
UNIT 2 MODELS OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Structures

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Aims of Development Administration
- 2.3 Conditions of Development
- 2.4 Edward W. Weidner's Models
 - 2.4.1 The Review of Models
 - 2.4.2 Evaluation of Models
- 2.5 F.W. Riggs's Model
- 2.6 Activity
- 2.7 Conclusion
- 2.8 References and Further Readings

2.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this unit, the learner shall be able to:

- Understand the aims of development administration;
- Identify the conditions of development; and
- Understand the models of Edward Weidner and F.W. Riggs.

2.1 INTRODUCTION

In the first unit, the concept, nature, scope and significance of development administration has been discussed. It has been analysed that development administration is a process of action motivated by and oriented to the achievement of progressive goals of development. It aims at creating and/or mobilising the will and skills to utilise in an optimum manner the resources of the country leading to the realisation of development objectives. Thus, development administration is a process of planned change.

The administration is being studied now a day in the contextual perspective. Comparative analysis of the administrative system in terms of organisation, administration and development management brings out two distinct elements of administration: (i) Administrative reforms are improvements that each nation has been trying so as to match administration with development needs; and (ii) Concentration of efforts at acceleration of rate of growth and change so as to meet the challenges of socio-political development and nation-building effectively. It is in this context that the concept of development administration has been used. However, the concept has varied dimensions – social, cultural, economic and political. The issue regarding the focus or scope of development administration as a discipline and as a process has been discussed in the earlier unit. In this unit, the focus of discussion is on the models of development administration given by two noted scholars of development administration namely Edward W. Weidner and Fred W. Riggs.

2.2 AIMS OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Before we discuss the models of development administration, let us highlight some of the essential aims of development administration. These include modernisation, socio-economic development, institution building and creation of an integrated political community. The societal change in the direction of modernity is the crux of development administration. The direction of modernity does not mean transformation of a traditional society into a modern western society. Its focus is essentially on indigenous development, which is sustainable and which meets the basic needs of the people. Its aim is to bring about planned change to meet the nation's broad economic, social, political and cultural objectives. It is concerned with the establishment of social justice through equitable distribution of social and economic benefits among the various social groups in society. Development administration focuses on modern techniques, both social and technical, in the pursuit of developmental objectives. Its aim is to promote economic growth by industrialisation. There is, thus, a close relationship between economic growth and development administration. Development administration is also concerned with political development, which includes – equality, the capacity of the political system to produce according to demands, and differentiation of governmental roles and organisations in the process of meeting these challenges. Development administration attempts to bring about changes in the values and attitudes of people, which differ from the existing ones and are supportive of the developmental activities. Development administration requires administrative modernisation, that is, creation of new administrative structures and reorientation of the existing ones to suit the needs of developmental programmes. Finally, development administration concerns itself with the creation of an integrated political community. Thus, development administration aims at transforming an entire society, with political, economic, social and administrative elements intermeshed for purposes of change.

2.3 CONDITIONS OF DEVELOPMENT

In spite of intensive activity in development administration, there is no unanimity among the scholars about the meaning of the term 'development administration'. As we see, more attention is given to the word 'development' than to the word 'administration'. According to Edward W. Weidner, one group of scholars has equated development with growth where as second group equated it with system change. A third group of scholars has clubbed it up with goal orientation, especially modernity or nation building and socio-economic progress. Apart from these three views, there is also a popular approach to development, which equates it with planned change.

Discussion on development has come from many sources outside the confines of development, for example, from those interested in economic, educational or agricultural aspects of development. According to Weidner, ultimately, the discussion emphasises three major facets of change pertinent to the student of development administration. We will be discussing the three major facets in the succeeding text.

According to Edward W. Weidner, first, we have to make a distinction between change in output of a system and change in the system itself. Coming to the changes in output of a system, these are in the direction of greater quantity then they are labelled as growth, if they are in reverse diversion then they are labelled as lack of growth or decline. Here, we have to look into one important aspect, that is, what is growth from one point of view may be decline from another. For example,

the growth in income of one business may not necessarily result in a decline in another. The important aspects of growth are the rate or time period, its extent, and who and what it concerns.

A group of scholars has seen the change in the system itself, as a change in the social system, and specifically change in the administrative system of a developing country. Riggs, Diamant and Eisenstadt are among the members of this group who have come with two similar formulations. Riggs has given the first formulation. He has emphasised on differentiation plus coordination as system characteristics that represent the essence of development. Whereas Diamant and Eisenstadt, who have come up with second formulation, are of view that system capability in handling change is the essential attribute. Both formulations are following different ways to say the same thing. In Riggsian formulation, differentiation plus coordination equals capacity whereas in Diamant and Eisenstadt's formulation, capability in handling change requires differentiated and centralised systems. Both the formulations show that in neither case is output invariably related to system capacity or differentiation. In the process capacity can be merely potential and unused. Of course, growth can occur without alterations in capacity or differentiations within limits.

Taking formulations into consideration four possibilities emerge, such as growth with system change, growth without system change, lack of growth (or decline) with system change, and lack of growth (or decline) with no system change.

As per Edward W. Weidner, a second distinction has been drawn among the different goals or outputs of an administrative system. No two societies, perhaps no two persons or groups have identical goals or emphases. Modernity is a cluster of values that are vividly sought by less developed societies and also most developed societies. As the term modernity is all inclusive but there is unanimity among the leaders of developing countries in the use of term modernity, thus, in common usage of the term, a rapidly developing country is a goal oriented country headed in the direction of modernity, with special emphases on nation-building and socio-economic progress.

Coming to the defining of development, a complete description of development process would be growth, whether under conditions of system change or not, in the direction of modernity and particularly in the direction of nation-building and socio-economic progress. Now we can come to a reasonable hypothesis that in order for growth to proceed in this direction, system change in form of increase in differentiation and coordination, together with appropriate accompanying specialisation would be required. In a nutshell, differentiation and coordination would be development – related to the extent that they lead to accomplishments of these goals.

Development is manipulative and those engaged in development work are consciously trying to bring about change in a particular duration, is the third distinction drawn by Weidner. Human beings can affect the environment in which he/she is a part of and as well be affected by it, is a commonly understood assumption, but this is rejected in favour of a reciprocal view. Riggs and Lee have compared an environmental approach with an ecological one to bring about the major change in a society, environmental factors in general and cultural factors in particular. The countries, which are committed to change, give highest priority to goals, which brings changes in culture and environment. The study of development administration proceeds on the assumption that the selection of goals in planning for national development is that achievement of modernity in general and people through one way or the other in particular can promote nation-building and socio-

economic progress. Now, we understand that it is entirely possible that some growth in the direction of modernity or nation-building and socio-economic progress can come about without being specifically planned or even intended. But for extensive progress towards achievement of these goals, it is likely to require major system change besides being true that major development on a large scale will be planned at least to that extent of encouraging environmental factors favourable to unplanned development.

The experience of less developed societies is that many accomplishments of their governments are clearly not planned or even intended. And the underlined motivations for actions are normally very diverse and or by no means exclusively developmental or anti-developmental. Therefore, it would be unduly restrictive to attribute to any government or bureaucracy complete rationality and singleness or duality of purpose. According to Lee, there are almost no occasions when both the power and task elites, much less the bureaucracy, or developmentalists-minded, are oriented in the direction of development. According to Landau, “decision making involves both facts and values, or there may be ignorance of the one, disagreement concerning the other, and avoidance of the consequences of either. So some change is planned, other change is largely unplanned. It is observed that even within the area of planned change, there are intended and unintended aspects to the results and some planned change may result in more modernity quite accidentally”.

One of the necessary tasks for development administration is identification of the circumstances under which modernity or nation-building and socio-economic progress take place. Several sets of conditions are possible, using directional growth, system change, and planned or intended change as varying elements. Now, we will examine the each set of conditions, which Edward W. Weidner has formulated them into eight developmental models.

2.4 EDWARD W. WEIDNER’S MODELS

Edward W. Weidner, a noted scholar of development administration has formulated eight development models on the basis of directional growth, system change and planning. We will be discussing the models.

(i) The Ideal: Planned Directional Growth with System Change

Edward W. Weidner has viewed this model from an idealistic point, where development is visualised as a continuous process. The plans are formulated for growth in the direction of modernity or nation-building and socio-economic progress. To realise this growth, programmes are worked up and implemented with system change. Differentiation and coordination are brought about necessarily to ensure goal accomplishment. In this context, most of the less developed countries have set up Planning Commissions, which reflect the view of development process. It has been felt that this ideal set of conditions of planning, system change, and growth does not often evidence itself. Mainly due to: (i) the ability of any political and administrative system to go in for directional growth and system change is severely restricted; and (ii) the ability of administrative system to carry out a planned programme of major change is often severely limited.

Further, Weidner explains that successful innovation in an administrative setting is not easily accomplished. All the countries of South-East Asia have formulated five-year plans and majority of these plans have been a complete failure in practice, of courses, the prominent reason for this is inadequate administrative system.

(ii) The Short-run Payoff: Planned Directional Growth with No System Change

In this model the less developed countries, which face difficulty in introducing major system changes have made many leaders of these countries to explore the possibility of maximising development within the limitations of the present system. Weidner held the view that the positive attraction to this strategy is its having maximum payoff in the short run, in the terms of consumption or in terms of nation-building and socio-economic progress. The scholar in Weidner has found four circumstances in which this model is adopted: (i) where the leadership of a country is not revolutionary and represents a balancing of forces, short-range results are appealing; (ii) if there is little technical assistance or foreign aid or if such assistance or aid is obtainable without major strings attached, planned directional growth with no system change is attractive; (iii) where the country's leadership is experiencing political trouble, but there is a desire for stabilisation; and (iv) in countries where there is a demand to show results or an emphasis on consumption, the short-run payoff is frequently followed. In all four cases they must be committed to idea of development and this commitment should reflect in carefully laid down plans, suitable goals and appropriate execution. "An example of this model is the promotion of native arts and crafts, such as the cottage industry programmes in India and Pakistan. These programmes were adopted as a part of the plans. They did not disturb the economic or social structures in turn they realised economic gains for the country's concern and peasants or other participants. These gains have been small" (Weidner, 1970). This is often true of the short run payoff strategy; the returns are relatively limited because the basic system remains intact.

Planned developmental growth within limitations of present systems does not mean that the amount of differentiation cannot be increased in any way or the level of coordination can't be raised, but it is a matter of degree. This provides leaders with a tremendous range of possibilities. This can be made possible through – the creation of in-service training unit in the personnel agency of the government, subdividing an existing bureau of a rather unimportant agency, by adding additional units to a branch of an agency, which could enhance the authority of its chief. All these moves are in the direction of differentiation and ultimately require new or supplementary mechanism for coordination.

Apart from it, changes internal to an agency headed by an innovator that do not involve major system changes can be made rather rapidly and easily. In contrast, the minister or department head who tries to establish fundamentally new rules for the administrative system over which he/she presides finds many impediments in his/her path. By above discussion it is evident that substantial growth in output, even impressive growth, can be brought about with no or minor changes in administrative system, but there are points beyond which such increases in output cannot grow.

(iii) The Long-run Payoff: Planned System change with No Directional Growth

In this model, Weidner says that there will be planned system change with no directional growth. Growth is the direction of modernity or nation-building and socio-economic progress, which is a common short run occurrence, and may also obtain over relatively long periods of time. According to him, system change does not necessarily result in growth; in turn it may have an adverse effect on growth. He has given examples of land reforms that have resulted in lower agricultural production.

Edward W. Weidner feels that political and administrative systems themselves are objects of values. He uses Esman's classification of regimes such as conservative oligarchies, competitive interested-oriented party systems, dominant mass party system, authoritarian military reform regimes and communist totalitarian regimes are political systems that vary widely in regard to differentiation and co-ordination. According to Esman, each system has distinctive consequences or implications for administration and each has its vigorous champions, individuals and groups who highly value the system that is the systems pattern of differentiation and coordination.

(iv) Failure: Planning with No Growth or System change

In this model Weidner discusses planning with no growth or system change. In 1965, a group of Asian and American Economists came to the conclusion that development planning had not been much success. The reasons they cited were – economic growth had not been accelerated, apparent growth was barely adequate to cover population increase and inflation.

Weidner gives an excellent illustration of a budget reform to prove that it is difficult in determining failure in regard to growth with or without major system change. According to the budget reform in Vietnam in the fifties, the budget function was removed from the Ministry of Finance and foreign aid from the Ministry of Public Works. In the place of these ministries, a Central Budget Agency was established and highly innovative director was recruited from civil services. He changed the internal administration of the budget agency. An important step, which he had taken, was that without firing existing employees or demoting them, he conducted a massive retraining programme and assigned them with new duties. The employees were highly motivated, gradually the entire operation became capable of carrying out complete mechanism of budgeting and accounting, giving the President a comprehensive expenditure balance each month within a few days after the accounting period ended. The training programme was extended for budget officers of the Ministries and agencies of the government. Up to this point the Director with occasional assistance from one or two foreign advisors had made extensive changes in the budget procedures largely using the transferred personnel, with a very few new comers. The changes were accomplished within a year, which led to greater increase in the output.

Coming to the second aspect of this illustration, Weidner's observation is that the limitation of the output increases without major system change extended to an agency, which gets evident through subsequent events.

When the concept of programme control and programme budgeting were introduced in other Ministries and Agencies of the Government, there was stiff opposition from various heads of other agencies towards the Director of the Budget Agency. If these concepts were to be carried out then there would have been a major shift in the decision-making framework of the government that would have resulted in a substantial change in the role of the budget agency, the Presidency, the Finance Ministry and others. But, ultimately the Director was removed because carrying out above changes, involved major changes in the government.

On the basis of above illustration, Weidner has brought to fore certain propositions as listed below:

- The less an innovation involves a threat to the security of employees or the personnel system, the more probable its success. Perhaps if Vietnam had had a personnel system based on civil service classes together with personnel

rotation, as do India and Pakistan, the budget reforms would have been far more difficult to consummate;

- Changes within an agency headed by an innovator that involve major system changes tend to create resistance because the major changes have implications for those outside the agency;
- Any proposed major changes in the administrative system of agencies external to that of the innovator will encounter extremely heavy resistance; and
- Innovation short of government-wide change will be inhibited to the extent that central controls are present.

We conclude that if from one point of view, the budget reform was a failure then from another, and it was a partial success. Changes had taken place, but some of them were erased whereas others remained.

(v) Environmental Stimulus: Unplanned Directional Growth with System Change

This model stipulates that by deliberate act we can bring differentiation, coordination and growth. In the larger part this is true. Modernity or nation-building and socio-economic progress involving major differentiation and coordination can take place in an unplanned manner also. The process of planning on large scale involves several steps such as goals to be determined, priorities to be established, programme of action to be identified and implementation devices to be put in place besides putting control into effect.

According to Weidner, there are several things that make planning in this manner unlikely or at least very difficult. It is due to the fact that a strong nation-wide push for developmental change is most difficult to carry out in practice as it encounters maximum of resistance, for such a movement to take place, the development politics base of development administration must be secure, preferably in both the power and task elite.

Weidner stresses that while some planned change can take place from the centre with a determined and able leadership but most extensive innovations are likely to be a product of the individual minister, bureaus, provinces or districts and the autonomous pilot projects. He also makes a difference between planning as normally conceived and planning as “unplanned change”. Weidner feels that many of the changes emanate from any society come by reaction of leaders or groups to certain environmental factors.

Coming to the bureaucracy, major system change can be brought by adhoc pragmatic adaptation to the conditions in which an agency finds itself. To cope with particular circumstances, the changes may be planned, but they may represent no larger commitment to planned development. This type of situation we can find in field administration.

As per Edward W. Weidner, emulation is another force for change that may have an essentially unplanned character. Foreign or domestic models relating to programmes, agencies, procedures may be emulated on a wider scale. Emulation will be a strong force for a change where communications and transportation are good, so that opportunities for simulation from other models are readily available. In addition, there should be a sense of or a desire for modernity, which should be wide spread. These will lead to handsome results.

It can be inferred that through decentralisation initiatives, competition, adaptation and emulation, much change, even of a major kind, can take place although the normal processes of planned change are not utilised. Thus, environmental stimulus is a potent force for change.

(vi) Pragmatism: Unplanned Directional Growth with No System Change

In this model, a little change in differentiation and coordination with the decentralised initiative, competition, adoption and emulation, growth in the direction of modernity or nation building and socio-economic progress could be brought about.

The most common form of development to be found in mildly liberalising regimes, world around is unplanned growth in a development direction accompanied by no system change. According to this model, it is relatively painless; it produces some short run payoffs and does not require complicated planning mechanisms. In countries, where integrated attack on poverty, disease and social isolation have not been launched and there is at least a limited desire to adjust to the changing world, the most natural and attractive course to follow is unplanned growth in a development direction with no system change. It is natural and the most important supplement to extensive programme of planned change.

(vii) Crisis: Unplanned System Change with No Directional Growth

In this model, unplanned change largely comes as a result of decentralised initiatives, competition, adaptation and emulation, whereas decentralised initiatives, adaptation and emulation are likely to be at work in case of unplanned system change without decentralised growth. The system may change in some substantial respects. Weidner feels that emulation can bring change in system without directional growth orientation being present. The system may change in some substantial respect. To a greater extent there will not be nation-building and socio-economic progress. With formalistic system change, it will lead to greater output and developmental growth. The following circumstances are well suited to unplanned system change with no directional growth that is adjustment to the emergencies, the ravages of war, international or civil and the shock of newly won or granted independence and even refugee problems, starvation, uncontrolled epidemics, floods and drought.

The above-mentioned crisis requires on the spot adjustments. Decentralised initiatives, adaptation and emulation related to the particular nature of crisis may lead to major system change. Continuous or extended crisis will lead to plan as well as unplanned adjustment.

(viii) Static Society: No Plans, No Change

There are few societies, which are totally static, and there are also parts of societies that approach a static state. There are pockets of change and also pocket of resistance to change in developing countries. Weidner also states that in spite of favourable circumstances for change a certain amount of driftlessness often occurs in large segments of nations. In the earlier model we have observed that crisis lead to on the spot adjustment in turn it may lead to major system change. In this model, crisis may not lead or bring forth a desired change but may be viewed fatalistically. By planned or unplanned manner we can introduce change into previously static society. There is a possibility of confrontation by static conditions over all

developmental efforts that form hurdles to overcome and by islands or areas of static conditions that exist and in hand with wide spread change.

2.4.1 The Review of Models

By analysing Weidner's models it is felt that the conditions under which change takes place are many and varied. Emphasis on production and consumption lead to three major strategies of the formal planning process. A similar group of three strategies also exists for unplanned change. In addition to these six sets of conditions depending on strategies and tactical choices, we can also have other sets of conditions. According to Edward W. Weidner, these schemes can be applied to an administrative system, a member of the task elite or a policy-concerned administrator. These schemes provide for greater variations in the conditions in existence from one period of time to another and from one part of the administrative system to another. It is also possible that several sets of conditions will form part to some degree or another in any large agency or in any government as a whole in perhaps all the eight models, including the two that lead to no change. Basically, the decisions depend upon essentially with the balance or mix of the six types with some kind of payoff.

Normally, there is no standard prescription for or description of developmental change; planned system change resulting in directional growth is a set of conditions that can be considered as are ideal type. In development administration, two important aspects are planning and system change. They are potentially producers and their most effective combination leads to modernisation. Planning and system change are important but not the exclusive aspects of the development mix of a government or agency. An administrative agency devoted to modernity or nation-building and socio-economic progress is expected to consider how to encourage developmental change under each of the six sets of conditions leading to change. According to Edward W. Weidner, lack of devotion by the administrative agencies would result in short sighted planning. Full-scale planning fades into a less vigorous type that eventually leads to a lack of planning or perhaps just maintaining an encouraging environment for modernising change. Major system change fades into minor system change leading to lack of system change. Keeping all the above in mind it would be a likely hypothesis that in their efforts to achieve development goals and outputs, public agencies actually prefer to encourage unplanned change and planned change that avoids major alterations in the system.

Lastly, as students of development administration, we should focus on the following:

- End results of the policies or goals of the political and administrative systems, such as modernity or nation-building and socio-economic progress;
- To take into account several different sets of conditions under which development outputs can be increased; and
- To be concerned with a dynamic research model that will assist in answering a basic question such as what strategies, policies or programmes make for the most effective growth towards modernity, nation-building and socio-economic progress.

2.4.2 Evaluation of Models

It has been pointed out that it is difficult to state in which model a developing country fits in. Some features of a developing country may be appropriate to one model, while some other features may belong to another model. However, these models are useful to identify the developmental direction of a country.

Some scholars have observed that it is difficult to define goals for development action. Goal identification is never simple, and in complex developmental change situations, it can be very elusive and difficult. Lack of clarity on important aspects of goal orientation at times causes confusion about the true nature of development administration.

Further, Weidner did not provide an operational framework indicating the kinds and nature of administrative change that will be necessary to transform a non-developmental system into a developmental system.

We have discussed the models propounded by Edward W. Weidner. The other scholar who has qualitatively contributed to the development administration is Fred. W. Riggs whose model of development administration is discussed in the next section.

2.5 F.W. RIGGS'S MODEL

Fred W. Riggs, a pioneer in the field of comparative Public Administration, has made a significant contribution to the field of development administration also. "Frontiers of Development Administration", "The idea of Development administration" and "Administration in Developing Countries" are some of his important works, which contain his views on development administration. As the long-time chairman of the Comparative Administration Group (CAG), F.W. Riggs is regarded as the prime mover of academic interest in the field of development administration.

According to Riggs, development can be seen as a process of increasing autonomy (discretion) of social systems made possible by a rising level of diffraction. This autonomy manifests itself in the form of increased ability of human societies to shape their physical, human and cultural environments. He presents an ecological view of development as an increasing ability to make and carry out collective decisions affecting environment. The essence of development is a process of improved decision-making rather than the output of those decisions. Riggs has maintained that development level of a society is reflected in its ability to make decisions in order to control its environment. This decision-making capability is based on the level of diffraction in a society. Diffraction, in turn, is a function of differentiation and integration.

Riggs considers differentiation and integration as the two key elements in the process of development. The levels of differentiation and integration represent diffracted and prismatic conditions of development. A high level of differentiation coupled with a high level of integration make a society diffracted. A low level of differentiation with a corresponding level of integration makes a society prismatic. Diffraction leads to development and the higher the level of differentiation and integration, the greater the level of development, and the lower their level, lesser the development. Riggs considers the prismatic society as a less developed society because of maladjustment of differentiation and integration. In such a society, the new structures are half-born and are trying to adjust with the old ones. The

prismatic society is not fully fused nor is it fully diffracted. According to Riggs, development leads to a key problem of effecting integration. The necessity of integration arises in development administration because there are a variety of specialised roles, which may lead to confusion and chaos unless they are carefully coordinated with each other. Integration of the specialised roles can lead to development.

“Development administration”, says Riggs, “refers to the administration of development programmes, to the methods used by large-scale organisations, notably governments, to implement policies and plans designed to meet their developmental objectives”(Riggs, 1970). It includes organised efforts to carry out developmental programmes. Riggs like Edward Weidner, views development administration as a goal-oriented administration- an administration that is engaged in the task of achieving progressive political, economic and social goals. This goal-orientation and change-orientation of an administrative system gives it the characteristics of development administration. In this context, Riggs presents the concept of ‘the development of administration’, which involves the strengthening of capabilities of an administrative system to achieve the prescribed goals. Much of the effectiveness of a development-oriented system depends upon the capacity of the administrative system itself. This capacity approach is the crux of the concept of administrative development. It may be noted here that there is a similarity in Riggs’s stress on administrative development and Taylor’s emphasis on increasing effectiveness of an administrative system in order to reach its prescribed goals.

From the preceding analysis it is clear that to Riggs development administration refers both to administrative problems and governmental reforms. The problem relating to governmental tasks is connected with agricultural, industrial, educational and medical progress, etc. Reforms of governmental organisations and bureaucratic procedures have necessarily to go with the administrative process connected with problem solving.

Prismatic-Sala Model

The ecological approach to development administration is the central point of Riggs’s analysis. It is on account of environmental influences that an administrative system in a prismatic society develops the characteristics of heterogeneity, formalism and overlapping. These three, according to Riggs, are the important features of development administration in a developing nation.

Heterogeneity

It is the presence of a mix of traditional and modern forms and institutions in the administrative system. For example, office attendants coexist with telephones as aids to the administration. Modern ideas are superimposed upon traditional ones. Behind the façade of new structures introduced, the old and traditional ways of doing things persist in reality. In brief, in prismatic society modernity and tradition coexist in an uneasy companionship.

Formalism

The existence of discrepancy between the formally prescribed norms and their practice is known as formalism. As a result of formalism there is a wide gap between government proposals and their implementation. Most of the laws are either bypassed or not implemented at all. Although government officials insist on following some of the laws, rules and regulations, yet their official behaviour does not correspond to the legal status. Very often they work for the realisation of goals

other than the achievement of programme objectives. Formalism gives rise to administrative evils like, red tape, passing the buck, inefficiency and corruption.

Overlapping

It means non-administrative criteria determining what is described as administrative behaviour. The administrative structures are intermixed with the social, economic, political and cultural aspects of society. As a result of overlapping, the administrative institutions give the impression of performing specific administrative functions, but actually they perform a variety of non-administrative, traditional functions. The social role of the officer often overlaps his/her official role and causes a lot of confusion and maladjustment.

Evaluation

Riggs's model has been criticised on certain grounds. Firstly, new words coined and used by him to explain his concepts may create confusion rather than clarifying them. Secondly, this model serves no purpose to find out the stages of process of development. This model also is not very useful when the objective of the development administration is social change, because of its doubtful utility in analysing the process of social change in development. Thirdly, he has emphasised on the influence of social and economic factors on the administrative system but he has neglected the influence of administration on its environment. The prismatic model of Riggs has been referred to by some, as inadequate for the study of even the transitional societies. The developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are not homogenous category. Hence, one single model as propounded by Riggs, seems to be inadequate for study of even the so called prismatic society.

2.6 ACTIVITY

1. Try to find out whether any of the Weidner's models is followed in your country? If so, how and what have been the results thereof?
2. Examine whether your country has the characteristics of prismatic society as propounded by F.W. Riggs? Illustrate with suitable examples and suggest ways for improvement.
3. Examine whether development administration as propounded by Weidner and Riggs is still relevant in the present context?

2.7 CONCLUSION

During the 1960s the members of the Comparative Administrative Group of American Society for Public Administration undertook research in the field of development administration. Their research findings revealed that western developmental models and concept of public administration might not be appropriate or feasible in developing nations. And in order to handle the foreign technical assistance programme, the administrative systems and practices of developing nations need alteration. This led to search for new administrative models, which fulfil the developmental needs of the developing countries. Since 1960 the idea of planned change to bring about rapid socio-economic transformation has become a kind of administrative ideology in the developing states. In this context, we have come across the models developed by Edward Weidner and F.W. Riggs, which have been discussed in this Unit.

2.8 REFERENCE AND FURTHER READINGS

Riggs, Fred W., ed., *Frontiers of Development Administration*, Duke University Press, North Carolina, 1970.

Weidner W. Edward, ed., *Development Administration in Asia*, Duke University Press, North Carolina, 1970.

Lee, Hahn Been, "The Role of Higher Civil Service under paid Social and Political Change", in Weidner, ed., *Development Administration in Asia*, Duke University Press, North Carolina, 1970.