

Chapter 1

ADMINISTRATIVE CULTURE AND VALUES: APPROACHES

O. P. Dwivedi

Introduction: Administrative Culture and Values

The profession and the academic discipline of Public Administration all over the world is going through a period of turmoil, both in practice and in theory. After a period of unprecedented growth from the end of World War II until the mid-1970s the industrialized world experienced increasing financial difficulties for which it blames, among other things, its large bureaucracies and the welfare state that had been created. This led to strong challenges, mostly from politicians and people in business. Consequently, the management practices used in the business sector were seen as great cure-alls for the ills facing public sector management anywhere. This resulted in the creation of a new Public Management movement, and the remedies proffered by the movement are lionized in and by the West as the panacea for public management problems facing the world.

In recent years, this subject has received worldwide attention, especially as people wonder if the concept and operation of administrative processes are universally common or if there is a difference between the administrative cultures of nations. Thus, the main purpose of this essay is to raise the fundamental question: Do administrative cultures really differ? Gerald Caiden, in 1998, alerted us to this issue. However, he also said that despite the lure of Americanization (read “globalization”), people are interested in retaining their distinctive identity and culture (Caiden 1998:388). This appears to be true. For example, French people are keen to preserve not only their culture and language but also their administrative system. Similarly, other European nations have their distinctive administrative cultures, though they do share some core administrative values. In this essay, we are interested in developing a general framework for understanding administrative culture, as well as examining what approaches can be utilized to study and compare different administrative cultures.

The most important challenge to conventional views of administration is the process of globalization. Irrespective of the definition used for “globality,” the context, the structure, the processes, and the effects of administration are decisively influenced by it. The circumstances of administration are increasingly defined by parameters outside the confines of the nation-state. So are goals, resources (human, material, and “semiotic”), communications, and performance. The same is the case with the impact of policy decisions, non-decisions, actions, and inactions upon the context of administration. For the latter encompasses interwoven domestic and extraterritorial dimensions. In an era of growing interdependence, but also of mutual vulnerability, domestic and international micro and macro security is interconnected. At the centre of this global-local interface, there is an emerging global consciousness (Dwivedi and Nef 1998:6).

This essay focuses on the debate regarding administrative culture, understood here in its broadest sense as the modal pattern of values, beliefs, attitudes, and predispositions that characterize and identify any given administrative system. In this inclusive definition we are covering both the private and public spheres of the managerial ethos, for societies in general possess certain specific ways of “getting things done,” which transcend the official sphere. We recognize that the construction of an administrative mind-set presents significant difficulties. Yet, we also recognize that it is possible to configure clusters of cultural matrices that have important heuristic value in understanding the relationship among contexts, structures, behaviors, and effects. This modal outline, though tentative, may also endow the analyst with ways to hypothesize upon the sources and effects of such culture upon the larger social and political order. Dwivedi and Nef have suggested eight general propositions that researchers may explore, in their specific ways, because we believe that administrative cultures, like all cultures, do differ (Dwivedi and Nef 1998:6-7):

- (1) The administrative culture of any part of the globe reflects the distinctiveness and complexity of the various regional, national, and local realities; their unique historical experiences; their forms of insertion (subordination or domination) into the system of regional and global relations; and their levels of development and fragmentation.
- (2) Such cultures are historical products, where past experiences, myths, and traditions have shaped modal psychological orientations.
- (3) Any administrative culture is also conditioned by existing structural and conjunctural circumstances and challenges. Even perceptions of the past are mediated by current experience.
- (4) The administrative culture is part of a larger attitudinal matrix, containing values, practices, and orientations toward the physical environment, the

ADMINISTRATIVE CULTURE AND VALUES

- economy, the social system, the polity, and culture itself.
- (5) Administrative cultures, like all cultures, are dynamic and subject to change. Syncretism, continuities, and discontinuities are part and parcel of their fabric and texture.
 - (6) An administrative culture is the result of a process of immersion, acculturation, and socialization, whose structural drivers are both implicit as well as induced and explicit.
 - (7) Most attempts at administrative reform and “modernization” address, either directly or indirectly, the question of administrative culture. Any profound administrative reform entails significant attitudinal and value changes.
 - (8) Administrative cultures are influenced by global and regional trends. In the lesser-developed regions of the world, they are particularly derivative, reflecting a center-periphery mode of international political economy.

In addition, a researcher should ask the following questions: what is culture and where does it come from? What are the sources of such culture, and to what extent have these sources influenced the prevailing norms and values of administration? How might administrative culture, and particularly its values, be studied in a reasonably objective way? What are organizational culture, corporate culture, and administrative culture? And, finally, what do we mean by the term “culture”?

What is Culture?

Anthropologists tend to define culture in broad terms. According to Singer, the anthropological concept of culture covers all facets of humans in society: knowledge, behavior, beliefs, art, morals, law, customs, etc. (Singer 1968). Culture should also be seen not only as a material possession but also consisting of institutions, people, behaviors or emotions, a style of accomplishing things, and, specifically, how people perceive, relate, and interpret events both from within and without. Essentially, culture in this sense refers to the shared values and representations of the members of an organization, such as a governmental bureaucracy.

Despite some differences of emphasis, anthropologists agree that a culture is the way of life of a given society. However, this concept has some implications: (a) the concept is holistic because it involves the entire society; (b) it implies a certain coherence among the elements of a culture; and (c) it reveals the fundamental values of a society, including its attributes, patterns (both explicit and implicit), and acquired behavior transmitted by symbols (Singer 1968:528). The author suggests the following definition of culture: a way of life of a group of people or a society through which it views the world around it, attributes meanings, attaches

significance to it, and organizes itself to accomplish, preserve, and eventually pass on its legacy to future generations. The study of culture attracts our attention to the world of symbols and meanings, the values and patterns of organizations, and their behavior, which constitute particular ways of seeing, interpreting, and judging the world. However, when it comes to the transmission of culture from one place to another, several actors participate (both consciously and unconsciously) in the process, such as the state apparatus, socioeconomic and political factors as well as religious institutions.

Administrative Culture

We should note that like most other concepts used in the social sciences, the term “administrative culture” does not always mean the same thing for all people. Different perspectives may be offered, and a variety of conclusions can be drawn by people (from different places or geographic regions) studying the administrative culture. But, the most important question that we should ask is why should anyone study administrative culture? Will such study lead to new perspectives on the administrative history of a nation? Is it because by studying it, we are able to study the learning experiences by which an administrative culture is passed on from generation to generation? Is it because by studying it, one can explain how the administrative system of the nation operates the way it does? In this essay, an attempt will be made to answer these questions.

Two main perspectives may assist us in understanding the administrative culture of a nation. First, the government administration in all nations happens to be larger and more complex than any single organization, being composed of many departments, agencies, corporations, and so on. Of course, there are some multinational corporations with larger administrations than some small countries, but for our purpose, we are talking about the state which is, in reality, “an organization of organizations” (Bergeron 1990:181). Second, policies and administrative decisions get implemented through the state apparatus, state financial and other resources are distributed, and the entire society is affected in many ways by the attending administrative culture. The behavior of the state apparatus depends on the kind of administrative culture that prevails in a country. Lack of transparency and professionalism, as we have seen in several countries, are symptoms of malaise prevailing in the administrative culture (as well as in the political culture) of certain nations. We should also note that no administrative culture is monolithic; instead, it is a part of the wider culture of a society including its constituent parts such as political, economic, social, religious, corporate, and civil society cultures. Nevertheless, it is the political culture that influences the administrative culture most because it

brings its political values to modulate the behavior of state employees. Finally, the culture of the administration is sometimes supported, sometimes challenged, by two important subcultures: first, the culture of each department or agency of government, with its own mandate, interests, client groups, and major professional and occupational components; second, professional subcultures, such as those of accountants, lawyers, economists, engineers, diplomats, and scientists, that cut across organizational boundaries. A composite administrative culture then reflects the values of all its constituent parts.

The Place of Value in Administration

A value can be defined as a principle or a quality from which may be inferred a norm or standard conducive to ordering or ranking, by preference, objects, activities, results, or people. Values may be either personal or collective (Dwivedi and Gow 1999:23). Obviously, culture deals with collective values, but an important source of conflict may come when individual members' personal values are at a variance with the collective values of an organization. Values are, generally, of two kinds: the desired and desirable. The "desired" value is observable (for example, an audit of an account can tell us if the funds have been spent appropriately). But what is "desirable" need not be grounded or evident in behavior. Hofstede notes two possible contradictions coming from this: (1) the contradiction between behavior and what is desired (we act so as to achieve what we desire); (2) between what is desired and what is desirable (this involves someone else's judgment about what we desire) (Hofstede 1981:21). However, when it comes to the place of values in public administration, the subject, in the past, was untouchable.

The Values and Facts Dichotomy

In the past century, two major events occurred which shaped the future of public administration as a discipline and profession. First was the emphasis that Woodrow Wilson and Frank W. Goodnow placed on the separation of administration from politics as the single most essential reform in achieving efficiency and removing the objectionable and unethical practices of spoils and patronage besetting the democratic system of governing. For Woodrow Wilson, administration as a field was outside the sphere of politics because administrative questions were not political questions. After Wilson, other scholars in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Germany joined a steady stream of advocates who viewed the politics-administration dichotomy both as a self-evident truth and as a desirable goal. Public administration was perceived as a self-contained world of its own, with its

own rules and methods. Politics, then, came to be viewed as the domain of values, whereas administration was considered the universe of fact, enshrined in a value-free environment. Thus, the stage was set in the education and training courses of public administration for the exclusion of ethical issues and value questions.

The second event that further strengthened the deliberate neglect of ethics and values from public administration programs was the rise of European-led scienticism in the discipline with the two core elements: rational objectivity and quantification. The main purpose of these scientific elements was, and still is, to remove the biases and fallacies of human thought by searching for “hard data,” which can be measured, quantified, and then presented in an objective and rational manner. In this context, academics and practitioners of public administration were considered applied scientists who were to stay dispassionately aloof from that subjective (and therefore irrational) realm of values and ethical issues. The European ideal of detached “scientific” administration (or administrative science) meant that policies were to be implemented without much thoughtful reflection. The impact of scienticism supplemented by the American-led public service reforms was most visible in the form of several administrative reforms introduced as “performance budgeting,” “Planning Programming Budgeting System” (PPBS), “Zero Based Budgeting” (ZBB), “Policy and Expenditure Management System” (PEMS), New Public Management (NPM), and now New Public Expectations (NPE). These efforts in the West were made in the name of increasing efficiency while relying on quantification. The more complex the governing process became, the stronger was the insistence on the use of scientific methodology. One specific result by the use of this methodology was that the system became too obsessed with quantification, thereby bringing such dysfunctions into the public service system as social inequity, institutionalized biases, and the minimization of the human element. Perhaps the greatest fallacy of this approach was to imply that public servants were akin to “robots,” blindly implementing policies. Experts failed to realize that government managers were also supposed to exercise thoughtful action while implementing policies and programs. Development administration, as a subfield of public administration, could not escape from the above excessive emphasis on formal aspects of organization while the effectiveness of institutions suffered.

It would not be wrong to say that the entire twentieth century either relegated the question of values and ethics to the periphery, or dismissed it altogether. The dichotomy between politics and administration has continued and it still appears to dominate the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of public policy issues without due regard to ethical implications and moral reasoning. Finally, the dichotomy is basically false that the field of public administration (or

its subfield, development administration), is value-neutral and ought to be performed in a dispassionate, scientific, and almost mechanical manner.

Efforts to separate politics and administration, accompanied by the simultaneous movement to make a science out of the art of administration, account for an early and persistent neglect of ethics and values not only in the teaching of public policy and administration courses, but also in the public service training programs. The baneful influence of these two major factors has contributed to the rise of amoralism in the public sector (more insidious in the developing nations) as well as to the weakening of such underlying ideals as: (a) government is a public trust and the public service is a profession for those who should know how to behave morally; (b) public servants should perform their duties impartially, efficiently, and ethically; and (c) serving the state is the highest calling, which is intricately connected to serving democratic ideals (Dwivedi 1987).

The above set of ethical ideals have come into conflict with the narrow outlook characteristic of organizations that are influenced by business practices, including some precepts advocated by the New Public Management Movement (factors such as: budget restraint, downsizing bureaucracy, accent on results at any cost, treating the public as customers, decentralization and devolution, contracting out, and accountability), and essentially market-driven rhetoric. The rationale was that with fewer bureaucratic structures there would be fewer bureaucratic problems. Once more, heavy emphasis was placed on quantification in the name of applying objective criteria for securing accountability with a blind faith on structures, processes, and procedures while showing a total disregard for the moral or ethical dimension (called a subjective matter by NPM people).

Studying Administrative Culture: Approaches

The author suggests three main approaches to studying the administrative culture of a nation: (1) deontological approach, (2) teleological approach, and (3) spiritual approach. It should be noted that these three approaches are based on some common values such as fundamental rights and freedoms, efficiency, accountability, fairness, etc. These values can be considered the core values of any nation. The three approaches are discussed briefly below.

The Deontological Approach

Deontology is the study of duty and ethical/moral obligations of human beings as well as of the organizations they represent. By using this approach in the study of administrative culture, one focuses on the ethics and morality of the administrator.

This approach is based on the search for the cardinal virtues of the nation as reflected in the nation's constitution and other legal treaties. It seeks to emphasize a person's duty regardless of the circumstances. Deontological judgments take place in the realm of the desirable, or ethics. Thinking about ends and means has always been at the heart of public administration as a discipline. It has long been recognized that there are two great paths to improving the performance of an administration: you can either try to improve the people by leadership, motivation, and training, or tinker with institutions and systems in order to create an atmosphere of desired accountability among officials. The deontological approach also seeks its sources in either religion or philosophy. This author has for some years been an exponent of an "administrative theology" based on a synthesis of world cultures, religions, and their leaders (Dwivedi 1987). Such an attempt follows upon the invitation of Dwight Waldo to survey religion to see "what instruments of navigation it can provide" (Waldo 1980:109). Dwivedi sees a secular administrative theology as providing guidelines for administrative ethics and the idea of a vocation in the service of the public good. This is tricky ground, for the modern secular state has had difficulty disengaging itself from the embrace of established religion, which often has had the effect of placing the spiritual beliefs of some over those of others.

Morality and spirituality, which have been guiding forces in the history of human civilization, are often seen as closely associated with religion. But, the moment one raises the issue of religion in relation to governmental affairs, the forces of secularism feel threatened. The result is not only the weakening of morality in state affairs, but also the emergence of "amorality" or "ethical relativism" in the individual's conduct and behavior, and the rise of unethical activities in the public sphere all over the world. If justice, equality, equity, and freedom are to be maintained, proximate political and administrative acts must draw on some ethical foundations, such as public service as a vocation (Dwivedi 1995). It is a concept based on the ideal of service to the community. That ideal draws upon the concept of sacrifice—a concept that rises above individualism and materialism in order to create a shared feeling or spirit of public duty among government officials. Of course, the concept of sacrifice, in the context of modern times, does not mean that public servants must take a vow of poverty. Rather, it means adhering to the principle of serving others by setting a high standard of moral conduct and by considering a job a vocation, a calling, with conviction and duty. By considering public service a vocation, emphasis is placed on the service dimension of public service, an ideal to be acknowledged by public servants as higher than other economic and material considerations. Public service, then, approaches the status of a secular religion, similar to medical practice or nursing, rather than a mere

occupation. Public servants ought to derive inner satisfaction from rendering service unto others rather than from material gains. For them, the symbols and myths of public service are equally, if not more, valued than other employment related benefits.

In this traditional or classical role, there are correct ways of doing things by adhering to what Hennessy calls “a genetic code of conduct,” which includes the following values: probity, care for the evidence, respect for reason, willingness to speak the truth to Ministers, a readiness to carry out instructions to the contrary if overridden, an appreciation of the wider public interest, equity, and a constant concern for democratic ideals (Hennessy 1989:5). To them, any movement toward greater symbiosis with their political masters, as is the case in many countries, is to be avoided.

The Teleological Approach

The teleological approach is based on analyzing the success of a decision in producing a desired effect. While still in the realm of the desirable, this approach pays much more attention to intervening realities on the path to realizing goals or respecting values. The teleological approach also concerns the causal relationship between means and desired ends. Teleology is the doctrine of final causes. As an approach to the study of administrative culture, the doctrine would assert that processes and procedures in government administration ought to be determined by their ultimate purposes/ends. Thus, the emphasis is on the effects observed, results achieved, and ends met.

The Spiritual Approach

When we refer to spirituality, we generally mean a kind of energy source that (a) is beyond ourselves and transcendent; (b) impels us to search for the purpose of life here and after, as well as why are we here on earth; (c) has an overarching influence on our sense of right and wrong; (d) empowers us to care for others; and (e) inspires us to act for the common good. Willa Bruce and John Novinson, in an article dealing with spirituality in public service, suggested that an effort ought to be made to operationalize the concept (Bruce and Novinson 1999). A few years ago, the present author suggested a similar approach about the place of morality and spirituality in managing statecraft by stating “the moral dimension of governance represents a concern for an improvement in the quality of public service and the conduct of statecraft” (Dwivedi 1987:707). Although spirituality is supposed to be an integral part of our religious traditions and beliefs, its secular dimension (which

is yet to be particularly acknowledged by secular institutions) is crucial in governance, especially with respect to public service ethics and values. That energy source, mentioned earlier in this paragraph, can be converted into a moral force to be used for good governance. How can this be possible? Through understanding the relevance of spirituality in the management of statecraft, a common strategy for good governance can be developed. Such a strategy depends upon how public officials (a) perceive a common future for their society; (b) act both individually and collectively toward protecting the common good; and (c) realize that they as individuals have a moral obligation to support their society's goals since their acts will have repercussions on the future of their society. In addition, it is important to note that the demonstration of social conscience and caring behavior by public officials is intertwined with the general concept of a common good. It is an obligation that human beings owe not only to each other within a society but also to others living elsewhere. It is most important for public officials to know how they can better serve the common good. In a liberal democratic system of governance, there is no higher public service value than the mission of demonstrating social conscience and caring behavior by doing one's respective duties toward the common good and good governance.

There is a general misconception in the field of public policy and administration that the development of public policy and its application is purely an objective and secular endeavor, where moral, subjective, and spiritual factors have no specific role to play at all. However, values and morality are not limited to personal matters only. A democratic society is founded on the principle of the dignity and worth of all people; and that moral principles emanate from basic religious values that hold human life both sacred and social. Furthermore, every constitution is generally the embodiment of moral values that guarantee us fundamental freedoms, justice, rule of law, and the like. These are the moral foundations upon which public policy and its management must be based. We live in a world of interdependence, in which morality and secularism share and balance each other in the protection and development of human values. There is no need to fence out morality and spirituality in the name of secularism, public service objectivity, and neutrality, lest the moral vision that has shaped and guided humanity thus far may well be compromised by immorality, expediency, and corruption.

By insisting on morality in public policy and governmental decision making, we may be able to strengthen the ethical and moral obligations of the people as well as of the organizations they represent. The focus must be on the ethics and morality of the administrator. What sense of duty should the public servant have, toward whom, and how can this sense be operationalized? The spiritual approach assumes there are correct ways of doing things, that there are

standards and rules that should be adhered to. Public servants in this mold believe that administrative responsibility is primarily a moral question (Bernard 1948). They are moved by a higher cause, believing they have been entrusted with the stewardship of the state, and therefore owe special obligations, have specific expectations, and reside in a fiduciary world. Here, the spiritual approach or spiritual dimension (discussed later) acquires a holistic tone. Ultimately, our public servants exist for the public they are employed to serve. This approach needs to be revitalized in our public service. The commitment to a collective vision is one of the cardinal virtues of public servants; it is derived from the concept of public service as vocation. For, if the profession of public service is not a calling, then it is merely a job. In that case, loyalty to that job will depend largely on the material benefits and satisfaction that job provides. Under these circumstances, no one can expect public servants to exhibit the virtues of service to society, prudence in the use of taxpayers' money, and commitment to the common good and collective welfare of the people.

We are also aware that morality can lead to mastery over our baser impulses such as greed, exploitation, abuse of power, and mistreatment of people. Spirituality requires self-discipline, humility, and, above all, the absence of arrogance in holding public office. Morality enables people to center their values on the notion that there is a cosmic ordinance and divine law that must be maintained. Spirituality serves as a model, and as an operative strategy, for the transformation of human character by strengthening the genuine, substantive will to serve the common people. If our goal is to serve and protect the common good, then spirituality can provide the incentive for public officials to serve the public with dignity and respect.

A comprehensive account of the use of power and authority by public officials would be incomplete without these approaches (deontological, teleological, and spiritual). By using these approaches to good governance, we may be able to create a holistic vision for human governance. In their absence, no number of laws, codes of conduct, external or internal control mechanisms, or threats of punishment can force public officials to behave ethically and morally. Indeed, all the nations that are deemed the most corrupt, according to Transparency International, do have various laws and mechanisms to control corruption, and yet it continues. Unless public officials are guided also by a sense of a vocation, service to others, and inner spirituality, we cannot expect good governance. This sense of vocation holds that "government is a public trust and public service is a vocation for persons who should know how to behave morally. Behavior emanating from ideals associated with service as the highest calling includes possessing and exhibiting such virtues as honesty, impartiality, sincerity, and justice. Further, it is equally desirable

that the conduct of public administrators should be beyond reproach; and that they should perform their duties loyally, efficiently, and economically” (Dwivedi 1995:297).

The author believes that confidence and trust in democracy can be safeguarded only when the governing process exhibits a higher, credible, and ethical stand, based on the trinity of justice, equity, and morality. Only by bringing together the domains of moral and procedural accountability, can we wage a strong fight against corruption, mismanagement, and bad governance. For no nation or society, irrespective of its political and religious orientation, can survive in a spiritual or moral vacuum. Furthermore, the author believes that there must be articles of faith (drawn from societal values, cultural traditions, and moral ideals) that govern our lives and that these should be encouraged, reinforced, resurrected, and strengthened, because good governance is essentially a moral enterprise. From a holistic viewpoint, a comprehensive study of administrative culture cannot be complete unless these approaches are utilized. That is why a study of administrative culture should employ all three approaches, although the author realizes that one treads difficult ground by venturing into the realm of spirituality.

New Public Management and Administrative Culture

Although public service reformers keep hoping (or claim to *know*) that their new institution, method, or device will deliver change in government policy and programs in order to bring efficiency, accountability and transparency, there are some propositions that are so well established they seem axiomatic. The first is that the choice of objectives depends in part on the means available. That is, in public policy and administration, most choices are not moral absolutes, but depend on calculations of costs and benefits, not only to the public, but also to politicians and public servants. Second, administrative reforms have both intended and unintended consequences.

When applied to Public Management, this approach offers the following observations: (1) there is symmetry, for the managerial revolution is part of the worldwide triumph of democratic capitalist values; (2) the metaphorical language of management seems easily adapted to the public sector, as in “corporate culture,” “corporate management,” “management by results,” etc.; (3) there is much ambiguity in expressions like “value for money” or “excellence”; (4) it requires the suspension of disbelief, corresponding to what Dunsire says of doctrine: “it makes plain, but in the manner of ‘revealed truth’ rather than the tentative hypothesizing of theory: it shows what must be done but as if it were from necessity rather than the mere instrumentalism of policy” (Dunsire 1973:39); (5) selectivity in argument

is found in the recourse to examples, to “best practices” and to anecdotal evidence without considering contrary evidence; (6) a doctrine based on private interest, it is said to meet the requirements of the public good (Dwivedi and Gow 1999:171).

The trouble with New Public Management, then, is that it is all technique. If politics is about the art of the possible, or what is acceptable in a society, and if it is also about the major value choices of that society—“authenticity” and “justice” values—then management has forgotten politics (Manzer 1984:27).

Public management also appears to neglect the importance of law in public administration. This can be seen at two levels. At the top, in introducing notions like corporate management, corporate culture, and even that of management itself, it tends to obscure how relations between senior officials and ministers are constitutional in nature. As we have seen, when Canadian officials answer questions from members of parliament, they do so in the name of their minister. Faced with the complexities of day-to-day administration and the conflicting values that the system has thrust upon them, they need some fundamental reference point to which they may turn in case of doubt. As John Rohr states, the constitution must serve as a source of regime values for administrators (Rohr 1978:67). That is why at lower levels of administration, the law is a guarantor of democratic government. In this respect, a public manager differs from a private one, because while the latter may regard the law as a constraint, something he must obey, the public manager must also uphold the rule of law.

To us, the greatest charge against managerialism is its reductionism and its lack of imagination. It tries to reduce a complex phenomenon to a single model drawn from business. We argued above that the appropriate image for the public administrator is the steward, not the entrepreneur. What remains to be pointed out is another curious paradox of management. Astley and Van de Ven have observed that there are two versions of organization theory, one which is basically deterministic and the other which is proactive in its outlook (Astley and Van de Ven 1983). The deterministic school sees management as a kind of fine tuning; adapting organizations to changes occurring in the environment. The proactive outlook takes a strategic view of that environment. It is there to be acted upon.

The paradox of the New Public Management is that while its language is full of references to a proactive stance, where strategic planning, innovation, change, and growth are promoted, in its basic thrust the NPM is profoundly deterministic. Its message is that there really are no choices; that deficits, structural economic change, and world trade competition are forcing governments of all developed countries to adopt the same policies. This obscures the fact that these same governments do things very differently, with European countries accepting a more corporatist form of national bargaining with business and labor, while

Britain, the United States, and Canada have more liberal societies, where individualism reigns supreme. It also masks the fact that there are other models of the new state different from the market model. In sum, if the New Public Management movement (which is essentially based on the teleological model of administrative analysis) is carried to the extreme, technique drives out the desirable. What is feasible informs what is desirable, but if feasibility is the only criterion for the desirable, then our vision has become too limited. It is here where the deontological and spiritual approaches become relevant. Against this context, these two approaches acquire a holistic tone. In the end, our public servants exist for the public they are employed to serve. It is this aspect that needs to be revitalized in our public services. Even with the current emphasis on downsizing public services, one should not abdicate its belief in serving the collective interests of its society. Rather, it should express more of a concern for the collective welfare of its people. This commitment to a collective vision is one of the cardinal virtues of our public servants. Abandonment of the commitment for public service as a vocation that would follow from the adoption of market-based practices would be highly undesirable. Any predisposition to reject duty and commitment to vocation among public servants is not going to serve a country well. Of course, duty-based deontological approaches have disadvantages apart from the fact that not all agree on their contents. In public administration, difficulties often arise because two or more values are in conflict, such as the sense of patriotism and the obligation to do one's legal and constitutional duty.

Diversity in Theory and Practice of Administration Ought to be Protected

The trilogy of approaches employed in the study of administrative culture and administration should not be seen as contradictory; each is incomplete without the other. No amount of factual analysis can allow one to escape certain moral and spiritual judgements, fundamental choices about both the public service and public life of a country. On the other hand, the kind of all-embracing ethical and spiritual dimensions do provide us with a deeper perspective but not the whole picture. That is why all three approaches should be used to study administrative cultures. The three approaches discussed ought to be considered a package deal when one wishes to examine the administrative culture of any nation. Among these three, the deontological approach has its basis both in philosophy and policy analysis. The most relevant school of philosophy, utilitarianism, took as its slogan "the greatest good for the greatest number." However, such an approach offers little help in deciding when the rights of the larger number may be invoked to limit those of the few, nor does it give consideration to the means to achieve a desired end. On the other hand,

the teleological approach is blamed for being all method and no result. Complementing the above two approaches is the spiritual approach that, while accentuating the positive elements of public service vocation, emphasizes the relationship between the desirable and the feasible. While the study of administrative culture may be done in a detached, relatively objective way, it raises the problem of the best way to treat values. Finally, without the presence of individual spirituality and a sense of duty, laws and codes of conduct would not create the environment for good government.

It is also clear that in the name of globalization, a certain dependence and continued reliance on the theory and methodology of Western-style administration is being fostered in the developing nations, with an emphasis on transplanting and replicating the ideas and institutions of the West. As more and more Western values and practices prevail everywhere, with standards of performance based on the indicators developed in the West, an imitative and replicative system of public management is emerging in the rest of the world, and public servants everywhere mirror the bureaucratic structures and mores in Washington DC, London, Paris, Bonn, and Ottawa. We should be ever vigilant in the field of public administration so that the diversity in administrative culture does not face the same fate as is happening with the declining of bio-diversity in the world. With this perspective, let us also worry about what is happening in the world around us (Nef 1998):

- (1) For years, Western scholars have been unable to include alternatives in the form of non-Western contributions to administrative studies. Instead, it was expected that institutional imitation would easily produce similar results to those obtained in the West.
- (2) Ethnocentrism and ignorance in the West have continued to overshadow the need to appreciate the importance of local culture, traditions, and style of governance. It is their style of governance and the administrative culture that reflect the distinctiveness and complexity of various national identities, realities, and cultural diversities. These factors should be taken into consideration when imposing public service reforms and other conditionalities.
- (3) The public sector reform imposed by Western ideology has created, in its wake, skewed management styles and structures that are unrelated to the prevailing cultural norms, needs, and realities; these styles and structures reproduce the symbolism, but not the substance, of Western administration. It is also not surprising that the culture of governance in the Third World has tended to follow, or has been forced to replicate, the costly fads in the industrialized nations. Thus, efforts at administrative restructuring, “modernization,” and other types of reforms must address first, either

directly or indirectly, the question of the indigenous style, values, and culture of governance.

As culture and style of governance are the keys to understanding what makes a country function, it is imperative that any public sector reform imposed on developing nations draws from the local customs, culture, and traditions. When the local culture and traditions are discarded in the favor of Western-style management practices, and when not enough time is given to these nations to see if such a transplantation has germinated, a hodge-podge of two value systems start operating simultaneously with no one specific standard against which the conduct of public officials can be measured. For the West as well as for the Third World, a key to a just and sustainable world requires diversity in thought and action rather than the self-proclaimed universal relevance of Western originated paradigms and administrative culture. Finally, true globalization means the ability to decide with an open mind, to understand and to incorporate different and alternative cultural traditions into a common matrix, and to respect diversity all around. That ability to incorporate these new strains and challenges in the governing system of a nation will determine, to a large extent, the quality of life that ours and future generations will enjoy, or suffer.

NOTE

This essay draws from Dwivedi, O. P. and James Iain Gow. 1999. *From Bureaucracy to Public Management: The Administrative Culture of the Government of Canada*. Peterborough, Canada: Broadview Press. Chapters 1 and 6.

REFERENCES

- Astley, W. Graham and Andrew Van de Ven. 1983. "Central Perspectives and Debates in Organization Theory." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28:245-273.
- Bergeron, G. 1990. *Petit traite de l'Etat* (A Minor Treatise on the State). Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Bernard, Chester I. 1948. *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Caiden, Gerald E. 1998. "Are Administrative Cultures that Different?" Pp. 377-393 in *Governing India: Issues Concerning Public Policy, Institutions and Administration*, edited by O. P. Dwivedi, R. B. Jain, K. Dhirendra and K. Vajpeyi. Delhi: B. R. Publishing.
- Dunsire, Andrew. 1973. "Administrative Doctrine and Administrative Change" *Public*

ADMINISTRATIVE CULTURE AND VALUES

- Administration Bulletin* (UK) 13:39-56.
- Dwivedi, O. P. 1985. "Ethics and Values of Public Responsibility and Accountability." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 51:61-66.
- . 1987. "Moral Dimensions of Statecraft: A Plea for Administrative Theology." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 20(4):699-706.
- . 1995. "Reflections on Moral Government and Public Service as a Vocation." *Indian Journal of Public Administration* 41(3):296-306.
- . 2002. "On Common Good and Good Governance: An Alternative Approach." Pp. 35-51 in *Better Governance and Public Policy: Capacity Building and Democratic Renewal in Africa*, edited by Dele Olowu and Soumana Sako. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Dwivedi, O. P. and E. A. Engelbert. 1981. "Education and Training for Values and Ethics in the Public Service: An International Perspective." *Public Personnel Management* 10(1):140-145.
- Dwivedi, O. P. and James Iain Gow. 1999. *From Bureaucracy to Public Management: The Administrative Culture of the Government of Canada*. Peterborough, Canada: Broadview Press. A joint publication with the Institute of Public Administration of Canada, Toronto.
- Dwivedi, O. P. and J. Nef. 1998. "Administrative Culture: A Global Perspective." *Africanus* 28(2):5-7.
- Guillen, Mauro F. 1994. *Models of Management, Work, Authority and Organization in a Comparative Perspective*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
- Hennessy, P. 1989. "Genetic Code of Conduct Inherited by Mandarines." *The Independent* (UK), 5 June.
- Hofstede, Geert. 1981. "Culture and Organizations." *International Studies on Man and Organizations*, 10(4):15-41.
- Manzer, R. 1984. "Policy Rationality and Policy Analysis: The Problem of the Choice of Criteria for Decision-Making." Pp. 27-40 in *Policy and Administrative Studies*, edited by O. P. Dwivedi. Guelph, Canada: University of Guelph.
- Mosher, Frederick C. 1968. *Democracy and the Public Service*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Nef, Jorge. 1998. "Administrative Culture in Latin America: Historical and Structural Outline." *Africanus* 28(2):19-32.
- Nevitte, Neil. 1996. *The Decline of Deference: Canadian Value Change in Cross-National Perspective*. Peterborough, Canada: Broadview Press.
- Rohr, John A. 1978. *Ethics for Bureaucrats: An Essay on Law and Values*. New York: Marcel Decker.
- Sayre, W. 1958. "Premises of Public Administration: Past and Emerging." Pp. 103-106 in *Administrative Questions and Political Answers*, edited by C. E. Hawley and Ruth G. Weintraub. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand.

- Singer, Milton. 1968. "The Concept of Culture." In *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*. New York: Macmillan Press.
- Waldo, Dwight. 1980. *The Enterprise of Public Administration*. Nuvato, CA: Chandler and Sharp.
- Willa, Bruce and John Novinson. 1999. "Spirituality in Public Service: A Dialogue." *Public Administration Review* 59(2):163-169.
- Wilson, Woodrow. [1887] 1992. "The Study of Administration." In *Classics of Public Administration*, edited by Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.