

CULTURAL IMPERATIVES OF POLICY SCIENCE

by

GUNAPALA NANAYAKKARA

SUMMARY

Policy science is a growing sub-discipline of public administration in the Western developed countries. It advocates a future-oriented and scientific approach to the improvement of public policy-making processes, policy analysis, policy-making, and policy evaluation. This paper examines some of the culture-bound aspects of policy science in order to assess its viability and use in developing countries, like Sri Lanka. The writer attempts to show among other things, that policy science's (a) concern for controlling the future and change presumes a set of orientations in man which is alien to many LDC cultures, (b) belief in scientific methodology is not quite compatible with the orientation of LDC public administrator, and (c) concern for a policy science culture requires patterns of group behaviours which are not widely practised here. Given the vital role that policy science can play in the LDCs, it is the task for the policy science researchers to find out suitable adjustments within the context of those socio-cultural imperatives.

I. Introduction

The study of cultural imperatives of management in developing countries is a topic that has been attractive to many in recent years. The research interests, however, have been heavily concentrated on management in the productive sectors in both private and public arenas. Enquiry into hard-core public administration from a cultural viewpoint has been almost neglected. The study of public policy-making or policy science is more and more accepted to represent the central-core of public administration in developing countries and elsewhere. Policy science, as many other notions of administration, is an outgrowth of intellectual currents in public administration in the West. Therefore, it is quite relevant to examine the (Western) cultural assumptions underlying policy science as a prerequisite to the study and practice of policy science in developing countries.

The term culture seems to carry a wide meaning covering many things in a society. R. Thurnwald, for example, used it to refer to both practice and evolution of family, political and economic achievements, ethics, customs, law and thought (Seneviratna 1971 : 10). Sociologists seem to confine the meaning to a rather narrow area of individual's knowledge, beliefs, customs, and skills which are carried forward in a society. It has a material or overt aspect and a socio-psychological or covert aspect. While it often includes religion, its relationship to concepts like civilization is a subject of debate. Thus, we are dealing with a concept which has very different and wide connotations.

However, the view of culture here goes beyond the mere physical expression in art, dance, sports or drama. It embraces the various means of communication, traditions, beliefs, habits, social artifacts, and perceptions of the

material biological psychological and spiritual goals of life which are considered worthy of achievement. Therefore, culture signifies the spectrum of the responses of a group to its environment which provides a sense of purpose and a reason for existence (Ventura 1981 : 22). It is the fundamental ethos of every society which brings self-awareness and determines aspirations for dignity and success (UNESCO 1978 : 4). Indeed, a strong culture carries with it national pride, self-awareness, confidence and the flexibility necessary for the creative and innovative spirit to meet changing needs and situations of organizations (Japanese are the example today).

On the basis of common usage and understanding and with regard to the special interests of students of management, the following definition of culture is proposed here : "A culture is the configuration of learned behaviour and results of behaviour whose component elements are shared and transmitted by the members of a particular society."

In a given society individual's behaviour learning (and results of behaviour) is a product of the total societal system in which political and economic systems are two sub-systems. Therefore, the learned behaviour of an individual at a given point in time cannot be separated from politics and economics of the society concerned. Further, the results of behaviour can be politically and economically interpreted. Thus, culture, as defined above encompasses political, economic, and social phenomena which are fundamental to a society. However when we talk about culture, we refer to the configuration of learned behaviour, and results of behaviour whose component elements are shared and transmitted by the members of the society. In this definition, phenomena of three different orders are included : material, behavioural and psychological. The first two are normally classified as overt and the other as covert aspect of a culture. In understanding the relevance of approaches to public policy, all three aspects of culture may be helpful.

Within a given culture of a larger society, there could exist sub-cultures which share certain aspects of the larger one while exhibiting peculiar characteristics of its own. These sub-cultures may have their foundations on geographical area socio-economic class, education, profession, etc. Of particular interest here are sub-cultures of public administrators, policy analysts and those who share policy science thinking—policy science culture.

The term 'policy sciences' gained popularity in the 1970s. One of the strong contenders of 'policy sciences' attempted to draw the framework for this discipline in the following manner :

The main concern of policy sciences is with the understanding and improvement of macro-control systems and especially public policy-making systems. In addition to overall improvement oriented study of such systems the main foci of policy sciences include, for example (a) policy analysis... (b) alternative innovation... (c) master policies (or megapolicies)... (d) evaluation and feedback... and (e) improvement of meta-policy that is "policy on policy-making"... (Dror 1971_b : 14).

According to Dror 'policy sciences' is based upon a fusion between behavioural sciences and analytical decision approaches. While it shares with normal sciences, a main involvement with instrumental-normative knowledge, 'policy sciences' is characteristically sensitive to the questions of value and tries to contribute to value choice :

The principal tasks for the policy sciences will be found in the development of concepts and measures to strengthen the links at the policy level and to make them effective in ensuring conformity between forecasting, planning, decision-making, and action, and between values and these activities (Jantsch 1970 : 38).

Thus 'policy sciences' represents a concerted attempt to bring system, rationality and interdisciplinary approach to the study and improvement of public policy-making. Though the term 'policy sciences' is common usage in the West, we shall use 'policy science' in this paper so that the general reader will not be confused.

An introductory reference to cross-cultural studies in (business) management is in order. The interest in cross-cultural study in management was generated partly by the recognition that the effectiveness of experts from Western donor countries was dependent upon the degree of adaptation to local culture of the operating country (Megginson 1967: 69-70; Yoshino, 1968 : 65) and partly by the academic interests of those who were involved in planning and aiding business schools and training institutes in the developing countries (Committee on the Professional School and World Affairs, 1967 : 54). Transferability of managerial concepts and practices from donor countries to recipient nations was the major concern when the interest in this subject matter gained popularity in the early 1960s. In fact the International Labour Organization laid down as the major objectives of the study of Socio-cultural factors of management as to facilitate the task of foreigners involved in developmental activities abroad (ILO 1965 : 5). With regard to public administration, interests were confined to cross-cultural

communication with the assumption that the foreigners had to understand the locals in order to be effective. Thus, the questions of fundamental value than of immediate relevance were not asked.

While the concern on the transferability of Western management to developing countries in the context of development assistance continues (Reichard, 1982), the growth of multinational enterprise linking the different cultures together gave rise to a new class of international conglomerate managers and for this reason the study of culture everywhere in the world received attraction in management research. One group has taken an open system or environmental approach by which the impact of external environmental factors, not only cultural but also socio-economic, political, educational, legal etc. on managerial practices and effectiveness is emphasized (Farmer and Richman 1965, Negandhi, 1975; and England, Negandhi and Wilpert 1979). The other group has taken a behavioural approach to explain individual and group behaviour differences in organizations in different cultures: predicting organizational behaviour patterns (Narain 1967; Davis, 1971) and attitudes and perceptions of managers (Barrett, 1970; Haire 1966; Nath, 1969, Thiagarajan, 1968). While these studies attempt to integrate cross-cultural literature with organization theory, suggestions have been made, in a rather crude way, to undertake further research, mainly for the purpose of developing comparative organizational theory (Weinshall, 1977). These studies and propositions for further work imply a bias toward the study of the receiver's cultural context and much less attention is paid to the cultural properties contained in those management concepts and practices to begin with.

Management in Japan has aroused curiosity among Westerners to raise questions about cultural properties of management in both Japan and the West. Started with the studies of management in Japanese factories (Abeglen, 1958) interest has developed into the inquiry of employment policies, decision-making and group dynamics in Japanese organizations (Dore, 1973; Drucker, 1971; and Yoshino, 1968). More recently, Western management thinking has begun to show fascination for selected instruments of Japan's managerial behaviour such as the "quality circles" (Huthins, 1981; and Jones, 1983). It is rather unfortunate that the cross-cultural studies mentioned earlier have continued without seeing the importance of learning from the relatively richer experiences and analyses of the cultural properties of management in Japan. However, the desire to learn from management in Japan and the attempt to make predictions about a possible conversion between the Japanese and American systems are responsible for the current thinking that specific management concepts must be thoroughly examined in order to identify their culture-bound properties.

Public policy studies or policy science as developed in the West, mainly in the United States, is encroaching the development of public administration in developing countries. In the West itself, the debate continues as to the appropriateness of the rational/analytical approach in policy science to social problem solving. Paradoxically, there has been an amorphous growth of the policy science field in the past decade or so, and the governments increasingly seek the support of policy analysis, modelling, and prediction. The danger is not in the tendency that governments in our part of the world seek such functional support of policy science without knowing its efficacy in solving social problems. The real danger is in the doubt as to the appropriateness of policy science approach for our public administrators. Even if it is proven to be effective in solving social issues elsewhere can our public administrators be efficient in the use of policy science approach? This is the problem that this discussion intends to pose.

II. Policy Science and Cultural Elements

With the demise of the politics-administration dichotomy in the 1930s and 1940s in the West and quite sometime later in Sri Lanka, policy studies became more popular in the field of public administration. Public policy studies purportedly represented the (more political science oriented) study of policy-making processes, the (more economics oriented) formulation of plans, programmes and policies, and their evaluation. Public policy was seen as a framework of influence, either explicit or implicit (Nanayakkara, 1980 : 10, 11). Contributions of economics, political behaviour, mathematics and statistics, decision theory and systems theory were utilized together by researchers in order to conceptualize about the processes of policy-making in a more popular manner in the 1960s. This attempt, motivated partly by the pressures to define the central-core of public administration, gave rise to a field known today as policy science.

Policy science advocates scientific study of an arena encompassing policy studies and some more. In fact the advocacy of scientific approach to public policy is not new. More than three decades ago, John Dewey first conceived the idea that public policy could be systematically dealt with. Harold Lasswell, a political scientist drawing from Dewey's suggestion broached the idea of policy sciences. He promoted the idea of an interdisciplinary approach to policy studies where by a cross-fertilization of knowledge could, professedly, understand, predict, and control social events (Lasswell and Lerner, 1951). As the call for an interdisciplinary approach was responded to positively, the field could be defined more precisely.

“The policy sciences study the process of deciding or choosing and evaluate the relevance of available knowledge for the solution of particular problems... Since an official decision or a private choice is

a problem-solving activity, five intellectual tasks are performed at varying levels of insight and understanding : clarification of goals; description of trends; analysis of conditions; projection of future developments; and invention, evaluation, and selection of alternatives.” (Laswell, 1968; 181–182).

The content of policy studies was expanded and redefined to give meaning to policy science. Dror is in the forefront. Policy formulation about public policy-making, or meta-policy-making is one important addition by Dror.¹ He, furthermore, emphasized the policy implementation activity which he labelled as post-policy-making (Dror, 1968 ch. 14).

Policy science has emerged by extending its roots into the socio-cultural environment of the West. Policy science is seen in the context of the process of rational creative action of which the conception and implementation of policies form an integral part. Erich Jantsch conceived the process of rational creative action as unfolding in the interaction among four activities : forecasting, planning, decision-making and action. “The policy sciences deal with the horizontal unfolding, as general instances of human activity of forecasting, planning, decision-making and action at the policy level (Jantsch, 1970 : 36).

From Dror’s concern with the understanding and improvement of macro-control systems (meta-policy-making) and Jantsch’s emphasis of future oriented activity one can decode some important cultural assumptions underlying policy science. Policy science assumes that people can substantially influence the future. People in the Western civilizations are perhaps overly optimistic about their ability to control human destiny. Embodied in this is the primary assumption that people want to change their future. With this “master of destiny” viewpoint or belief there is a second cultural drive that is relevant to policy science. This is the never-ending quest for improvement. “A relentless urge for improvement is part of the (United States) cultural fabric” (Newman 1972 : 348); and “the promotion of change and the search for efficiency are becoming more widespread and somewhat easier as a result of fundamental change in British Society” (Mosson 1972 : 48). Thus the themes of policy science such as planning and controlling and change and improvement are deeply rooted in the future and improvement oriented cultures.

1. Meta-policy-making includes such steps as processing values; processing reality; processing problems; surveying processing and developing resources; designing, evaluating and redesigning the policy-making system; allocating problems, values and resources, and determining policy-making strategy.

While emphasis on macro-systems of control and planning formed the ideological and conceptual framework of policy science, there was the emphasis being placed on decision-making and analysis at the empirical level to form the "Craft" side of the field. The decision-making approach is rational and revolves around the systematic application of scientifically collected knowledge to social problems. From Lasswell through Dror to the present, the idea that policy science entails a theory of choice remains central.

The intellectual roots of policy science methodology (decision-making approach) can be found in management science, welfare economics, and at a rather distance point in von Neumann and Morgenstern's *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior* (1944). This problem-solving approach informs the policy science model of the relationship between knowledge and action.

Thus, policy science is a systematic and rational approach to public policy-making. What are the cultural assumptions underlying this approach? It obviously assumes a regard for science or reasoning. And it assumes a cultural belief that decisions should be based on objective analyses of facts. Objectivity and rationality are the driving cultural forces behind modern, Western science. The rationalist model involves a "commitment to scientific planning" (Scott and Shore 1979 : 63).

As innumerable commentators have remarked, the growth of policy science is a dramatic overhaul of the traditional patterns of public policy-making. However, the absence of the "scientific community" character in the behavior of policy scientists has been a draw-back in the promotion of public policy "science". Greater rationality in policy-making has been advocated through the deliberate creation of a policy science culture in which democratic participation in the policy-making process is to be encouraged (MacRae 1976). The idea of a policy scientists' (analysts) culture presumes a cultural orientation (in groups) toward shared decision-making on the one hand and an individual's inclination to consult anyone who can contribute useful information or opinion on the subject, on the other.

By way of concluding from the preceding discussion, some cultural elements of the Western societies can be closely associated with the principal concerns of policy science : (a) Policy science's concern for improving meta-policy-making and control of future can be associated with the belief in man's controllability of his future and the never-ending quest for improvement, (b) the methodological approach in policy science can be related to a high social regard for science, and therefore, for objective analysis, and (c) the concern for a policy science culture assumes readiness for shared decision making. A further consideration of each of these areas is useful for the understanding of the interplay between cultural factors and the expectations of policy science.

III. The Cultural Imperatives

1. The Planning Horizon

The ideological foundations of Western Societies mainly the American Society, are to be found in the ideology of democratic liberalism. While such philosophers as John Locke (1632–1704), Stuart Mill (1806–1873), and John Dewey (1859–1952) gave conceptual interpretations to the ideals of democracy and liberalism, the American constitution promised life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; the individual's freedom of action and possession was placed central and high in the social order. In contrast, the philosophical foundations of many LDC societies particularly in Asia are apt to emphasize the universal concepts, and to subordinate the concrete individual and the particular perception to the universal. The view of an integrated society is incompatible with the concepts centered on the individual or the particular.

The individual in the liberal society acts in a social environment in which he has considerable choice in what he does. Being individualistic, he expects future events to follow his action now. He is ready, therefore, to take the blame for what may go wrong. Individual responsibility for one's action is stressed in other societies such as India and Sri Lanka, as well. This is often explained in terms of the religio-social doctrine of Karma which says that an individual is working out in the present life, the consequences of his actions in the past life, and also those of the present life. However, there are two distinct differences to be noted in these American and Eastern doctrines. The liberalist notion of the individual refers to the relations between individual and his external environment, the material and social. There the individual is self-confident in his ability and in the desirability of self-determination of his own situation. The Karma outlook of the individual, drawn from the principle of moral responsibility of man for his own deeds, refers to individual's actions in relation to one-self, the spiritual and internal environment. Here, the individual is helpless regarding his own situation, and the question of man's ability and desirability of determining external, future environment does not arise. The doctrine of Karma professes the transference of guilt or merit from one individual to other individuals or to the group as a whole (Thakur, 1981 : 72). Attribution of cause to the external like in attributing famine to the wrong deeds of the king for example, is related to the doctrine of Karma. Thus, the idea of controlling the future is alien to the cultures where Karma is valued. It fits into the liberal value that the individual has confidence in self-determination of his future environment but not into a system of value where the individual does not take responsibility in his relation to material and social environment and change of which can be attributed to the external by transfer.

While self-determination of the material and social environment is a culturally alien concept for many LDCs, the politico-economic structures that are transplanted on the LDC's pre-capitalistic economy have dampened any hopes for the promotion of the idea of self-determination and control of their future. Thus, one could say that the cultural values in question are re-inforced by the politico-economic structures of the LDCs, and therefore, policy science's orientation to the control of future—planning orientation—would not be appealing to the cultural minds of public administrator in the developing countries.

Justification for Wildavsky's brilliant attack on the feasibility of planning in LDCs comes from the definition of planning as the ability to control the future. The loss of uniqueness in planning as a process which can control the future of LDCs is attributed to the political process and economic environment of those countries (Wildavsky, 1973, Caiden and Wildavsky, 1974). For the impossibility of planning, discreet political decision-making pervades over all the activities of government. Under these circumstances the policies emerging from public administration would be highly pragmatic showing tendencies toward sub-optimization. The policy processes could be incremental or what Richard Rose calls as discontinuous or cyclical. Incrementalism implies, among other things, conservation, lack of confidence in significant departures and a lack of will to exercise freedom to choose. The definition of a new policy objective represents discontinuity from the past, while the policy-makers' alternation between options over time represents a cyclical model (Rose, 1976 : 7-9). Cyclical and discontinuous policies are adopted when the government wishes to cope with a problem rather than eliminate its causes; resolve dilemmas of choice by making different choices at different points in time; and deal with 'problems,' only when they are present and pressing for solutions. This behaviour is different from perseverance of a direction based on expectation and prediction. The politico-economic explanation of this difference gains its strength from the the anti-planning phenomena which describes the impracticability and perhaps futility of planning efforts. A socio-cultural explanation goes beyond this, and it would attempt in part to find on its own account what is there underneath the politico-economic phenomena which are anti-planning. A socio-cultural explanation would also attempt to deal with another phenomena, that is, the socio-psychological environment which makes the concept of planning inappropriate and alien to the administrative systems in LDCs. In other words, even if the politico-economic factors are conducive to planning, would people in LDCs plan ? The answer to this question may be "no" if one is confident that a given LDC society does not have a planning tradition. In the event, can policy science hope to shift policy-making approaches in LDCs and

thereby find and introduce fundamentally new policies ? Or, will policy science have to contend with cyclical and discontinuous policies which are guided by pragmatism and sub-optimization ?

Wildavsky's extensive study of planning experiences in LDCs (Wildavsky, 1974) alone is sufficient to understand the extent of practical use of plans in the formulation of public policy. With regard to the private sector, Negandhi's study of 126 industrial firms in seven countries (six developing countries and the USA) finds that long-range planning of 5-10 years' duration was common among US subsidiaries in the six developing countries. The typical US subsidiary formulated its long-range plans in detail and involved all levels of managerial, technical and supervisory personnel in the planning process. Policy-making was taken seriously at higher levels to use major policies both as guidelines and instruments of overall control of the firm (Negandhi, 1975 : 246). In contrast, the planning orientation of a typical local firm in those LDC countries is characterized as medium to short-range (one to two years). The plans are less comprehensive, participation in planning is sporadic, and plan implementation was not taken very seriously (Negandhi, 1975 : 248). With regard to public organizations, nothing more than this could be true.

The lack of future orientation in a culture could be an obstacle to the absorption of policy science (because of its future orientation), so we contended above. However, what in the presence or absence of this future orientation are practically responsible for the state of having or not having a planning tradition ? At least four aspects of the future orientation need some attention here : (1) realistic cost-benefit analysis, (2) faith in hard-work, (3) obligation to fulfil commitments, and (4) belief in time as a critical factor.

An important assumption underlying future orientation is the realistic or pragmatic evaluation of what can be achieved in the future, an equalization of one's capacity and objectives. In many LDCs planning is idealistic in the sense that costs are under-estimated, benefits are over-estimated, and targets are set at higher levels. Idealism affects the extent of clarity, detail, and logic in implementation. Organizations are overly optimistic about achieving objectives on the one hand, and on the other they do not have faith in the means toward goal achievement, i.e. persistent hard work as understood in the West. The Westerner, though not necessarily influenced by the Puritan ethic that hard work is a virtue in itself, holds the belief strongly that persistent, purposeful effort is necessary to achieve high goals. In some of LDC societies, inherited wealth as opposed to recently accumulated wealth, and perhaps luck, are valued more than hard work. Those who work hard are looked-down by others in the belief that those who work hard do not have other short-cut means or they are not strong enough in the socio-political "system" to achieve their own goals. Faith in rewards for persistent hard

work is an assumption in the broader context of future orientation, and the lack of this faith could explain the failure of plans. Can policy science expect to survive there?

At the individual level, planning means a future commitment to be honoured by the individual himself. Planning makes one obligated to one-self. From an organizational point of view both at corporate and interpersonal levels, planning requires employees moral obligation to meet prior commitments. In many LDCs, the term "commitment" carries different meanings. For example, what a Westerner takes as a commitment may be, in an LDC context, little more than a friendly conversation (Newman, 1972 : 331). To the Westerner, furthermore, *when* things occur is important. Planning is done essentially on a temporal dimension. If time is not valued as a critical factor, planning will have little meaning. These assumptions put together seem to suggest that planning is a culturally loaded activity, and therefore, policy science in this direction needs consideration in the socio-cultural context of the country concerned.

As was mentioned earlier, another principal assumption underlying policy science is the never-ending quest for improvement of public policy and policy-making. A fundamental value at the centre of the process of building up modern industrial society had been and continues to be the widespread readiness in a society to challenge the status quo. The vital role of science in industrial and economic development through innovation has been possible because of this fundamental value. Both technological and social changes are accepted in those societies as prerequisites or essentials in the normal way toward progress.

In most of our oriental cultures change is viewed as natural. It is nature, not man, that is responsible for bringing about change. Nature should determine when and where change is suitable. Therefore, at a given point in time, the natural that is status quo, has to be accepted by man. Attempt to go against or beyond natural change is often considered undesirable or futile. One should not, however, overlook the innovations in these societies, especially in the sphere of technology in agriculture. Ancient civilizations were symbolized by unique technological developments, but the societies were unable to continue with the process. An explanation to the technological discontinuities in these civilizations has to be found perhaps in the interface between attitudes toward change and the orientation toward future. The tendency toward technological conservatism had its happy marriage with Western colonization of these countries after the 16th century. The present day societal attitudes toward change must be understood as a hybrid of old values and values cultivated in the colonization process.

In a study of 279 public administrators in India, it has been found that approximately 97 percent of the administrators would like to follow routine work methods of the organization or work as directed by the superiors rather than make experiments (Thakur, 1981 : 295). Bureaucratic behaviour generally favours status quo in organizational work methods elsewhere too. Nevertheless, this finding simply points to the rather excessive acceptance of things as given. This value environment places serious constraints around the policy science's expectation of creativity, experimentation and invention of methods and designs in public policy.

2. The Scientific Dimension

Policy science's systematic and rational approach to solving social issues is drawn from the traditions in natural sciences. "As social science does more analysis of hypotheses, predictions, causation, and optimizing, there develops a body of potential premises that can be used in deducing conclusions, just as chemistry was able to deduce the existence of new elements before they were empirically discovered" (Nagel, 1980 : 204). The origins of policy science also lie in management science and the classical management literature. The association with management science suggests an instrumental relationship between social research and choice. Carol Weiss describes this instrumentalist understanding as a "decision-driven" model of research use (Weiss, 1977).

The impressive number of chapters and articles devoted to the teaching of policy studies and the training of policy analysts/scientists reflect the fact that the policy science involves primarily the development of professional experts in rational decision-making. The orientation of these professionals is apparent from Nagel's discussion of methods of policy analysis, which consists mainly of a review of the principles of optimization in decision theory. The thorny question of how to accommodate values within a rational model of choice is faced in a cursory way by (a) acknowledging the significance of the matter, and (b) suggesting that policy analysts be required to submit "sensitivity analyses" along with their recommendations, in order to demonstrate how the optimal policy choice varies with changes in the relative weight assigned to the values being maximized. In response to the often made criticism that the methods of policy analysis are open to abuse, lending themselves as readily to the maximization of undesirable ends as to desirable ones, Nagel advocates the development of a code of ethics, professionalization, and institutionalized checks (Nagel, 1980 : ch. 9).

The influence which Deweyism has had upon policy science is profound. Lasswell acknowledged the intellectual debt when he wrote that, "policy sciences are a contemporary adaptation of the general approach to public policy that was recommended by John Dewey and his colleagues in the deve-

lopment of American pragmatism" (Lasswell, 1971). Faith in human intelligence is central to Dewey's thought. As Hook explains, "for Dewey the survival and expansion of democracy depends upon its use of scientific method or creative intelligence to solve its problems" (Hook, 1980 : 172). This is not merely a rationalism of means, but a rationalism of ends as well. Dewey maintained that, "if ever we are to be governed by intelligence, not by things and by words, science must have something to say about *what* we do, and not merely about *how* we may do it most easily and economically" (Dewey, 1910 : 217). The foregoing review is sufficient to demonstrate that policy science is but the most recent manifestation of a longstanding tradition in American Social Science, viz. the flight from messy confrontational politics.

Policy science demands from the public administrator a scientific approach to social issues. This is an appeal for objectivity. Science requires rationality in behaviour, and faith in it. How much of this does the LDC administrator possess? In Thakur's study quoted earlier, the administrators surveyed were asked whether science or religion would do good to humanity. Thirty eight per cent said both were equally necessary, 43.3% said 'plenty of science and a little bit of religion,' and the rest held that science would do more than religion. The important point here is not that everyone thought of religion as having some role, but on average both science (rationality) and religion (extra-rationality) are equally valued. Furthermore, in a traditional society where kinship and other group loyalties matter very much emotional neutrality and impartial evaluation cannot be expected to pervade the society and its organizations. And, therefore, a high degree of objectivity in the gathering, dissemination, analysis, and evaluation of information in those organizations must not be expected.

A factual, rational analysis of decisions is not made in some countries for one or more of the following reasons. First, a decision may be based on the personal judgment of a key executive, and any attempt by him to explain his action would be interpreted as implying a lack of confidence in his judgment-both by the executive himself and by others. Second, the use of "hard data" may be not customary; instead, decisions are expressions of wisdom whose infinitive beauty might be sullied by controversial detailed information. And, third, it may be inappropriate for a senior executive to consult others, at least personally, about matters in which he is already presumed to be wise. In such situations, objective analysis would only destroy the aura or mystique surrounding decision-makers (Newman, 1972 : 341-42).

In a society where values dominate over facts, objective evaluation of facts by someone is hindered by the beliefs shared by others. An attempt at objective evaluation of facts can be easily and quickly interpreted, for example,

in terms of the personal relations between the evaluator and the one responsible for the gathering or utilization of the facts. The tendency is to hide than disclose facts and values which are considered in a decision or policy-making situation. Can policy science survive in such an environment ?

3. The Social Aspect of Policy Science

Policy science encourages democratic participation in the policy-making process. Duncan MacRae's book, *The Social Function of Social Science* (1976), contains a typical statement of this position. MacRae advocates greater rationality in policy-making, achieved through deliberate creation of a policy analysis culture. This policy analysis culture has three principal features : (a) technical experts who are sensitive to the ethical implications of decisions (b) close cooperation between researchers in academic and research institutes, and policy practitioners in government, and (c) an informed citizenry to fend off the anti-democratic spectre, of an expert ruling class. This is squarely in the tradition of Dror's pioneering writings on the contours of a policy science culture.

The idea of a policy science culture assumes the existence of identifiable decision-makers whose choices are decisive and who, themselves, are identifiable. Dror attempted to make allowance for the reality of an amorphous policy-making system through his advocacy of both a decentralized network of policy science cultures and the deliberate promotion of a policy science culture (Dror, 1971a, 1971b). However, Lindblom and Cohen suggest that the policy analysis approach is invariably misleading in that it identifies problem understanding as both necessary and prior to problem solving, and thereby neglects the interactive and social learning approaches to social problem solving. These latter approaches, they suggest, are more appropriate to the reality of an amorphous policy process in which outcomes are seldom attributable to the choices made by one or a small number of identifiable actors (Lindblom and Cohen, 1979).

This view of policy, made in a larger socio-political process, has its own intellectual history in the German and American traditional methods of historical and philosophical inquiry which have now become unfashionable. Policy Science attempts to introduce greater rationality into political institutions. The 'ideal of objectivity', as Hugh Hawkins has described, can be attained by involving the participation of social scientists in the policy process through consultation, and generally, as a source of expert advice (Hawkins, 1976). The sense of mission which is found in the policy science writings of Lasswell and Dror is no less evident in the work of America's first social scientists. Universal public education and sociological training for legislators were measures advocated by Lester Ward in order to embed rational decision-making into the very culture and political institutions of American

Society. This social science tradition of introducing rationalism into democratic institutions runs undiluted from Ward to Dror. These visions of a new politics share a conviction that the institutionalization of scientific analysis into the policy-making process is a necessary condition for the attainment of democratic government in a modern society.

A social science tradition of the nature described above is either absent or present only in a weak form in the LDCs. Bringing rationality to political institutions through social scientists' participation is far away from a rationalist expectation. Among the many factors which may account for this, we are concerned with the socio-cultural ones. At the heart of many problems that may arise in the way toward a policy science culture there is the socio-cultural variable of interpersonal relations. To what extent are managers in LDCs open and ready for sharing decision-making ?

England's study of over 2,500 managers in five countries finds that the value that managers place on most employee groups as significant reference groups is high for the USA and low for Korea and India (England, 1975 :10). The relatively less concern for group membership in organization is due probably, at least in part, to managers' loyalty to groups outside the organization. This also implies a relatively closed mind, one which does not allow the recognition of one's weaknesses. Under the circumstance, managers may not be ready for horizontal consultation whereby those outside the channel of command, type of position or echelon, are consulted for policy and decision-making. A policy science culture, that is professionalization of policy science activity, requires, beyond the cultivation of professional and ethical standards, an analyst who is flexible, open, and democratic. Do our policy-makers and administrators come closer to this requirement ?

IV. Towards an Agenda for Research

Policy science promises a dramatic improvement of public policy-making. Concerned with future, it offers a scientifically sound approach to dealing with public or social issues. In the process of development of policy science in practice, it envisages, perhaps as a prerequisite to the success of its function, that the community behaviour among policy analysts and policy-makers must also develop.

The need for improving public policy-making in developing countries is unquestionably great. In these countries, unlike in the developed societies, the fundamental public choices are still to be made. These choices are economic, political, and inter-national. Very frequently they are complicated by social and ethnic concerns. The policy choices are not carefully made. The attempts, by nature, are fragmented, problem or issue directed in a

narrow sense, and therefore, often discontinuous. Careful investigation, broader outlook, and deep analysis are required on an extended inter-organizational framework. The delay in our effort at sharpening the public administrator's involvement in policy-making will mean an unbearable decay of our institutional capability in the future. Therefore, the policy science's promise for a dramatic improvement of policy-making needs serious attention in the developing countries.

However, the foregoing discussion of the cultural imperatives of policy science poses a dilemma for the developing countries. From a cultural point of view, there are some serious reservations about the possibility of the using policy science approach, as developed in the West, at the service of public administration in developing countries. What shall we do? Should we reject policy science as totally inappropriate or incongruent with our environment, and therefore, leave the subject matter at the academic level? Otherwise, are we ready to look into policy science as an approach which could be of practical use in public administration? If the latter is the case, the issue at hand is finding out the modifications required to make policy science viable and useful in our socio-cultural environment. For this, responsibility lies mainly with Policy Science researchers in developing countries who are required to search for modifications on both sides, namely, the policy science and the socio-cultural environment itself.

References

- Abegglen, James, 1958.—*The Japanese Factory*. Glencoe : The Free Press.
- Barret G.V., and B. N. Bass, 1970.—“Comparative Surveys of Managerial Attitudes and Behaviours,” Boddewyn J. (ed), *Comparative Management : Teaching, Research, and Training*. New York : Graduate School of Business Administration, 179–207.
- Caiden N., and Aron Wildavsky, 1974.—*Planning and Budgeting in Poor Countries*. New York : John Wiley.
- Committee on the Professional Schools and World Affairs, 1967.—*The Professional School and World Affairs*, Albuquerque : Univ. of New Mexico Press.
- Davis, Stanley M., 1971.—*Comparative Management : Cultural and Organizational Perspectives*, Englewood Cliffs : Prentice Hall.
- Dewey, John., 1910.—“Science as Subject Matter and as Method,” *Science*, 31
- Dore, Ronald, 1973.—*British Factory—Japanese Factory*. London : Allen and Unwin.
- Dror, Y., 1968.—*Public Policy-making Reexamined*, New York : Chandler.
- , 1971a.—*Design for Policy Sciences*, New York : American Elsevier.
- , 1971b.—*Ventures in Policy Sciences*, New York : American Elsevier.
- Drucker, Peter F., 1971.—“What We Can Learn From Japanese Management,” *Harvard Business Review*, March-April.
- England G. W., A. R. Negandhi, and B. Wilpert (eds), 1979.—*Organizational Functioning in a Crosscultural Perspective*, Ohio : Kent State University Press.
- Farmer R.N., and Barry M. Richman, 1965.—*Comparative Management and Economic Progress*, Homewood III, Irwin.
- Haire M. et al. 1966.—*Managerial Thinking : An International Study*, New York : Wiley.
- Hawkins, H. 1976.—“The Ideal of Objectivity Among American Social Scientists in the Era of Professionalization, 1876–1916,” in Frankel (ed) *Controversies and Decisions*. New York : Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hook, S., 1980.—*Philosophy and Public Policy*, Carbondale : Southern Illinois University Press.
- Hutchins, David, 1981, “Ringing the Bell with Quality Circles,” *Management Review and Digest*, 8 : 1.

- ILO, 1965.—Conclusions of the I.L.O. Meeting of Experts On Social and Cultural Factors in Management Development, Geneva, 22 November-4 December.
- Jantsch, E., 1970.—“From Forecasting and Planning to Policy Sciences,” in *Policy Sciences* 1. pp. 31-47.
- Jones, W. G., 1983.—“Quality’s Vicious Circles, *Senior Management* June.
- Lasswell, H. D. and D. Lerner (eds). 1951. *The policy Sciences*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- , 1968. “Policy Sciences,” in D. L. Sills (ed), *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*, 12. New York : Crowell Collier and Macmillan.
- , 1971.—*A Pre-View of Policy Sciences*, New York : American Elsevier.
- Lindblom, C., and D. Cohen, 1979.—*Usable Knowledge*, New Haven : Yale University Press.
- MacRae, D., 1976.—*The Social Function of Social Science*, New Haven : Yale University Press.
- Megginson, L.C., 1967.—“The Interrelationship and Interaction between the Cultural Environment and Managerial Effectiveness,” *Management International Review*, 7 : 6.
- Mosson, T.M., 1972. “Management and Its Environment in Great Britain,” in Joseph L. Massie and Jan Luytjes (eds). *Management in an International Context*, New York : Harper and Row.
- Nagel, S., 1980.—*The Policy Studies Handbook*, Toronto : D. C. Heath & Co.
- Nanayakkara, G., 1980.—“Public Policy Studies : The Role of Facts and Values in Policy,” *Kalamana*, 1 : 3.
- Narain, D., Mar. 1967.—*Annals*, 124-132.
- Nath, R., 1969.—“A Methodological Review of Cross-Cultural Management Research,” Boddewyn J(ed), *Comparative Management of Marketing*, Glenview, Scott, 195-222.
- Negandhi, A.R., 1975.—*Organization Theory in an Open System*, Mass., University Press of Cambridge.
- Newman, William H., 1972.—“Cultural Assumptions Underlying US Management Concepts,” in Joseph L. Massie and Jan Luytjes (eds). *Management in an International Context*, New York : Harper and Row.

- Reichard, C., 1982. "Socio-Cultural Influences on Management Concepts," (unpublished paper) Seminar on Management in a Socio-cultural Context, Colombo : 7-11 December.
- Rose, Richard, 1976.—"Models of Change," in Richard Rose (ed). *The Dynamics of Public Policy : A Comparative Analysis*, London : Sage.
- Scott, R., and A. Shore, 1979.—*Why Sociology Does Not Apply : A Study of the Use of Sociology in Public Policy*. New York : Elsevier.
- Seneviratna, Anuradha, 1971.—*Culture and Society* (Colombo, Lake House) (Sinhala).
- Thakur, R., 1981.—*Elite Theory and Administrative System*, New Delhi : Sterling Publishers.
- Thiagarajan K.M., 1968.—"A Cross-cultural Study of the Relationships between Personal Values and Managerial Behaviour", Technical Report 23, NONRNOOD 14-67A, Rochester, Univ. of Rochester, Management Research Centre.
- Ventura, Arnold K. 1981.—The Cultural impact of the Transfer of Technology in Developing Countries, *Regional Development Dialogue*, 2 : 1.
- Weinshall, Theodore D. (ed), 1977.—*Culture and Management*, Penguin Books.
- Weiss, Carol., 1977.—(ed) *Using Social Research in Public Policy-making*, Toronto : D. C. Heath & Co.
- Wildavsky, Aron., 1973.—"If Planning is Everything..." *Policy Sciences*, 4.
- Yoshino, M.Y., 1968—"Administrative Attitudes and Relations in a Foreign Culture," *MSU Business Topics* 16, 1.