

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20523
BIBLIOGRAPHIC INPUT SHEET

FOR AID USE ONLY

Batch 72

1. SUBJECT
CLASSI-
FICATION

A. PRIMARY

Development and economics

DC00-0000-0000

B. SECONDARY

Development assistance

2. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

The application of the institution building model, an overview of IB programs

3. AUTHOR(S)

Axinn, G.H.

4. DOCUMENT DATE

1970

5. NUMBER OF PAGES

17p.

6. ARC NUMBER

ARC

7. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS

MUCIA

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

(Presented at annual meeting of Rural Sociology Soc., Washington, D.C., 1970)

9. ABSTRACT

10. CONTROL NUMBER

PN-RAB-720

11. PRICE OF DOCUMENT

12. DESCRIPTORS

Application
Institution building
Models

Projects
Technical assistance

13. PROJECT NUMBER

14. CONTRACT NUMBER
CSD-2958 211(d)

15. TYPE OF DOCUMENT

~~AMM~~ J. Green 5

CSD-2958 211(d)

MUCIA

**THE APPLICATION OF THE INSTITUTION BUILDING MODEL:
AN OVERVIEW OF IB PROGRAMS**

**Dr. George H. Axinn, President and Executive Director
Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities, Inc.
and Professor, Michigan State University**

**Paper to be presented at a Special Session on Institution Building Abroad
at the annual meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, Washington, D.C.,
August 28, 1970, 1:15 p.m. at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C.**

**THE APPLICATION OF THE INSTITUTION BUILDING MODEL:
AN OVERVIEW OF IB PROGRAMS**

Dr. George H. Axinn

One of the crucial aspects of planned social change is the necessity for institutionalizing innovations. In the context of international development, this has come to mean that besides the introduction of new technology, innovations which persist are typically supported by the creation of formal organizations. These need to be technically capable of performing or supporting the new function. Examples include extension services, universities, family planning clinics, and research institutes.

In addition, institutionalization implies that the new organization establishes itself in its environment in such a way that it will obtain support from and exchange services with its environment, and thus achieve the capacity to persist and to maintain its innovative activities.

We may define "institution-building" as the process of developing new agencies or reconstituting existing organizations or agencies, equipped to plan, or to execute programs in the area of economic and social development. The Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities, with which I am intimately involved, has focused its concentration in developing countries, and includes the functions and processes of the institution as well as the linkages of the institution to the broader system of performance. But institution building is going on wherever there are social systems, and fruitful opportunities for institution building research exist in rural America, in the inner city, in modern Europe, and elsewhere.

In that sense, it is a special case of institution building with which I find myself most concerned. That is, institution building, or institution development, which is one aspect of technical assistance, which, in turn, is one type of international development assistance.

There are other kinds of international development assistance, and there are institution development activities in other contexts--but our focus lies in the area where institutional development, technical assistance, and international development overlap.

We are particularly concerned with the processes and their effects in this area of overlap--the process of institutional development as an aspect of the process of technical assistance when viewed in its international development context.

The institution building model is a set of concepts. It is a collection of categories, developed for their usefulness. It grew out of a long history of human social evolution; out of the contemporary wisdom of the behavioral sciences; out of the fertile mind of Professor Milton Esman,^{1/} and many of his colleagues and contemporaries. It is an invention of thinking men who wanted to understand certain phenomena better, exchange ideas, and accumulate experience, and enhance our ability to manipulate improvement in the human condition.

The categories...concepts like leadership, doctrine, and linkage...are nothing magic or ultimate. They are like other category systems invented by scholars. They may be useful aids to thinking. With them, we can build hypotheses, test them, and develop principles. These principles, in turn, can be useful guides to action.

With most category systems, the categories are governed more by the knowledge, discipline, and insight of those who invented them than by the nature of the world.

So it is with the categories in the institution building model. The previous speakers have discussed the concepts, the model, and the theory. Others have testified as to their value and usefulness. And, they have been applied and field tested in the world-wide crucible of reality.

Later, I will illustrate with examples from recent research in which the concepts of this model provide blueprints for the scholars. But first, a bit of history.

In one sense, the concept of institutionality has been the property of sociologists for many years. And rural sociologists, in particular, have concentrated on the study of the diffusion of technological innovation. In another sense, however, a new thrust has developed recently within the social sciences. Between 1964 and 1968, thirty-eight (38) individual research projects were designed specifically to test the model of institution building which has just been described by Dr. Katz and Dr. Siffin.

These studies were supported by the Inter-University Research Program in Institution Building, IRPIB, which is a partnership among scholars then at Indiana University, Michigan State University, the University of Pittsburgh, and Syracuse University. This group, in turn, was supported by the Ford Foundation and by the Agency for International Development.^{2/}

Independently at first, and then with increasing collaboration, another series of studies of the U.S. technical assistance efforts to build agricultural institutions around the world was sponsored by the Agency for International Development. Known as the CIC/AID studies, these have been summarized in a volume entitled, "Building Institutions to Serve Agriculture."^{3/} Although they started out with a primary focus on the effectiveness of U.S. technical assistance, they became more and more enmeshed in the institution building matrix as they went along. The series of seminars, conferences, and workshops which have followed the CIC/AID studies have incorporated the name institution building.

This past year there were conferences on institution building and technical assistance in Washington for AID officials; in Rome for FAO staff; at Purdue and

Utah State Universities for university personnel and others; and in Indonesia for personnel from that country's Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Education, and the Faculties of Agriculture. There have probably been other workshops around the world on this topic during the past year as well.

Next month, a traveling Asian Agricultural College and University Seminar will build a program around the institution building concepts, and take officials from 14 different countries on visits to growing institutions in three different Asian nations.

One could put all of this in the context of U.S. and other efforts at international technical assistance. As the Task Force on International Development Assistance and International Education of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges reported in January, 1969,^{4/} "After two decades of experience--with much trial and some error--we are beginning to understand what needs to be done to make international development assistance more effective and more efficient.

"Just as the automobiles, airplanes, radios, and highway systems of the 1940s have become obsolete, and we have learned to build better versions, so our developmental assistance operations have been evolving. New models have replaced old ones, and we are learning how to put together programs which will have greater impact, and more long-run effectiveness, and which may even cost less. Our successes and our failures deserve thorough study; the results should guide our planning for the future."

That report goes on to point out that "experience has demonstrated that the myth that Americans had the 'know-how' to solve all the world's problems" misled us. The assumption that we had unlimited resources, human and material, that could be widely scattered, built false hopes that could not be realized. Too often, the formulation of our foreign aid and technical assistance measures

was a hasty response to cold war competition for host country favor. Failures resulting from faulty objectives and programs produced disappointments, frustrations, and antagonisms both at home and abroad.

That Task Force came to the conclusion that "the building of enduring institutions is a long-term proposition and is fundamental to success of our developmental assistance policy."

The time when "experts" could travel willy-nilly around the world, spreading technology, appears to be over. There is a growing realization of the need to approach this process in a professional and scholarly way. And thus the willingness to sponsor research in the process of technical assistance and institution building--and the increasing demand for extension of the findings of such scholarship among the practitioners around the world.

In the field of practice, there is much activity. The U.S. Agency for International Development was engaged in 114 different contracts with American universities for various kinds of technical assistance abroad last year. The Ford Foundation had made a similar number of grants to universities for such work. International agencies ranging from the World Bank to UNESCO and FAO are involved in similar efforts in the so-called developing nations. And many Western European governments and universities are also operating in this area.

Much of our effort at technical assistance and institution development in the last two decades was based on the assumption of U.S. tutelage...on the assumption that the proper role for "developed" and "senior" U.S. universities and research institutions was to assist in the growth of the "less-developed" and "junior" institutions abroad. Whatever its validity in the 50s and the 60s, this assumption cannot be considered valid for the 1970s. We have entered the era of full partnership between U.S. institutions and their sister institutions abroad. The viable relationship for the next few decades will be one of linkage between equals.

Thus the need, and our attention, might well shift from the building of institutions, at home and abroad, to the building of the linkages between these institutions.

And this brings us back to the application of the institution building model.

Most technical assistance programs involve or ought to involve a significant institution-development effort, if they are to have any permanent value. Institution development programs touch upon most of the non-economic questions that arise in technical assistance. Institution development is a strongly operational and interdisciplinary combination involving the contributions of such professional fields as agriculture, business administration, education, engineering, etc., as well as social sciences, particularly political science and public administration, sociology, anthropology, communication, and psychology.

At the present time, the institution building theoretical framework could best be characterized as an heuristic scheme which identifies some crucial variables, suggests some interesting relationships, challenges some of the conventional wisdom, and which may lead to some significant hypotheses. It is not a theory on the basis of which one can explain institution development. More important, given the needs of those responsible for developing technical assistance programs, the scheme provides no prescriptive statements nor can prescriptive statements be deduced from it. In other words, it tells one very little about how to go about building an effective institution, given certain objectives and a knowledge of values, attitudes, social structure, and culture of the place where the institution is to be built. While it has a social engineering bias, it has very little to tell social engineers.

However, the set of categories which has been developed by scholars in the field offers a conceptual framework which does provide a base for continued research. It also provides useful categories to the practitioner in institution

development who wishes to take into account these critical variables. And, the technical assistance agency which is attempting to evaluate the effectiveness of institutional development efforts can utilize the already existing categories as a beginning base. For example, in looking at a new institution in a developing country, one can ask questions about its leadership, its doctrine, its internal structure, and its resources, and the linkages it has developed in its environment. This will help in assessing the extent to which it is likely to persist and be effective as a permanent institution. But the present state of knowledge does not afford the ability to predict the consequences of alternative actions taken in the present situation.

We thus have a beginning--a foundation on which we can build in order to develop a deductively powerful theory on the basis of which one can account for successes and failures in institution development. From this theory and supporting empirical data, one might develop prescriptive statements that will be realistic guides for decision makers.

Systematically moving from an heuristic scheme toward a deductively powerful theory with a clear-cut prescriptive implication is the major research goal which the MUCIA Consortium has set for itself. Others are invited to participate. This shall strengthen the capacity of the United States and others to carry on technical assistance abroad, particularly where institution development is involved.

Two shortcomings of the present institution building scheme illustrate the need for continued study. First, because it concentrates attention almost exclusively on the building of formal institutions (organizations), it provides little guidance to help answer the question of what institutions to build. The two problems must be handled with the same intellectual framework, because estimates of the way in which existing structures and values impose constraints on the building of any specific institution will affect decisions on what kind of

institutions to build. Second, because new technology is not an immitable perimeter and because in a number of instances it is possible to modify technology in order to make the problems of adaptation easier, the framework should include technology as a significant variable.^{5/}

There are other opportunities, as well. The time dimension needs further study. McDermott, Rigney, and Haws^{6/} got into this when they described phases and stages in the technical assistance--institution building process as part of the CIC/AID study. But we lack "if-then" propositions with respect to variables affecting speed and pace of institutional development.

I have an hypotheses, for example, that institution development effort tends to be punctuated by a series of crises. Some crises are more severe than others, and the crises are intermittent, rather than continuous. By measuring the severity of each crisis, and the time space between crises, one can make predictions regarding institutionality. In its simplest form--the longer the crisis internode, and the lesser the severity of the crisis, the further along is the process of institutionalization.

Martin Landau^{7/} has pointed out that "as a system develops, it tends to become specialized: its parts assume definite structures and functions.

"As a system develops, it tends toward centralization: differentiated structures and specialized functions become subject to essential control which operates to integrate the various behaviors in the system. And, the organizational form of a living system tends toward hierarchy: its value structures and functions are arranged in terms of levels, the higher levels comprehending the lower."

From a systematic viewpoint, then, Landau suggests that standards of development could be constructed in terms of the rate and extent of differentiation, specialization, and integration, which are the properties of complexity. Much additional research could be done in this area.

Landau has also contrasted formal complex organizations, which tend to be the goals of institution building work, with intermediate organizations. The latter tend to have fewer and simpler linkage arrangements and less complicated structure. Thus he emphasizes: "When stable intermediate entities are the bases of complex organizations, they provide protection against disintegration. When such organizations are overwhelmed, they are not necessarily annihilated: They are more likely to break down into their major subassemblies--which not only continue to function but provide the basis for reconstitution." The concept of the intermediate organization is another area where research potential looks promising.

An overview of institution building research reveals much progress to date. John Hanson of Michigan State University, who, after several years as a technical assistance practitioner in Nigeria, conducted one of the AID-sponsored studies utilizing the institution building model, came to this conclusion: "If I were to attempt any amateurish assessment of the usefulness of the conceptual framework in analyzing institution-building overall, I would point out that even in its current rough shape, the schema provide a series of lenses with which to examine a phenomenon. Many are found in particularly sharp focus, albeit they were crudely ground and still unpolished."^{8/}

Eugene Jacobson, also of Michigan State University, made an intensive review of four of the case studies designed to utilize the model. He came to the conclusion that the "idiosyncratic characteristics of each of the institution building projects can be recognized readily even though the basic analytical concepts are the same. Each of the authors was able to use the concept to enrich his account of the process, without forcing his analysis into a stereotyped form. And each of the reports suggests extensions and elaborations of the original conceptual framework."^{9/}

Jiri Nehnevajsa^{10/} of the University of Pittsburgh found that institution-
alization could be measured. He used three criteria: (1) an organization's
ability to survive; (2) the extent to which an innovative organization comes to
be viewed by its environment to have intrinsic values, to be measured operationally
by such indices as its degree of autonomy and its influence on other institutions;
(3) the extent to which an innovative pattern in a new organization becomes nor-
mative for other social units in the larger social system.

Guthrie Birkhead of Syracuse University studied the Public Administration
Institute for Turkey and the Middle East, which was launched at the University of
Ankara in 1953.^{11/} He reviewed its activities over a 14-year period in which it
trained and educated civil servants, supported research, issued publications, and
participated in government and university-related functions.

Bill Siffin,^{12/} then at Indiana University, analyzed the institution
building process at the Institute of Public Administration at Thammasat Univer-
sity in Bangkok, Thailand, which ICA supported through Indiana University beginning
in 1955. In that study, he examined in detail the doctrinal commitments of the
staff of the institute, and in part, that of the leadership, illustrating the
tensions and conflicts that accompanied the intent of some of the members of the
staff to move from traditional to innovative administrative patterns.

In another study, Hans Blaise^{13/} of Pittsburgh University studied the
Central University of Quito, Ecuador. His report is concerned with the inter-
action between efforts of the technical assistance teams to encourage education-
alization and the massive intervention of environmental events and circumstances.

The field has largely been analytical and descriptive. Material now exists
for comparative research, and such scholarship is greatly needed.

If one compares the findings of one of these studies with others--for
example, comparing Siffin's work with that of Donald A. Taylor^{14/} of Michigan
State University, who studied institution building and business administration

in Brazil, and that of Birkhead in Turkey and the Middle East, one might develop such propositions as: "Resident and stable leadership can more easily command resources for a new program and develop strong enabling linkages with other institutions in any society than absentee and changing leadership."

David Derge^{15/} and others at Indiana University, working as part of the CIC/AID study, developed a linkage matrix. Across the top were the linkage variables. Down the side were the institutional variables.

From all this one can infer that the institution building model is being applied. I believe it has demonstrated itself to be a highly useful analytical tool. A good beginning has been made in accumulating descriptive data. Much more research is needed in moving from analysis to comparison, in generating a more complete set of "if-then" propositions, in testing these through experimental approaches, and in contributing to theoretical development.

#

Footnotes

1. Milton J. Esman and Hans C. Blaise, Institution-Building Research--The Guiding Concept, Inter-University Research Program in Institution-Building, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, mimeo., 1966; and Milton J. Esman, Institution-Building as a Guide to Action, AID/CIC Conference on Institution Building and Technical Assistance, Washington, D.C., December 4-5, 1969.
2. Report to the Ford Foundation, Inter-University Research Program in Institution Building, Research Headquarters, University of Pittsburgh, 1968.
3. Building Institutions to Serve Agriculture, a Summary Report of the CIC-AID Rural Development Research Project, Committee on Institutional Cooperation, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, October, 1968.
4. International Development Assistance; A statement by the Task Force on International Development Assistance and International Education, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, January, 1969.
5. William J. Siffin, "The Institution-Building Perspective: Properties, Problems, Promise," and several other mimeograph papers.

6. J. K. McDermott, J. A. Rigney, and Austin Haws, "A Conceptualization of the Technical Assistance-Institution Building Process." One portion of the Final Report of the CIC-AID Rural Development Research Project, Purdue University, June 30, 1968.
7. Martin Landau, "On the Use of Functional Analysis in American Political Science," Social Research, Vol. 25 (1968).
8. John W. Hanson, The College of Education, Nsukka: A Study of Institutionalization, 1966, 639 pp., mimeograph, Michigan State University.
9. Eugene Jacobson, Research and Institution Building: Lessons from the Field; paper presented to the CIC/AID Conference on Institution Building Overseas, French Lick, Indiana, August, 1968.
10. Jiri Nehnevajsa, Methodological Issues in Institution Building Research, mimeograph, Institution Building Headquarters, University of Pittsburgh, 1964.
11. Guthrie S. Birkhead, Institutionalization at a Modest Level: Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East, 1967, 126 pp., mimeograph, Syracuse University.
12. Williem J. Siffin, The Thai Institute of Public Administration: A Case Study in Institution Building, 1967, 275 pp., mimeograph, Indiana University.
13. Hans C. Blaise and Luis A. Rodriguez, Introducing Innovation at Ecuadorean Universities, Inter-University Research Program in Institution Building, GSPIA, University of Pittsburgh, 1968, 135 pp., mimeograph.
14. Donald A. Taylor, Institution Building in Business Administration, The Brazilian Experience, East Lansing, Michigan, Institute for International Business and Economic Development Studies, Graduate School of Business Administration, Michigan State University, 1968.
15. David R. Derge and others, Institution Building and Rural Development: A Study of U.S. Technical Assistance Projects, Indiana University, 1968.