and adaptation as the institution evolves. Perhaps foremost among these processes is indigenous research, too often minimized in the institution-building effort. Another is the process of periodic review and evaluation, through which change and adaptation could become a normal part of the young institution's evolution.

There is another group of strategy questions which focuses on internal institutional program priorities. For example, should the new public administration institute stress degree programs, in-service training, short-course efforts, research of various types, graduate programs, or service and consulting work? What priorities should be attached to each? What priorities should the new university attach to agriculture, engineering, social sciences, public or business administration, and teacher training? What balance is needed between short- and longer-run efforts? The American institution builder should help pose these types of questions and find appropriate ways to assist intelligent decision making.

The institution builder must also help define strategies which will permit adequate blending of temporary advisors with local leadership and faculty. Difficulties in this sphere are usually most apparent and sometimes disastrous. A way of working together must be evolved, with control clearly in the hands of the host nationals who are going to make their careers within the new institution.

The groups of strategy questions are far from exhaustive. There are others, and each university project will tend to make highly specific the

generalized issues posed here. Each project will face these and find its own answers, explicitly or implicitly. Obviously, over the years the answers have varied from one situation to another and, unfortunately, have not always been productive.

Campus Difficulties

Experience over the years makes it clear that the contracting university also faces difficulties on its own campus. Too often the university or some part of it entering into a program abroad will get started without sufficient commitment by faculty and administration to see the project through to a reasonably successful conclusion. When the initial luster of the enterprise abroad has worn off, when the difficulties are becoming real, and when personnel commitments are beginning to hurt, can the university maintain the program or will it find reasons to slacken its effort or withdraw?

Personnel pressures may well be the first to be felt at home. Usually, the right people for the post abroad are also greatly needed at home. There have been cases in public administration and in other fields in which, after agreeing to a contract program overseas, the university begins to fill even the crucial chief of party position by recruiting off-campus, not necessarily with permanent commitment to the man hired. There may well be some positions on a contract team which should be filled by off-campus hiring of competent people, but it seems indefensable to start a program without home campus leadership or, for that matter, to fill a majority of key positions with off-campus personnel.

Personnel difficulties take other forms as well. One is the question of professional advancement for service under university programs abroad. This is a complex issue on most campuses, and it is not easily discussed or settled.

Suffice it to say that good people serving abroad must be engaged in activities which will lead to advancement at home so that overseas service helps their career development. When this does not occur, the overseas effort has suffered in both reputation and quality of performance. Each university must find its own solution to this problem.

Feedback

Much has been said about the need to find ways of feeding back the faculty and institutional experience in overseas contracts to the programs of the home campus. Positive feedback is clearly important if university interest is to be sustained, if performance abroad is to be improved, and if the next generation of technical assistance personnel is to be produced intelligently. Feedback is always difficult to measure. Superficially, we could count such obvious increments as new courses introduced at home, specific new international centers or institutes created, and articles written. However, more adequate evaluation would have to include some measurement of the impact of these apparent changes and contributions as well as some totaling up of the concealed but important impact within existing courses and career interests. In such a broad evaluation, public administration as a field would probably rank rather high, though no field would be high enough when compared to the potential that has existed.

The contract system, with its overriding emphasis on development abroad, has not been very permissive when it comes to specifics which would facilitate feedback--research, graduate student participation, and free time for writing. Universities themselves have probably been willing to settle too easily on these points when they negotiate specific contracts. The situation may well be improving, but how much further ahead would we be now if liberali-

zation had been started a decade ago?

Experience has shown that the traditional system of contract arrangements in public administration as well as in other fields has certain built-in inhibitions or limitations for feedback. These can be considered briefly here in three categories: lack of fit, resource gaps, and discontinuities.

Lack of Fit. Technical assistance needs abroad do not match the fields within which feedback to campus programs would most easily fit. Personnel needs abroad fall largely within agriculture, education, business and public administration, economics, engineering, and other technical fields. Campus feedback would occur most easily in the social sciences, and to some extent in the humanities. Because of the nature of his field, an agriculturalist working on animal or soil problems in South Asia finds less to bring back to his classroom in the Midwest than would a sociologist or anthropologist. Similarly, the engineer engaged in strengthening an engineering school in India would not have as much professionally meaningful experience to bring home as would a political scientist, a linguist, or a scholar in South Asian literature. Of course, these oversimplified comparisons do not point up the many gradations within each assignment and each field which can and do occur. In this respect, public administration has been more fortunate than others (with the exception of economics) since so much of its concern is closely tied to the social sciences within which feedback is more easily accomplished. The alert public administration scholar will have little difficulty in finding the relevance of his experience abroad to his research interests and classroom at home.

Resource Gaps. The public administrator abroad on an institution-building project would be more plagued with difficulty in the second category--

lack of resources. He would lack the funds and the free time to collect data and mount research activities. The typical contract project has not usually provided these. Nor has it made it easy for graduate students to enter into the pattern abroad. Contract projects have emphasized the service and institution-building function, not the learning process. Nor has the building of a research emphasis within the new institution abroad been given sufficient priority in these projects to open the door for such activity by the U. S. scholar abroad. In recent years, some of these deficiencies have been remedied, but over the years it has often been necessary to "bootleg" those things which later enhanced the chance of feeding back these experiences and new insights into campus programs, even in those fields that have a relatively good "fit."

Discontinuities. Some universities are now encountering the third type of difficulty, that of discontinuity resulting from the conclusion of a contract abroad. Feedback (and, incidentally, the strengthening of the new institution itself) would be facilitated by long-range relationships in which the intensive ties and interactions of the contract period would be followed by a longer period of easy flow of colleagues overseas in both directions. Unfortunately, such continuity does not prevail. Just as easy and comfortable relationships are built up at both the home campus and abroad, the contract ends. The U. S. university or department is left with enlivened interest, but few ways of realizing the full potential of its efforts. These problems of discontinuity, inherent in the limitations of the contract system, have been experienced increasingly in recent years. Universities have struggled, with limited success, to find solutions to this difficulty. Potential solutions within recent AID legislation and the new International Education Act will be greatly welcomed.

Universities themselves must continue to search for ways to overcome some of these inherent problems. If they settle for too little, feedback will still be an unrealized potential during the next decade as it has been during the past.

Gaps in Experience and Knowledge

Although university experience internationally has been broad and varied in the past decade, there are still great gaps in what we have learned and in our knowledge about development processes. This is true in various fields concerned with development, including public administration.

Some gaps in our learning through experience occur because of our weak institutional memories. Perhaps it is inevitable within our pluralistic, decentralized educational system that we have not found sufficient ways to transmit what we learn from one experience abroad to another. Weak memory occurs within single universities and even more obviously among institutions nationally. At many institutions the contract project experience of the agriculture college is little known to those engaged in similar institution-building activity in public administration or other fields. This has occurred even when both parts of the university are working abroad in the same country, and even when this work has overlapped in time. If institutional memories and intrauniversity communications are weak, it is not at all surprising that on the national scene similar deficiencies exist. It would take major effort on the part of any newcomer to the task of institution building abroad to accumulate even all of the superficial "do's and don't's," not to mention the deeper insights derived from university efforts abroad.

A number of current efforts may partially remedy this memory gap. On individual campuses there are an increasing number of administrative offices aimed at remedying this and other related international program problems. At the University of Pittsburgh there is now an interuniversity effort to provide intensive case studies of institution-building efforts and to systematize knowledge through research in this field.[3] The Committee on Institutional Cooperation (C.I.C.) is now studying comprehensively the experience to date.[4] The Rural Development office of the Land Grant College Association is also relatively new central point of information. Also, Education and World Affairs through several of its activities is trying to facilitate the flow of information and the growth of a national "memory."[5]

Running contrary to this trend, however, is the understandable desire by government to involve new institutions and groups of universities in the international effort, rather than to build up the efforts of the most experienced. As each contracting university begins its work, it has the obligation to try to learn from the others and not repeat the mistakes of 10 years ago, at least not those for which there now are correctives.

Before turning to the gaps which occur in public administration, one other broader university consideration might be mentioned. At this time in our own national development, 25 years after the traumatic end of our history of isolation, there are still many universities which have not seriously confronted the issues within their own academic programs created by the nation's broad international involvement. There are professional schools as well as liberal arts colleges which have never taken into account the far broader world into which their graduates will fit.[6] Local and state boundaries are still viewed in many instances as the limits of research and service interests. Many institutions are still placing insufficient attention and priority on their own

international role and that of their graduates. Although a trend in the international direction exists within universities and colleges, there is still a large gap between the present reality of the university program and what is truly needed by American society in this international age.

Within public administration itself, experience has shown a number of significant gaps to exist between where we are now and where we ought to be. Two of these, broadly stated, are clearly worth attention here: the gulf between public administration and the functional fields abroad and the lag between our knowledge base and action programs.

Public Administration and Other Fields

We have now helped to bring into existence institutes of public administration in many countries of the world. The number would vary depending on definitions and categories of aid sponsorship, but they do exist in number, varying in ability and impact from one country to another. Most need continuing nourishment intellectually if not financially as well; but they are beginning to contribute on their own and their faculty members are, in some cases, holding their own internationally. While American public administration schools should continue to maintain ties with their colleagues abroad, the task ahead is in an equally significant new direction.

Public administration must now turn to cooperative efforts with university people in other fields. The development assistance task now calls for public administration scholars and specialists to participate more fundamentally with educationists, economic planners, agriculturists, and others seeking to speed development in economically poor countries. This is not a new

role abroad, but the shift in emphasis is now clearly needed and, perhaps, overdue.

The shift will not be easy. Even within the United States, public administration as a field has not always blended smoothly with functional fields. In the low-income countries striving for economic growth, however, the need is even more apparent and government's role in spurring development is more clear-cut. Development-oriented public administration is clearly needed, and this means government organization and administration effectively planning and managing in traditional areas as well as in a variety of new public enterprises on a base of scarce human and financial resources.

The questions have become: What can public administration do to help development administrators, economists, and educators abroad who are planning and building the secondary or higher educational system for their country? What can we do to assist the agricultural extension specialists who seek to improve a system which will diffuse new technology to farmers in a rural province? What can we say or do to help organize a bureaucracy so that in a ministry of public works, field administrators and central office personnel are more mutually reinforcing and less competitive?

For a number of years we have been concerned with "development administration," usefully defined as the application of organizational ideas, management methods, and general administrative skills to programs of various types aimed at economic and social development within low-income countries. Within development administration we include concern with central services of government and their orientation so as to facilitate development programs. It may well be that most services--even those concerned with law and order--can be considered within this rather loose definition, that is if they are administered in such

a way as to encourage development programs. In many respects, development administration is a way of approaching an administrative task within a low-income country--an orientation or a way of thinking about tasks to be performed.

Without lingering longer on definition, the point stressed here is that the task ahead ties administration more closely to substance programs, usually in such fields as education, public health, public works, or agriculture. Leaders and constructive innovators in these fields must be able to match technical specialists with those who know how to carry out and administer programs. The new institutes of public administration abroad must be infused with this concern for development-oriented activities, and our own contributions to them in the future should be such as to help assure this direction.

If our contribution is to be relevant, we must meet problems where they truly exist. Since rural, agricultural, local problems are most crucial in most of these countries, public administration should, in the years ahead, focus more attention on administration of rural and local problems. The gap between our major concern with central or national administration and "grass roots" program administration abroad should be closed.

It will not be easy to bring the thinking and action of public administrators abroad closer to the local rural problems which exist in Asia, Africa, and other developing areas. Life and thought in the urban centers is so vastly different than that which exists at Comilla in East Pakistan, or the provincial towns and rural areas of Can Tho or Eastern Nigeria or Northeast Brazil. But improvement programs administered for and in rural areas are so greatly needed that new and heroic measures to close this gap must be made. Public adminis-

strators should increasingly have something to contribute at this local level. To do this, our efforts should be joined with those of anthropologists, rural sociologists, and agricultural specialists far more than is now the case.

The Knowledge Gap

The other broad gap which plagues our efforts abroad lies between what we really know about development administration and what we are called upon to do abroad. The task of hastening development in any one country or region--of building new institutions, programs, and strategies which will stimulate and assure beneficial social and economic change--is unsurpassed in complexity and difficulty. When this is multiplied by the number of different countries and cultures within which such development is needed and desired, the immensity of the job is awesome. The role of administration, clearly a central concern in the whole process, is equally great. Yet, our strategy of how to proceed administratively is still frequently on a hit-and-miss basis.

This criticism may seem too harsh. After all, we do know much about our own administrative experience in development programs within our own country. We do know some things about administration in European countries, on which the administrative systems of many other countries are based. We have learned more as we have proceeded to aid developing countries in recent years. But, in spite of all this, there is still very much to be studied, written, and learned.

We would avoid embarrassment if we held back until we knew most or all of the answers. But to do so would be foolish and probably negate our chance of learning and contributing. Our course must be to participate as best we can, to learn from our experiences and those of others, and to be sure that knowledge is expanding and being absorbed just as rapidly as possible as we go along. Our record on the last point--essentially the research and analysis

phase--has lagged badly over the past decade. It is about time for it to catch up.

We need research applied to specific situations and aimed at problem solving, and we need more theoretically oriented research and analysis which may or may not contribute new insights and approaches until a decade from now. Differentiating between the two types of research may seem arbitrary. In fact, both types may be long-range and theoretical, or immediately practical. Whether or not one accepts distinctions such as this, neither type should be relegated to low priority, for both are needed.

We need sustained, analytical attention to whole administrative systems in many countries. We need analytical models which will sharpen our understanding of single systems and our comparison of several. We need descriptive and theoretically oriented case studies of specific development administration innovations and experiences. We must systematically proceed to learn more about "actual," in contrast with "formal," administrative processes in transitional or "prismatic" societies. We need new terms and redefinitions of old culture-bound concepts so that we can appropriately cope with non-Western, unfamiliar administrative behavior and processes. We need the contributions of scholars in various disciplines, as well as the "pandisciplinary" approach urged by Professor Fred Riggs.[7] We need research which will clarify alternative strategies for assisting development. The research effort by Americans and others must be expanded so that our knowledge base expands in proportion to the size of the development task itself. An increasing number of research scholars and data-minded practitioners must be attracted in this direction.

Appropriate University Role

Our immediate concern is with the role of universities and public

administration schools or institutes within them, not with individuals or the profession as a whole. Public administration practitioners and scholars should be involved broadly in all of the international and development-oriented aspects of the field; universities have a more limited, though fundamental, role. Though the appropriate role of individual universities may vary depending on institutional philosophy and purpose and will change over time, there are and should be minimum efforts common to all as well as limits to what most institutions can and should undertake.

In view of the past experience and present needs, the appropriate role of universities now seems to fall in four broad areas of activity: (1) research and analysis, (2) institution building and strengthening, (3) advanced and special training, and (4) education of American professionals and scholars. No one university may choose to move with equal energy in all four directions. Some may move broadly and others with only a minimal effort. But, taken as a whole, the community of universities with public administration programs should pursue these four activities. And, in a few cases, centers of excellence, with broad as well as intensive programs, should emerge.

Expanded Research and Analysis

The need to expand the volume and quality of research in public administration as it relates to development has already been mentioned. Weaknesses in theory and knowledge clearly exist. Sustained efforts are called for, and a variety of targets should be defined by scholars and practitioners.

While this can be done by individuals from American universities, it can be facilitated by the universities themselves. It is true that research is not done by a department of a university but by people or groups of scholars.

But our universities can help to add sustained attention to the research effort and facilitate multidisciplinary and broad research endeavors. Universities should do what they can to encourage their professors to spend research time abroad and to develop programs which will interest younger scholars in international research.

A main point to be stressed here is that these efforts should be tied closely to foreign scholars and institutions. We seek to expand knowledge about development processes. American scholars are not alone in this quest. They may not even be the best suited for the task since they may wear culture-bound blinders when they conduct research abroad. Language difficulty is just one dimension of the broader problem of understanding. A well-educated Thai scholar may be far better suited to define categories for data collection and expand our knowledge about development administration in Thailand or Laos than an American could ever be. Such local talents are to be encouraged whenever possible.

One of the best ways to do this would be for American universities to help establish indigenous research centers on administration and other fields related to development. Such centers or programs would become focal points for truly cooperative research projects in which American, local, and other nationals would be working together on theory, data collection, and problem solving. Over the years these centers would assure expanded local participation in research. If located within a foreign university, they could become a training resource as well and could eventually contribute to advanced degree programs which so often are lacking in the developing countries.

The more our research efforts can be cooperative and channeled through such indigenous institutions the better off scholarship in this field will be in the future. Isolated, totally American efforts are bound to be less productive. There will be certain difficulties to overcome as we involve local scholars and institutions, but over the long run these are worth confronting rather than avoiding.

Research within public administration and the social science disciplines closely allied to it should increasingly encompass concern with local government and rural development. Those American universities which can comfortably work with rural and agricultural development research problems should expand these efforts, and public administrators should join into such expanded efforts.

Each of our university institution-building efforts abroad should carry with it a goal of strengthening the spirit of inquiry which breeds research. The institution we help to create should have research and analysis as firmly embedded within its philosophy and programs as it has classroom teaching or special training. Too often we have settled only for the latter two, without sufficiently acknowledging that research reinforces the other programs and keeps them vital and relevant.

Selective Institution Building

Efforts of the past decade or more to build public administration institutes are continuing. However, since many of the initial tasks have been roughly completed, our institution-building goals within public administration should now be of a different nature. The differences related to research have just been noted. In addition, we should now view our efforts in a broader way,

i.e., the institution-strengthening effort abroad should be tied to larger, more encompassing programs--universities as a whole, interdisciplinary development-oriented institutes, and segments of colleges and institutes in the "substance" fields such as agriculture, education, and public health. In other words, public administration schools should put institution-building efforts in the future into joint efforts with other fields within the university which are working with development problems abroad.

As in the past, American universities should stress building of educational institutions abroad rather than budget offices or other types of operating agencies. University people know far more about the intricacies of the former than they do about the latter.

In addition to meeting development needs abroad, this more selective effort would have certain positive gains and advantages at home. Broader projects, including a research dimension, could have better feedback potential to the university as a whole. Such projects would offer better prospects of developing a long-term interinstitutional relationship. Chances of continuity would be enhanced. Within the home university, useful interdepartmental or intercollege cooperation might be strengthened. Institution-building strategy would draw on broader experience; "memory" would be more comprehensive.

Advanced and Special Training

Universities will and should continue to make perhaps their greatest contribution to the developing areas by educating students from abroad at advanced degree levels. Few universities in the developing countries can provide graduate programs in public administration or the related disciplines, although an increasing number can now offer undergraduate work. Our graduate

programs will be crucial to the maintenance of academic quality in the new programs abroad, since many faculty members will be drawn from those who return after receiving a graduate degree in the United States.

In recent years many people have advocated reappraisal of our graduate programs to assure their relevance to the needs of the foreign student. Graduate programs are constantly being refined, updated, reviewed, or revised. It would be reasonable, therefore, to adjust the graduate program in public administration in order to include options with expanded cross-cultural and international content. However, such revision must be done with care since it would be unfortunate if revision, while intended to strengthen the curriculum and make it more relevant, appeared to be a softening of requirements or standards for the foreign student.

Foreign graduate students in public administration or the related disciplines might be encouraged to conduct their thesis research at home or in a neighboring country. Where this would require less rigorous research or watered-down writing because of political sensitivities, it should be avoided. But in many instances, careful selection of topics and definition of the research task will result in a suitable thesis and also contribute to our knowledge of administration abroad.

Universities also have much to offer through special training programs for public officials from developing countries. Whether conducted on a campus or at other locations within the United States or abroad, these activities should be encouraged. The more successful become valuable learning experiences for the instructors as well as the trainees. There is plenty of room for universities to experiment with various approaches to training style and format. Training innovations in both content and style, with built-in

evaluation, are needed and should be encouraged by those attempting to assist development.

Public administrators working cooperatively with agriculturists, economists, educators, and others interested in the developing countries might well mount special programs for our present "overseasmen" who should return to universities from time to time in order to keep abreast of their field. In these special programs, universities can gain as well as give. The presence in our graduate seminars of some experienced AID specialists in midcareer would add greatly to the reality of the classroom.

Education of American Professionals

The mainstream of American university efforts will and should continue to be the education of American undergraduate and graduate students--in public administration as in other fields. We are coming to realize that good education of our students in the present times means providing something far more international, non-Western, and cross-cultural than was the case several decades ago. Even those who will never work abroad or who will find their careers entirely in domestic organizations or local professional pursuits will need, as potential community leaders, exposures and insights to broaden their views far beyond the purely local. Their training in administration would be enhanced, and their understanding of American administration sharpened, by this added dimension. Furthermore, an increasing number will encounter international or cross-cultural experiences even while working in state or local agencies, or will directly pursue career opportunities in international settings or agencies.

Our universities have the task of preparing the next generation of scholars and professionals who will serve abroad in development administration

roles, and they will have to shape courses and curricula to meet the need. To assist this process, our experiences abroad must increasingly find their way back into the classroom.

The returning Peace Corps volunteer will present a challenge and serve as a great asset in this respect. It may well be that the next generation of overseasmen in our assistance programs will be made up of a preponderance of Peace Corps returnees who, after additional professional education, return to positions abroad in a variety of assistance programs. Universities should be taking special heed of this group of well-motivated, more mature, and experienced graduate students. They represent a new potential for us, and they have a head start which is similar in many ways to the advantage held by the present-day area specialists who came through military intensive-language and area-training programs during World War II.

Less Appropriate Tasks for Universities

There is much to be done to aid development abroad--in public administration as in other fields. The needs are urgent; the tasks, challenging. But it would be a serious mistake to think that universities can or should enter into all aspects of the work to be done. While universities can do certain things well, they have no special talents as institutions when it comes to other matters. Both strengths and weaknesses should be respected in overseas assistance programs. While universities conceivably could change and begin to assume all of the tasks and responsibilities they now usually reject, it would be foolish to do so, for in the process they would probably lose many of the unique assets they now have. Gradual evolution is needed; but if unlimited change were suddenly the case, society as a whole would be the loser.

The four broad functions described above apply within public administration and with some modification to the university as a whole. Research and analysis, assistance to educational institutions abroad, training, and education--these are, with rare exception, the appropriate roles for the university.

What are the less appropriate activities? Given the desirable, pluralistic nature of American higher education, it would be hard to defend many absolute restrictions. Those who most narrowly view the university's role suggest that to uphold university honor and traditional integrity we should exclude all overseas projects contracted with government and even all "mission-oriented" research by universities, whether it be classified or unclassified. Others would restrict university activity to fields which could not under any circumstances become politically sensitive. Under such precautions, participation in public administration assistance would be out of bounds.

Without suggesting such firm or narrow restrictions as these, it does seem that universities, and schools and departments within them, should generally not become involved institutionally in certain development administration activities. Individuals, public administration organizations, and agencies should not be equally restricted.

It would be inappropriate for a university public administration program to become involved in direct management of a development activity abroad in place of U. S. government or host government personnel. Universities are not suited for such highly responsible action roles, nor would such roles fall within a reasonable definition of university purpose and function. Furthermore, only under unusual circumstances should a university become institutionally committed to even a sustained consultative function within a foreign government, particularly in public administration, a field which by definition deals with

potentially sensitive questions. This suggested restriction would not eliminate all projects in which research and analysis lead to specific recommendations and limited consultation. But the balance of university effort in such projects should be on the side of research, and the period and scope of consultation by the university should be clearly limited. Here once again, the proper role of the individual and the consulting firm may well be much broader.

Except under rare circumstances, universities should not become engaged in institution building of noneducational or nonresearch institutions in the developing areas. The sustained effort and broad planning demanded by institution-building projects can be used better on efforts more akin to universities. In this context educational institutions and research organizations should be defined broadly but not as all-encompassing. Planning agencies or related units in some circumstances may well fall within bounds. A rural development institute or extension service may fall within the bounds, especially if the main emphasis falls on some form of educational activity.

Such institutions as budget agencies, civil service offices, and action-oriented rural reconstruction or refugee resettlement agencies generally fall outside the limits. They would fall outside of university competence and definition of purpose. Furthermore, such projects would have little feedback potential and for this reason alone might be considered inappropriate. A general rule might well be that in public administration and other fields universities should not undertake projects which promise little feedback or growth value to academic endeavors on campus.

Another restriction pertains to research. Except in rare circumstances, universities should avoid research responsibilities abroad which do

not tie in quite directly and cooperatively with foreign scholars or foreign institutions. The values inherent in cooperative research relations are clear. The risks and weaknesses of "go-it-alone" or "hit-and-run" research are becoming increasingly and painfully apparent. Furthermore, universities should leave to others those research projects which cannot result in open publication of major results.

During the period ahead, university-based public administration programs have much to offer in development administration efforts. They have significant contributions to make abroad and much to be gained which should add up to better performance at home. They should build on their strengths within a reasonable definition of American university philosophy and purpose in this age. They should leave to others the many tasks for which universities are less suited and which lie on the periphery of the university's meaning in our society.

Summary

Ever since the early 1950's, universities have worked with American aid agencies to provide technical assistance to developing countries in public administration and other fields. Universities have gained experience through a wide range of training programs, research, and educational projects; but the most significant university activities have helped build or strengthen educational and training institutions abroad. These institution-building efforts in public administration have resulted in new institutes which now participate with varying degrees of success in the development of their country.

Our institution-building experience has been marked by difficult and complex problems. The problems of strategy can be grouped into four clusters:

(1) those occurring at the initiation of new projects, when goals and plans are being spelled out; (2) those related to the duration and phasing of the cooperative effort; (3) problems within the process of innovating and adapting our knowledge and experience to different cultures; and (4) problems of program balance and priority within the new institution itself.

There have also been problems on the home campus related to these efforts abroad. Sometimes a project will be undertaken without sufficient commitment by the department, school, or university. When the initial luster has worn off, such a basic weakness takes its toll. Personnel pressures mount as the project continues and must be met if the project is to succeed. The home institution must also find appropriate ways to reward faculty members who have served well abroad.

Over the long run, experience abroad must find its way into home campus programs so that an expanding non-Western and international dimension emerges. Experience to date with this feedback process, though better in public administration than in many other fields, has not been encouraging. There have been certain built-in inhibitions within the contract system which restrict feedback. First, the fields for which specialists have been most needed abroad--usually the more technical fields--have not been those within which feedback would easily occur. Second, there has been a lack of resources within the projects for research and graduate student participation, both of which would facilitate feedback. Finally, there is a problem of discontinuity. Just as the critical interest and colleague relationships have been built up among the American and foreign faculty groups, the contract ends; and the task of continuing mutually beneficial ties becomes formidable.

There are notable and serious gaps in university experience and knowledge as we attempt to assist developing countries in public administration and

in other fields. In general we have suffered from weak institutional and national memories in these experiences abroad. Furthermore, there are still many universities and professional schools which have not sufficiently confronted within their own academic program the issues resulting from the nation's broad international involvement. Within public administration itself there are several gaps: The relation to the functional fields, e.g., education and agriculture, has not been well worked out. There is also a lag between our knowledge base and the action programs in which we engage abroad. We must now find ways to work more closely with academic colleagues in other "substantive" fields, most notably those contributing to the development of rural areas. We must also find ways to expand and deepen our knowledge of development processes through research.

International experience of the past 15 years suggests certain appropriate university activities and functions for the future. One of these is expanded research and analysis. A second is institution building on a more selective basis. A third is advanced and special training, of great importance in public administration. A fourth appropriate role encompasses the education of American scholars and professionals who will carry with them interest in and knowledge of the administrative problems of transitional countries and increased ability to be of assistance. Universities have the ability to perform these four tasks, and they are within university tradition.

Some functions are clearly less appropriate. Although the pluralism of American higher education dictates that the definition of what is appropriate will differ from one school to another, some tasks are clearly marginal and had best be left to others. First, universities--and public administration schools with them--should avoid becoming direct managers or operators of development

programs abroad in place of U. S. or host government personnel. Universities should not undertake prolonged consultation assignments to a foreign government, especially in the field of public administration which by definition touches highly sensitive national issues. Furthermore, only under rare circumstances should universities become engaged in helping to build noneducational institutions. Such projects would usually have little feedback potential, an important criterion for university participation in any project overseas. Finally, universities should not undertake research contract projects which do not tie closely to foreign scholars or institutions and should avoid those which cannot result in open publication of major results.

Footnotes

[1]Edward Weidner outlines the history of technical assistance efforts in public administration and points out the ups and downs encountered by those emphasizing the needs in this field. See his Technical Assistance in Public Administration: The Case for Development Administration, Public Administration Service, Chicago, 1964.

[2]See Proceedings of the Conference on International Rural Development held in Washington, July 27-28, 1964. The conference was organized by the International Rural Development Office of the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and had AID sponsorship.

[3]The Inter-University Institution Building Research Program is based at the University of Pittsburgh and includes Indiana, Michigan State, and Syracuse. It is conducting research under a Ford Foundation grant and an AID contract.

[4]The C.I.C., headquartered at Purdue, includes the Big Ten universities plus the University of Chicago. It has contracted with AID to review and evaluate university experience in agricultural assistance projects abroad. Many have been institution-building projects. The research project is directed by Dr. Ira Baldwin and is headquartered at the University of Wisconsin.

[5]EWA activities include several national committees which facilitate this flow, a data center and library, and several publications which point in this direction. See The University Looks Abroad, a report from EWA, New York, 1965.

[6]There have been a number of reports on this subject: Report of the Committee on the University and World Affairs ("The Morrill Committee") Ford Foundation, New York, 1960; The College and World Affairs, 1964, a report published by Education and World Affairs. An EWA committee on the Professional School and World Affairs is now writing its report and is expected to complete work this year. One major section of the overall report will deal with public administration.

[7]Riggs argues persuasively that the research task in transitional societies goes well beyond the tools and abilities of any one discipline and "requires teamwork of a more systematic and integrated sort that we have hitherto considered necessary." On this point and for other stimulating insights into conceptual needs in administrative research see Fred W. Riggs, Administration in Developing Countries, Houghton-Mifflin, Boston, 1964.

OPTIMIZING UNIVERSITY CAPABILITIES

FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE OVERSEAS

Henry Reining, Jr.

My charge from those who planned this conference reads as follows: "Optimizing university capabilities--statements of the steps AID, the government generally, private foundations, and universities can take to create university capabilities of value to AID, consonent with overall university objectives, including methods of financing."

Mine is one of two papers on this subject; the other has been prepared by an official of AID. You may gather from this arrangement that I will be emphasizing what AID can do for the universities. I do have something to say, however, about what the universities should be doing for themselves, as well.

The first step I took in preparing for this assignment was to reread the report that John Gardner prepared in 1963-64 and which was published under the title AID and the Universities. My rereading of the Gardner report made me all the more appreciative of its high quality and of the soundness of its recommendations. I strongly suspect that most of our discussion on this topic of optimizing university capabilities will be a sequel to the Gardner report itself and an exploration of how well its recommendations have been

carried out.

If we need a theme for this paper, we can borrow it from the Gardner Report. This quotation is from page 11 of the publication which Education and World Affairs issued: "The main purpose in AID's acting to strengthen the universities is not only to serve the national interest broadly conceived, but to enable these institutions to serve AID more effectively, now and in the future."

The mission of the Gardner Report itself was to recommend steps leading to a strengthened partnership between the Agency and the universities in fulfilling the world responsibilities of both. I am sure none of us at this conference would disagree with this overall objective as governing our discussion as well.

What AID Can Do for the Universities

Institutional Grants

Let me plunge right into the heart of the matter and raise the question of institutional grants. Our bible, the Gardner Report, raised this same question and answered it as follows:

> It is time that AID examined significant measures employed to strengthen the universities by such agencies as the Department of Agriculture, National Institutes of Health, the Office of Education and others.
>
> The National Science Foundation provides institutional grants on the following formula: 100 per cent of the first $10,000 of applicable NSF grants to that institution and a graduated percentage of grant amounts in excess of $10,000, subject to a maximum award of $150,000. The money can be used for scientific research, research training, teacher training, graduate instruction, or library acqui-

> sitions. It cannot be used for general instructional costs nor for activities outside the scientific fields. The National Institutes of Health provides even more generous grants. For a number of years, a variety of observers have been recommending that AID find some means of providing comparatively broad, multi-purpose grants to strengthen selected universities as resource bases for the development field.
>
> The National Defense Education Act language and area study centers represent another approach to the problem of strengthening the universities. Some centers were established de novo. Others were already in existence but were greatly strengthened. The NDEA programs respect the autonomy of the universities and enjoy excellent relations with them.
>
> The NIH approached a number of universities with the proposal that they establish overseas research centers, and five such centers are now in operation. About half of the money provided by NIH is spent at the home campus of the university. AID might well examine the possibility of establishing a few overseas research centers with strong home-campus ties.
>
> In short, drawing on the experience of other government agencies, AID has at its disposal a variety of means to help those well-qualified universities develop themselves as powerful resources in development work. Each university might specialize in certain ways--either in terms of function or geographical area. Such centers could be called upon by AID, by any other government agency,[1] by private groups, or by foreign governments.

This proposal of grants for general institutional purposes, I am sure, is going to intrigue us most in our discussion. That is the reason why I raise it first. The institutional grant is the direct way of accomplishing what we have tried to accomplish, usually unsuccessfully, through other means, especially through the contract to perform a given project of work overseas.

What are the needs? The first is to augment and strengthen faculties so that the university can continue overseas technical assistance over a long period of time. This means actually increasing the faculty and staff in a given university so that replacements for regular faculty and hiring of outsiders to do project work overseas can be accomplished through long-term personnel planning.

Institutional grants would serve a second need already alluded to --a longer term of operation than the specific project grant usually can provide, since project grants are based on a three-year initial term and on two-year renewals with the financial provisions always in jeopardy from annual Congressional appropriations.

The institutional grant would also permit the university to carry on in more normal style. That is, it would provide funds to do research; train students both at home and abroad; build up library resources on a given function or area, or in a certain language; publish writings, indeed, provide time and opportunity for writing; give language training to faculty; give country and region orientation to faculty; and do all the other kinds of tasks which have either not been provided for at all in past contracts or for which funds have been so limited as to be almost useless.

In addition to these three needs--augmented faculty; continuity; and provision of research, student training, library resources, and other underpinning--I would add institution building as a fourth need. The institutional grant would suit much better than the contract the customary task universities have undertaken, especially in public administration, of assisting host countries to establish and perfect institutions for human resources development. The trouble with the contract is that it is not only too short-term and too limited in its financing, but it is also the wrong

device for the purpose. Once the university has made the initial survey, recommended a given procedure for institution building, and then been the principal partner in building that institution, it establishes lifelong interest and associations in the host country and especially in the institution that the university was involved in establishing. In other words, it establishes a need for continuity which the contract simply cannot meet. Faculty exchange; student exchange; joint and reciprocal research, writing, and publications; help in building each other's libraries; and other kinds of mutual assistance which ought to go on for generations are simply not suitable for financing by contract.

Plainly, the institutional grant seems to be about the only mechanism which will enable the universities really to carry out the recommendation of the Gardner Report that a number of strong centers of research in development processes be established both here and overseas.

Let me as a footnote also mention the problem of the small college or university. This same institutional-grant process can be utilized to augment AID's resources among these colleges and universities so that they can be built up to a level of utility and can then become involved in the development process.

So far we have talked about the institutional grant entirely in terms of AID providing the funds. Fortunately, under 211(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act and the new International Education Act, such grants will become possible. However, experience so far with the institutional-grant technique has been through grants from the foundations, especially the Ford Foundation. We need to examine that experience. We need to know more of how these grants have worked out and what the problems have been in operating

under them. Are there some natural barriers? For example, will the faculty of a given university keep up its enthusiasm both for the development process and for a given place and language over a long term of years, or is this too much to ask?

This leaves undiscussed, of course, the whole question of who should get the grants--the large experienced places, small new places, or both? For what purposes should grants be made? How large should they be? What should be their term or length of life? How should they be administered, both from the AID or HEW or foundation side and also from the university side? How many centers do we need, country-wide and world-wide, for what purposes and with what specializations?

And what kind of master plan is required to meet the total needs of overseas technical assistance for, let us say, the next 20 years? Then, of course, there is the ancillary question of how the grantors would coordinate their efforts, particularly with regard to given functions and areas of the world.

The Contract as a Cooperative Device

The real matter of contention at the time Dr. Gardner headed his committee was the university contract. We certainly cannot omit that topic so long as we are asking the question, "What can AID do for the universities?" The answers to that question are pretty well provided in the Gardner Report itself. The Gardner recommendations boil down to keeping the contract a simple document with a statement of broad goals and with a minimum of details. The report called for longer-term contracts and for mutual trust and confidence on the part of AID and the university in their

contractual relations.

Furthermore, the Gardner Report asked that indirect costs be more adequately provided than had been past practice in AID contracts. Indeed, the report called for more adequate financing throughout the contract so that the university could do a thorough job.

More specifically, the Gardner Report called for lead time so that the universities could conduct feasibility studies and background research, could have time to recruit replacements for faculty being sent overseas, and could give the faculty language training and orientation to the culture of the host country and to their new role in technical assistance overseas.

The Gardner Report urged that sufficient funding and time be included in contracts to permit universities to capture and record their experiences and to provide feedback of new ideas for curricula and research, for writing of articles and books, etc. And finally, the report called for a more adequate funding to provide proper home-base support for the faculty when it was overseas.

I doubt we can improve on these recommendations. I cannot answer with certainty as to how much progress has been made toward carrying out these recommendations. I have the impression that perhaps this is the area of greatest weakness so far as AID is concerned. In other words, I have the feeling that the general attitude throughout AID personnel has not changed as thoroughly as these recommendations of the Gardner Report propose.

The Gardner Report called for close and constant teamwork between the AID and the university personnel involved in overseas contracts. That is not as easy to do as it is to say. Consider, for instance, travel funds. Until

Congress is more generous in providing travel funds for AID contract people, so they can make more frequent visits to the universities with whom they are providing liaison and become better acquainted with the actual operations involved on the campus, mutual understanding will continue to be restricted.

My university has been in the overseas contract business with AID and its predecessor agencies since 1943. In all of that time I doubt whether more than six AID officers have visited our campus to take a look at what we're doing or what we've proposed. The number of AID contract people who had a direct personal acquaintance of our activities overseas was just as limited.

It is possible that this subject of aid to university contracts has been discussed to death. However, I for one would like to see us thrash this old straw again, if for no other reason than my pessimism that Congress will make sufficient funds available through the institutional grant mechanism to get the total job done.

While talking about the contract let me bring up a couple of ancillary items; namely the attitude of AID personnel; the alleged conspiracy against the private universities; and the conspiracy, so-called, against the small universities and colleges.

Has the change of attitude which the Gardner Report called for taken place among AID officials? It is my impression that this change has not come about. The ingrained, bureaucratic habit of operating through direct-hire has not been overcome, and cooperativeness simply has not come about, in my view. It seems to me that less, rather than more, is being done by university contract around the world, and this is due almost entirely to the attitudes of officialdom of AID regarding university contacts. I should dearly love to be

proved wrong.

I mentioned the alleged conspiracy against the private universities. Let me say that I do not think there is any such conspiracy even though I have heard the word used by a number of representatives of private universities. Because of the Association of State Universities and Land Grant Universities, its well-staffed office in Washington, its close relationships with AID and other government agencies such as the Department of Agriculture, and the so-called interlocking directorates which have been established, it is only natural that AID has turned more to state and land grant universities than to the private universities. How serious is this problem? What can be done about offsetting the ease with which an AID official can establish contacts with the state universities as compared with the private universities? I don't know what the answers are; I raise these questions for what they are worth.

A similar "conspiracy" is the one against the small college or university which may be interested in breaking into the overseas technical assistance business but has never been successful because it has limited resources and only a few interested faculty members. How do we bring these new institutions into the act? Some have suggested the consortium approach. I remain to be convinced. The consortia that have been put into practice have not been among the small places, but among the large ones.

Perhaps I am addressing this question in the wrong manner. Maybe we should be talking about how to utilize the faculty members in the small places through centralized recruitment devices, rosters of qualified personnel, etc. Whichever form of this question you choose, I lay it before you. Certainly we cannot talk about maximizing college and university

resources in the United States until we take into consideration the possibilities that all of the hundreds of institutions of higher learning have to offer.

Research as a Prime University Undertaking

So far we have talked about the institutional grant and the contract with the university. Let me shift away from means of financing and talk about specific university activities--first, about research. It often has been stated that AID has never recognized that universities are in the research business. Yet to many universities research is just as important as education, indeed is an essential part of education.

The Gardner Report divided its discussion of research as a university function under four headings. First, it called for a program of research grants and contracts and urged, among other things, that AID support even such basic research as the study of social processes because such research might provide the quickest path to new insights into the development process itself. It recommended that a research program among the universities should be supported at a much higher level than ever before.

Second, the Gardner Report recommended that AID should support project-related research and make research a component in its university contracts, pointing out that without such inclusion the university scholar would be altering his role drastically when he goes overseas by not having the accustomed research opportunity.

Third, the Gardner Report recommended in-house research within AID itself to address specific development problems and to make surveys and evaluations. Fourth, the report talked about what the universities can do

to address the problem of research on the development processes. The universities were called upon to create interdisciplinary units of research in the form of research centers at home and abroad and were urged to do vastly more research, since we need to know much more about the processes of modernization and how to bring them about more effectively.

How much progress has been made on these research recommendations from the Gardner Report? I cannot answer the question. I am afraid little has been done to support basic research on social processes. We do know, of course, that a program of research grants and contracts has been inaugurated. But these certainly have not constituted any great river from which it has been possible to water many research enterprises.

The second recommendation of project-related research has not come about except in unusual circumstances. Let me raise this as a question: How much progress has been made to incorporate research into AID projects under university contracts, particularly in our area of interest, public administration?

The third recommendation of in-house research has been installed. Just how much research has been done in-house in AID I do not know. Perhaps others can answer this question for us.

Fourth, as to research centers here and abroad, I am afraid the answer again would have to be that this recommendation has been carried out only in a very fragmentary manner and not at all in the scope that Dr. Gardner recommended.

Within our own field of public administration research, certainly ASPA's Comparative Administration Group has done the most outstanding job, but their research has not resulted in the establishment of interdisciplinary

research centers at home and abroad so much as it has fired up the imagination and the effort of a great many academics who might not otherwise be in the business.

All of this raises the question, What about research activities in connection with overseas technical assistance? Is CAG enough? Assuming that we are going to take more seriously the recommendation for a number of research centers, where should those centers be located--within universities or outside? If at universities, at what universities? What kind of specialization should each of those centers engage in? Where should overseas research centers be located?

Participant Training

Just as research is a reciprocal consideration as we talk about what AID can do for the university, so is participant training. As a matter of fact, not only are universities engaged contractually in research and institution building overseas, but they also have undertaken to train foreign students to become officials and professors in their own countries. The Gardner Report again had a great deal to say on this subject. It boiled down largely to a plea for AID to allow the universities more lead time and more funds for planning training and for becoming familiar with their countries. The Gardner Report notes that there are extra needs which the foreign participant has over and above those generally recognized for domestic students. For example, he needs extra counseling; all kinds of extracurricular activities to familiarize himself with the American setting; and help with visas, alien registration, and various personal problems including those created by the presence of wives and families when they travel with the

foreign participant.

Participant training is a critical problem to us at the University of Southern California. We have at present 76 professors, officials, and other participants from 19 countries. By no means are all of them from AID, but the biggest block is. Even with the 25 per cent override that we require over and above tuition for our foreign participants, we simply cannot finance adequately the kind of special handling that foreign students require. We feel strongly that we need a more satisfactory financial base from which to operate. I should be most interested to know how many of the rest of you have this same experience. What is the proper financial arrangement for the training of foreign participants? I must confess that I do not know, but I do know that the present arrangement is not sufficient. Is a general contract for training of AID participants preferable? If so, what kind of financial arrangements should this contract provide? Should it have written into it such provisions as the Gardner Report mentions--lead time for planning, for host country explorations and for becoming familiar with the objectives of the AID program in that country?

By way of a footnote, let me add that the most difficult type of training program is that which has highly particular objectives that require field experience as well as academic training. We have found these programs very hard to carry out faithfully and fully because of the meager financial base which AID provides.

Finally, regarding participant training, let me point out how difficult it is to finance any special organizational entity created to handle foreign participants. We happen to have such a unit in our school. We call it the International Public Administration Center. It has two prime

ions: one, to backstop overseas contracts; and two, to take personal ther care of our foreign participants. We have never succeeded in y adequately financing this unit. What is the answer? Assuming that specialized units are desirable, what is the answer by way of adequate cing?

As I warned you, my presentation is largely one-sided, focusing on AID can do for the universities. However, let me rectify that just a y talking about what the universities can do for themselves, or what ought to be helped to do for themselves.

What Universities Can Do for Themselves

"Use full resources of the total university." The Gardner Report this recommendation several times. I do not know exactly what it means. pecific, of course, is the need to have at the university-level a dean, e-president, a faculty committee, an interdepartmental council, or some kind of coordinator which will be responsible for the visibility of the ational aims of the university, which will see to interdisciplinary ions, and which will commandeer such relevant resources as should be t to bear.

I have no doubt that the International Education Act has brought some very real soul-searching on the part of a number of the universities at many that have not been able so far to get grants from the foundations e searching for them from the new Office of International Education in The sad fact is that even to make a survey of itself a university needs it needs financial help. That is why the strategy which Dr. Gardner ended--that only planning grants be made during the first year of the

International Education Program--is such an important one. Of course, no money has as yet been appropriated.

A second step that universities can take in order to make total resources more fully available for overseas activities is to provide more visibility for such efforts, especially to faculty in schools and departments which have not been previously exposed to the idea. What are the devices for doing this?

I am, of course, familiar with the more general efforts which have been made, especially by Education and World Affairs. EWA's current effort to get together eight reports representing as many professional fields--including law, medicine, agriculture, public, and business administration--is especially interesting since this effort involves professional schools which have not heretofore been conscious of the international dimension, not to mention the needs of technical assistance overseas.

Mutual Assistance

No doubt the universities of the United States do a great deal to help each other. But we in public administration have not even reached the point of a common roster as yet, unless we feel that the EWA efforts achieved this objective. No doubt if we had the resources we could set up some central facilities which would help us aid each other not only with the names of eligible and qualified people who might serve overseas or who might do research at home on overseas subjects, but also in the exchange of information and in joint use of knowledge, library resources, etc. Would it be possible to get a grant to explore mutual assistance on the part of the universities which are engaged in public administration efforts overseas or would like to be

so engaged?

Research Centers for Development Administration

What more needs to be done along the lines of setting up research centers and other centers for development administration? Do we need a national discussion among ourselves on setting up such centers for research, for the gathering of information, for capturing and recording experience, for education and training purposes, etc.? What should be the interdisciplinary mix for such centers? What would we like to do if we had the funds and other resources to set up these centers and had them operating?

Assuming centers, what kinds of specialization and other differentiation should exist among them? What are the important functions of the development process on the basis of which specialization could be established? What kind of area differentiations and specializations are necessary?

This discussion then quite logically brings us around full circle, back to the need for one system or one total approach. You may remember that Dr. Gardner alluded to our pluralistic system in the U.S.A. In his introduction he referred to the network of private, public, profit, and philanthropic agencies, institutions, and corporations which have been engaged in the technical assistance enterprise overseas. He made no apologies for singling out the university as more than just another source of technical services. He pointed out that the university was a uniquely valuable ally to AID, because it is the universities which produce both the new ideas and the new men to work for and with AID.

One System

Having explored both the AID side and the university side, we should go on to think about a systems view of overseas technical assistance which would take into account the interests and needs of all concerned. Technical assistance overseas in the development process is a subject on which no one has a monopoly. The U.S. government has a central role, at least on a short-run basis. The universities' role we have already explored. The foundations' role we have alluded to. There is a role for the private, nonprofit organization that we have not mentioned, and no doubt the role of profit-seeking enterprises is much greater than we sometimes admit. Would it be helpful in trying to figure out the relationship of AID to the university, and visa versa, if we did more talking and thinking about a total systems view of overseas technical assistance?

Do we have a shared concern for advancing the state of the art of overseas technical assistance, of modernizing governments of developing societies? If so, would it be helpful to look at the technique itself ? Would this help in figuring out the relationships between AID and the universities and visa versa?

Enhancing Competence

In the same fashion, should there be shared concern for enhancing the competence on all sides of the people who are involved in technical assistance overseas, of the people who are doing the thinking and the writing about the process of modernization and of development? If that is so, what

are the education and training problems of AID personnel? What are the education and training problems of the university faculty? How many people are we going to need in the near future? In the next 20 years? Who is going to supply them after what kind of educational preparation, with what kind of field experience? How are we going to keep track of them as they move from job to job, from level to level, from--if we are really sincere about free exchange--university to private corporation and philanthropic enterprise, and back again to AID or to the university? What is real competence in overseas technical assistance? Is there such a thing as an overseasman? Is it a profession separable from the regular established ones? If not, what components are there to overseasmanship which need to be added to the preparation of the professional, the doctor, lawyer, accountant, or public administrator?

These considerations are becoming rather high-flown. While I am on this high plane, let me add that we need a national memory, a national digestion of the experiences of all of us who have been and are in this business. What is the role of the university in this? Should we conceive of a library-type analogy and designate selected universities, even selected faculty members, as depositories, so to speak, of all that is known on given subjects? How can this depository function be achieved? Does it not imply an informational bridge that does not now exist between practitioner and scholar, central headquarters and field, and universities and government agencies? The hardware for such data storage is at hand. It is the software we need if we are to build the data book of memory.

Digestion means evaluation, the referring of experience, and experimentation with new approaches. How do we accomplish this? Yet, without such constant probing and testing, how can we make real progress?

Footnote

[1]Agency for International Development, AID and the Universities Washington, D.C., 1964, p.14.

IMPROVING UNIVERSITY CAPABILITIES
FOR OVERSEAS ASSISTANCE IN DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Carroll K. Shaw

This paper is based on a number of firsthand observations from some years of experience in the overseas technical assistance program in public administration as carried out by the United States government. It is intended as a starting point for a more fruitful discussion centering upon steps which might be taken to improve university capabilities for overseas assistance in development administration.

Overseas assistance programs are only one of many demands being made upon American universities today. In this competitive situation, it is necessary to consider how the universities can be encouraged to give sufficient attention to the demands of overseas technical assistance programs, including assistance in development administration. We must consider the range and content of development administration and the areas of competence that should be built within the American university community so that the needs of developing countries may be better fulfilled. We should consider from what sources the universities may expect assistance and support for their efforts to increase their capabilities in development administration, and what kinds of support would be appropriate from each source. In all

›ur discussion, we should keep in mind that development administration in ›ach country is affected by cultural and historical factors about which we ›ave at present all too little knowledge and understanding.

Motivating the Universities

Many observers of the current scene at American universities ›elieve that on their campuses is a strong awareness of the importance and ›ignificance of what goes on abroad and its effect upon the welfare of the ›merican people and that universities will respond without much pressure to ›he requirements of overseas technical assistance programs. The actual level ›f university concern for overseas problems and needs is debatable. I am less ›ptimistic than many and propose that some special thought be given to assur- ›ng that the level of university interest and concern for overseas development ›dministration will meet the needs of developing countries.

We cannot overlook the great pressures upon our universities today ›o meet domestic needs which grow yearly more urgent and demanding. Educa- ›ion and World Affairs, in a recent report entitled The University Looks ›broad, quotes the President of Stanford University, Dr. J.E. Wallace Sterling, ›s saying that we are spreading our available higher education resources too ›hin in view of U.S. requirements. EWA goes on to point out that for perhaps ›he next two decades the United States will face critical manpower shortages ›n our higher educational establishments. To meet the demand, every institution ›ust reassess its priorities, explore new ideas, and perhaps modify personnel ›olicies. All too familiar to all of us are the figures on the rapid growth ›f the st›dent population in American universities, the rapid expansion of ›nowledge in all fields which makes heavy demands upon faculties to keep

abreast with new developments, the expanding services provided to business and local communities by the universities outside of and beyond classroom activities, and the accelerating pace of research in all fields. Against these demands we must balance the requirements for overseas technical assistance programs in development administration and consider what motivations may stimulate within universities in the United States the required attention and resources.

In this connection, we should keep in mind that the university is not really a single organism which will respond wholly to the stimulus applied to one of its parts. The course of university policy and action is determined by the reactions and value judgments of four constituent parts of the university: the administration, including not only the president and deans but also the state legislature or board of trustees; faculty members, especially those with tenure; students, including undergraduates, but especially the graduate students and those enrolled in professional schools; and alumni, an articulate special interest group whose voice often may affect university policy. Optimizing university capabilities for assistance overseas in development administration will call for steps to enhance the interest and support of each of these constituent parts of American universities. Obviously, different approaches to each element are called for.

The Administration

Motivating the interest of the university administration in overseas development administration will be achieved through activities or programs which include some of the following attributes: Projects should be planned for terms long enough to accomplish their stated objectives and should be

carried on with a minimum of change. Objectives should be consistent with university purposes--the advancement and spread of knowledge. Project activities should be similar to those normally carried out by a university--teaching, research, and consultation--in the disciplines in which the university has competence. Requirements for personnel and other university resources should not be so great as to jeopardize normal operations of the university, and outside support to the university should compensate it for both direct and indirect costs incurred. (In this aspect of the technical assistance project, we can expect the administration to use a liberal definition of indirect costs.) And the university administration will be most interested in technical assistance projects which may directly or indirectly enhance the university's ability to do its primary task of teaching and research.

The Faculty

Faculty interest and support for university participation in development administration will be based in part, it seems to me, upon considerations similar to those which might appeal to the administration, but there are other aspects which would have special appeal to the faculty. The faculty will, above all, expect that the university will recognize personal service overseas in technical assistance work as an essential stage in professional career advancement, as important as research and publication. Faculty interest will be greatest where the project affords opportunity to enrich personal competence in teaching through new approaches to the subject matter in a new environment and in research through access to new information which may expand studies already done or contribute new materials for courses already taught. Of

special appeal to the faculty is the opportunity which development administration offers for overseas research by graduate students under guidance and sponsorship of faculty members.

Year by year we see overseas a growing competence in development administration within public agencies and universities of the less developed countries. Among their staffs are found many persons of considerable training and experience in management and administration. This opens to us another incentive for faculty interest in overseas projects--the opportunity for collaborative work with foreign specialists in teaching, research, and consulting. A team relationship with foreign associates can be mutually stimulating and can enhance the quality of the product through cross-fertilization of ideas arising from the different cultural backgrounds of American and foreign experts.

The factor which I think is the most persuasive for the type of faculty member most needed in development administration overseas is the element most difficult for us to introduce into technical assistance projects--an opportunity to exercise creativity. The most competent specialists will respond with greatest interest to overseas projects in which there is opportunity to work out and try new approaches to long-standing problems, to tackle problems not before encountered, or to seek solutions to familiar problems encountered in an unfamiliar environment. In my own experience with AID and predecessor agencies, we have found it very difficult to accord to universities the freedom to innovate, to try new approaches, and to carry on research which may or may not contribute directly or significantly to specific project objectives. We have tended to prescribe courses of action which leave to the university and its team limited opportunities for the kind of creative effort

which would appeal to their most highly competent faculty members. Perhaps we in AID should consider the example of private foundations which, in ordering their overseas technical assistance projects, give greater latitude for action.

The Students

And what of the third constituent part of the university, the student, whose interest, participation, and support we should regard as necessary to the improvement of university capabilities in development administration? I venture to suggest a few considerations which may interest and invite the support of undergraduate and graduate students in overseas programs of the American university. Most students, much as they would like to have a winning football team, would endorse overseas technical assistance programs which appear to raise the prestige of their institution among other universities. The more serious students may be expected to encourage the university to undertake overseas projects which might enrich and make more stimulating the courses offered on campus to undergraduates. This enrichment might be gained from the overseas service of a faculty member who uses his personal experiences as a classroom resource, or whose courses include new topics added as a result of new perspectives gained from overseas service.

Overseas programs which bring to the campus interesting foreign personalities as visitors or as students will have a broad appeal to students. In the field of development administration, there is a good chance that foreign visitors may be officials of considerable prestige and consequence in their home countries. Overseas projects in development administration which include on-campus research employing undergraduate or graduate students will have added appeal. Projects which provide opportunities to students for study or work

abroad will also have a strong appeal, especially to the graduate student who may see this as an opportunity to finance required research for an advanced degree.

The Alumni

It may not be too unfair to dispose of the "fourth estate" of the university, the alumni, by suggesting that their interest and support of technical assistance in development administration will be based primarily upon persuasion that such projects will bring outside recognition to their alma mater. Many alumni would endorse overseas programs which can be expected to enrich in various ways on-campus educational and research activities.

In my judgment, the first step in optimizing capabilities of American universities in development administration is to see that in our overseas technical assistance projects we have built in as many as possible of these inducements. Only then can we hope for the essential full institutional support of the university in our overseas projects.

Range and Content of Development Administration

In considering development administration, we have long since departed from the limited concept of public administration as staff services: budgeting, personnel, O & M, fiscal and accounting administration, procurement, communication and records, and reporting. Development administration is a much broader term encompassing the entire process from inventory of national needs and resources through short- and long-term planning to directing and coordinating the execution of develomment programs, evaluating results, and revising plans and programs in the light of accomplishments to date and

ultimate goals. Development administration concentrates upon the needs of the national leadership, especially the executive, and the management tools required for accomplishing national development. The traditional specialties of public administration, of course, are among those management tools.

We should consider, however, another aspect of development administration to which the university is in a position to make an important and significant contribution. When considering the management tools appropriate for use in development programs, due regard should be given to cultural and historic factors which may condition how management should be adapted to the situation prevailing in the assisted country. Application of the merit principle in personnel administration may have to be modified in the light of the familial obligations established in the national culture over the past centuries which affect the selection of individuals for appointment, promotion, or other recognition. The decisive factor in a given culture may be a personal relationship instead of competence. The American university, while having available the services of management experts, also has specialists in the behavioral sciences--psychologists, sociologists, and anthropologists--who can add a multidisciplinary approach to development administration.

When considering how to optimize the role of American universities in overseas development administration, therefore, we should include plans to develop cultural and social data which may limit or influence the application of Western management principles or techniques. This may require enlarging the traditional scope of public administration projects to include research into national culture and customs by behavioral scientists to provide information essential for the successful adaptation of management techniques to the local situation.

Optimizing University Capabilities in Development Administration

I have suggested in the foregoing discussion some of the elements which should be incorporated into technical assistance projects in development administration in order to elicit the full support and participation of American universities. Let me conclude with a summary list of other steps which might be taken to the same end.

1. As part of technical assistance projects, universities should be encouraged to survey and report fully on current administrative practices of less developed countries.
2. Universities should conduct research studies on the traditional practices and social standards in less developed countries as they may affect the rate and direction of social change. Particular attention should be directed to the effect upon administrative practices and policies.
3. Universities should be assisted in developing personnel policies which will encourage the growth of a cadre of faculty members who, through repeated tours of service overseas as teachers or consultants, acquire in-depth understanding of social and economic factors which condition the adoption of Western management concepts and techniques.
4. Technical assistance agencies and private foundations should provide universities with persons having practical experience in the management of public and private enterprises in less developed countries. They would serve either as teachers or resource persons in specialized seminars to prepare people for management assignments overseas.

5. Universities having special competence and interest in development administration should be assisted in assembling from countries overseas monographs, reports, and other relevant source materials for use in teaching and research. These collections would include theses and dissertations of degree candidates in appropriate fields of specialty, especially those prepared by foreign students.
6. Universities with special interest in development administration should be assisted and encouraged to cooperate with appropriate institutions in less developed countries (usually universities) for exchange of students in graduate research and for cooperation in providing local faculty guidance of research.
7. The university presses should be assisted in encouraging research for publication in development administration by faculty and graduate students. When appropriate, university presses should publish significant research studies of foreign scholars in development administration. In some cases, subsidies by outside government or foundation funds may be necessary and justified.
8. Area and language study centers at universities having special interest in development administration should be encouraged to include a greater emphasis on studies of development administration in non-Western countries.

Optimizing Capabilities of Less Developed Countries

Finally, we should give some attention to a situation prevailing in

most less developed countries which limits the opportunity to improve development administration and to build management competence. People in developing countries generally resent as an unwarranted and unwelcome intrusion the investigator who seeks through interview or questionnaire to develop recommendations or to prepare evaluations of current operations in public or private enterprises. It makes little difference whether the investigator is a foreigner or a fellow countryman. If we are to advance the knowledge of good management in the less developed countries, American universities, foundations, and technical assistance agencies must find a way around the customary opposition to investigation and collection of data by persons from outside the office or agency under study. We must develop in these countries a general acceptance of fact-finding research and investigation as a normal activity in government and business and in society at large.

Similarly, leaders of non-Western nations must somehow be persuaded that the prudent commitment of national funds and other resources for research and fact-finding is an essential part of any national effort or program for national development.

Success in these two fundamental aspects of management improvement are prerequisites for the advance of development administration in less developed countries in all regions of the world today.

POTENTIAL FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION:

211(D) AND THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Ray D. Pethtel
with the assistance of
Curtis H. Barker

Any effort to set forth the roles to be played by American universities, AID, and other governmental agencies in meeting administrative needs and problems of developing countries over the next decade must be based on adequate financial and legislative support for the research, training, education, and public service activities of these agencies and the universities. With this in mind, this paper outlines the available information on the two newest sources of federal funding for universities--the International Education Act of 1966 and Section 211(D) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, Amended--and indicates the prospects and limitations of these programs for development administration.*

In testimony before the House Task Force on International Education, David E. Bell, former Administrator of the Agency for International Development, referred to universities as "a major resource, capable of supplying professional personnel . . . to man overseas programs and projects, as a source for the conduct of research, as advisors on policy, and as a training ground for foreign

participants and visitors." AID, he said, was:

> attempting to maintain a clear and sensible distinction between activities in the foreign aid field authorized and financed under the Foreign Assistance Act, and activities designed to enlarge and strengthen U.S. training and research facilities in international fields--not for foreign aid purposes, but to permit our country to fulfill better its normal and continuing role as a member of the world community of nations.

Mr. Bell's remarks quickly and incisively distinguish between these two funding programs and at the same time indicate the character of the bridges that span them.

At first glance, the International Education Act (IEA) and 211(D) do not appear to be similar programs, but their effects are significantly complementary. The IEA is a domestic program meant to identify, establish, develop, and promulgate international affairs education programs within colleges and universities so they might more adequately participate in the international affairs of the United States. 211(D), on the other hand, is designed to create a sustained and specialized competence in educational and research institutions related to specific development problems and programs. The bridges are inherent at several significant points. Both programs are developmental. That is, new resources, new institutional arrangements, and new university interests are hopefully to be spurred by them. Both programs focus attention on development of domestic educational resources in the international arena. Both programs will affect the role of universities in foreign affairs either by the implantation and generation of knowledge or by exportation and institutionalization of ideas abroad. Both programs permit program flexibility not currently possible in university efforts. Both emphasize continued university efforts in international affairs. And, perhaps

most significant, a formal organization will be established to encourage more effective coordination and communication among the various foreign assistance and foreign affairs programs and related activities of federal agencies and universities.

Section 211(D) of the Foreign Assistance Act

Section 211(D) authorizes AID to commit up to ten million dollars annually to create university and other institutionally based "centers of competence" not currently available to meet developmental needs uniquely relevant to AID and its foreign assistance efforts. The program is to emphasize development of indigenous institutions and scholarship in order to deepen and strengthen institutional capacity for dealing with developmental problems. The "centers of competence" will be involved in foreign assistance through such traditional academic efforts as:

- -- the addition of faculty chairs for continuing attention in areas relevant to foreign cooperation programs;
- -- the development of specialized curricula on problems of technical assistance operations in a foreign culture;
- -- the establishment of graduate fellowships designed to furnish depth of understanding of foreign cultures and economic and social development problems; and
- -- the planning and pursuit of research to support systematic generation and organization of knowledge relevant to developmental processes.

The implementation of 211(D) programs will be based on several AID-originated premises.

First, to achieve effective development of institutional resources, sustaining grants will be made for five to ten years (renewable yearly) and limited to a small number of well-funded programs. New organizational arrangements will be encouraged and required to stimulate institutional and individual commitment. New curricula will be developed and appropriate faculty and students recruited. New library facilities and resources will be developed.

Second, to assure attention to high-priority programs and to develop a significant increase in across-the-board capabilities in AID programing, AID will maintain the initiative on grants--programing to universities according to current and projected operational needs.

Third, the grant principle will be recognized to maximize university flexibility, since the funds are to be used to build long-range resources in depth rather than to procure services for a specific limited purpose. Contracts will still be used to obtain specific services.

Fourth, the selection and evaluation of fundable activities will be guided by the following principles:

-- The need must be responsive to an AID program need that cannot be satisfied by existing resources or facilities.

-- The university must prepare and develop curricula, recruit and train personnel, engage in research related to AID's needs, and be willing to organize its program and faculty to guarantee a sustained institutional effort.

-- Programs should be planned over a time span of five to ten years and geared to technical, social, and economic problems in less-developed countries.

-- AID evaluation of program performance will be based on the achievement of professional development objectives rather than on accounting of specific performance details so that universities can maximize discretion in developing specialty competence.

In planning for grants, AID and an external advisory committee will determine projects. Specifically, AID in cooperation with universities and relevant professionals will determine areas appropriate for funds. The advisory committee will evaluate and advise on the institutional characteristics necessary for creating the "centers of competence" and assist in determining the actual grant recipients. (The membership of the advisory committee will broadly represent universities, foundations, and other relevant AID interests.)

Further, AID expects that the "centers of competence" will be developed in at least two basic forms. One form will be oriented to professional, technical disciplines peculiar to the less-developed countries. For example, tropical soil science, land tenure and reform, tropical medicine, development planning, educational technology, and legal institutions are among the technical disciplines currently given a high priority. Another form will orient itself to geographic areas or particular countries where a technical sector will be developed on its relationship to the total development of the country or region. An example of this form is the strengthening of the capability of the universities currently providing assistance to Indian agriculture.

The International Education Act of 1966

The IEA may be the most underpublicized and least understood program enacted by the 89th Congress. One reason is that the title--International Education Act--does not clearly describe its intent. The IEA is a domestic development program to establish and promote the internationalization of educational efforts within domestic colleges and universities. It is not a program primarily to import or export educational talent. Another reason it may be misunderstood is that the essential planning for implementation of the act has not yet begun in earnest. The act focuses on inculcating aspects of international affairs into universities by providing grant programs for the development of advanced and undergraduate international studies.

On the graduate level, grants will be made to institutions of higher education or to combinations of institutions to establish, strengthen, and operate graduate centers of national and international research, training, and study related either to geographic areas or to international affairs. Funds may be used to establish, equip, and operate research and training centers (including the cost of teaching and research materials and resources, programs for visiting scholars and faculty, training improvement and travel of staff, and training stipends). On the undergraduate level, grants will be used on the same basis to assist in planning and developing comprehensive programs to strengthen and improve undergraduate instruction in international studies. Elements indicated in the legislation that may be a part of these efforts are:

-- planning for the development and expansion of undergraduate

programs in international studies; teaching and research curriculum development; training faculty members in foreign countries; expansion of foreign language courses; planned and supervised student work-study-travel programs; programs under which foreign teachers and scholars may visit American institutions as visiting faculty; and programs of English language training for foreign teachers, scholars, and students.

The act further provides for the establishment of a national advisory committee on international studies, appointed by the President, to assist the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in carrying out the act and to represent a cross-section of educational institutions and other organizations and individuals experienced in and concerned with foreign affairs.

To provide greater flexibility in international education, the IEA also amends several existing laws, including the National Defense Education Act of 1958 instilling greater program flexibility and removing the current 50 per cent federal participation limit. It provides for the establishment of international affairs institutes for secondary school teachers and, in addition, amends the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961.

Perhaps as significant as the act itself is the proposed method of implementation by HEW. A Center for Educational Cooperation will be created to implement the various IEA titles and to coordinate the international education activities of HEW, AID, and other governmental programs and agencies. Since Congress has not yet appropriated funds for the act, planning and staffing for the Center have not begun. However, HEW hopes a supplemental request will be approved to provide limited funds for the establishment of the Center. The grant programs envisioned under the act may not begin until 1968, 1969, or

possibly as late as 1970. This, however, is not considered to be a drastic limitation since the IEA does not call for a crash educational endeavor, but rather a development program for American universities.

The Promise

That the IEA and 211(D) mutually complement each other holds much promise for academic institutions and federal agencies. Funds from both programs may be concentrated on developing graduate and undergraduate programs and curricula related to international affairs. Thus, for example, while 211(D) funds are being used for development of a technical center in a foreign region, IEA funds may also be used to strengthen the related international affairs programs affecting the same geographic area or to strengthen an area study center so that supporting disciplinary resources inherent in the establishment of a "center of competence" can be adequately developed by the university. It may also be that both 211(D) funds and IEA funds can be used for rapid and substantial development of the same technical or areal program.

At least five other partly or totally new factors make these programs significant:

-- An institution is created to assist specifically in coordination and communication of educational development.

-- Presumably, the universities and the professions will be intimately involved in the planning of program activities and the determination of projected problem areas.

-- The Development efforts both domestically and in technical assistance give at least minimum deference to "total" development (in our case inherently including administration even in the most

technical "center of competence").

-- The establishment of an "internationalized" American college or university is raised to the level of Presidential concern with the appointment of the HEW advisory committee.

-- The grant principle and program operational flexibility are recognized.

The Problems

There are several problems that must be considered in discussing these new legislative programs. These are not necessarily a part of the written legislation, but are functions of the interpretation AID, the Center for Educational Cooperation, and HEW give to the legislation.

First, it is difficult to assess whether the "centers of competence" and the "international affairs centers" will be broad enough in scope to assure adequate consideration of the "total development process" rather than simply development of the technical components of foreign assistance. For example, if a "center of competence" in tropical medicine is established under 211(D), what considerations will be made for developing foreign competence in the organization and reorganization of indigenous public health services, recruiting and training of indigenous supportive medical and administrative personnel, developing training resources in foreign countries for supporting medical and administrative services, and creating a capability of the less-developed country to absorb the tremendous administrative problems that are a part of the technical assistance program once it is transferred? "Total development" is not clearly legislated. It is not based on a historical pattern of program funding experience. It does not seem to be a clear-cut element of AID and HEW planning.

And it certainly has been accepted and generalized policy in only a very few universities. (The problem of getting different university disciplines to cooperate may be the most difficult and frustrating part of institution building if history is the judge.)

Second, what is required for the federal government and universities to assure each other that the problems, needs, and issues of development administration will be considered as an integral part of the technical "center of competence"? And how can development administration or a part of it be placed on AID's "high priority" list as a relevant technical assistance need?

Third, there are not enough current indicators that convincingly suggest such continued legislative support as will surely be required for developmental efforts. Neither the IEA nor 211(D) is presently funded. Nor does it appear that the current projections of available funds will be near adequate for development of knowledge of the development administration processes. This is particularly true considering that these processes are in the infant stage of growth and have yet to attain acceptance as partners with the technical processes.

Finally, the level of toleration for trial and error efforts is uncertain. In the past, programs tried but evaluated as unsuccessful--perhaps through lack of funds or knowledge--have been refused new trials. Universities traditionally seem reluctant to institute untried organizational arrangements. The federal government traditionally has seemed reluctant to fund them. And the criteria for program evaluation and selection, although termed flexible, may not turn out to be flexible enough to permit efforts in new subjects where only the barest minimum of theoretical or applied knowledge has been developed.

But the problems seem to be outweighed by the promise. It appears that trends now started through the International Education Act and the Foreign Assistance Act are beginning to meet the problems of development and, for us, its administration.

Bibliographic Note

Little has been formally written on Section 211(D) of the Foreign Assistance Act and its prospects. Several staff memorandums are available and in fact have been used as the basis for this paper. An especially relevant document has been prepared on the International Education Act by Education and World Affairs. EWA's pamphlet International Education Act of 1966 (November 1966) is available from their offices at 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10036. This pamphlet excerpts the principal documents related to the International Education Act and supplements them with interpretations and summaries of recent developments related to the act.

In addition, the House Task Force on International Education has prepared International Education: Past, Present, Problems and Prospects. Copies are available from the House Committee on Education and Labor and the United States Government Printing Office.

Footnote

*Additional funding programs relevant to development administration were passed by the 89th Congress that will not be mentioned further--the Food for Peace Act of 1966 administered by the Department of Agriculture and other sections of the Foreign Assistance Act administered by AID, especially Title 9. This omission is to focus attention on what at this time appear to be the most significant if not the best funded potential sources of financial support for development administration programs.

GUIDELINES FOR A MULTIDISCIPLINARY APPROACH TO DEVELOPMENT

Ferrel Heady

American universities have been working with the Agency for International Development and its predecessors for at least 15 years in projects to help developing countries meet their administrative problems. In one way or another, nearly all of these efforts have been concerned with "development administration," although the term itself has become popular only in recent years as a label to call attention to the exceptional demands made upon administration to bring about rapid social, economic, and political change.

In considering how to marshall the resources of our universities in a broad multidisciplinary approach to development, we must keep in mind the twin criticisms that have legitimately been leveled at past technical assistance efforts involving American universities and AID. On the university side, the advisors in administration have been accused of exporting too doctrinaire a formula for administrative improvement, ignoring or at least discounting both local conditioning forces that must be taken into account and the contributions that might be made by other than specialists in public administration. For their part, officials in AID and their counterparts in the governmental agencies of developing countries have been charged with trying to make

dramatic advances in governmental programs without giving enough attention to the administrative requirements for program accomplishment. These are justifiable criticisms, even though there are understandable explanations for the failings noted. Given a desire to meet these deficiencies, our task is to comment on how this might best be done through activities initiated by and centered in a school of public administration or public affairs at an American university.

Characteristics of the Schools

First, we ought to take a look at these university-based entities that are to be the action agents, because their characteristics restrict the scope and pace of what they can do. Much evidence suggests that they are in a state of transition themselves. Certainly there is great diversity among them as they now operate, and there are diverging views as to proper directions for their development. These questions have been explored recently in a report on Higher Education for Public Service, prepared by John C. Honey for the ASPA Council on Graduate Education for Public Administration. They are also under scrutiny by study groups on a number of university campuses. Several observations based on these inquiries are pertinent here.

With very few exceptions, these programs are relatively small and weak specimens in university settings where spectacular growth has occurred in other fields. Their resources are already strained to do what they are doing and to respond in a minimum way to domestic demands for stepped-up efforts at public service education. If they are to engage in sizeable programs to improve development administration abroad, they must have support from outside the usual sources.

The continuing uncertainty as to the nature of public administration as a field of academic study may affect the degree to which action-oriented development administration programs have an appeal. If public administration is viewed as a social science discipline on the make, the schools are liable to be judged detrimental or at least tangential. If the orienting concept is a professional one, which in my opinion is preferable, then development administration programs fit in much more easily.

The organizational arrangements for the public administration or public affairs programs are far from uniform, ranging from adjuncts of political science departments to interdepartmental institutes to separate schools that may be confined to public administration or may be combined with business or other forms of administrative study. The trend seems to be toward the professionally oriented graduate school of public administration or public affairs in the larger universities that have the most reputable records for public service education. These are the places that should be most reliable as centers for development administration activities.

Nearly every set of recommendations for reform and infusion of new vigor in the schools of public administration includes a strong urging for closer cooperative relationships with the social science departments and with other professional schools within the university. One of the great advantages of what I have called elsewhere the "nuclear" graduate school of public administration or public affairs is that it has the focus of interest and the flexibility in operation to accomplish this. It can offer to our large universities an organizational instrument for generic attention to the public service role of the university, not focused on a single professional specialty or program field. With freedom to act autonomously, such a school

can explore possibilities for cooperation in teaching, research, and service activities and can exploit these possibilities when they are found. Fortunately, such an agenda fits neatly with our objective of working on a broad multidisciplinary front to bring American university resources to bear on development administration.

How can this be accomplished, either by improving on past experience or by innovative experiments? It appears to me that American universities have two basic options as to the kinds of obligations they undertake:

(1) They can carry out training and research projects that are based on the home campus and have as their purpose some direct contribution to training or research objectives in development administration.

(2) They can enter into collaborative programs with institutions abroad where the main purpose in an indirect one of building up the capabilities of the host institution to deal with development administration in the country concerned.

In each of these cases, we are interested in the most promising ways of involving not only schools and programs in public administration or public affairs but also other relevant disciplines and professions in coordinated university-wide efforts to meet these demands.

Home-Campus Programs for Development Administration

The projects with a home-campus base usually are aimed at providing education or training for individuals. That is, the objective is to upgrade the capabilities of specific persons or groups of persons in some aspect of development administration. These may be foreign nationals who are primarily

interested in the development of their own countries, or they may be Americans preparing to engage in developmental programs abroad under the auspices of some agency endeavoring to offer technical assistance, such as the United Nations, AID, or a private foundation. Entrance to the program may be open to qualified applicants who are admitted on an individual basis or restricted to those who qualify on the basis of membership in some group for which the program is designed. The work may fit into a curriculum leading to a degree, or it may be a special nondegree program of a more specialized scope and usually of shorter duration.

These are all suitable variations, but I doubt that each of them is equally feasible at any institution. I would regard as the foundation stone--one that should be present before other programs can be built upon it--a graduate degree program that offers development administration as a major field of specialization. Unless this exists, I would question whether AID or any other aid-giving agency should place major reliance upon that university. The degree may be a more general one such as that of master of public administration or a professional degree such as master of public health or master of social work, provided an option is available that stresses training in problems of development and the administration of development programs.

On the assumption that a university is interested in offering such an educational opportunity and wants some institution-wide mechanism for integrating its efforts to do this, what should it choose? Without claiming that there are no feasible alternatives, I would recommend a core seminar in development administration offered under the auspices of the public administration or public affairs program. It should provide a forum for bringing

a variety of disciplinary and professional skills to bear on typical development administration problems. Participating students need not be enrolled in a common degree program. Indeed, diversity in their backgrounds, interests, and career plans is an asset because the integrating function of such a seminar can be realized in part by such a student mix, as well as by such usual means as arranging for faculty input from a variety of fields and drawing upon diverse library resources. The pattern of instruction should be chosen so as to capitalize on these interaction possibilities, emphasizing such devices as the case method and the syndicate approach.

A key question is what part of a student's total program should be devoted to such an integrating seminar. My suggestion as a guideline is that it should be substantial but not predominant, comprising perhaps one-fourth or one-third of the full load. This allows combining a shared common experience with considerable individual specialization, extensive enough even to permit seminar participants to satisfy different degree requirements.

The most relevant illustration of this kind of pattern that occurs to me is the plan that has been followed at most of the universities taking part in the recent special internship programs of the National Institute of Public Affairs, which have brought government officials in midcareer back to the campus for full-time graduate study for an academic year. Usually a common seminar has been offered on each campus for all students in the group, who are then allowed considerable discretion in choosing among other course offerings at the institution. Similar in scope and objective are the development seminars which have been instituted by the universities participating in the Ford Foundation "Study Fellowships for International Development" program.

The Fellows, mainly Peace Corps returnees and all with a demonstrated commitment to overseas development, meet in common seminars on development regardless of their differing fields of study.

I am not prepared to specify the detailed content of such a core course in development administration. As far as I know, not much has been written about what should go into this kind of course, and there are not many existing examples. A forthcoming study on education for development administration, being done under the auspices of the International Institute of Administrative Sciences, may help on this score. The course should probably be problem oriented, but experimentation rather than standardization is in order until we know much more than we do now about this kind of educational undertaking. Certainly the focus should be on what is different about administration in a "developmental" context and on adaptation to fit administrative practice to the circumstances. Since most of our attention has been given to the conduct of administration in more settled situations, what we with some confidence regard as known and justifiably teachable to the future administrator in our own society may be irrelevant or downright misleading to the student of development administration. Hence the approach must be eclectic, drawing as directly as possible upon experience that has relevance to the functional specializations of the participants and the operating conditions under which they can expect to be working.

Similarly, I can only hint at the array of courses that should be available for supplementing and elaborating the contribution of the core development administration course. At a minimum, these ought to include courses that themselves have a developmental orientation. For example, in economics there should be course work in economic development and in political

science course work in political development, probably in each instance having some specialization on geographical area, level of development, or both. Professional schools need to provide comparable offerings dealing with such topics as public health practice in developing countries, development education, community development, problems of agricultural production and natural resource conservation in developing areas, and so forth. Many of our leading social science departments and professional schools already have a scattering of such courses. However, the courses tend to neglect administrative implementation, and there is little attention to interlinking program relationships. This gap can be filled in part by the meeting ground provided by the development administration seminar for both faculty and students drawn from these more specialized backgrounds.

I think it is possible to identify some of the requisites that a university should possess before it can expect to launch successfully the kind of a program I have outlined.

(1) It should have strong faculties, an adequate library, and other supporting facilities not only in public administration but also in the most relevant social science disciplines such as political science, economics, and sociology and in several of the concerned professional fields such as agriculture, natural resources, public health, social work, and education.

(2) It should have assurance of a sufficient number of qualified students who combine a central interest in development administration with the capability of holding their own in some established discipline or

professional field. Unless this student nucleus is present, the benefits of a broadly based development administration seminar cannot be realized.

(3) Even with such a combination, assured backing from an external source for several years will probably be necessary to persuade a university to allocate the required institutional resources for a concentrated push in development administration. If the objective is a concerted national program and we will not be satisfied with a series of sporadic and vulnerable responses by a few institutions willing to make the effort on their own, AID must make a major policy decision to select a limited number of university centers for guaranteed long-range support for a period of five to ten years. The selection process should provide some specialization on the basis of geographical region and program field of interest, while assuring that at each institution chosen there would be sufficient diversity and depth of resources to sustain a basic program in development administration at a graduate level. With such a base, special training or research programs could be added on a project basis as needed.

Overseas Programs for Development Administration

In a discussion of AID-university relations, we are on somewhat

more familiar ground in turning to activities overseas undertaken by universities, usually under AID contract, that have objectives related to development administration.

The range of such assignments has been considerable, and there are possibilities that have not yet been tried. I take a more limited view than do some others on what universities can most appropriately be called upon to accomplish. American universities are versatile institutions. If a university so decides, it may be capable of doing very well what could just as reasonably be done under other sponsorship, such as by AID directly, by a management consultant firm, by a nonprofit organization, or by a professional society. I would put in that category such responsibilities as furnishing manpower for strategic positions in foreign administrative systems through an OPEX-like plan, the provision of a consultant advisory service on development administration problems, or maintenance of a roster of persons available for overseas assignment. There is nothing inherently wrong in assigning these and other functions to a university, but a university does not have a particular claim for competence in handling them.

My assumption is that the primary proved utility of American universities is in carrying out collaborative programs with universities or similar educational institutions in foreign countries. The usual purpose is to assist the counterpart institution in improving its capability for effective participation in development administration in the home country. This necessarily calls for an established relationship over a period of several years and assistance in a spectrum of programs such as curriculum planning, demonstration teaching, acquisition of library collections, staff training, research guidance, and so forth.

Present Patterns of Assistance

These projects have by no means been identical in focus and scope. Alternative patterns can be identified, with variations that affect, among other things, the multidisciplinary dimensions of the enterprise.

Public Administration Programs. The most common approach has been to enlist the help of the American university in the initiation and first stage of growth of a public administration center within the host institution. This has been typical of past efforts. Well-known examples are those of the University of Michigan in the Philippines, the University of Southern California in Iran, New York University in Turkey, the University of Tennessee in Bolivia, etc. These joint efforts have had varying degrees of success, ranging from actual or virtual abandonment soon after expiration of the technical assistance contract to a demonstrated capability for sustained growth with an adequate base of local support, plus a variety of in-between examples.

Since the goal here has been to launch a program in public administration where none existed or to develop a rudimentary beginning into a substantial program, effort has been concentrated rather narrowly on providing a curriculum for students planning to enter the public service, midcareer training for officials already in the service, and related research activities. Personnel involved directly in the project, either as contractor technical-assistance experts or as cooperating faculty or participant trainees from the host institution, have generally been public administration specialists whose talents could be brought to bear directly to meet project deadlines. Although other kinds of specialists frequently were involved, their proportion to total personnel was small. Usually they were political scientists, often with an

area specialization appropriate for the country where the work was being done. Economists might be brought in to handle public finance or related courses considered integral to the public administration curriculum. Once in a while a recruit from another social science was involved. For instance, the Michigan team in the Philippines included a sociologist who was an expert in demography, and the Southern California group in Iran had a social psychologist.

These appointments represented modest attempts either to bolster the resources of the host university in social science fields considered very close to public administration or to build into the contract team itself expertise that might help bring a better understanding of the problems faced and how to cope with them. The contract was unlikely to recognize these as official objectives, so such people had in a sense to be smuggled in. At any rate, this did mean a limited interlinkage with political science, other social science disciplines, and established faculties such as law (particularly in instances where the public administration program was made an adjunct to the law school), engineering, or business administration. In general, however, staff connected with public administration were given more favorable treatment on salary, teaching load, research support, library holdings, opportunity for study abroad, and other important matters.

Business and Public Administration Programs. A second alternative has been to combine a public administration program with a related one in business administration. The two examples I am aware of are the Institute of Business and Public Administration established at the University of Karachi in 1955 with help from the University of Pennsylvania, and the Center for Business and Public Administration Education set up in the early 1960's at the National Chengchi University in Taiwan with assistance from the University of Michigan.

There may be other instances.

This combination assumes, as do similar programs in this country, that there is a close community of interests between business and public administration, that educational programs can be basically the same in the two fields provided opportunity for specialization is offered in more advanced work, and that manpower requirements are similar in both the public and private sectors of the society and can be dealt with jointly.

Certain conditions increase the likelihood of such a double-barreled program. In the recipient country, these include recognition of the desirability of a mixed economic system requiring substantial input from both public and private enterprises and a desire to channel managerial talent into both kinds of careers. At the host university, this form of technical assistance is most attractive if prior efforts in public and business administration education have been at about the same level, so that each can build upon an equivalent base or start together if there is none. Similarly at the American contracting university, it is helpful to have a combined school of business and public administration or at least a past record of cooperation between the two units if they are separate. At Pennsylvania the former was the case, and at Michigan the latter. The Michigan Institute of Public Administration was the formal contracting agent, but the whole enterprise was planned and staffed jointly.

In these ventures, as in joint programs on American campuses, the dimensions of the business administration segment have tended to overshadow the public administration part. Ralph Braibanti reports that in the contract party of 11 Americans at Karachi in 1958 only two were public administration specialists. In Taiwan, the pressure also was to move from a balance toward more emphasis on the business administration side in terms of staff and

clientele for the program. Possibly this reflected circumstances in these two countries rather than a relationship that would emerge in many developing countries. In Pakistan the Institute apparently did not succeed in establishing cordial lines of relationship with the important leaders in the higher ranks of the Civil Service of Pakistan, and later a separate set of training institutes was set up to train government officials in middle-management ranks. In Taiwan, the private enterprise sector has been unusually active in the economy for a developing country; it has also been more innovative than the governmental bureaucracy and hence more receptive to utilizing the facilities of such a center.

Clearly this type of operation opens up more opportunities for interdisciplinary cooperation between the two types of specialists in administrative studies and those other specialists normally closely associated with each group. Depending upon the orientation of the business administration contingent, this may mean more contacts not only with economists but also with industrial engineers, social psychologists, and some kinds of mathematicians than might be the case if only public administration were involved. However, there is nothing in this combination that automatically assures that attention will be given to an institution-wide attack on development administration problems. The technical assistance contracts have not authorized or supported such a broad-gauged approach, and the objective of the public and business administration experts has been to create going concerns modeled after their American prototypes, which have not been designed to focus primarily on development administration issues.

"Across-the-Board" Programs. Another type of operation in which an American university may be engaged with AID backing is an institution-to-

institution relationship that does not place any special emphasis on public administration, although these fields may be incidental beneficiaries. In contrast to the programs already mentioned, the objective here is a general across-the-board upgrading of the local university through a "sister" or "elder brother" association between the American institution and the foreign one. This calls for a massive long-term commitment on the part of all three parties--each of the universities as well as the aid-supporting agency.

Although there has been much talk of the advantages of having a one-to-one institutional bond rather than a series of smaller, more restricted, and perhaps uncoordinated projects at a foreign university involving different American institutions, I am not aware that AID has actually done this systematically. Apparently something of this order has been attempted in recent years in Nigeria by Michigan State University and in Ecudor by the University of Pittsburgh, but the details are not available to me nor have I seen any evaluation of results.

The idea of selecting an American university that is able and willing to extend all the help needed to a host university, and then making this assistance actually available for an assured period, is certainly an appealing one. Perhaps such a policy should be adopted, despite the enormous cost that would be incurred by systematic application of it in a large number of countries. However, given limited resources and a special concern with development administration, there are drawbacks to this approach. If the stress is to be on overall enhancement of the host university as an institution of higher education, many other deficiencies are likely to be more obvious than inadequacy in public administration or development administration. Prior claims will be made on behalf of basic requirements in the natural sciences,

in social sciences, and in the humanities. When it comes to graduate and professional work, needs may be most urgent for training lawyers, doctors, engineers, and teachers. A strategy that precludes moving at greatly differential rates among various elements of the academic program may prove beneficial for raising general standards of higher education in the country, but is not likely to concentrate early attention on an ability to respond adequately to current development administration problems on which the government may seek help from the university.

The familiar arguments in the literature on economic and political development concerning balanced versus unbalanced theories of growth seem relevant here. Our past technical assistance efforts in public administration at foreign universities certainly assume that it is feasible and in the long run presumably desirable to induce more rapid growth in selected fields than is possible in all and that public administration should be one of those fields in many developing countries. Unless this view is abandoned, a commitment to thoroughgoing institutional uplift as the touchstone to technical assistance policy should be passed over in favor of selective assistance in higher education where it will be of the most mutual benefit to both the aid-giving and aid-receiving countries.

A New Approach

This line of thought suggests a type of program that differs from any actually tried to date, as far as I know. AID might initiate a kind of university-to-university project that is less than an across-the-board uplift undertaking but more than the fostering of a public administration or combined

public and business administration center. Development administration should be the guiding concept. The objective should be a rapid upgrading of capacity in the host institution to cope with development administration demands that can appropriately be made upon it.

An assessment of the particular needs of each nation in view of its own developmental situation would provide the criteria for selection and relative emphasis among the wide range of possible fields for assistance. There ought to be no assumption that a standardized pattern can be found. Indeed, the concept of development administration stresses that administrative action should be responsive to program objectives and that these vary depending on the setting. Therefore, the exact dimensions of such a project would be unique in each case.

Nevertheless, some prerequisites and priorities can be identified. The American university that contracts to provide this kind of help should be one already possessing the combination of resources discussed earlier that would qualify it as a center for work in development administration. The aid-receiving institution also would have to demonstrate that it has an existing base that justifies this investment. As a minimum, this means an ongoing center for public administration or public affairs that has proved its effectiveness. With few exceptions, this will be possible only at institutions that have previously been assisted with such a center by the United Nations, AID, or a private foundation. Just as in the case of the American university, I would regard such a center as a sine qua non for a successful university-wide development administration effort. This is the core or center around which other institutional resources can be clustered.

As already mentioned, this approach rests on the view that not all portions of the foreign university can be stimulated equally and simultaneously and that the mix will reflect judgments about needs and the feasibility of providing help. Nevertheless, it is clear that important segments of the academic spectrum would be relatively untouched by such a program. These include generally the humanities and arts, the natural sciences, and certain traditional professions such as medicine and law, either because these fields are less directly associated with the success of developmental programs or because they are already comparatively well advanced.

Especially critical areas also can be mentioned. In the social sciences, these are political science, economics, sociology, and social psychology. Social scientists in these categories ought not only be well-trained in their disciplines but also ready to bring knowledge from their disciplines to bear upon local problems of development. Unfortunately, in many universities in the countries where such an orientation is most urgently needed, social scientists on the faculties are in short supply and are trained in a tradition that does not foster such an applied orientation. This may mean that staff additions or staff retraining along these lines may be resisted rather than welcomed. In those circumstances, the public administration program may have no alternative but to try to build in such staff capacity directly in a modest way until prospects improve. A preferable and usually possible device is to offer joint appointments or to contract for part of the time of suitable social scientists to engage in developmental training or research activities.

What direction should these activities take? In the long run, the most important aim will be to educate future economists, political scientists,

etc., to be aware of the relevance of their subjects to current dilemmas in developing countries by weaving this attitude into the degree curricula. In the short run, attempts can be made through short courses or extension-type offerings to familiarize government officials with social science findings that might be useful to them. A third objective can be the stimulation of research on development topics. Freeing of time from an overburden of teaching duties is often the most obvious step. Research guidance or collaboration in research with a respected visiting social scientist can yield dividends both in the work directly involved and in future endeavors of the local social scientist.

In a sense, these attempts to build up the social sciences are designed to strengthen the infrastructure rather than to grapple directly with the administrative tasks of development. What should be done about the role of the host university in producing competent administrators in the crucial governmental programs of a developing society?

Educating Foreign Public Servants. Responsibility for professional education of many kinds is already well recognized in the academic structures of major universities in these countries. Long-established professions such as law, medicine, nursing, and engineering usually have their own schools or colleges. Large numbers of their graduates go into public service; apparently the proportion that do so is considerably higher in the developing than in the more developed countries. Other professionals such as architects or pharmacists are less likely to be locally trained but equally likely to have government-related careers.

Of even more direct concern here are the professional specialities that are much more exclusively geared to the public service, such as public health, social welfare or community development, education, and forestry.

Agriculture falls much more in this category than in the industrial and urbanized countries. Even business-administration trained graduates are more likely to enter governmental or quasigovernmental organizations, or business firms with close governmental links.

Although I do not have adequate information, my impression is that most of these fields are unlikely to be provided with adequate professional educational programs at the typical institution of higher education in these countries. A teacher-training curriculum is almost a must, but it is intended to produce elementary and secondary school teachers in quantity rather than development-minded educational administrators. Similarly, although colleges of agriculture are not uncommon, their mission is to disseminate information about how to raise crop productivity on the individual farm unit rather than improve the administration of plans for national agricultural development.

The more specialized public service professions, if provided for at all locally, are represented by subdivisions of larger academic units, such as a public health department in a school of medicine or by recently established and usually struggling programs in such fields as social welfare or natural resource conservation. At an embryonic or infancy stage, such an academic program can give very little attention to development administration without outside help.

A fact of tremendous importance in planning strategy for an assistance program is that a high percentage of those now engaged in these fields of governmental work, and even of those now preparing for this work, are or will be graduates of foreign universities. This is explained by a mixture of reasons, some good and some less so. If local training is unavailable, there is no choice, but sometimes the prestige of a foreign degree leads to

passing over an opportunity close by that may be in fact more appropriate. However reputable and advanced the training abroad may have been, it is unlikely to have equipped the trainee to adapt what he learned to circumstances in his own country. The most he could have expected is some help in application to countries in a group including his own.

Another background consideration to keep in mind is that many development administrators in very responsible positions will have arrived there legitimately without ever having had any special preparation of significance, and with slight prospect of getting it. Ways need to be offered to provide help on terms that are understandable and with realistic time limits on availability for instruction.

The contours of a university-based response should reflect such actualities as have been mentioned. Among other things, this means that the assisting American university has to be ready to support a program that may have quite different characteristics from that university's own program on the home campus. The aims generally must be more modest as to quality and sophistication in subject-matter content. At least temporarily, specialization in academic organization and in faculty may have to give way to combinations that are supportable and workable. Advanced training may have to be delayed until the needs for more basic preparation have been met. The emphasis may have to be heavily on in-service training for those already in public service careers and on research with short-range objectives. Program decisions need to be made in close consultation with the responsible government officials in the programs most affected. Readiness to modify and, if necessary, to accept makeshift arrangements is a virtue even at the price of some sacrifice in professional quality.

I have placed the main reliance for organizing this sort of development administration effort on an existing public administration center at the host university. It is a fair question to ask how well prepared such centers are for this assignment. Some may not be, and all probably would require a revamping to take on the task. The likelihood of doing this should be a major factor in the selection of sites for experimentation. Account should be taken particularly of a development administration outlook on the part of current staff and a willingness to recruit with this in mind. There must also be assurance of a desire to work cooperatively with program area specialists either by adding them to the center's own staff or by entering into working agreements with other departments or schools.

The Promise. A decision to move along these lines toward overseas technical assistance projects with a greater multidisciplinary and multiprofessional approach to development would not be a drastic departure from past practice. It holds promise for AID and cooperating American universities as a means of meeting the needs and problems in some of the developing countries over the next decade, for the following reasons:

(1) It is compatible in its emphasis and requirements with what seem to be emerging trends in public administration and public affairs programs at leading American universities.

(2) It is consistent with the major concern of AID to concentrate its technical assistance efforts on improvement of administrative capabilities in the program areas most crucial to development.

(3) It provides institution-building aid to foreign univer-

sities in disciplines and professions that they increasingly recognize as warranting special attention and requiring assistance from sources outside the country.

(4) It offers the best likelihood of early and effective help from local university sources for dealing with development administration problems.

Acknowledgement

The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of George M. Walker in preparation of this paper.

AID AND AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES: A REVIEW OF PRACTICES AND PROPOSALS FOR ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND UNIVERSITY RESEARCH

James J. Heaphey

Introduction

My assignment in this paper is to review the literature, especially the output of previous conferences and seminars, (1) to examine observations and proposals for furthering development administration through organizational arrangements between the United States Agency for International Development (AID)--or other government agencies charged with the conduct of foreign affairs--and American universities; and (2) to examine proposals for research relevant to AID's goals.

While the assignment is challenging and stimulating, it also presents problems. Surely I cannot claim enough familiarity with the literature of development administration to offer this paper as a definitive review. Indeed, I cannot even claim to have digested thoroughly all the rich ideas and insights of the literature I have read.

Therefore, this paper should be read as a nondefinitive yet serious attempt to "wrap up" some of what is being written on relationships between AID and American universities. To do this it has been necessary to exercise judgment. An article analyzing the difficulties of converting academic behavioral

science to practical currency, though making no reference to AID or to any government agency like it, is reported in this paper because it seems to me to be relevant. Similarly, I have drawn out what I see to be key issues for this assignment, such as theory versus practice and the interdisciplinary approach to development administration.

Furthermore, this paper should not be regarded as pure reporting. When I said that I was asked to examine what has been observed, I meant the word "examine" to mean "interpret." This paper is full of interpretation and judgment. But I hope it is clear to the reader when I am interpreting and when I am reporting.

Two other introductory matters are in order. First, I want to say a few words about the relevance of administration to development. Second, I want to refer to some statements David Bell made when he was Administrator of AID.

Administration is viewed by almost all practitioners and scholars of development to be a critical and problematical element in development. It comes as no surprise that administrative specialists and scholars would think this. What is impressive is that nonadministrative specialists and scholars of development--such as economists--also think this. For example, in the report of the Third Annual Meeting of Directors of Economic Development Training Institutes, held at Berlin-Tegel in 1964, and sponsored by the Development Center of the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development, administration is considered to be a central problem in development. In his summary report, the American economist Benjamin Higgins says that "the political framework, the role of the market, and the administrative framework" were the themes that pervaded the discussions at the meeting.[26] (For an explanation of footnote numbers, see the introductory note to the

annotated bibliography at the end of this paper.)

Though there is such agreement on the importance of administration to development, there is not agreement on how administration relates to development, or even on what administration is. In the literature one can find at least four different points of view with different implications for optimum cooperative arrangements between AID and American universities:

(1) For some, especially public administration experts and planners, administrative improvement is a prerequisite for development of economic, social, and political institutions in the newly emerging countries, i.e., the capability of these countries to build viable development institutions and programs depends first upon their capability to develop administrative skills and efficiency.

(2) In the viewpoint of others, especially economists and sociologists, the kind of administrative improvement proposed in viewpoint (1) is impossible prior to development of an industrial base, which includes "industrial attitudes" as well as manufacturing and commercial structure, because no government program can hope to train a satisfactory number of qualified administrators of the type envisaged in (1) if industrial attitudes towards time, mobility, etc., are not imbedded in the society.

(3) Still another viewpoint, found particularly among political scientists, is that an administrative structure with some cohesion and capability to act as one unit is a prerequisite to development in the newly emerging countries, but this structure need not necessarily be the sort contemplated in (1). Given certain political regimes, nonpolitical, efficient administrative systems based on achievement norms could be dysfunctional to

development, whereas a "corrupt" (in Western-value terms) administrative system could be functional to development.

(4) Finally, there is the viewpoint that economic, political, and administrative development are concomitant experiences and that there are stages of development for the three together. Thus, at a primitive stage of development a nonefficient administrative system that has great loyalty for the ruler might be far more functional to development than the kind of structure envisaged in (1). At a later stage, type (1) bureaucracy might be appropriate to development.

It would be beyond the boundaries of this paper to stop here and argue the merits of any one of these viewpoints. What is important here is to see that these differences exist, that each is reasonable in its own terms, and that each is supported by many respected practitioners and scholars. Furthermore, one must be continually aware of equivocation in the literature, if not in the writings of any one individual, on the term "public administration." Most definitions of public administration are value statements; that is, the definition explicitly includes or assumes a specific function for administration, and it has been my experience that this is particularly so when development is involved in the definition. Thus, one person might be talking about how to improve the capacity of development administrators, and he might have in mind administration as a force for mobilizing mass support in the country. Another person might be arguing with him on details, unaware that he really disagrees with the "definition." If such difficulties exist at the level of basic concepts, how difficult a job indeed it must be to forge effective organizational arrangements between AID and American universities.

My purpose in this paper is to be as much in line as I can with the explicit goals of AID. Of course, all of us trying to do something in the field of development administration within the groves of academia share an oral traditional understanding of AID's objectives, and we rub elbows with individual members of the Agency often enough to have constant insights into those objectives, though, obviously, such insights are limited. Beyond this I searched for some kind of public statement that appeared to set a broad yet pointed direction for my paper. The best I found was the following made by David Bell when he was still Administrator for the Agency:

> We still have much to do to adapt our arrangements for administering foreign aid to the fact that a successful aid program must be a process of partnership.... There is by now a strong consensus--although far from complete unanimity--that foreign aid in all its forms will produce maximum results only insofar as it is related to maximum self-help. This is the opinion of leading public officials and development scholars in developing countries as well as in advanced countries. The broad concept of partnership and self-help applies to technical assistance projects, in which the purpose increasingly is to establish effective permanent institutions in the developing countries.
>
> A second element of consequence in current thinking about foreign aid is the growing emphasis that is being given to pluralism in developing countries. I believe there is now ample evidence and a growing consensus supporting the proposition that those countries will develop fastest which rely most heavily on multiple sources of private and local initiative and energy--in contrast to countries which rely most heavily on central direction and control.
>
> It is my impression that the organizations which carry out aid programs do not have a distinguished record of building into those programs strong elements of research and evaluation. Certainly this is true of AID, the agency I know best. This is unfortunate on at least two counts. First, foreign assistance is a relatively new activity and plainly we have an enormous amount to learn about how to conduct it effectively. We have lost much valuable time and have failed to learn from much valuable experience, because we have not had adequate research and evaluation programs. Second, the process of foreign assistance is

> inherently dependent on research. It is often described as a method of transferring know-how, but this is plainly wrong; it is instead a process of developing know-how--a process of finding out what will work in Nigeria, not of transferring what has been found to work in Nebraska. If we understood our own business better, it might well be that the whole process of foreign aid would be seen as a research process, aimed at learning how to move a particular society, with its special and unique characteristics of history and culture and physical geography, toward specified objectives.[3]

AID-University Organization

In this section I shall discuss problems of and proposals for improvement in AID-university arrangements. Usually I shall be talking about American universities; when I am not, I shall try to make it clear.

Coordination of the Universities' Efforts

With varying degrees of emotion, the lack of coordination in academicians' efforts to make a contribution to the study and practice of development administration has been noted. Some observers consider this to be an expected and natural condition, one that should be appreciated rather than deprecated. Other observers suggest that more can, and should, be expected from American academia by way of concerted effort. Of course, there are and have been coordinated programs. Most notable in this regard is the Comparative Administration Group (CAG) of the American Society for Public Administration. Similarly, the Society for International Development has been a catalyst for cooperation among academic institutions, and there have been a number of consortium arrangements between university campuses. Still, some scholars and practitioners point out that such cooperative efforts should be viewed as merely the beginning of far more of the same and of more sophisticated strategies for

generating and applying knowledge in what is today's most important question in international affairs.

One proposal for coordination is that national professional and scholarly associations be used as catalysts for coordination. National societies (in various social sciences, law, health professions, and so on) could work with AID and other government agencies in screening projects, setting priorities, and assisting in selecting universities for projects. These societies "could also serve as a clearing house for information about personnel, sources of research support, and the existing programs and facilities of the various institutions. Thus individuals in universities lacking support for any programs of their own would be helped to secure the assistance they desired, and the universities with programs would get assistance in locating personnel they needed."[41]

The Comparative Administration Group has demonstrated the fruitfulness of this idea. With Ford Foundation financing, CAG has succeeded in bringing together over 300 scholars and government officials into an active, stimulating, and productive association. Six-week summer seminars resulting in books on development administration; cosponsorship of conferences with the Eastern (Asian) Regional Organization for Public Administration, the East-West Center, and the Committee for Comparative Politics of the Social Science Research Council; stimulation of research in new teaching methods--these are some of the outputs of CAG. In all of this, Americans and overseas participants have worked together.

Another proposal for coordination envisions establishment of a public corporation created and jointly accepted by a number of universities.

This corporation would be originally funded by foundations but would grow through AID contracts and P.L. 480 funds. There would be a number of advantages in this. Under the existing system, relationships between AID and American universities are unhappily dependent upon the annual appropriations procedures. By putting together American dollars with local currencies from P.L. 480 funds, a corporation could inject more continuity and planning into American university efforts in this field.[17]

Coordination of American and Non-American Institutions

Increasingly one hears the complaint that the output of American universities maintaining training and research programs in development administration is not meaningful to the programs of the developing countries and, especially to the development institutes in developing countries. We hear more and more about the need to develop institutions in the developing countries, rather than develop people from these countries in programs in American universities. An interesting proposal along these lines is that "institution-to-institution" linkages (between an institution in a "developed country" and one in a "developing country") be established and nurtured. According to this proposal, an agency such as AID would seek to promote direct institution-to-institution relationships, as opposed to using the channels of official bilateral and multilateral aid agencies. The purpose of the relationships would not be any immediate project or contract; rather, the purpose would be to build the capacity of both institutions to undertake training and research in development administration.[53] Hopefully, such an organizational arrangement would provide what appears to be most needed in developing countries--institutions capable of coming up with new approaches, creative ideas, and nonconservative

frameworks. Institutes organized as part of a technical assistance program usually have government backing and are reluctant to be innovative.

It is extremely important to make the institutional linkage during original contract negotiations, rather than after. The following example, stated by a Nigerian, indicates the kind of problem to which proponents of this proposal often point:

> Recently the United States Agency for International Development decided to put more resources in agricultural research in Nigeria. One way in which they arranged to do this was to channel resources through a consortium of four American universities. This consortium would receive about $2.5 million and in consultation with local institutes evaluate existing USAID activities in Nigeria in the field of agricultural development and rural improvement and organize further research on these problems. The consultation contract had been signed, and it soon became apparent that at best local institutes can only act as subcontractors to the consortium or at worst provide the organization with the local platform from which to undertake its research. It is only too evident that this arrangement will contribute little to the building of local institutions. A more useful arrangement might have been the formation of a consortium between Nigerian and American institutions which will jointly plan and jointly execute the necessary research projects.33

Some of the suggested ways for interaction between institutions in developed and developing countries are:

(1) Team research, with members of both institutions on the team.

(2) Information interchanges through bulletins, providing regularly to institutions in developed countries information about problems in developing countries. Identification of such problems and "wording" of them could be done by small groups including members of both institutions. Research currently in progress at both institutions would also be included in the bulletins.

(3) Student exchanges, with students going from the developing to the developed countries to learn models, theories, and methods of research.

Students would go from developed to developing countries to do research, perhaps for a thesis.

Another proposal, which could perhaps be the basis for an interesting and fruitful organizational arrangement in the "institution-to-institution approach," is for use of a joint commission of the kind used by the Sino-American Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction (JCRR).[32] The JCRR has been a successful association of the United States with Free China using five commissioners, two appointed by the President of the United States and three by the President of China. It has administered aid of various types to agricultural, rural health, and related projects. Because it is autonomous and semi-independent, the JCRR has been an unusually flexible agency, dispensing aid rapidly in response to requests from local agencies and placing managing and operating responsibilities directly with the aid-requesting or "sponsoring" agency.

According to a report on JCRR, it has exhibited the following strengths:

(1) Because of its character as a joint operation, the agency has been able to develop procedures peculiar to its own needs and has acted quickly in approving projects; disbursing funds; issuing travel orders; and selecting, hiring, and discharging personnel.

(2) It has been relatively isolated from political pressures because of its joint character--which makes it "extra-governmental" or "extra-political"--and thus it has been able to make decisions on technical and economic grounds.

(3) Requests for aid come directly to JCRR, rather than through a governmental middleman. This has enabled JCRR to be more demanding in its

requirements for responsible planning and implementation. Furthermore, it has increased the capacity of local institutions to articulate their specific interests and develop these into programs.

According to the same report, application of the JCRR "model" to different kinds of aid appears reasonable, under the following conditions:

> 1. Prospects for such ventures would be best in countries where the U.S. has a continuing long-term interest, where a corps of technicians and administrators are already available who are sympathetic to American approaches and technologies, and where the host government manifests clear intention to support the programs involved.
>
> 2. Criteria for selecting the sector of activity best suited to joint operations can also be suggested on the basis of JCRR experience: it should supplement rather than compete with existing government functions; it should include a distinctive (but not narrow) aspect of governmental responsibilities and possess a large number of potentially useful projects that can later be absorbed into conventional public and private responsibilities when U.S. support is terminated; it should permit, and even require, the merging of different technologies and an innovational approach (jointness is rarely possible when one partner has all the answers); and finally, the projects or activities involved should permit the enlistment of private as well as public elements.

The authors of the report also suggest the following organizational forms:

> It could be situated at the national level within a ministry, or above or parallel to it, or it could be made responsible to it by means of annual budget reviews. In a large nation it could be organized as part of state or provincial governments, also in a variety of forms. It could be set up on a subregional basis..., embracing several units of government.... However organized, its decisions on project operations and financial allocations should not be subject to requirements for detailed approval from either the host government or AID except through audits, technical reviews, and the normal program submissions on the basis of which a total or annual budget is established. General agreement on such reviews, special funding, and personnel procedures should be reached among the governments concerned with the agency is established and should not be subject to unilateral change.

Proponents of this joint-commission approach point out that it is a method to enhance pluralism because many "small" groups and institutions can apply for aid directly to the commission.

Within specific institutions there is a further problem in coordination, namely that between research and training. Most observers agree that in development administration it is folly to attempt to train without constantly doing research and that training without research will fail because there will not be the necessary adaptation of the tools (i.e., what is taught in training) to the environment in which the tool is to be used. On the other hand, research separated from training may become too abstract and removed from the pressing problems of development. While there is general agreement on this need to bring research and training together, there is some disagreement on what might be the best way to do it. One proposal is to have separate research staffs; another proposal would release the training staff for research.

A further suggestion is "to foster continuing collaborative relationships among scholars oriented to the disciplines and those concentrating on professional practice." Through this approach, teaching materials and operationally oriented research would draw heavily on the insights, concepts, and research findings of the disciplinary sciences, and the scholar in disciplinary sciences would get direction from his professionally oriented colleagues in selecting research topics of maximum relevance to current and future social action.[20] Although it might appear as though these are strictly internal university problems, there is a fruitful role for an agency such as AID. Left to themselves, universities should not be expected to generate meaningful interchanges between professionally oriented and discip-

linary-oriented staff. They might, but they probably will not. Whether they will or will not can be affected by AID programs. For example:

--An "AID problem" can be the basis for meaningful discussion between professionally oriented and disciplinary-oriented scholars.

--AID financing can enable a disciplinary-oriented scholar to research a topic of professional importance. It would be interesting to know how many research proposals are rejected by financing agencies such as the Social Science Research Council and the foundations because they deal too directly with action problems as opposed to problems of one of the disciplines such as economics or political science.

--An AID program can facilitate fruitful interdisciplinary discussions because "AID problems" are interdisciplinary, inherently. If it is the case that interdisciplinary approaches are prerequisite to intelligent thinking about development and that universities encourage wittingly or unwittingly, disciplinary autonomy, there appears to be an important function for AID to develop.

Communications

There are many reports on problems in communications between AID and American universities. For example, there is the problem that AID training officers apparently are not familiar with the content of programs being offered by the universities to which they are sending foreign students. Then there is the problem that the university has difficulty evaluating what it is that AID expects and, in turn, knowing how to look at a foreign candidate's application forms to decide whether the university can be of service.

It would appear that AID training officers lack sufficient knowledge

of the universities' programs because: (1) The language of the field of development administration is not a precise one. Therefore, what one course title means varies not only from university to university but also from instructor to instructor within one university. The same problem is found in research-project descriptions. (2) American academia is a highly mobile community and highly susceptible to change. (3) Considering the lack of coordination in American universities referred to above, there is no viable opportunity for the AID training officer to get to know the programs to which he is sending foreign students.

One of the reasons for problems in communications is that AID must communicate with practitioners and scholars in developing countries, as well as with practitioners and scholars in developed countries. The latter tend to consider the "sciences" of development to be politically neutral; the former know that they are not. A Mexican stated the problem succinctly:

> As the concern of Latin American social scientists, in their great majority, is centered around social and economic change and immediate policy problems, they can hardly subscribe to a proposition widely defended in the advanced societies that social sciences, including economics, are politically neutral. For very many Latin American intellectuals such "political neutrality" is a cover for the defense of ideologies in force in affluent societies inimical to the interests of the underdeveloped world. To ascribe such attitudes exclusively to Latin American Marxists and neo-Marxists would amount to an over-simplification of the prevalent situation.60

There is another problem in communications resulting from this "middleman" role of AID which, again, can be illustrated with an example from Latin America. The United Nations Economic Commission of Latin America, utilizing what is referred to as "Prebisch doctrine," has developed a frame of reference to Latin American economic problems that is widely criticized

because it conceives the world economy as being divided into an advanced center(s) and the backward peripheries, with an uneven distribution of the benefits of technological progress and secular deterioration of the terms of trade of the primary producing countries, resulting in chronic external disequilibrium--all of which are criticized as being questionable assumptions. Similarly, the ECLA policy recommendations for import substitution, accelerated industrialization, and regional economic integration are challenged as "running counter to traditional theoretical welfare maximization concepts." Now, it just happens that the ECLA studies have resulted in a consistent set of ideas that appear to many people in Latin America to deal with real problems. The ECLA research, with all its "theoretical and conceptual shortcomings," has had considerable impact in Latin America "both to understanding the nature of the region's underdevelopment and the functioning of the world economy."[60]

One proposal relevant to these comments is for "middlemen" or "social science technicians" to facilitate communication between practitioners and scholars. One writer suggests an "anatomy of utilization" in a four-link chain:[45]

```
Scientist-Middleman-Practitioner
                   \            \
                    \Technician——\User
```

An analogy in industry is:

```
Physicist-Mechanical Engineer-Production Manager \      User
                              \                   \      of
                               \Technician         \Product
```

This prompts the following question: In such a scheme, what is the most effective role for AID as user, practitioner, technician, or middleman? It would appear that in the past AID has performed in all these

roles, partly because few universities have been geared to perform the middleman in addition to the scientist role, and partly because the system from scientist to user breaks down in practice since the problem dealt with communications--is merely a manifestation of a deeper problem, namely, a lack of agreement on ends. If there were a community of persons (American universities, AID, and institutions in emerging states) who agreed on an operational definition of the purpose of development, a division of labor between roles of scientist-middleman-user would be operable. The lack of such a community leaves us with a situation where we use the language of such a role system, while in concrete organizational arrangements the roles overlap. We cannot, therefore, "solve" what appear to be certain organizational deficiencies (for example, the university criticism that some AID procedures for evaluation of university-based, AID-financed programs are inappropriate to the science involved in the programs) prior to making greater progress as a community of understanding. Generalizations are risky here, but there are signs that such a community is emerging.

"Normal" vs. "Contract" Academia

The university's capacity for a fruitful contribution to AID is shaped by structures that were fashioned to serve other purposes. There are some critics of academic organization who point out, correctly, that this is an organization designed to enable a great deal of pluralism and autonomy within. Academic organizations, whether we are speaking of a university or a division or department therein, are not easily mobilized. That is, it is not easy to mobilize the resources of an academic organization in pursuit of a new idea. Some persons who are intimately involved in trying to get

university organizations to be otherwise are disappointed, sometimes bitter, about this fact. There is another side of the fence; some wonder why there are those who would want academic organizations to be like government organizations--i.e., easily mobilized.

Because of this organizational aspect of the American university, there have been proposals for government agencies to relate not to "normal" academia, but rather to a kind of "contract" academia. For example, it has been recommended that AID should contract for "special" programs with American universitites, thereby ensuring that the persons carrying out the programs think in terms of the programs rather than their "professional" interests. The trouble with "contract" academia, many observers have noted, is that the persons hired to carry out the contract may not be up to the standards of the academic organization concerned but are literally "hired for the contract." Thus, AID has found itself in the unsatisfying position of dealing, in some cases, with a "contract academia" rather than an academia that is carrying out a contract.

In 1961, it was noted by one observer that American educators had given little serious thought to problems of newly emerging countries. Though by 1961 the International Cooperation Administration had sent many hundreds of university faculty as technical advisers to underdeveloped countries, there was little evidence, in his view, that they had developed more adequate operational training or supporting research programs for their staffs than had government agencies or business firms, many university programs being "naive, shallow, and fragmentary."[20]

It would appear that "contract academia" can be avoided by using contracts that support the kinds of research universities are best prepared, and want, to do. As government agencies learn what this is within "normal

academia," contracts with universities can be instruments to unleash the power of knowledge rather than facilitators of a pseudoacademic effort. This is dependent upon the ability of AID to formulate a vision of its role that goes far beyond the primitive notion that technical assistance is a transfer of "know-how" to newly emerging countries. There can be no doubt about AID's ability to think beyond such primitive notions.

The Private Sector and Decentralization

A number of distinguished practitioners and scholars agree that aid to developing societies should be based on the proposition "that those countries will develop fastest which rely most heavily on multiple sources of private and local initiative and energy--in contrast to countries which rely most heavily on central direction and control."[3] Whereas Western European governments have provided aid to nongovernmental agencies with international goals, American government policy has prevented a similar arrangement in this country. There is support for a change in policy.

One organizational suggestion to enhance pluralism and decentralization in development is for Congress to authorize and fund a new instrumentality, much like the National Science Foundation, for making grants to American national nongovernmental societies.[41]

Another suggestion is to facilitate direct relations between American businessmen and businessmen in emerging countries. This would require an incentive (perhaps a tax incentive) and a vehicle such as a "special foundation," financed by tax rebates for overseas investment, which could "make grants to universities for cooperative programs, provide for strengthening training and educational programs to improve the capabilities of

business leaders, teach students preparing for careers in business and industry, invest in research in order to experiment with and discover effective approaches," and facilitate the overseas operations of American firms "not so much on the technical side, but rather by analyzing the conditions under which investments could be made more secure, and local political support for private business activities generated."[41]

While this proposal has been made by an American political scientist, it appears to be supported by the writings of the American business community. For example, in a Harvard Business Review article we read that:[58]

> ...the variables encountered (by the American businessman in the developing countries) are far more numerous, subtle, and difficult to rationalize than those common to the background of most businessmen from the United States. The art of politics and the concepts of social science can become as important, or even more important, to the success of an investment negotiation as hardheaded technical and financial calculations or a carefully prepared legal and administrative basis for an overseas organization.

The same author goes on to point out that investment in emerging countries requires a change in viewpoint for the American businessman--from a perspective in which the operation is a relatively isolated economic entity in the U.S. to a perspective in which he sees his operation as a visible part of the U.S. efforts overseas and as an outstanding element of the "dynamics shaping social change and political movements."

Another writer points out that American business now employs intelligence agencies and intelligence networks in order to ascertain social and political conditions. As an illustration, "a large pharmaceutical company maintains close contacts with medical-school professors in several foreign countries. This practice has proved extremely valuable in keeping both the United States and overseas management informed of current and future

legislation in the fields of social medicine and drug regulations. It also has proved useful in seeking government authorization for the local manufacture of various drugs." The writer concludes that "the relative success or failure of many American companies in the 1960's can depend in part on the intelligence of international developments that is available to them."[2]

Another proposal from the American private sector is that some liaison be established between leaders of U.S. technical and financial assistance programs and the leaders in the private sector. What needs to be blended is the logic of the assistance programs with the "logic of profit." For example, most specialists in the agriculture of underdeveloped countries come from government agencies and universities which "have had little reason to wrestle with the attractions of risk capital" and "have rarely organized their data into economic and technical feasibility reports with cash flow projections, such as are prerequisite to a management decision to invest." Therefore, the first purpose of communications between government aid administrators and private business administrators is to apprise the former of the needs of the latter prior to making an investment decision. "The kinds of skills important to competence in feasibility analysis must be categorized. The help that can be extended by management in training personnel and in assembling data (e.g., its ability to release staff men for short-term assignments to research and educational institutions overseas) will have to be made clear, or there will be no tangible way to begin to implement the plea for change."[59]

Theory and Practice

No discussion of government-university cooperation should avoid confrontation with the theory-practice relationship. Normally, "practice" in

the discussion of "theory and practice" means acting in the present so as to bring about desired changes in the future. The classical challenge to theory by the practitioner is that theory should enhance the rationality of such action. Right-sounding as this is, there are potentialities for confusion, such as:

(1) The objectification of practitioner reality. The world as interpreted by practitioners is no more or less real than the world as interpreted by theoreticians, provided that both are dealing with phenomena. If a practitioner sees a need to increase the mechanical efficiency of budgeting in a developing country, there is no basis for concluding that the reality of that problem goes beyond the fact that a practitioner sees things that way.

(2) Proposal for marriage of the unengaged. Reality as seen by those who have the power to affect things directly could be the reality of the theoretician. The theoretician and the practitioner could see things the same way and have the same motivations, in which case we have what the French once called science engagée. Often the practitioner's criticism of theory is directed to theories that are not engagée with the practitioner's view of reality.

(3) Inverted time. The practitioner often challenges established theory to help him solve a temporal problem. He wants to increase the number of agricultural cooperatives in a country and challenges existing theories of agricultural and administrative development to tell him how to do it. Actually, in many cases, he would get more help from theory if he asked: "What might be the results of an increase in the number of agricultural cooperatives?" Much of contemporary social science theory is based upon an "if...then" understanding of existing systems. Thus, the practitioner can expect an answer to the question

"If I increase cooperatives, how might this affect other things?" The theorist regards this as a change with which he can deal. But the question of how to do it involves a time dimension strange to most contemporary social science because it asks it to reverse its time dimension from one of predicting the future from knowledge of the present to one of predicting what needs to be the present to bring about a desired future.

These confusions do not mean that contemporary social science and practice cannot interrelate fruitfully; though they do indicate some dangers and constraints. Some possibilities for such interrelationships are:

(1) Theory unengaged with practice can provide the practitioner with views of reality different from his own, thus giving him a basis for comparison and evaluation of his views.

(2) Theory unengaged with practice is often highly mentally disciplined. The process of theorizing is useful for the practitioner to consider as a form of mental exercise.

(3) To the extent that theory is engagée with practice, there is the opportunity to make theory scientific. Lacking the opportunity to validate its propositions by formulating and testing hypotheses, social theory cannot become social science. If development of social science is desirable, there is some appeal to the marriage (following the engagement) of idea and power to test the idea in human organization. As John Dewey said, social planning is not the product of social science, but vice-versa. social science is the result of social planning.

Research to Further AID Objectives

In this section, I shall present ideas for university-based research

that is relevant to explicit AID goals. The capability of any government agency to finance research is constrained by three things: (1) "To promote research is...to admit ignorance and to open the door for unlimited future demands for funds."[43] (2) The product of research is difficult to evaluate. It cannot be counted like students and classroom hours nor can it be measured like the length of a training program. (3) Research can yield information that is embarrassing to government officials.

Effects of AID-University Exchange

Considering the seriousness of the task confronting AID and American universities in their contribution to development to say nothing of the vast amounts of money involved there should be more interest in understanding what happens when government agencies and universities concert for common goals. One would assume, on the basis of what we know about organizational behavior, that cooperative arrangements and interchange of personnel between the two would have profound effects upon behavior that could not be understood in terms of the two organizations acting separately. That is, one would assume that new forms of behavior result from the interaction between government and academia.

Regarding outcomes of such interactions, there is a fair amount of speculation and surprisingly little theory based upon empirical studies. To the best of my knowledge only one person has used empirical data to analyze the behavior of "outside nongovernment experts" as they participate in the conduct of United States foreign affairs, and there are a few such studies at the local level of government. The study of the nongovernment experts--the "external bureaucrats"--participating in foreign affairs produced 19 propositic

that are potentially fruitful for further analysis. I shall list here, those that appear to be particular relevance for the subject of this paper. "External bureaucrats," as the term is used here, means persons who maintain their nongovernmental role while working in one of the following four main categories: individual consultants; public advisory committees; nongovernmental members of delegations to international conferences; and those furnishing a variety of contract services, including research, instruction, evaluations of government operations, and the conduct of operations.

> Proposition 4. External bureaucrats serve as restraints on the activities of both the bureaucracy and outside groups with which the external bureaucrats are affiliated.
>
> Proposition 5. External bureaucrats contribute to the stability and continued existence of bureaucratic activities with which they are associated.
>
> Proposition 11. External bureaucrats may not have the same goals for their activity as the internal bureaucrats have.
>
> Proposition 13. Announced purposes for the employment of external bureaucrats are not necessarily the actual purposes.
>
> Proposition 14. External bureaucrats who are experts in one area may be accepted by the public as experts in areas for which they do not have expert qualifications.
>
> Proposition 2. External bureaucrats communicate information to influential groups and thereby affect the scope of choice perceived by policy makers in future decisions.
>
> Proposition 6. By conveying an image of nongovernmental participation in bureaucratic activities, external bureaucrats help the public in general and segments of the public to identify with a bureaucratic unit or to have greater confidence in its activities and policies.
>
> Proposition 15. Some foreign governments accept criticism and advice more willingly from foreign persons they perceive as private citizens than from foreign persons they perceive as governmental officials.
>
> Proposition 21. Interaction among representatives of private groups who are members of the external bureaucracy helps them to coordinate the activities of their groups

and to reach agreement on problems in which their groups are in conflict.

Proposition 18. External bureaucrats obtain knowledge about governmental programs that enables them to arrange private activities so as to conflict with governmental programs and not to duplicate these programs.

Proposition 19. External bureaucrats serve governmental needs by stimulating private persons or groups to perform tasks that tradition or limited resources will not permit the government to undertake for itself.1

Empirical research on any one or a combination of these propositions, or on the idea of "function and role of external bureaucrats," should yield important and useful information. Experienced persons in academic-government interchanges know full-well that the outcome of such encounters and cooperative efforts is something far more diversified in scope than the transmission of theoretical knowledge to practical problems; it is compelling to search out systematically way the nature of the outcome.

Types of Research on Development

The only attempt I know of to canvas, classify, and interpret research projects on development being conducted throughout the world is that of Guilio Fossi and F. Machado de Amorin[22], based on information collected from 98 institutes in 37 countries during an inquiry conducted by Development Centre of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, and published in 1966. The researchers classified projects into two groups, the first of which included research concerning a country, a group of countries, a continent or any subject concerning a specific location; the second of which included all other studies. Around 60 percent of the projects fall into the first category, to which we will refer as "localized research."

Institutes in emerging countries conduct more localized than non-localized research, whereas institutes in Europe and North America give the same amount of attention to both. According to the authors, research carried out on the development process as such in European and North American institutes often does not yield solutions that work when applied to specific problems. Yet, developing countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America still appear to import at least as much research as they carry out themselves, and roughly half the research on these continents is carried out by institutes in industrialized countries. The authors say that there is a danger in this, "in the fact that the approach to a specific country's development problems is, for obvious reasons, quite different if the researcher dealing with them is acting on behalf of a foreign academic insitution or on behalf of the planning authority of the policy makers of the country itself."

Specific findings of the report are:

(1) Thirty out of a reported 1,300 research projects claim to be cooperative ventures bringing together an institution from a developed country with an institution from a developing country. In each of these 30 cases it was reported that the initiative to do the research was taken by an institution an industrialized country.

(2) Research of multinational or regional scope constitutes as much as one-third of the total number of projects in both Africa and Latin America, but only a little over 10 percent in Asia Regional studies on Africa relate to as many as 12 different groups of countries, bound together by historical or geographical links, whereas studies on Latin America apply to only four groups of countries, which might be interpreted as a sign that Africa is still in search of a pattern of integration.

(3) Attention seems generally focused on a few countries. There are "star" countries on each continent, namely, Nigeria, India, and Chile.

The authors of the report also divided research projects by subject matter, using two categories: projects strictly connected with planning or economic policy and background research projects. The latter account for about 70 percent of the projects, while planning and economic policy each seem to receive the same amount of attention (about 15 percent each). These proportions hold true for the institutes in both developed and developing countries. Other findings of the report are:

(1) Nonlocalized research projects on the subject of planning are carried out mainly in Europe and North America; localized ones in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

(2) Regarding "background studies," 60 percent deal with economics while not much more than 10 percent deal with statistics and national accounts, with institutions, or with social and political sciences. About 20 percent involve an interdisciplinary approach.

It is important to evaluate this report for the purpose of identifying new meaningful research for AID to stimulate. Clearly, there is need for increased efforts to join scholars from developing and developed countries in joint research activities, and if a better world-wide coverage is a virtue, there is certainly much that needs doing in that regard. Similarly, the ratio of background studies on social and political aspects to those on economic aspects indicates an obvious imbalance, particularly when we consider that so many persons, including many economists, have rejected the pure-economics approach to development. It appears that anything AID could do to stimulate cooperative research (between scholars from developing and developed countries

that is interdisciplinary and gets into relatively unresearched countries would be a significant contribution.

The Process of Development

Development is planned change and is therefore a political concept. Whatever one's preferences regarding what kind of knowledge should be the basis of development, or who should be the key participants in drawing up the plans, the fact remains that planned change at the level of the state is a political concept. Up until a few years ago most of the people writing in and influencing the field called "development" were economists. Thus, development was viewed primarily as a question of economics. In a sense, during this period there was also an administrative concept of development in that there was agreement on the need to have efficient implementation of economic plans. More recently in academia it has been clearly brought out that economic development with efficient administration is that, and no more, i.e., that economic development does not bring about any one political form (the experience of the Soviet Union destroyed the notion that societies highly developed in economic terms would necessarily be "like" the United States and Western Europe politically). Furthermore, the more recent view from academia sees the choice of economic development plans as a political act.

As development was more and more conceived by academic observers as a political act, the question arose as to what relationship there is between the enhancement of an administrative capacity in any country and development. American scholars have become less certain that rapid administrative development in a country is consonant with other, perhaps more important, features of development, such as nationbuilding. Indeed, some have argued that rapid adminis-

trative development in a newly emerging state might be a detriment to political development, that is, detrimental to the capability of a country to develop useful and acceptable (by the people) institutions for decision-making of contentious issues.

If we cannot comfortably and with certainty equate administrative development with development, we cannot take every opportunity to improve the administrative capacity for action in a country. Rather, we need to know more about the process of development so as to understand the various ways in which strengthening administration affects other institutions in the developing society. Thus, administrative development becomes a relative question. Under certain conditions it might be highly desirable; under other conditions it might be highly undesirable. We do not know enough about these "conditions," and this leads us to the recommendation for research that is needed for AID to pursue its goals, namely, research into the conditions of the development process, in terms of which we can more reasonably evaluate the contribution to overall development made by a contribution to administrative development.

Two writers have provided useful frameworks for such research--there are probably more; but these two come readily to mind--although each has something quite different in mind. Milton Esman has presented an action model for development in which administration is pictured as one of several "action instruments" available to a political elite in a developing country. Political parties, the military, and mass media are examples of other action instruments. Joseph LaPalombara has suggested "profile analysis" to place administrative development into broader pictures of development, so as to be better able to assess the impact of the former on the latter. The profiles would include analyses of the needs, resources, obstacles, and potentiality of a developing society.

Esman leans more toward universals of development, whereas LaPalombara stresses peculiarities of African and Asian conditions as opposed to Latin American conditions, and so on. Research on either of these approaches would contribute to our understanding of what might be called the "development ecology" of public administration. By "research," we mean both attempts to check the acceptability as well as attempts to fill out details of the approaches.

Culture

A question one hears in academia these days, although not as often as one would like, is: "So we know what culture affects administration. But do we know how?" One observation, by a person experienced in foreign and American administration as well as in academia, is most interesting:

> In my work in Brazil and Ecuador, particularly, I found myself struggling to identify certain basic cultural determinents that condition the structure and operations of the bureaucracy. In Brazil and to a larger extent in Argentina, I found that the plantation heritage had been transferred over to government agencies and institutions in a way that made attainment of a directoral post a piece of property that had been earned or captured with practically seignorial rights attached: the director becomes the patron, operating the bureau or hospital in a highly personalized fashion with regard to appointments, operations and rewards. In Ecuador, the basic cultural facts appear to be a subtle but extreme racism and a social organization that makes the conflicts of oligarchic economic groups the pivot of political and administrative behavior--under a theory reminiscent of Europe's mercantalist era, which I imagine represents a freezing of Spain's colonial policy.
>
> In my somewhat casual look at public administration training in Brazil and Argentina, which was being done largely (and in Argentina, entirely) by nationals, I found almost no cultural adaptation of U.S. scientific management--type public administration teaching. (Memorandum from my colleague, Professor Morris Schaefer, September 26, 1966)

Another interesting comment in this regard comes from a dean of a school of public administration in the United States. He says that culture shock is like the weather; everyone talks about it but no one does anything about it. And a Dutch scholar adds: "Once one has admitted that there is need for "transculturation" one must admit that systematized means to this end as yet lacking."[54] Needless to say, AID could use any "systematized means to the end" that academia might be able to offer, or vice-versa.

From what appears to be our knowledge of cross-cultural problems, research into what we will call the "culturally subjective notions of process" is very much needed. The questions for such research are these: how does culture affect the way in which an individual participant in that culture views process? What is the reality of change, according to variations in change? There are come clues. One writer has differentiated culture according to concepts of time. Another writer has noted that in some cultures the truth (of something like development) is regarded as either "given" or "not given," whereas in other cultures the truth (of something like development) is considered to be affected by the actions of people. It would academically interesting and useful to AID, I believe, to search for how what we (Americans) regard as administrative questions are comparatively viewed in terms of "culturally subjective notions of process." This might require, at the beginning, a better understanding of American ideas about administration as a manifestation of a culturally subjective notion of the American process.

Théorie Engagée

When one stops to think of it, the difference, albeit an assumed complementarity, is striking between what academic social science in the

United States and AID are pursuing. The former is searching for explanations of why things are the way they are. The latter is searching for a way to intervene in the universe so as to change things from the way they are to something else. The complementarity of the searches is often noted: AID cannot change things until it knows what things are. But is American social science preparing a picture of "what is" that can be used by a government agency intent upon bringing about a new world?

Discussion of this difference is becoming more and more sophisticated. One can find analyses of the problem emphasizing differences between statics (i.e., what, for the most part, American social scientists are pursuing) versus process (i.e., the way in which the universe appears to AID and leadership in some developing countries); between science as a classifying procedure and science engagée, the name the French gave to the earliest theories in social science which were intended "to present suggestions for a better organization of the human world";[8] and between the spectator and participant concepts of reality.

Unfortunately, if some observers are correct, recognition of such differences may not be a step in the right direction or, at least, may not be a big enough step, if it is in the right direction. For example, consider the following statement by a German director of an economic development institute before an international conference on development plans and programs:

> The natural sciences for some time remained, and are partly still today, the prototype for all sciences. Scientists were so used to the abstract and symbolic thinking of the natural scientist that they forgot the origin of the abstract concept of nature and came to mistake this abstract concept for nature itself. In this way "nature" became imperceptibly the basis for the science of man too.... Since this naturalistic system of theories and abstract concept of nature was taken for granted, no true basis for the behavioral

> sciences was established. It is therefore understandable that the particular came to be taken for the universal and that there was great surprise when it turned out not to be universally, or interculturally, valid after all. In reaction to this, many were led to reject the use of universal concepts or categories in the field in which we work and to adopt instead a kind of nominalism (in the philosophical sense) with regard to the developing countries. This means that every developing country and every development problem would have to be considered on its own because allegedly it is not possible to apply general concepts and methods.8

If American social scientists are to be relevant to the question of development, they will need to put man back into variable space and time. They will have to discard the natural scientist's causative mode of thinking in which objects are placed in objective space and time and in which there is a continuity of space and time governed by causality.

> Whereas our knowledge of the natural sciences is characterized by the construction "if...then...," our knowledge of the behavioral sciences is marked by the insight reflected in the construction "because...therefore...," which, when motives are concerned, may become an "in-order-to" relation. In motivational causation the order between "earlier" and "later" is the reverse of that of natural causation. That which is to be later, that which I want to achieve as the aim of my action, is really that which induces my action.8

However, this is not to suggest that the persons who recognize this basic difference between natural and social sciences do not see a need to use both in development. There are, for example, economic factors that cannot be changed whatever social attitude may prevail, and development plans cannot ignore them. The ideal, apparently, is an intertwining of scientific understanding based upon motivational causation with scientific understanding based upon causation unaffected by space and time as variables. In other words, how can we shape plans for development that incorporate man as a motivated actor along with objects naturally determined?

Interdisciplinary Research

Perhaps nothing has been said more often than that the study of development must be interdisciplinary (or multidisciplinary). In America it makes sense to have separate sciences for the various social behaviors such as economic, social, and political because human behavior itself breaks down into such categories, although, of course, there are limitations both to how consistently people can behave according to separate rules of the game of economics, or politics, or family and to how adequately the individual social sciences enable us to understand behavior

A Persian scholar, reflecting on this in the context of his own country, point out that in a Western country...

> when an economist studies price fluctuations he knows the limits of his field of investigation fairly accurately, and does not risk encountering any surprise non-economic element, the effect of which might be to alter his assumptions considerably. The economist, the sociologist, and the population expert are thus able to concentrate on their own fields without paying too much attention to the problems of others. . . . In a developing society the researcher must have a multi-disciplinary training in keeping with a traditional society in which behavior is not separated into such compartments as in an advanced country. . . . When one studies prices, one realizes that they are conditioned by a whole complex of social relationships; for example, prices vary not only with areas but with the social standing and even the behavior of the buyer. It might be said that there are as many prices as there are kinds of buyers.33

There is considerable research interest in American universities on the relative lack of differentiation in "traditional behavior." Fred Riggs has constructed and built considerable understanding from his model in which societies are classified in terms of three ideal types: the "fused," in which there is no differentiation of human behavior; the "refracted," in which

there are extensive and pervasive patterns of differentiation; and the "prismatic," where some patterns of differentiation exist in a society also marked by "fusion." As Riggs has already demonstrated, these concepts can be the basis of considerable insights.[40]

Many American social scientists are talking about "being interdisciplinary"; there can be little doubt that the basis exists for fruitful relationships between them and AID. However, there have been some caveats registered which should be considered. First, the intellectual magnitude of the task must be recognized. We tend to discuss an interdisciplinary approach as one to be taken to study action, and we assume that the different social sciences cover different segments of social experience. This would imply, one observer has said,

> that their only potential interconnection is at the level of "applications of" the social sciences; i.e., where they would have to do with segments of reality that happen to merge into one (incidental) complex socio-cultural phenomenon. If one starts out from this notion, one is bound to run into questions of how to correlate, coordinate, or integrate the segmentary dealings which the several social sciences have, each in their own sovereign manner, with socio-cultural reality. Of course these questions would not matter so much if the unpleasant thing about them were not that they are logically insoluble.[54, 55]

To say that the social sciences can be integrated at the level of action applicability, though in their natural state they do not integrate, is a statement requiring far more philosophical investigation than we have given it. The writings of Talcott Parsons and other distinguished persons on this problem are methodological rather than philosophical.

Another caveat is that imperialism may be mistaken for interdisciplinarianism. The sociologist who uses concepts of "struggle for power"

may say that he is blending the roots of political science into his sociology, but "struggle for power" is just an aspect of political science, not the fundamental concept. Similarly, the economist who uses the concept of role has not merged economics and sociology, though he may be a better economist because of it.

Perhaps we will have to become more phenomenological in our approaches, and such has been suggested by more than one writer. If we begin with the phenomena of development, particularly if we begin at the level of reality of how people in developing countries construct for themselves understanding of development, and if we then try integrating our social sciences, there may well be a future for interdisciplinarianism.

Epilogue

It appears that there are many ideas for continuing, expanding, and improving relationships between AID and American universities. I realize that not all the ideas presented in this paper are consistent with one another, There is so much thought being focused on development, and so much of it is rich and exciting, that we should expect such inconsistency. Furthermore, as I have tried to emphasize in various sections of this paper, "development," development administration," and "the involvement of development administration with development" are all protean and debatable terms. Perhaps what we need first and foremost is a "purifying" of the language, to have someone do for our field what Hans Kelsen did for the language of international law. After that, surely the next step would be our attempt to gain greater understanding of how theory and practice can interrelate regarding problems of development.

From that we could set out to discover the inscrutables of culture, the mysteries of how politics and administration blend in a process of development, and the many other thorny problems such as interdisciplinarianism. All of this assumes a community encompassing government and the universities. The community has already been slightly formed, and there is great hope that it will grow and flourish in the future. It is possible that what this community does will have historical impact on Washington, D.C., and on campuses throughout the countrt, as well as in the newly emerging societies.

Annotated Bibliography

(INTRODUCTORY NOTE: This bibliography includes the footnotes referred to throughout the paper. Since the bibliography lists references in alphabetical order, footnote numbers are not consecutive within the text.)

1. Chadwick Alger, "The External Bureaucracy in United States Foreign Affairs," Administrative Science Quarterly, June 1962. (Utilizes data from a study of the participation of private experts in the conduct of United States foreign affairs to analyze the effects of such participation by placing the behavior in the context of other relationships between bureaucracies and their social environment.)

2. John Beauvois, "International Intelligence for the International Enterprise," California Management Review, Winter 1961. (Points out the uses American business is making of intelligence networks around the world.)

3. David Bell, "The Quality of Aid," Foreign Affairs, July 1966. (Presents current goals of American foreign aid programs.)

4. Warren Bennis, "A New Role for the Behavioral Sciences: Effecting Organizational Change," Administrative Science Quarterly, September 1963. (Identifies a newly emerging function for the behavioral scientist and exemplifies its activities by describing and analyzing some recent work in organizational change.)

5. Warren Bennis, "Theory and Method in Applying Behavioral Science to Planned Organizational Change," The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, January 1965. (Discusses the strategic, methodological and conceptual issues brought about by the emergence of the action role of the behavioral scientist.)

6. Blanche Blank, "A Proposal for a Statistical Approach to Comparative Administration: The Measurement of National Bureaucracies." July 1965. Comparative Administration Group Occasional Papers, Published by the Comparative Administration Group of the American Society for Public Administration, International Development Research Center, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. (Following the pattern-search method of the Cross-Polity Survey and the rank-order system used in the World Handbook of Social and Political Indicators, a design of 60 variables or attributes is developed based on a quite commonplace model of bureaucratic elements.)

7. Ralph Braibanti, "Administrative Reform in the Context of Political Growth." Symposium on Research Needs Regarding the Development of Administrative Capabilities in Emerging Countries. Prepared Papers and Report on Proceedings Conducted for the Agency for International Development, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., November 14-17, 1965. (Assumes

that transnational inducement of administrative reform increases administrative capacity of emerging political systems, though there is a large margin of error. Seeks to examine certain issues of strategy within the context of these assumptions.)

8. Gerd Brand, "Address of Welcome." Development Plans and Programmes, Studies in Development: No. 1, Third Annual Meeting of Directors of Economic Development Training Institutes, Berlin-Tegel, September 9-11, 1964. Development Centre of the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development. (Discusses relationship of behavioral sciences to development. Points out lack of genuinely fundamental concepts, lack of unity, and cultural boundaries of the behavioral sciences.)

9. Robert Buron, "Opening Address." Training and Research for Development, Annual Meeting of Directors of Development Training and Research Institutes, Portici, Naples, 16-21 September 1965. Development Centre of the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development. (Emphasizes need to interwine research and teaching. Questions the possibility of a universal science of development. Calls for need to gather basic statistics and to improve research institutes in developing countries.)

10. Catalogue of Social and Economic Development Institutes and Programmes: Research, Development Centre of the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development, 1966. (Review research programs of 100 institutes in 38 countries.)

11. Catalogue of Social and Economic Development Institutes and Programmes: Training, Development Centre of the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development, 1966. (Reviews training programs at 70 institutes, using a standard layout, in Europe, North America, South America, Africa, and Asia.)

12. Ladislav Cerych, Problems of Aid to Education in Developing Countries New York, 1965. (Tries to define the essential features of a consistent policy of external aid to education, the conditions for making it more effective, and the means by which it can be extended and coordinated internationally.)

13. Development of the Emerging Countries--An Agenda for Research, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1962. (Essays on experience and possible future problems in development requiring research.)

14. Alfred Diamant, "European Models of Bureaucracy and Development," June 1966. Comparative Administration Group Occasional Papers, Published by the Comparative Administration Group of the American Society for Public Administration, International Development Research Center, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. (Proposes that research on European development will yield generalizations valuable in the study of newly developing nations.)

15. Joseph Eaton, "Symbolic and Substantive Evaluative Research," Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1962. (A study of professional employees in two large treatment-oriented organizations revealing a

contradiction between the avowed objectives of program research and the acceptance of its findings by those engaged in the program.)

16. S.N. Eisenstadt, "Continuity of Modernization and Development of Administration," January 1965. Comparative Administration Group Occasional Papers, Published by the Comparative Administration Group of the American Society for Public Administration, International Development Research Center, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. (Proposes approaches for research on factors in internal structures of bureaucracies contributing to breakdown of bureaucracies and development.)

17. William Y. Elliott, ed., Education and Training in the Developing Countries: The Role of U.S. Foreign Aid, 1966. (Essays on "education and training in national growth," "the role of the American government," the role of the university," and "the role of the foundation and private enterprise.")

18. Milton Esman, "The CAG and the Study of Public Administration: A Mid-Term Appriasal," January 1966. Comparative Administration Group Occasional Papers, Published by the Comparative Administration Group of the American Society for Public Administration, International Development Research Center, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. (Review of issues and research questions for scholars in development administration.)

19. Milton Esman, "Development Administration as a Profession." Symposium on Research Needs Regarding the Development of Administrative Capabilities in Emerging Countries. Prepared Papers and Report on Proceedings Conducted for the Agency for International Development, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., November 14-17, 1965. (Exploration of some of the problems inherent in the professionalization of the bureaucracies of the developing countries and some of the opportunities this provides for applied research.)

20. Milton Esman, Needed: An Education and Research Base to Support America's Expanded Commitments Overseas, Pittsburgh, 1961. (Analyses the basic forms of knowledge necessary for the United States to carry on a rational international aid program and proposes how to go about gaining that knowledge.)

21. Amitai Etzioni, "On the National Guidance of Science," Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1966. (Analyzes the way in which decisions are now made on the support of scientific activities and the institutional mechanisms by which they are made, finding the system to be essentially pluralistic. Argues for a more centralized system

22. Giulio Fossi and F. Machado de Amorin, "Outline of a Technical Analysis of Data on the Orientation of Research in Development Institutes and Their Institutional Structure." Training and Research for Development, Annual Meeting of Directors of Development Training and Research Institutes, Portici, Naples, 16-21 September 1965. Development Centre of the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development.

(Presentation of findings of a survey of institutes, around the world, doing research in development.)

23. George Grassmuck, "Polity, Bureaucracy and Interest Groups in the Near East and North Africa." June 1965. Comparative Administration Group Occasional Papers, Published by the Comparative Administration Group of the American Society for Public Administration, International Development Research Center, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. (Proposes that there are specific relationships between Milton Esman's categories of states and the nature and frequency of appearance to the Riggs sala model features. Attempts to match an Esman-derived classification of policies to the Riggs model of prismatic bureaucracies. Preliminary conclusions are drawn as to the role and effectiveness of bureaucracies as action instruments in developing countries.)

24. Bertram Gross, The Administration of Economic Development Planning: Principles and Fallacies, United Nations, New York, 1966. (Presentation of 25 propositions based upon empirical studies of national planning and the author's personal experience.)

25. Harold Guetzkow, "Conversion Barriers in Using the Social Sciences," Administrative Science Quarterly, June 1959. (Analyzes what is involved in converting basic social science knowledge into a form suitable for application in practical affairs.)

26. Benjamin Higgins, "General Summary of Discussions." Development Plans and Programmes, Studies in Development: No. 1, Third Annual Meeting of Directors of Economic Development Training Institutes, Berlin-Tegel, September 9-11, 1964. Development Centre of the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development. (Summarizes the conference and points out the need for more research in nontraditional public administration.)

27. Robert Holt, "Comparative Politics and Comparative Administration," February 1966. Comparative Administration Group Occasional Papers, Published by the Comparative Administration Group of the American Society for Public Administration, International Development Research Center, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. (Suggests a return to a concept of a political system as a concrete structure to facilitate certain types of comparative political and administrative analysis.)

28. Martin Kriesberg, ed., Public Administration in Developing Countries, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1965. (Papers prepared for an international conference on public adminnstration in Latin America, covering the political, economic, and social factors affecting public administration in developing countries; the organization of government for development; establishment of a civil service and a career service; and education, training, and research in public administration.)

29. Joseph LaPalombara, "Alternative Strategies for Developing Administrative Capabilities in Emerging Countries," Symposium on Research Needs Regarding the Development of Administrative Capabilities in Emerging

Countries. Prepared Papers and Report on Proceedings Conducted for the Agency for International Development, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., November 14-17, 1965. (Deals with the problem of increasing administrative capabilities in the developing areas. Tries to take account of crises other than, as well as, economic growth and to note how they impinge on public administrative capabilities and subsequent political institutional evolution. Proposes "profile analysis" of countries.)

30. Angus Maddison, "The O.E.C.D., Training Institutes and the Development Problem." Development Plans and Programmes, Studies in Development: No. 1, Third Annual Meeting of Directors of Economic Development Training Institutes, Berlin-Tegel, September 9-11, 1964. Development Center of the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development. (Points out need for research in the "economics of aid" and development administration as such, i.e., not as public administration in a developing country but as something else.)

31. Nelson Mello e Souza, "Public Administration and Economic Development," in Perspectives of Brazilian Administration Vol. I, Getulio Vargas Foundation and University of Southern California, June 1963, p. 163. (Proposes that efficient administration is a consequence of development, especially development of an industrial base which then provides the tremendous impetus necessary for improved patterns of administration.)

32. John Montgomery, Rufus Hughes, and Raymond Davis, Rural Improvement and Political Development: The JCRR Model, Papers in Comparative Public Administration, Special Series: #7, Comparative Administration Group, American Society for Public Administration, Washington, D.C., July 1966. (Description of the experience of the Sino-American Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction and evaluation of its performance as a model for joint commissions in other program areas.)

33. E. Naraghi, "Problems Relating to the Creation in a Developing Country of a Body of Research Workers in the Social Sciences." Training and Research for Development, Annual Meeting of Directors of Development Training and Research Institutes, Portici, Naples, 16-21 September 1965. Development Centre of the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development. (Discusses the problems of both conception and execution of research in developing countries.)

34. Walter Neale, "The Economy and Public Administration in Developing Countries." April 1966. Comparative Administration Group Occasional Papers, Published by the Comparative Administration Group of the American Society for Public Administration, International Development Research Center, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. (Discusses development administration as more a problem in micro- than macro-economics.)

35. H.M.A. Onitri, "The Role of Economic Development Research and Training Institutes in Developed Countries in the Building up of Similar Institutes in Developing Countries." Training and Research for Development, Annual Meeting of Directors of Development Training and Research Institutes, Portici, Naples, 16-21 September 1965. Development Centre of the Organi-

zation for Economic Co-Operation and Development. (Discusses the need for more emphasis on research than on training and proposes some possible organizational arrangements between research institutes in developed and developing countries.)

36. Glenn D. Paige, Proposition-Building in the Study of Comparative Administration, Papers in Comparative Public Administration, Special Series: #4, Comparative Administration Group, American Society for Public Administration, 1964. (Proposes the need and method for building propositions that are verifiable and cumulative.)

37. H. G. Pope, "Underpinning our Technical Assistance Efforts in Public Administration Through Better Utilization of our Knowledge and Resources," Symposium on Research Needs Regarding the Development of Administrative Capabilities in Emerging Countries. Prepared Papers and Report on Proceedings Conducted for the Agency for International Development, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., November 14-17, 1965. (Pursues the proposition that the body of experience of AID and its predecessor agencies can be made a vast resource for improving administrative capabilities in developing countries through a program designed to assure that relevant information is adequately recorded and reported, thoughtfully analyzed, and made fully accessible at critical points in the design and conduct of assistance activities.)

38. Henry Reining, The Fourth Dimension: The Administration of Development and the University's Role, Papers in Comparative Public Administration, Special Series: # 3, Comparative Administration Group, American Society for Public Administration, 1964. (Outlines the contributions which schools of public administration might and should make to development administration.)

39. Henry Reining, Jr., "The Role of the Technical Assistance Adviser Overseas." Symposium on Research Needs Regarding the Development of Administrative Capabilities in Emerging Countries. Prepared Papers and Report on Proceedings Conducted for the Agency for International Development, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., November 14-17, 1965. (Analysis of a study on role of technical assistance advisers overseas by Bruce Storm and Jason Finkle.)

40. Fred Riggs, Administration in Developing Countries, Boston, 1964. (Essays presenting and elaborating on Riggs' "prismatic model.")

41. Fred Riggs, "Memorandum on Foreign Aid, Political Development, and the International Role of Universities and Professional Societies," unpublished, n.d.

42. Fred Riggs, "Models and Priorities in the Comparative Study of Public Administration," in Models and Priorities in the Comparative Study of Public Administration, Papers in Comparative Public Administration, Special Series: # 1, Comparative Administration Group, American Society for Public Administration, June 1963. (Discussion of the function of models in the study of public administration.)

43. Fred Riggs, "Developing Research Capacities in Emerging Countries to Support Training in Administration." Symposium on Research Needs Regarding the Development of Administrative Capabilities in Emerging Countries. Prepared Papers and Report on Proceedings Conducted for the Agency for International Development, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., November 14-17, 1965. (Analysis of causes and consequences of the lack of evaluative studies of training programs in developing countries.)

44. "The Sayre-Kaufman Outline: A Research Design for a Pilot Study in Comparative Administration." January 1966. Comparative Administration Group Occasional Papers, Published by the Comparative Administration Group of the American Society for Public Administration, International Development Research Center, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

45. W. Schramm, Utilization of the Behavioral Sciences, Report of a Planning Review for the Behavioral Sciences Division. New York, 1954. (Presents a model for roles involved in the flow of knowledge from scientist to user.)

46. Joseph Starr, "The Logistics and Tactics of Training for Administration in Emerging Countries." Symposium on Research Needs Regarding the Development of Administrative Capabilities in Emerging Countries. Prepared Papers and Report on Proceedings Conducted for the Agency for International Development, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., November 14-17, 1965. (Discusses questions such as the separation of management and training, responsibility for training, administration of training, etc.)

47. Donald Stone, "Creating the Administrative Capabilities for Development," Sudan Journal of Administration and Development, January 1966. (Emphasizes administrative needs in development.)

48. Donald Stone, "Tasks, Precedents and Approaches to Education for Development Administration." Unpublished paper prepared for a symposium on Education for Development Administration. International Institute of Administrative Sciences, Brussels, Belgium, 1965. (Attempts to deduce guidelines for education in development administration from field problems.)

49. Irving Swerdlow, ed., Development Administration, Syracuse, 1963. (Essays on basic concepts and issues in development administration, with specific references to some countries but with a general orientation.)

50. Fred. J. Tickner, Technical Cooperation, London, 1965. (Descriptive review of international technical cooperation since the Second World War with a concluding analytical chapter regarding problems in evaluation.)

51. Fred. J. Tickner, Training in Modern Society, Albany, 1966. (International review of training in the sixties in both government and industry, including a chapter on the developing societies.)

52. UNESCO-ECA Final Report of the Lagos Conference, on "organization of research and training in Africa in relation to the study, conservation and utilization of natural resources," UNESCO, 1964.

53. F.J. van Hoek, "The Future Role of Development Training and Research Institutes," unpublished, Paris, March 8, 1966.

54. C.A.O. van Nieuwenhuijze, Cross-Cultural Studies, The Hague, 1963. (Essays on problems in cross-cultural encounters, emphasizing that reality must be conceived as a pluralistic phenomenon rather than as one continuum if there is to be a viable cross-cultural approach in the world.)

55. C.A.O. van Nieuwenhuijze, "Social Scientist in Pursuit of Social Change," Revised unpublished version of a paper presented at the International Seminar on "Interdisciplinary Approach to Social Change in Developing Countries," India International Centre, New Delhi, November 30-December 10, 1964. (Analyses why modern social science is unable to deal with change, as opposed to dynamics. Presents a model that attempts to deal with social change.)

56. Albert Waterston, "Administrative Obstacles to Planning," Economia Latinoamericana, July 1964. (Seeks to describe the main personnel procedural, and organizational impediments in the way of formulating and carrying out plans for accelerating development in developing countries.)

57. Edward Weidner, "The Search for Priorities in Comparative Public Administration," in Models and Priorities in the Comparative Study of Public Administration, op. cit. (Discussion of the levels of theory and the relationship of theory to the problem of development.)

58. Simon Williams, "Negotiating Investment in Emerging Countries," Harvard Business Review, January-February 1965. (Emphasizes the need for politica information if American businessmen are to make rational investments in developing countries.)

59. Simon Williams, "Private Investment in World Agriculture," Harvard Business Review, November-December 1965. (Says that private business has a great stake in world agriculture and proposes ways of articulating that interest with other resources in the United States and developing countries.)

60. Miguel Wionczek, "Development Research Problems in Latin America." Training and Research for Development, Annual Meeting of Directors of Development Training and Research Institutes, Portici, Naples, 16-21 September 1965. Development Centre of the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development.

Section IV

OTHER MATERIALS

ORGANIZATION AND UTILIZATION OF RESEARCH IN DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Excerpts from Some
Post-Conference Notes

by

Fred W. Riggs

There was general agreement at the Conference that research in development administration is necessary...if technical cooperation programs are to become more effective, but there was little consensus about the various types of research, how they are related to each other, and how they ought best to be organized and utilized. The earlier Conference on Foreign Area Research...appears to have agreed that there are essentially, three different kinds of research: basic, applied, and policy-oriented. They proposed the following definitions:[1]

a. Basic research is knowledge-oriented in that its primary purpose is to develop scientific theory and method;

b. Applied research is directed toward the solution of narrowly formulated problems of administration, training and education, program planning and program evaluation in both private and public organizations; and

c. Policy-oriented research is concerned with information for, and analysis of, broad areas of domestic and foreign policy.

No doubt the Conference (just passed) would not have accepted this classification, at least not without further qualification. It would, perhaps, have added the distinction between "structured" and "unstructured" research, in which the former is organized with a view to solving a specific set of questions posed in advance, whereas the latter is more free-wheeling in permitting the researcher to follow up on leads, data, and hypotheses which seem interesting and relevant to him. Further distinctions might be made in the scale of research, between the traditional type of "lone-wolf" studies and more elaborate research designs in which teams of scholars work together and employ many research assistants. Important distinctions

could also be made methodologically between studies which collect information, which formulate models and theories, which test hypotheses and utilize rigorous quantitative or behavioral methods, as well as distinctions between research which is oriented to one country or situation or to comparative studies in several locations, and between research which is value or action oriented (or operationally relevant) as contrasted with studies which are empirical and analytic in character (but perhaps operationally irrelevant).

No purpose would be served by attempting to assign priorities and assert preferences among these various types of research. Rather, the important task is to discover what kinds of research are most appropriate for particular purposes, and to devise means by which these types of research can be carried out and their findings effectively utilized and related to the results achieved by other varieties of research. Using the basic, applied, and policy-oriented distinction, and relating it to the structured-unstructured distinction and various modes of institutionalizing research, the following additional observations seem called for.

Basic Research and Institutional Resource Development

The report of the Conference on Foreign Areas Research asserts that:

> Well-selected fundamental social science research...adds to those areas of knowledge judged to be most relevant to the future action problems of the agency and related agencies and may in the long run be the shortest route to useful or helpful planning for both policy and action.[2]

From this point of view, the essential criterion of basic research is not its irrelevance to agency goals, nor can it be considered a "fringe benefit" or a "goodie" for scholars who need to build up their publication records in order to secure professional recognition and advancement. Rather, it may well prove the "shortest route to useful" knowledge for agency goals. Surely a better understanding of the dynamics of social change and economic development is highly relevant for programs intended to promote development. The essential point about basic research is not what it discovers but how it is organized. It tends, unavoidably, to be "unstructured." It is the kind of inquiry in which "serendipity" plays a large part, in which free-lance scholars, following their own hunches, reinforced by intelligence, knowledge, methodological sophistication, and identifiable goal-orientations or values, sometimes, but certainly not always, come up with new theories, knowledge, products, or skills which could not be anticipated. These are the real "discoveries" generated by research, and the very fact of their novelty makes them unpredictable. It is the fact that we really know so little about development that makes fundamental research in this field both necessary and almost impossible to structure in advance. Consequently,

support for this kind of research is intrinsically a gamble. If financial backing is provided, it must be based on the qualifications and past record of the scholar concerned more than on a carefully programmed research design.

Since development administration means working abroad in many countries where diverse cultural situations, governmental structures, patterns of behavior, and stages of development are found, the number of variables and unknowns are overwhelming. This means that it is peculiarly difficult in this field to structure research in advance. If only tightly structured research can be supported, then the important things which need to be learned will probably never be discovered.

The more "mature" a science, the more its basic concepts, problems, and methods have been worked out, and the more possible it is to treat research problems as "puzzles" whose solutions can be found by highly structured research. But the less mature a field, and the more problematic its basic concepts and methods, the more difficult it is for any research-supporting organization to judge the potential pay-off of basic research. Scholars who seek external support for fundamental research are often compelled to fake up a plausible rationale for structured research in order to obtain the resources with which to carry on the unstructured research that produces significant discoveries. Often the returns from their formal research efforts, while meeting advance specifications, actually do little but document the obvious.

It can be argued that action agencies ought not support fundamental, unstructured research, that this is the proper field for financing by private foundations and such governmental entities as the National Science Foundation. This may be true, in principle, but it is also true that these agencies have not given much support to fundamental research in the field of development administration. If the basic knowledge, methods, and theories of development administration are to grow, then the agencies which have the greatest need for this product ought to find ways to support the kinds of research which are most likely to generate it.

Fortunately, with the enactment of Section 211(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act, a vehicle for such research support from AID is now available. It is an important fact that basic research in the United States is closely linked with education and the training of new scholars. This is because the most important institutional framework for basic research, at least in American universities, is the graduate seminar. Here a scholar can work out some of the implications of his ideas in close association with his best graduate students. As the students apply themselves to the detailed examination of some of these ideas, they do research for dissertations which not only helps them to complete their own preparation as scholars, but adds to the growing stockpile of knowledge. Thus grants made to scholars and graduate students with the primary goal of increasing institutional resources in the field of development administration are likely to pay off handsomely in that

they will also support basic, unstructured research which may (or may not, as the case may be) add significantly to the growth of this field.

An important problem in the administration of institutional resource development programs needs to be considered in relation to the problem of support for basic research. At present two patterns prevail, largely as mutually exclusive alternatives. Grants are typically made through academic administrators for institutional development, but to individual scholars for fundamental research. Of course, the two categories overlap in the sense that institutional support grants may include research funds for suballocation to individual scholars, and the external research grants which scholars secure are likely to be administered through the universities in which they are employed. However, the mechanisms involved in these two procedures--which we might call administrator-oriented and scholar-oriented, respectively--are rather different. If a grant is made to the university or to a school or department within the university, using the administrator-oriented approach, then pressures arise to divide up the research funds among many applicants, to slant projects which originally had a different purpose in order to make them eligible for support, and to help those who have difficulty securing external grants in preference to the better known faculty members who can usually do well for themselves anyhow. This means that such grants tend to strengthen the recipient organizational units but not to do very much for the research field.

By contrast, research grants to individual scholars tend to be in response to research designs which are highly structured. This means that it is difficult for a scholar who wants to do fundamental and relatively unstructured research to secure support from either the administrator-oriented or the scholar-oriented type of external support program. If the 211(d) institutional resources development program of AID is to be used to strengthen basic research as well as to increase the number of qualified persons in a field such as development administration, then some new means of providing support seems to be needed.

One possibility lies in the concept of a "project team," which was discussed at the Conference. According to this idea, a group of scholars having an interest in a particular subject, overseas project, or problem area would be selected on the basis of their proven competence, experience, and interest. They might come from different departments and schools, even from different universities. The team would, of course, need a base of operations with its own secretariat, which might well be located in a university, but it could generate a life of its own outside the boundaries of a particular department, school, or university. If funds for institutional resource development could be channeled to such a team, and if the funds could be used for research fellowships, faculty research, and related expenses, then fundamental research might be generated that would be directly germane to the subject concerned. Such teams might, of course, be established for any problem area, including such aspects of development administration as agricultural development administration, educational development administration, land reform

administration, and urban renewal administration.

Such topics as these are directly related to overseas technical cooperation in the various program fields of the professional schools. There are dimensions of development administration more closely related to the other social sciences and foreign area studies. Project teams might well be created for such problem areas, and they might be considered for support under the provisions of the International Education Act, or under section 211(d) of the AID legislation.

Applied Research and In-House Analysis

Unavoidably any operating agency of government encounters a wide range of problems which are quite specific to its own plans, programs, and projects. Applied research is a necessary tool for any agency as it seeks to evaluate its effectiveness and to discover more appropriate means to accomplish its objectives. Certainly AID and other agencies involved in technical cooperation programs encounter many questions which can and should be answered by applied research. Many of these problems involve administrative issues, how best to recruit and train personnel, how best to allocate funds, how best to help new institutions become established, what priorities to assign among alternative projects, how best to assure project success, when to terminate projects, and what stages to recognize in planning and plan implementation.

Such research can normally be quite highly structured. The questions raised are rather specific. Often the answers apply to one concrete situation but not to others. Thus a procedure which may be highly appropriate in Thailand might fail completely in Iran. A mode of organizing community development operations in the Philippines may be quite unsuitable for Egypt or Sierra Leone. If this is true, then applied research to a considerable extent can only be meaningfully designed and carried out within each operating agency and its component bureaus, branches, and field missions. So far as AID is concerned, it seems desirable for some applied research on development administration to be organized geographically through regional and country offices, and some on functional or programmatic lines, particularly through TCR.

An important point to remember about applied research is that it often requires experimentation, and only an operating agency itself can carry out effective administrative experimentation. It can test the relative success and cost of different approaches to handling projects by trying one approach in case A, a different approach in case B, etc. Outsiders can observe and comment on what is taking place, but they cannot control operations. Only those who plan and carry out projects can, if they wish, operate experimentally so as to provide empirical evidence of the relative effectiveness.

and comparative costliness of alternative procedures.

Much applied research also requires the kind of records which can only be made by those engaged in operations, and practitioners will make such records only if they are treated as part of the work load and duties are so structured as to make record-keeping both feasible and rewarding to practitioners. This means, in effect, that development administration has to carry it own applied research as a built-in component of the job to be done. Without an internalized structure of applied research, essentially a research-oriented approach to operations, it is unlikely that any external agency, such as a cooperating university or consulting organization, can carry on such research effectively.

No doubt whether or not AID wishes to build analysis, evaluation, and applied research into its operations is something which it must decide for itself, and an outside body, such as the ASPA Conference, can have little to say. But it can comment on an appropriate role for university people. Institutional research contracts are probably inappropriate for any specific problems requiring applied research. However, individual scholars can often make helpful contributions to the analysis and solution of these problems by suggesting appropriate methodologies for experimentation, testing, record-keeping, and analysis. The appropriate mechanism for AID-university cooperation in such matters of applied research, however, is to arrange for scholars to take leaves of absence to work on a direct-hire basis for the government. They can be employed as individual "consultants." Some agencies, the U.S. Geological Survey for example, reportedly make extensive use of scholars on direct hire by utilizing the "When Actually Employed" (or WAE) procedure for using scholars intermittently, while they continue to hold regular university positions. Such people can, of course, contribute to applied research only if they are actually used for such research and not given regular operating responsibilities while they are with the agency. In other words, unless an agency is research oriented, even employing scholars will not generate useful applied research.

Agencies may prefer to build their own staff of permanent research workers on an "in-house" basis. If so, they will perhaps want to recruit some persons from the universities who have specialized in development administration. They will then want the universities to train graduate students as research men, providing a manpower pool from which to draw. The more institutional resources in development administration can be strengthened, the more AID will find qualified persons to recruit for its applied research needs.

Policy Oriented Research and University Contracts

Policy-oriented research, which has been defined in terms of "broad areas of domestic and foreign policy," falls logically between the two categories of "basic" and "applied" research. It raises questions a about what program goals should be set rather than how projects should be carried out. It concerns such questions as how best to secure the implementation of national economic plans; what priorities to set for intersectoral coordination and intergovernmental relations; what degree of autonomy in local government will best achieve economic, social, and political development goals; the role of ethnic minorities in development; the impact of governmental structure, of cultural norms, and of the intelligentsia on development programs; etc. Such problems are often central concerns for the ne · instituions, schools, and institutes of public administration which American universities have helped to establish in the less-developed countries.

Consequently it may be assumed that research on these problems constitutes part of the mission of university contract programs. Moreover, the scholars who take part in these programs can carry out their responsibilities more effectively if they also contribute to the design of the programs in the first place. We are dealing, in other words, with the type of research that is most appropriate for a partnership between government and universities. It is here that David Bell's proposal to view foreign aid as a research process is most directly relevant. If specific foreign aid projects are thought of as being simultaneously research exercises, then it will also be easier to design policy-oriented research contracts with universities as a part of foreign aid operations.

Policy-oriented research tends to be relatively structured, but the scholar needs to join forces with the government administrator in designing the structure. Provision needs to be made in university technical cooperation projects for policy research as a major component, including the creation or strengthening of research capabilities in the overseas host institutions. Such provision should include graduate training and overseas field assignments for American graduate students, the expansion of library and documentation facilities, and the inclusion of faculty participants who devote all or part of their time to research while in the field, plus time for predeparture planning and for analysis and writing after their return home. It goes without saying that the training of participant researchers in the host institutions is a part of the mission of these contract operations.

The Conduct of Research in Development Administration

Although some research in development administration can be caried

on in the United States, much if not most of it, regardless of the type of research involved, has to be carried on overseas. This generates problems of peculiar complexity not encountered in those research fields which are purely domestic in orientation. Moreover, since the field of development administration is concerned primarily with governmental operations and with relations between governmental and other institutions, it is peculiarly vulnerable to charges of "political" interventionism.

The recent appearance in the less-developed countries of indigenous scholars and institutions concerned with development administration has enhanced the opportunities for meaningful research in this field, but it has also created a new range of problems. Indigenous scholars can be of great help, but only if they are treated as partners and colleagues. They are particularly sensitive about American scholars who treat them with disdain or overlook their interests and capabilities. Indeed, they know much more than Americans about the local situation and its problems, and their theoretical sophistication may be as great as, or even greater than, that of their American counterparts. They are receptive to collegial participation by foreigners in research, but only if their own concerns are weighted as heavily in its design and execution as are the interests of the American scholars.

Practical considerations must also be considered. The libraries and other facilities of indigenous institutions are utilized by foreign researchers, who also call upon local schools and universities to furnish students and young instructors as research assistants,interpreters, and aides. In so doing, they deplete the available resources and disrupt the programs of their hosts. Moreover, there may be idealogical differences in goal orientations which cause indigenous scholars to distrust foreign researchers as "imperialistic" or "ethnocentric."

These inherent difficulties are compounded when American governmental and foundation policies provide research support in a manner that discriminates against foreign scholars. An artificial distinction has been made between overseas development activities in which foreigners are treated as beneficiaries of aid, but not of research support, whereas research support has been provided for domestic programs in which foreign countries are treated as the objects of investigation by American scholars only. Fortunately there are signs that this peculiar dichotomy has been rejected, but its effects linger on in research planning and in research programs now under way. The result has been to impede the establishment of joint research programs in which American and foreign scholars can join together as equals to study a problem of mutual concern.

As the Camelot episode so well demonstrated, American scholars working overseas, and especially those with large-scale governmental financing, can hope to succeed only if they enjoy the unqualified support

of their indigenous counterparts. Much effort is now being expended in Washington to screen government-financed research in foreign areas so as to eliminate projects likely to cause untoward repercussions on American foreign policy goals. Certainly one of the ways of reducing the risk of such unfavorable reactions is to institutionalize patterns of cooperation between indigenous scholars, research institutes and universities, and their American opposite numbers.

The Utilization of Research in Development Administration

A frequent complaint made by government officials against the research carried out by academic people is that the results have little policy relevance, and that if they do, they are couched in obscure language, scattered in inaccessible publications, which busy administrators lack the time and patience to penetrate. To meet this problem various solutions have been proposed, and considerable time on this subject was spent at the ASPA Conference. The Foreign Area Research Conference also discussed this topic and reported that a special category of intermediaries or "middlemen" was needed to "translate" the outcome of research projects to administrators and to tell scholars about the operating problems of government on which research was needed. Another proposal made was to employ more social scientists in government and to send administrators to teach in universities, where they would presumably inform their academic colleagues about the research needs of government.

These suggestions are interesting and might be helpful if they could be implemented. However, they do not go to the heart of the problem. Much research, especially "basic research," has no immediate policy relevance to government. This is why, of course, administrators typically have little interest in it, and also why they cannot properly evaluate proposals for the support of basic research projects. The reasons can be illustrated in a more familiar field, such as medicine. Doctors who are treating cancer victims know that basic research on cancer is important to them, but may not want to know much more about it until it comes up with a cure or a promising therapy. Meanwhile they recognize that there are many hypotheses about the causes of cancer which ought to be checked out and that much still needs to be learned about basic anatomical, physiological, chemical, and biological processes which may or may not provide clues to the solution of the cancer problem. Any practicing physician who tried to keep up with the fruits of basic research in all the fields of anatomy, physiology, chemistry, and pathology which might have a bearing on the treatment of cancer would certainly be wasting his time, and he would undoubtedly encounter many specialized concepts and much peculiar terminology outside his normal vocabulary.

Although there are undoubtedly differences between the field of

health and the field of development, the fundamental relationship between fundamental research and the needs of practitioners is the same. Scholars studying the nature and processes of change in developing countries are learning interesting things about social structure, politics and administration, the relation of culture and ideology, of personality, demography, economics and geography to administrative development and economic growth. But many of these discoveries have no immediate policy relevance. It is therefore a waste of time for administrators to examine them, or for scholars to try to put them in a literary form which can be readily and quickly grasped by busy executives.

Fundamental research should be recognized as essentially not policy-relevant. If this were accepted, then administrators would not continuously ask researchers to tell them about their findings. They would also recognize the inherent limitations on their ability to decide what basic research should be supported.

By contrast, policy-oriented research should produce findings of immediate policy relevance, and it should be couched in language practicing administrators can readily understand, although administrators also have to learn some new concepts and terms which have an immediate bearing on their work. They do this all the time, however, so there is no special problem here. They really resist unfamiliar "jargon" only when they find that the jargon refers to concepts they have no use for. It is the people doing policy-oriented research, not the administrators, who need to know about the findings of scholars doing basic research, for the new knowledge generated thereby is often highly relevant to their policy investigations. The problem of utilizing basic research, therefore, is not essentially one of making it more available to administrators, but how to make it accessible to those engaged in policy-oriented and, to a lesser degree, to those doing applied research. The fruitless effort to establish communication between fundamental research and administrative practice rests on a misunderstanding of what is needed and failure to appreciate the role of policy-oriented research.

The reason why administrators do not appreciate the value of policy-oriented research is probably because they see so little of it, basically because so little is done. Left to themselves, academic people are chiefly interested in fundamental research, not just because it gives them the greatest professional advantage, but rather because it has the greatest general interest to other scholars, which is why, of course, it brings recognition in academic circles. Policy-oriented research is, by definition, of particular interest to those who have to make policy decisions, which means that it responds primarily to the concerns of those in operational and policy-making positions, not in scholarly roles. But the university scholar, since he has the requisite skills and is familiar with the fundamental research findings, is qualified to carry out policy-oriented research if he can be motivated to do so. Financial incentives can be provided through university contracts, as discussed above.

But money alone will not attract the best scholars unless opportunities to do fundamental research are also provided. When policy-oriented research is separated from fundamental research in the sense that some people make only policy-oriented studies in institutes and bureaus institutionally detached from the mainstream of academic life, the results are usually unfortunate because the best scholars refuse to accept such positions, and those who do so find themselves out of touch with the basic research literature which they need to know.

One solution seems to be to provide, through institutional resource development grants, for the generation of effectively linked groups of scholars interested in fundamental research and teaching, and to build around these groups a number of contract operations so that some of them are drawn, intermittently, into policy-oriented research projects. They will cooperate if they see that these projects enhance their ability to carry out fundamental research and to teach advanced students. At the same time, the results of their policy-oriented studies will necessarily be prepared in forms that are directly intelligible and relevant to the needs of those whose policy problems were the basis for the research design.

Insofar as policy-oriented research on development administration occurs only in the context of university contracts for overseas operations, we can assume that the results of such research may be relevant only to these operations. How then, can policy-oriented research of broader general interest be organized? One answer might be found if some scholars and some administrators spent enough time together to get to know each other's capabilities and problems quite well. It is unlikely that "middlemen" can do this for them, nor can short interviews, "workshops," or briefing and orientation programs do the job either. We are dealing here with problems of such complexity that long-term and intensive interactions are called for. Two approaches may be tried with some promise of success. One would be to bring a scholar into AID operations both in Washington and overseas, as a visiting professor in residence, not to have him become a temporary administrator, but to have him carry on research and take part in a "seminar" for development officers in which he learns about their problems at the same time that he transmits to them some of the fruits of research in development administration which may be policy-relevant. Agency research funds could well be utilized for this purpose.

Another and perhaps ultimately more promising approach would be to bring some practicing development administrators to a university campus for a substantial period of time, preferably a year, to take part with scholars in a seminar on selected problems in development administration, perhaps in one of the program fields. A two-way exchange would be encouraged thereby: scholars interpreting the status and findings of basic research and administrators explaining their key policy problems. Such

seminars should not be regarded as training programs, although it might be possible to finance them under the provisions of the Government Employees Training Act and the training provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act which authorizes AID personnel to spend a year at a university.

Footnotes

[1] Advisory Committee on Government Programs in the Behavioral Sciences, Foreign Area Research: A Conference Report, National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, 1967, p.5.

[2] Ibid., p.14.

1 December, 1961
Jack Koteen
Donald Stone

MOBILIZATION OF AMERICA'S DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION RESOURCES FOR A DECADE OF DEVELOPMENT

(Note: This paper is a slightly revised edition of the October 28 draft prepared for the consideration of a group of interested persons convened by the Conference on the Public Service.)

I. The Challenge to be Met

In stressing development planning and programming, self-help, efficient utilization of human and physical resources, social justice, and effective public services, the new AID program will place a staggering demand upon the skills and experiences of the United States public administration community--practitioner and professor, researcher and consultant, individual and institution. Though much is being done, and interest runs high, many persons intimate with U. S. public and private assistance programs have legitimate concern that the United States presently lacks the technical resources and fails to utilize what it has, to equal the tasks and commitments.

The purpose of this paper is to outline ways in which available public, or what may appropriately be called "development administration", resources* can be fully utilized, expanded, and concerted to support America's commitments abroad. Specifically, it is proposed that the assistance agencies, universities, research agencies and foundations concerned with development planning and administration establish an "allianza para progresso"--a collaborative relationship on our shores to forge cooperative programs of

---

* The term "development administration" as used in this paper means the planning, organization, and carrying out of public objectives and programs, notably those concerned with economic and social development and the establishment of effective public services in countries of relatively low income. It is thus concerned with the interrelationship of political, economical, social, cultural, technological, and other factors in development planning and administration and with integrating sector programs (health, education, public works, agriculture, etc.) into overall efforts. The term "universities" should be construed to include research agencies, foundations, and professional organizations where their participation and utilization would be relevant.

action, and build our resource base. We, ourselves, must practice what we preach to our friends abroad.

The nation's interests, resources, activities, and experience in administration and institution building overseas require direction and focus. Collaborative efforts must be undertaken to broaden the base of insight, understanding, and involvement in what is being done, and what urgently needs doing. The universities, professional societies, foundations, and government agencies significantly concerned with overseas development and directed change should engage in cooperative efforts to share experience, foster research, improve and expand education, and otherwise build adequate resources. An analysis of the character of resources required is set forth in a monograph by Milton J. Esman, "Needed: An Educational and Research Base to Support America's Expanded Commitments Overseas" (University of Pittsburgh Press, 1961).

II. Proposal for a Council

To further these objectives, consideration might be given to the establishment of a "Consultative Council for Overseas Development Administration."

The proposed Council would help bridge a big gap--the gap in planning, cooperation, and effective use of resources which has existed between assistance agencies and the universities.

Public and private assistance programs are vast. The world is a big arena. The universities' development administration resources are limited. Everything can't be done at once. But through partnership between official agencies and the universities (and related professional resources), capabilities can be greatly increased. The Consultative Council would be a bridge to keep closed the gap.

Specifically, the Council could assist in a number of ways:

a. Establish orderly processes through which consultation, cooperative planning, expansion, and utilization of the educational, research, and personnel resources in overseas administration can be maximized.

b. Provide a mechanism for the creation of a system of exchange of information, plans, experience and publications.

c. Assist in the identification of problems or areas requiring research and the formulation of conditions and arrangements under which the essential research underpinning for United States commitments abroad can be built.

d. Stimulate the conduct of training programs necessary to develop American technical expertness for overseas development assistance, for research and services at home, and for staffing assistance agencies.

e. Provide a means of formulating schedules and arrangements whereby the universities can conduct effective participant training, technical cooperation services, and supporting research.

f. Encourage the inclusion in each overseas project of a research component under which results would be evaluated, methods tested, and conclusions drawn; and assist in the dissemination of such information for educational purposes and operational guidance.

g. Assist in the inventorying and development of plans and financial arrangements for increasing university capabilities (personnel, knowledge, experience, and institutions) for the various development purposes described above, while at the same time keeping to a minimum the impairment of the universities' continuing educational responsibilities.

h. Provide a forum for consideration of policies and proposals relating to development planning and administration which affect the universities, for fostering innovation and demonstration projects, and for fostering cooperative efforts.

III. Limitations and Cautions

Assuming that the Consultative Council consists of fifteen or twenty representatives of the universities and other appropriate participants or observers as suggested below, certain cautions are needed. No group of this character can commit or in a real sense speak for all universities. The channels of communication and negotiation must always be open between any particular institution and the assistance agencies.

The members of the Council must have as an objective the involvement of more universities in development activities with information shared widely.

Periodic meetings or conferences would enable any institution interested in matters on the agenda to send representatives.

Only a handful of universities have established schools or centers which are concerned with education, research, and services relating broadly to overseas development administration in the context of this paper. Elsewhere responsibilities are diffused in various parts of the university (if carried on at all) without a central organic focus. In most universities

the development interest is restricted and specialized, e.g. to development economics, area study, agricultural or industrial development, or to a parochial view of public administration. Thus the pattern of representation on the Council would inevitably consist of persons with different types of responsibilities, and in some cases not able to speak for more than a segment of the development interests of their universities. The existence of the Council would thus stimulate more universities to establish development administration programs under suitable academic organization.

IV. Basic Areas for Cooperation

Within this context the following sections describe four areas for cooperative action:

a. Research in development administration and institution building

b. Education and training

c. Consultative and advisory services

d. Exchange and distribution of information

Many projects involve extensive activity in all four areas.

V. Research and Development

Unlike efforts in such fields as agriculture, health, military defense, and space exploration, the United States has endeavored to launch major programs of a highly technical and complex character in the field of overseas development without an adequate research basis. The result has been improvisation, clumsy performance, and repeated mistakes in this difficult and vast field of endeavor, We have engaged in very little analysis of experience, either as the basis for research and education or for operational guidance.

Much credit is due to national foundations for having supported a variety of research programs which have produced much of the institutional research capability that now exists. Until recently most of the research and educational programs have been non-operational or non-functional in character. Research concerned with the dynamics and processes of the administration of change and institutional building is in its infancy.

To close the gap, expanded and sustained efforts are required: research needs should be identified, resources created, and projects scheduled. Much of this should be of a cooperative character between agencies and universities. In some cases assistance agencies should conduct the research, but most of it--

as in other national program areas--can best be done through universities and other research institutions.

Some of the research should be basic in character, but much of it should be carried on as an element of program operations and project evaluation. Action-oriented research can be financed as a part of program costs. For example, every project which entails the establishment of a new or improved service, facility, enterprise, or organization in a participating country should include an appraisal of policies, methods, and results. A guide for making case analyses of "institutional building" endeavors is already available.

Another example is the need for manuals on development planning and administration for use by technical cooperation advisors and indigenous officials in formulating and carrying through national development programs. Program funds can appropriately be used to finance contracts with universities for the preparation of such documents, including the requisite research. In almost every sector, research for operational guidance is required. Some of this is already going on. Likewise, the government has need of analyses and publications on cross cultural operations and on other fields of knowledge and skill essential in training and supervision of its personnel. Preparation of such materials is a logical part of an effective program of agency personnel administration.

However, these operationally oriented research endeavors are no substitute for long-term basic research in the problems and processes of societal development, theoretical model building, formulation of new conceptual frameworks, or exploration of new disciplinary, inter-disciplinary, and professional contributions to developmental programing and administration. Until the government appropriates general funds for these purposes, the foundations will have to finance most of this basic work. An expanded and orderly program of operational or applied research will facilitate the development of more persuasive proposals and justifications for appropriations for fundamental research.

The Consultative Council would provide a mechanism whereby representatives of the government, foundations, and research agencies would come together to assess present deficiencies and consider lines of action which would be both fruitful and practical of achievement. It would provide a sounding board for government agencies and foundations in formulation of comprehensive research efforts (both in-house and out-of-house), in development of research policies and goals, in identifying financial requirements, and in fostering cooperative research.

VI. The Role of Education and Training

Recent surveys and reports have revealed how meager is the education and orientation of most Americans who are sent overseas to improve administration

and strengthen institutions. U. S. involvements abroad are a recent acquisition. Previously the government had made little demand upon universities for education for this purpose. Long after the need has become apparent, the country still has not developed an educational underpinning for its overseas commitments. The assumption of Capitol Hill has been that the programs are temporary--a one shot proposition. Thus there is no reservoir of persons qualified for these overseas assignments.

Enough persons have sufficient knowledge and experience to provide direction and focus and to establish priorities among the kinds of education and training required for overseas development administration. What is needed now is the sharpening of the needs and adoption of measures which will enable universities to institute new programs and modernize old ones in a way that will meet the country's preservice and inservice training requirements.

The proposed Consultative Council would provide a continuing forum for the open consideration of such matters. It would draw attention to short-term and long-term personnel needs, kinds of knowledge and skills required, and help make relevant research available to universities engaged in training programs.

There is also a host of common problems affecting the universities which derive from the education and training of foreign personnel. Thousands of foreign officials and others concerned with development administration are brought to the United States each year by the AID, Department of State, international agencies, voluntary organizations, and foundations. Many are channeled to universities for brief visits or for extended assignments. The universities have responded to the requests of the sponsoring agencies. But there are a host of common problems relating to:

a. Selection criteria, language preparation, and orientation prior to assignments of participants to a university

b. Evaluation of the relevance of educational programs for particular participant training needs and the assignment of participants in relation thereto

c. Systemization in the scheduling of participants so that universities may know what to expect and how to prepare for it

d. The evaluation of prior academic achievement, enforcement of academic standards, and establishment of policies regarding working for degrees

e. Relation of field visits and assignments to academic study

f. Development of arrangements for university control over housing of participants to prevent them from saving allowances by living in "slums" in order to send money home or load up on gadgets.

In addition there is the equally important work of strengthening or establishing training institutes and programs abroad. In the long run most of the preparation of personnel for development responsibilities must be done in the developing countries.

The Consultative Council would enable these and other important issues involving government-university relationships to be worked out on a more effective basis.

VII. The Exchange of Information and Reference Facilities

The need for broadcasting widely what is being done and known both in the United States and abroad in the field of development administration is obvious. Yet, every day attention is called to the fact that people still are in the process of "inventing electricity all over again". The Zaria Institute of Administration in Northern Nigeria is pioneering the field of education and training for African public service, and has great potential as a model for several other African states. Yet its teaching materials, its approach, and even its existence are unknown in much of Africa, and even less in the United States.

The time is long past when we could rely on exchange of information by "happenstance" in personal contacts or correspondence. What is needed is an extensive system of interchange of information, so organized as to produce a flow of information, at the lowest possible cost, to the widest audience. Not everything needs to be exchanged, but a number of categories can be quickly decided upon for high priority action--with the exchange of teaching and training materials in the vanguard.

It is suggested that the Consultative Council set up a task group to consider the problem of establishing a facility for the exchange of information, and to draft a proposal for action and financing.

VIII. Consultation on Advisory Needs

U. S. and international development agencies are dependent upon the universities for many kinds of assistance and services. Some of these are primarily in fields of research and training as described above. In addition, the government looks to the universities as a source of recruitment of staff for shorter or longer periods. Increasingly, universities are engaged under contract to work with foreign universities and institutes. Experts and survey teams are drawn from universities to make reconnaissance surveys and to provide

overseas advisory assistance.

Illustrations of specific problems which the Council might consider are:

a. The plan proposed by ICA three or four years ago to exchange personnel with universities and to enable them to develop more extensive staff resources to support development objectives.

b. The need for increased resources to assist in development administration for French and Spanish speaking countries, and the expansion of U. S. capabilities for this purpose.

c. The resolution of common difficulties encountered in inter-university contract programs, and methods of disseminating the knowledge and experience gained from such programs.

d. Restrictive and detailed provisions in AID contracts which prevent effective performance by universities or result in university subsidization of government.

e. The use of universities in convening and assisting in conferences of an international character, and in providing international dimensions in national conferences. Timely and significant topics, speakers, and work materials could be suggested.

f. Provision of advisory services in formation of overseas professional societies, conduct of research programs, etc.

If the contribution of the universities is to be increased, better planning and mutual understanding of potential needs and conditions under which they will be provided are needed. The Consultative Council would facilitate the identification of problems and development of more effective working relationships.

IX. Organization of the Consultative Council

The Consultative Council might well consist of about 15 to 20 members representing a cross section of the development administration community--universities, research organizations, professional societies, foundations. The American Society for Public Administration appears to be a suitable agency to activate the Council. Other organizations with which it might have a relationship are The Society for International Development, The American Council on Education, and the proposed agency on The University and World Affairs.

The Council might profitably meet two or three times a year on its own initiative, or on call by the AID, or a foundation, or some other appropriate body.

In dealing with particular problems requiring analysis and sustained attention, the Council might establish ad hoc or working groups. These could include especially qualified persons who are not regular members of the Council. Such groups would undertake specific surveys and investigations, or assume responsibilities for review of action projects.

Secretariat services will be needed to service the Council. Funds will be needed for this purpose, to finance participation in meetings, and for other Council activities.

Section V

CONFERENCE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONFERENCE SUMMARY AND PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS

Don L. Bowen

This statement is based on conference reviewed and generated ideas and action proposals. Additionally, it has been the beneficiary of a good bit of post-conference correspondence and informal discussion, especially with project steering committee members. As such it constitutes a summary of what a group of highly knowledgeable people at both operating and idea levels in universities and government think about the issues involved and the roles to be played by universities and AID in meeting public administration needs in developing countries over the next decade.[a] Succeeding sections: (1) review considerations of long standing in foreign aid; (2) take note of some of the newer elements of the overseas public administration technical assistance matrix; (3) record conferee views of priority areas of assistance needs; (4) outline action proposals with special reference to those that might be undertaken in the setting within which universities and AID presently operate; and (5) set forth principal features of a proposed new organizational tool serving and available to all committed to improvement of public administration in overseas development work.

Technical Assistance Considerations of Long Standing

What constitutes a long standing as opposed to a newer consideration in overseas technical assistance could provide the basis for

extended and probably fruitless debate. But since the beginnings of AID-university endeavors, there have been a number of limiting factors seldom satisfactorily surmounted. These include: (1) the barriers of distance, language, and culture; (2) diversity of the missions and ways in which these missions might be discharged, complexities accentuated by the mix in joint endeavor of any two or more enterprises combining the evanescence of AID, the variation of the American university system, and the extensiveness of both; (3) discontent with what is known and our ability to use what is known, even when goals are reasonably clear; (4) thinness of resources of all kinds--financial, manpower, organizational; and (5) great variation in the capability of the host countries (or other AID recipient organizations) to absorb and make the most of U. S. efforts in their behalf.

In many social situations this backdrop of frustration might be totally defeating, causing us to turn the page and go on to an easier, or at least different, task. But against it are arrayed a set of factors that make such withdrawal untenable; both unwanted and infeasible. Perhaps most basic are the unrelenting needs and hopes of both leaders and the people in the countries receiving assistance to move toward a better way of life. This commitment to progress is deep in the heart of most men, lesser-developed or otherwise. Moreover, it is matched by equally powerful motivations in this country. These range from an evangelical do-goodism, in both its smaller and nobler manifestations, to the hard-headed needs of mutual defense and national security. Also very much a part of our overseas

development efforts are an abiding intellectual curiosity, the many values associated with the exploitative capability of our free enterprise system, and the simple yearning for adventure of those who want to see what is on the other side of the hill. Expressed in combination as a national interest, these motivations converge to make our concern with overseas technical assistance a force to, indeed, be reckoned with, both at home and abroad.

Newer Elements in Overseas Public Administration Technical Assistance Efforts

Project paper writers and conferees assumed considerations noted above as unchangeables, as givens, and as a base for turning to what is new. Often the "new" is simply an intensification of the old, but as identified in the notes to follow, intensification is of such magnitude that a change in degree becomes one in kind. As a minimum, priority of the concern is greatly elevated. Those overseas public administration technical assistance considerations of new vintage most often pointed up had, as a common thread, changes in the basic environment in which AID-university activities take place. Some of these factors improve this environment; others worsen it. But all are both real and significant.

On the negative side, and one of unrelenting insistence, is the acuteness of the current manpower shortage. Personnel shortages have always plagued technical assistance efforts. But the sharpness of present shortages, both in quantity and quality, has markedly changed the dimension

of concern, especially in public service management sectors. The point at which a problem becomes a crisis is often not clear. But one measure of the depths of this current deficit in public administration is the phenomenon of recent years in which a single federal agency can often consume the entire public administration output, both education/training and research, of any major or several lesser colleges and universities. Regrettably this is a shortage in which AID fully shares. If this manpower shortage is not of crisis proportions, it must be nearly so.

Moreover, this shortage occurs at a time when AID's public administration technical assistance goals have enlarged. The growth of overseas development activities generally, of which public service management is but one of many elements, is responsible for part of this enlargement. More important is the new regard with which technical assistance activities in public administration are viewed. That this is a pressure likely to continue its upward course for a long time is a matter of common agreement.

A factor contributing to the two preceding changes in the setting in which public administration technical assistance activity takes place, but different than either, is the rapidly growing involvement of other agencies. The military establishment and two or three foundations, like AID and its predecessor agencies, have had long standing and extensive commitments in overseas development. But the increasing number and pace of acceleration of other agents in the field--government, foundations, and nonprofit organizations--have added to the complexity of the environment in which AID operates.[b]

On the plus side, environmental changes in which AID and the universities are carrying on public administration technical assistance include the confidence of success, spotty as it has been. Also a part of the picture is fuller realization of the large amounts that have been spent and a concern that this investment be protected. Other elements are accumulation of citizen awareness of the value of technical assistance through foreign travel and a growing cultural exchange, heightened belief that any deterrent to the new kind of war constantly in the offing should have all possible support, and pressure from U.S. private sectors in the realization that increasingly their goals are linked to developmental activity in the public sector. In any event, despite continued acrimony of foreign aid in congressional debates and other forums, foreign aid is accepted to be, if not a permanent, at least a part of the U. S. governmental apparatus for some time to come.

But perhaps the most decisive change in the environment of AID-university overseas public administration efforts, in a measure a distillate of all the foregoing, is that both in government and universities there is a broadly based mood to consider and accept change. Evidences of this new mood are a series of AID evaluations, especially the preceptive "Gardner Report," [c] and other lesser internal and external reviews of which this present project is one.

Some Basic Needs

As these and other changes have occurred, so have assessments

of public administration technical assistance needs and ways in which these needs should be met. A great many were identified in the course of conference deliberations, but in the main priority was given to the following six basic objectives and one underlying means of achieving these objectives.

Management as a Component of All Technical Assistance

Perhaps the most pervasive of these needs in government services management is to make administrative concerns a part of all technical assistance activity. Integral to this need is a clear articulation of just what good administration is and can contribute so that management concepts and skills will be sought and applied as specifically as possible in every relevant situation--political development, research, planning, and all program fields (agriculture, health, education, etc.).

This is not an easy task for at least two reasons. One is that there is no single "public administration" that all can repair to as to just what should be made a part of all overseas development endeavors. For example, on the university campus the intellectual base of public service management is often in dispute. It is clear that more than the traditional staff services are involved (but that these should not be abandoned), and its ultimate intellectual home is a focus of the social sciences. Getting agreement on the most desirable mix of these elements for purposes of curriculum design and guiding research often proves difficult, however. Such a setting leaves little room for dogmatism. Variation and experimentation constitute a much sounder basis on which to proceed, both at

home and in applications abroad. But within this framework exists a large body of public administration knowledge that has been thoroughly tested and that should be made a part of overseas development efforts.

Related to these observations on the "state of the art" and making the most of what is known is the fact that most persons concerned with the public service, both in government and in the universities abroad and here at home, have as a first impulse "seeing something happen." They have an end in view--a new hospital, better roads, more food, a stronger educational system, etc. Means to such ends, at least in administrative terms, are usually of secondary concern. But if administration is of secondary interest on an individual basis, it is more and more a first priority in terms of national interests, both at home and abroad.[d]

To summarize, the fact is that a great deal is known about public administration and that making the most of what is known is of mounting national importance. Those concerned--the universities, AID, and others--should turn to the job of seeing that the value of this contribution is articulated and considered in every relevant overseas development situation.

Conservation and Continuity

Over the past 20 years the United States government has spent in the neighborhood of $100 billion in foreign assistance.[e] Too small a portion of that amount has gone to public administration[f] and not all of this has been as productive as one might wish. Even so, the amounts of money involved are significant and much has been well spent.

Concern that this investment be protected has been noted earlier. But more than simple conservation is involved. In public administration technical assistance, conservation is closely related to continuity, a more dynamic factor of success. Continuity enables one project to build on another, indeed perhaps generate another. In this sense it is important to think of technical assistance as a process regardless of whether the activity involved is operational, developmental, or research. Available knowledge is applied to the situation and through feedback, further intensified and then institutionalized for solving problems in any given area. Moreover, the process has preservative and innovative qualities laterally as well as vertically. For example, a good budget process helps generate good personnel practices, a strong health program has salutary effects for educational activities, etc. Too often technical assistance efforts have not been conceived and conducted in this context, and both the U. S. and the host country have been the losers for this defect.

Sometimes the reasons for lack of continuity have been clear and perhaps unavoidable. Personnel, finances, and other resources have been cut off or reassigned in behalf of new priorities, either on a country or program basis. Equally disruptive may be changes in the internal affairs of host countries. But more common and damaging than any of these factors is failure to see public administration development work as the process described above with key points identified and timetabled over a sufficient interval to make the process operative. How

long an interval should be planned for depends on a number of variables. But the technical assistance process in which universities can most fruitfully be involved--education/training, research, and the kind of application of knowledge to basic problems that institution building demands--should be programmed over a realistic period of time which by any standard is likely to be longer than the three-year interval now commonplace in AID-university relations.

Strengthening Indigenous Efforts

Corollary to conservation of gains made and continuity as basic needs in the public administration development work is recognition that all development activity does not start from the same base in all countries. The variety of political, economic, social, cultural, and other factors encountered in a worldwide developmental effort is enormous. The fact that a given administrative institution or practice worked well in one setting is no assurance it will in another. Transplanting solutions in a world posing such diverse circumstances has proved to be both costly and ineffective.

A much better use of U. S. initiative in public administration technical assistance is developing host-country capacity to find its own solutions. For the most part this approach merely amounts to intensification of a shift in emphasis that is already much a part of AID-university development efforts. Intensifying this approach carries with it a number of advantages. For one thing it enlarges the range of developmental activities we may confidently undertake since, we are no longer

so much limited to "the kind with which we have had experience." Further, development of indigenous administrative capacity carries with it built in qualities of initiative, resourcefulness, and pride that reinforce host-country ties by moving the superior-subordinate implications of technical assistance toward those of colleagues making common cause. As this occurs, technical assistance becomes more and more the technical cooperation all want it to be.

Research Needs

Perhaps there is no area of foreign aid in which there is broader agreement than the lament that to do the job we need to know a lot more about the development process and the setting in which it takes place. That this agreement is so general on a matter as basic and in an enterprise of such vastness, importance, and long standing, and that so little is being done to remedy the situation, constitutes an anomaly of the first magnitude.[g] It is made all the more so because one of the principal participants are the universities whose main business is "to know."

Some of the reasons given for this course of non-knowing action are the usual ones stated in other areas of human endeavor. They include lack of money, scarcity of skilled manpower, and the press of action requirements that leave little room for research. Others are stated as AID-university impasses on such matters as "operational relevance" and "conceptual validity" or university publishing interests and AID's concern over "sensitivity of the data."

But countenancing such obstacles, formidable as they may be, does not reflect well on either AID or the universities. In most every other enterprise of the importance and complexity of AID-university public administration technical assistance efforts, research of all kinds, operational and basic, has proved to be a basic contributor to both effectiveness and economy and has been given a top priority. In the present instance, AID officials have not tried hard enough to sell research either within the Agency or to Congress. Moreover, such research as has been undertaken by the universities has usually been smuggled into contracts with the Agency under the guise of something else. Or worse yet, both AID and the universities have often proceeded with their respective tasks purporting to know more than they do or declaring that additional knowledge is not really needed.

Under such circumstances it is small wonder that research in AID-university relationships has been a constant source of bickering that has often had deleterious effects on other parts of the relationships as well. The mutual values of research in other areas of university-government endeavor, science to point to one conspicuous example, have been amply demonstrated.[h] It is high time that this fruitful relationship be instituted in foreign assistance.

Information Clearing House

Much akin to augmenting research is making adequate provision for its use. Integral to this need is a means of identifying research that has been completed or is in process and capability to produce its

findings for consideration at the time and place needed, whether for operational purposes or in conjunction with other research activities. In other words, a digestive system is much dependent on adequate memory and retrieval systems as well.

But the informational needs of an effort as gigantic and diverse as public administration technical assistance go beyond knowing of the existence of research and having access to findings. Of great value, too, for planning, coordinating, funding, and other vital technical assistance functions, especially in the administrative sector, would be like information on other development activities. As things stand now, each interested agency or person must create an information system on an individual basis. This is usually tantamount to no system at all with resulting gaps, duplications, delays, and other weaknesses.

Experience in other areas of endeavor has shown that modest advances in communication often result in quantum advances in achievement. Recognition of this fact and taking purposeful steps towards amelioration of these information needs is likely to do no less for overseas public administration technical assistance endeavors.

Other Needs

While the foregoing constituted major areas of conferee focus on government management technical assistance needs, and by a large margin, additional considerations were frequently mentioned. Sometimes these were ancillary to principal issues involved and sometimes objectives in their own right.

One of these, for lack of a better designation, might be termed political. Embraced in this consideration is the difficulty in national development in most emerging countries of winning consent, securing broadly based participation, establishing accountable governments, and amalgamating diverse influences into one national process. Conferee interest centered on the need for public administration activity to be made a part of other efforts seeking these objectives. Especially cited was the need for public service management interests to be supportive of efforts to develop legislative, judicial, and related political and social institutions.

Also identified by conferees was the importance of fuller definition and clearer articulation of general development goals of which public administration technical efforts are a part and the way in which activities in behalf of these total objectives are evaluated.

Working from Strength

If the foregoing were identified by conferees as principal objectives, ways in which such objectives might be sought were summarized by an approach that might be called working from strength. Just what constitutes strength is a question that immediately comes to the fore. Continuity, relevancy, integrity, initiative, responsibility, and quality are all commonly used watchwords. More specifically, there was widespread agreement that efforts to get AID-university public administration technical assistance efforts under way had been characterized by a proliferation of both objectives and means that had diffused resources to the point that

those available, limited as they were, were often not effectively utilized. The values of pluralism are numerous and often stated. But in an activity in which interests are so varied, and participating agencies so numerous, it is easy to go too far. Needed at this stage are what in the jargon of politics are described as power bases or, in more neutral terms, centers of gravity.

Perhaps an illustration will help clarify the point. All in public administration technical assistance seek and understand the value of innovation. Necessity may be the mother of invention, but whether this aphorism in and of itself constitutes a good base for development is open to question, at least the question of what kind of innovation is wanted. Continuing innovation is a planned and orderly process in which one development strengthens launching of the next, a chain of progress much more likely in a setting of strength. Without the latter, developmental activities are often reduced to handling each new exigency on a "putting-out-the-fire" basis. While putting out fires is an essential ability in every human enterprise and may indeed produce innovation, it is much more apt to produce worthwhile ones if circumstances are such that there is opportunity for some assessment of the factors involved and the possibility of follow-through. Under such circumstances, meeting an exigency may become an important part of the learning process and lead to discovery of a preventative worthy of institutionalization rather than a transitory palliative.

In all of this, one thing should be made clear. Working from strength does not necessarily mean working with the established. Indeed,

building on what is established may make permanent something that never should have been. Rather, working from strength may call for jettisoning what is now on the books and moving to something new. Loftier terms may put this process in terms of being experimentally minded coupled with the capacity to recognize a good thing when it is seen. To do this is difficult in any area of human endeavor, even more so in a developmental context. But the fact that it is difficult does not detract one whit from its essentiality as a goal to be pursued without compromise.

Project Recommendations Summarized

In an important sense the preceding notes on AID-university needs/problems in providing overseas technical assistance in administration constitute recommendations in and of themselves. The purpose of this section of the report is to summarize these recommendations and render them more specific.

Proposals made are a mixture of both objectives and means. Some are of strategic urgency, others of long-range significance. Some would appear to be relatively easy to implement, others much more difficult. Some relatively inexpensive, others costly. But with one exception, all can be undertaken within the existing framework of the two principal entities with which this project is concerned, AID and the universities.[(i)] That exception, and it is a major one, is a proposal for establishment of a new organization, a Consultative Council for Development Administration.

For the most part, recommendations in this section are self-explanatory, especially in light of preceding discussion of areas of need in overseas public administration technical assistance. A few, however, especially the Consultative Council notion, include explanatory notes. The order in which recommendations appear represents an effort to deal with like and related items in tandem rather than a priority sequence.

University Commitment

The role of the American university in public administration technical assistance has been varied, ranging from one of substantial commitment to ambivalence and opportunism. This has been true of both aspects of that role, overseas involvement and interest in public administration as a part of that involvement. While some of this variation can be justified in the name of diversity of goals, the time is at hand when both portions of this commitment are too important, to AID and to the universities, to countenance such variation. Limits have clearly been too great for operating effectiveness and of an extremeness difficult to justify even in such commodious and lofty declarations as experimentation or intellectual honesty. The universities must decide, it being understood that this decision will always be on the basis of any one institution and in its own terms, whether they want to engage in overseas technical activity, and specifically in public administration. For purposes of this report the answer in both cases should be "yes."[(j)]

Public Administration Steps the Universities Should Take

Getting from commitment (idea) to deed as far as the public administration portion of this commitment is concerned calls for the university to take, if it hasn't already, a number of steps.

The public administration (or possibly public affairs) program should be established with sufficient identity to reflect its interdisciplinary intellectual base, in this case the social sciences. Moreover, establishment of this program should be in such a way that it has the visability and prestige to compete both inside and outside the university for financial resources, faculty, students, and the other considerations that distinguish a "going concern." In most cases this is best done by setting up the program on a professional-school level. As a rough measure of means, annual support in the neighborhood of $1 million is probably required.[k]

These measures should, of course, be implemented with a generous sprinkling of imagination and adaptation to accommodate differences in institutional resources and goals. But it is highly unlikely that the elements identified above can be made viable with support of less than this amount and with any significant departure from the organizational conditions outlined.

University International Arrangements

The university should also have a focal point for all international activities. This is critical to the marshaling of university resources to assume responsibility for most overseas technical assistance

activities and holds special relevance for public administration. To illustrate, a school of public administration of the scale described above could make a meaningful contribution in its own right to most any university campus. But in terms of overseas technical assistance, its greatest impact is likely to be through other professional schools--health, education, agriculture, engineering, etc. While establishment of such linkages and related coordinated activities might be made a function of a number of overall university units (such as the graduate school), they are much more likely to take place if established at the level of the university vice president, preferably the vice president for academic affairs or professional schools.

Apart from but equally as significant as this organizational adjustment are modifications in the university value system. For example, agreement that "overseasmanship" makes university men more valuable, especially those in public affairs, is widespread. But measuring this value in university terms has proved difficult. As a beginning, perhaps insistence that faculty-member advancement comes only through publication should be modified to allow reasonable credit for overseas work.

Also helpful would be ability to commit faculty members to longer terms of overseas public administration activity, some of which might be spent on the campus and some in the country involved; capacity for overstaffing to accommodate new projects and assure continuity in ongoing overseas concerns; and more willingness to adjust curricula and related requirements to needs of individual foreign students as well as developmental needs more generally.

The AID Commitment

Just as the university's commitment to public administration technical assistance effort should be substantial, so should AID's. One reflection of this commitment is the degree to which AID will establish criteria, and abide by such criteria, in entering into contractual and other arrangements to measure institutional strength or willingness to develop that strength to meet overseas public administration technical assistance needs.

Further, AID funding should be sufficient both in amount and time duration. As has been noted earlier, the processes of teaching, research, and institution building are time consuming and require great skill and patience. By any measure the three-year contracts common now in AID activity are insufficient. Beyond the consideration of time are requirements that AID sponsorship be sufficient in amount to fully cover university overhead costs, such as development of library resources, student assistance, and the many other elements (including overstaffing arrangements noted above) that distinguish an opportunist or weak operation from one of commitment and strength.

The kind of commitments outlined above and referred to frequently in this report require an institutional-support approach to funding and related arrangements. In the past AID has been severely limited in its ability to make such commitments. However, section 211(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act (the so-called "centers of competence" provision) now opens the door to this long-needed approach, and every effort

should be made to see that applications of this provision are increasingly a part of AID-university relationships.

AID Organization and Related Adjustments

Paralleling the need for universities to modify their organizations to meet the requirements of overseas commitments, AID must get its own house in order to recognize some of the realities of academic life. For example, if for no other reason than facilitating communication, there should be some "one place" in AID where universities can turn for all relevant information about AID interests and resources in technical assistance in public administration. Moreover, the more this one place can move from information and communication to planning and funding arrangements the better.(1)

AID's value system may also be due for some adjustment. Overprotectiveness of research resources and skittishness about written materials that can "see the light of day" are two illustrations. Research and publication are and ought to be important in scholarly life, and AID must come to recognize that in order to protect the resource it is highly dependent upon, it must take cognizance of these and other elements integral to the life of that resource.(m)

Making Public Administration a Component of All AID-University Overseas Developmental Activity

To achieve this objective the university should view public administration as an element that should be made a part of, or at least available to, all professional schools. As a minimum, it should be built into any major overseas development activity in which the university is engaged.

This can be done in a number of ways, but by whatever route it should not be at the expense of or substituted for the identity of a central campus focus on public administration. Some place in the university must always be a center of initiative, a "yeast pot" that has public administration teaching and research as a primary concern. And in contributing toward this objective, AID should do no less. Building a public administration component into every part of the Agency's overseas activity should be standard operating procedure. The ways in which this can be done are as varied as in the universities. But if for internal or administrative reasons this is not feasible as AID authority is now constituted, the Agency should seek that authority from Congress.

Building AID-University Areas of Competence

By mutual agreement, perhaps with encouragement and even direction from AID, universities and their public administration schools should move in the direction of developing some special competence. This competence might be in terms of geographical regions, perhaps corresponding to AID's area desks--Viet Nam, East Asia, Latin America, Africa, and Near East-South Asia. Or specialization might be in some functional field (education, medicine, agriculture, etc.) in which the university has special strength. Such an approach will help the universities make the most of their own resources and at the same time be of special value to AID as a resource for program design and evaluation.

Research

Integral to all public administration programs of AID is knowing

more about management's role in the development process. Acknowledgement of this is no longer a cause for embarrassment. It is a first priority requirement, both for operational and intellectual concerns. For example, all Conference participants stressed the need for better information on the nature and extent of manpower needs in developing nations. Noted too were recent important theory-building efforts in development administration, now largely lying fallow because of the lack of field research to test theoretical findings.[n]

To be more specific, research of all kinds--both basic and applied--should be integral to all AID-university relationships. The issue of which should do which is overshadowed by the need for somebody to do something.

As a general rule, however, it is probably well to keep applied and operations research in AID and other research in the universities. The reasons behind such a division range all the way from access to data to relevancy of the research to basic interests of the respective institutions and the individuals involved. But such a guide is difficult to apply with much precision. Modifications in terms of need and available personnel and other resources are often necessary.

Additionally, there are occasions when some crossing over, even if avoidable, may be desirable. For example, planned interchange of personnel may have training, coordination, and other advantages for both AID and the universities. Such interchange is usually difficult to manage in an operations activity but sometimes relatively easy to achieve in research.

In these circumstances the question is not just one of maintaining the integrity of the line between applied (AID) and basic (university) research, a line which in any event is becoming increasingly "fuzzed up." Rather it becomes one of weighing gains and losses such interchange holds for the individual goals of the university and AID. Agreement is growing that there should be more such interchange in the future than has characterized this area of AID-university relations in the past.

Indigenous Resources

Both the universities and AID should become much more hard-nosed about the oft-given lip service of developing indigenous resources. This objective should be primary for a number of reasons--recipient country acceptance, program effectiveness, and economy. More basic is the ultimate goal of all overseas technical assistance efforts, helping lesser-developed countries help themselves. Among other things this means that the recipient nation should participate in planning technical assistance programs along with the universities and AID.[o] It also requires that universities should be committed to developing training materials and conducting research that reflect host-country needs and that host-country participants be built into these activities in significant ways. The processes of doing this are slow and expensive. If there are times when crash programs are a necessity, they should not be undertaken by either AID or the host country without an equal amount of effort devoted to this fundamental goal of developing indigenous resources.

Consultative Council

A sum of preceding recommendations is that they are built around the thesis that overseas public administration technical assistance needs can best be met by working from centers of strength. Targets in view include making public administration a component of all overseas activities, developing indigenous capacity of recipient countries, recognizing the importance of research, and the values of special areas of competence, etc.

But missing from this scheme are a number of elements. For example, how does the proposed AID-university relationship assure the development of new resources? How does it provide for the involvement of others, government agencies, professional associations, private foundations, etc., with kindred interests? As a minimum, how do all of these instrumentalities communicate? Is there an easy, natural, logical way for them in and of their own motion to establish values and operational systems that will serve their individual interests and simultaneously bring to overseas developmental efforts some of the acknowledged values of pluralism?

In other words, while the recommendations set forth above help establish a beachhead and make the most of what resources are presently available in AID-university relationships, they do not by any means embrace all interests involved. More importantly, they do not provide for forward movement in developmental efforts--the kind of planning and coordination that comes from full and regular consultation of all parties concerned.

These deficiencies, including their consequences for AID-university

relationships, were soon apparent to conferees, and from conference discussion there emerged a proposal for a "Consultative Council on Development Administration."[p] Suggestion of any new agency is tantamount to saying that there is little hope that what needs to be done can be done within existing facilities even though they might be greatly expanded. And this is the setting in which the Consultative Council idea was considered.

All who have been deeply concerned with technical assistance in public administration, and for that matter other developmental efforts as well, know the complexity of the milieu in which technical assistance efforts take place. Beyond the range of programs involved and the settings in which they take place, as has been noted, are the great number of agencies participating in these activities. If only AID or a few universities were concerned, or if those universities involved had a substantial degree of homogeneity, much of what has been proposed in this report would be comparatively easy, perhaps even unnecessary. But in circumstances where there are so many agencies attempting to resolve so many interests, the difficulties of making even a few basic ideas operational go up exponentially.

Experience with consortia, the multi-university, continuing conferences, and similar coordinating and communicating devices has in some measure proved of value. It has also emphasized weaknesses of such machinery in dealing with the prblems at hand.

The root notion behind the Consultative Council idea is to provide a simple and continuing system of consultation among those who want to consider and resolve the large number of planning, policy, and operating

problems that impair the effective performance and utilization of existing resources and provide for the mobilization of new ones. In this role the Council would provide a focal point for information and assistance. It would also function as a policy-advocating, policy-initiating and facilitating agent. The Council should not, however, be designed as an operating organization to supplant or duplicate the normal functions of AID, universities, or other overseas development agents.

Establishment of the Council should be with the encouragement and support of AID but as a separate legal entity, largely independent of its creator. Council membership would consist of (a) representatives of those with administrative responsibilities for university programs in public administration (perhaps appointed by the ASPA-sponsored Council on Graduate Education for Public Administration); (b) scholars actively engaged in teaching and research in such disciplines as applied anthropology, social psychology, economics, etc., (possibly to be designated by the Social Science Research Council); (c) other scholars especially concerned with development administration (perhaps nominated by the Comparative Administration Group, also sponsored by ASPA); (d) leading specialists in professional fields of particular relevance to development efforts--health, education, and agriculture (possibly to be designated by professional associations in these fields); and (e) others, including governmental officials not in AID and representatives from the United Nations, the Pan American Union, and other world regional organizations with development administration interests.

Operationally, the Council would arrange for working groups, task

forces, committees, or similar bodies to examine special subjects, to formulate proposals, and to engage in related activities such as advising on general matters of policy and implementation (but not on specific projects). Such groups would consist of Council members and nonmembers as appropriate. Activities of these groups would be reviewed by the Council.

In its activities the Council would be assisted by a continuing staff under central direction. Staff resources would also be made available to Council working groups and committees. The Council would function in close liaison with other groups, including the American Society for Public Administration, the American Council on Education, Education for World Affairs, and foundations, as well as relevant departments in the federal government.

While the Council would be formed with the view that it would be responsive to specific requests, it would also be self-initiating in the sense that it could designate areas of investigation on its own motion.

Many of the matters referred to in recommendations and proposals noted above would be appropriate for the Council agenda. Examples include: (1) suggest criteria that AID, foundations, and others might use in evaluating public administration schools in negotiating proposals with these institutions; (2) identify common difficulties encountered by universities in negotiating and administering contract programs with AID and others and proper ways of resolving these difficulties; (3) assist in defining AID and university goals in development administration and areas of congruency; (4) establish standards for use in evaluating the degree to which overseas development administration objectives sought were being achieved; (5) outline criteria AID and others

might use in considering withdrawal of assistance programs from recipient countries; (6) identify resources and ways in which objectives might be achieved; and (7) formulate project proposals for consideration of AID, foundation, and other development assistance by whatever universities, associations, or groups might be appropriate.

To the extent that the Council might engage in operational types of activity, it might enlarge upon the information clearing house function earlier suggested as an AID activity. The Council might also help make the case for research, assist in articulating the contribution that public management can make in all overseas developmental activity, and serve generally as a spokesman for other long-neglected and needed components of successful international developmental activity in public service management.

Optimism a Concluding Note

In discussing needs to strengthen AID-university capability to meet the technical assistance problems in administration of developing nations, the stresses and weaknesses of this relationship obviously come into play. It is important to remember, however, that the organizational affinity between AID and the universities is deep and only of the kind developed by substantial commonality in goals over a long period of time.

Beyond the strength of this affinity are other factors that augur well for both continuity and developing capability of the two entities to work together. One of these is that the importance of the role of each in

developmental work is daily becoming better understood, both within AID and the universities, by their respective constituencies, associated organizations, and the public generally. Such understanding has been accompanied by acceptance of another kind. In spite of many failures, there has also been visible progress resulting from AID-university public administration technical assistance endeavors, a conclusion that has to be acknowledged both here and in the host countries. Moreover, from these strengths of knowing that a job needs to be done and often has been done reasonably well comes the kind of confidence essential to self-criticism and experimentation.

These factors provide a solid base for AID-university relationships. That such a base is in being is no mean achievement. Discouragement in the face of its existence becomes increasingly difficult, and optimism increasingly easy that AID and the universities will become ever closer, stronger, and more effective collaborators in meeting the public administration needs of developing nations.

Footnotes--Conference Summary and Recommendations

(a) A restatement of the Conference objective noted earlier (Section I, page 2) with the exception that the Conference was designed to, and did, include coverage of other government agencies and private foundations as well as AID. But because of the overwhelming dominance of the Agency's activity in United States overseas technical assistance work and for economy of words, reference to AID in Conference discussion was commonly generic to include the work of other U. S.-based instrumentalities as well as AID--those a part of the federal establishment and private foundations with interests kindred to those of AID. It is so used here and will be throughout the following pages of this report unless specific references are to the contrary.

(b) Had this increase in instrumentalities involved all been "players on our team" the change might still be chalked up as a net increment. But some of the possible gains have been offset by the fact that similar developments have been a part of other national efforts with goals often in contention with those pursued by U. S. interests.

(c) John W. Gardner, A.I.D. and The Universities, Agency for International Development, Washington, D. C., 1964.

(d) President Johnson has espoused this view in a number of contexts, particularly in conjunction with announcement of new executive department appointments. Other evidences of this concern are reflected in executive and congressional activity flowing from his Princeton University speech May 11, 1966, in which he outlined a program for public service education and training, largely through universities. In terms of the present discussion, one bit of irony is that Mr. Johnson, who has probably done more in behalf of public service administration than any President since Wilson, did not with specific reference to AID in the "presidential iniative fields" include references to management along with priority goals in agriculture, education, and health.

(e) John F. Hilliard, "A Perspective on Institutional Development" p. 1. A Ford Foundation reprint from Universities and Development Assistance Abroad, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C. 1967.

(f) For example, AID has obligated to public administration programs only $182 million in the last ten years. See G. W. Lawson, Jr., "The Problems We Face," p. 1., a conference paper included in Section III of this report.

(g) For the record it should be noted that both universities and AID have conducted some research, and some of it has been of a very high caliber. But the essential point of this brief--that research has never been on the scale, of the imaginative quality, or integrated into AID and university activities to the extent circumstances warrant--is unshakable.

(h) A similarly productive relationship between government and the universities, and of longer standing, has been in agriculture. Here lessons learned may have even greater application than in science because of the close relationship of many AID-university endeavors to agricultural development.

(i) Perhaps it is well to note again that references to "the universities" are made in full knowledge that U. S. universities vary widely and that recommendations could not and do not equally apply to all. It should also be remembered that references to AID for the most part constitute simply a matter of editorial convenience, unless otherwise noted, since what is said usually has equal validity for overseas public administration development activities conducted by other government agencies, private foundations, etc.

(j) For a full and persuasive statement of the case for university involvement in overseas development administration see The Professional School and World Affairs: Report of the Task Force on Business and Public Administration, Education and World Affairs, New York, 1967.

(k) Included in the sum are faculty and related support (secretarial assistance, travel, communications, etc.), student fellowships, and other direct and indirect costs such as physical facilities and equipment, library, and central administrative services. A university enterprise of lesser scale can seldom mount the teaching, research, consultation, and other activities needed to design and launch a meaningful overseas development administration program nor can it assure the qualities of continuity and innovation integral to its successful completion.

(l) In this connection it is interesting to note that at the present time AID does not have any program or function centrally located or otherwise available to all throughout the Agency called "public administration," let alone a focal point so named adequate to the needs of its own development administration programs and those it sponsors in conjunction with universities.

(m) Related academic needs for which AID should seek to provide a better environment are training opportunities for graduate students and combining overseas experiences with thesis preparation.

(n) Especially by the ASPA sponsored Comparative Administration Group.

(o) Having a voice in the planning process will also help assure that the recipient country "gets what it wants" as well as what we have to send or want to send.

(p) Proposals akin to the "consultative council" idea have been made in a number of places, but genesis of the version outlined here was set forth earliest and most fully in a 1961 memorandum prepared by Jack Koteen and Donald C. Stone, included in Section IV of this report.

CONTRIBUTORS TO PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Steering Committee

CURTIS H. BARKER, Special Assistant, Office of University Relations, Office of Technical Cooperation and Research, Agency for International Development

FERREL HEADY, Director, Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan, (currently Academic Vice President, University of New Mexico)

G. W. LAWSON, Jr., Public Administration Advisor, Office of Technical Cooperation and Research, Agency for International Development

HENRY REINING, Jr., Dean, School of Public Administration, University of Southern California

RALPH H. SMUCKLER, Associate Dean, International Programs, Michigan State University

DONALD C. STONE, Dean, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh

THOMAS W. THORSON, Acting Chief, Public Services Division, Office of Institutional Development, Bureau for Africa, Agency for International Development

Conference Participants

JAMES M. MITCHELL, Chairman
Director, Advanced Study Program, Brookings Institution

JOSE ABUEVA, Visiting Professor, Department of Political Science, Brooklyn College of the City University of New York

STEPHEN K. BAILEY, Dean, Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University

CURTIS H. BARKER, Special Assistant, Office of University Relations, Office of Technical Cooperation and Research, Agency for International Development

HERMAN BERNHOLZ, Chief, Bureau for Near East and South Asia, Office of Technical Support, Public Administration Branch, Agency for International Development*

DAVID S. BROWN, Professor of Public Administration, George Washington University

SHELTON GRANGER, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Programs, Department of Health, Education and Welfare

FERREL HEADY, Director, Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan, (currently Academic Vice President, University of New Mexico)

JAMES J. HEAPHEY, Associate Professor of Public Administration, Graduate School of Public Affairs, State University of New York

RICHARD A HUMPHREY, Director, Commission on International Education, American Council on Education

JACK KOTEEN, Assistant Chief, Planning Assistance Division, Office of Program Coordination, Agency for International Development

G. W. LAWSON, Jr., Public Administration Advisor, Office of Technical Cooperation and Research, Agency for International Development

LLOYD D. MUSOLF, Director, Institute of Governmental Affairs, University of California at Davis

RAYMOND RANDALL, Chief, Institutional and Social Development Staff, Office of Technical Cooperation and Research, Agency for International Development

HENRY REINING, Jr., Dean, School of Public Administration, University of Southern California

ANDREW E. RICE, Executive Secretary, Society for International Development

FRED W. RIGGS, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California

---

* Observer

LOUIS A. ROUSE, Chief, Bureau for Latin America, Office of Institutional Development, Development Administration Division, Agency for International Development*

CARROLL K. SHAW, Institutional Development Advisor, Technical Advisory Staff, Bureau for the Far East, Agency for International Development

RALPH H. SMUCKLER, Associate Dean, International Programs, Michigan State University

DUVAL STOAKS, Chief, Technical Advisory Staff, Public Administration Branch, Agency for International Development*

DONALD C. STONE, Dean, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh

THOMAS W. THORSEN, Acting Chief, Public Services Division, Office of Institutional Development, Bureau for Africa, Agency for International Development

BEATRICE MARQUEZ DE SOUZA WAHRLICH, Directora, Escuela Brasileira de Administracao Publica, Fundacao Getulion Vargas, Rio de Janeiro

EDWARD W. WEIDNER, Director, Center for Developmental Change, University of Kentucky, (currently Chancellor, University of Wisconsin at Green Bay)

CHI-YEN WU, Senior Deputy Director and Head, Public Administration Branch, Bureau of Technical Assistance Operations, United Nations

WILLIAM H. YOUNG, Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin

---

* Observer

Documentary Materials

DON L. BOWEN, Executive Director, American Society for Public Administration

FERREL HEADY, Director, Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan, (currently Academic Vice President, University of New Mexico)

JAMES J. HEAPHEY, Associate Professor of Public Administration, Graduate School of Public Affairs, State University of New York

JACK KOTEEN, Assistant Chief, Planning Assistance Division, Office of Program Coordination, Agency for International Development

G. W. LAWSON, Jr., Public Administration Advisor, Office of Technical Cooperation and Research, Agency for International Development

RAY D. PETHTEL, Director of Administration, American Society for Public Administration

HENRY REINING, Jr., Dean, School of Public Administration, University of Southern California

FRED W. RIGGS, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford California

CARROLL K. SHAW, Institutional Development Advisor, Technical Advisory Staff, Bureau for the Far East, Agency for International Development

RALPH H. SMUCKLER, Associate Dean, International Programs, Michigan State University

DONALD C. STONE, Dean, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh

EDWARD W. WEIDNER, Director, Center for Developmental Change, University of Kentucky, (currently Chancellor, University of Wisconsin at Green Bay)