



Public Administration and Policy Analysis in Latin America: Diffusion of Models and Resistance to Change

Administración Pública y análisis de Políticas Públicas en América Latina: difusión de modelos y resistencia al cambio

LEONARDO SECCHI^{*1}

LUCIANO BUSARELLO^{}**

NICKOLAS ANDRADE DE ASSIS^{*}**

FLÁVIO FACHA GASPAR^{**}**

Clasificación COLCIENCIAS-PUBLINDEX: Artículo de investigación.

Recibido: 12/08/2021

Revisado: 30/13/2021

Aceptado: 11/10/2021

Abstract

This paper aims to study the adoption of Public Administration Paradigms (PAP) and Public Policy Analysis Traditions (PAT) in the national governments (executive power, direct administration) of the following Latin American countries: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Mexico. We focused on the triggers for change and institutional barriers for the adoptions of PAP and PAT. Data collection was carried out through document analysis and semi-structured interviews with scholars and practitioners of public administration and policy analysis from the selected region, totaling 14 interviews. Within the scope of Public Administration Paradigms, the research was based on the following paradigms: patrimonialism, bureaucratic Weberian, New Public Management and Public Governance. Regarding Policy Analysis Traditions, the study adopted the distinction between incrementalism, rationalist and argumentative approaches to policy analysis. The study shows that there is a hybridization of these Paradigms and Traditions, each adapted to the reality of the countries. The external influence of epistemic communities of Public Policy and Administration, and international organizations, such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the Inter-American Development Bank, are presented as key factors for policy/model diffusion. The main resistance to change with national governments is related to cultural and institutional factors, mainly path dependence on the established bureaucratic model and predominance of incremental models of policy analysis, even though there is dissemination of rationalist practices especially in technically intense "island of excellence", at the national governments and their agencies. The diffusion of argumentative policy analysis and public governance principles is perceived in discourse and in practice in a few countries. This recent diffusion is, nonetheless, depend on the political leadership in charge of the National Government to promote an open and integrative approach to public affairs.

¹ *Professor associado, Departamento de Administração Pública, Centro de Ciências da Administração e Socioeconômicas (ESAG), Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina (UDESC). Bacharel em Administração pela Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC, Florianópolis) e Doutor em Estudos Políticos pela Universidade de Milão (Milano – Itália). Grupo de Pesquisa Callipolis – Políticas Públicas e Desenvolvimento. leonardo.secchi@udesc.br

^{**} Bacharel em Administração Pública no Centro de Ciências da Administração e Socioeconômicas (ESAG), Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina (UDESC). Grupo de Pesquisa Callipolis – Políticas Públicas e Desenvolvimento. E-mail: luciano.busarello19@gmail.com

^{***} Bacharel em Administração Pública no Centro de Ciências da Administração e Socioeconômicas (ESAG), Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina (UDESC). Grupo de Pesquisa Callipolis – Políticas Públicas e Desenvolvimento. E-mail: nickolas.assis@edu.udesc.br

^{****} Graduando em Administração Pública no Centro de Ciências da Administração e Socioeconômicas (ESAG), Universidade do Estado de Santa Catarina (UDESC). Grupo de Pesquisa Callipolis – Políticas Públicas e Desenvolvimento. E-mail: flaviofachagaspar9@gmail.com

Cómo citar: Secchi, L. (2021). Busarello, L. (2021). Andrade de Assis, N. (2021) y Facha Gaspar, F. (2021).

Public Administration and Policy Analysis in Latin America: Diffusion of Models and Resistance to Change.

Revista de Administración Pública del GLAP. RAP-GLAP, 5(8), páginas 9–24.

Keywords: Public Administration Paradigms, Policy Analysis Traditions, Policy Diffusion, Latin America.

Resúmen

Este artículo tiene objetivo analizar la adopción de Paradigmas de Administración Pública (PAP) y Tradiciones de Análisis de Políticas Públicas (TAP) a nivel de gobierno nacional (poder ejecutivo, administración directa) en los siguientes países de América Latina: Argentina, Brasil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Perú y México. El estudio se centró en los factores desencadenantes del cambio institucional y las barreras para la adopción de PAP y TAP. La recolección de datos se realizó mediante el análisis de entrevistas semiestructuradas a académicos y especialistas en Administración Pública y Análisis de Políticas Públicas de la región seleccionada, totalizando 14 entrevistados. En el ámbito de los Paradigmas de la Administración Pública, la investigación se basó en los siguientes paradigmas: patrimonialista, burocrático, nueva gestión pública y gobernanza pública. Con respecto a las tradiciones del análisis de políticas públicas, el estudio adoptó la distinción entre enfoques incrementalistas, racionalistas y argumentativos para el análisis de políticas públicas. El estudio evidenció la existencia de hibridación de PAP y TAP, cada una adaptada a la realidad de los países. La influencia externa de comunidades epistémicas de Política y Gestión Pública, organismos internacionales, como el Banco Mundial, el Fondo Monetario Internacional y el Banco Interamericano de Desarrollo, se presentan como los actores clave para la difusión de modelos. La principal resistencia al cambio en los gobiernos nacionales está relacionada con los factores culturales e institucionales, principalmente el *path dependence* del modelo burocrático y el predominio de modelos incrementalistas de análisis de políticas públicas, incluso con la difusión de prácticas racionalistas especialmente en sectores con intensidad técnica (islas de excelencia). La difusión del análisis argumentativo de las políticas públicas y los principios de la gobernanza pública se perciben en pocos países. Esta reciente difusión depende, sin embargo, del liderazgo político a cargo del Gobierno Nacional para promover un enfoque abierto e integrador de gestión pública.

Palabras clave: Paradigmas de Administración Pública, Tradiciones de Análisis de Políticas Públicas, Difusión de Políticas. América Latina.

Introduction

Public Administrations from different countries face similar policy and management hardships and they create similar solutions to these problems. Public Policy and Administration studies focus on concepts, processes, government systems, public policies, and institutions in certain countries (or subnational entities), to identify standards and good practices.

Jeisat (2005, 2011) argues that most internationally published studies in Public Administration focus on countries from Europe, Asia, and North America. The same conclusion was reached by Geva-May, Hoffmann and Muhleisen (2018) about policy research. The authors explicitly indicate a lack of comparative publications from the Global South, in general, and from the Latin American region, specifically. This shortage of publications hinders the diffusion of knowledge and administrative solutions across Latin American countries, and from Latin America to the Global North.

The objective of this paper is to analyze the adoption of different Public Administration Paradigms (PAP) and the Policy Analysis Traditions (PAT) in Latin American national governments.

Public Administration Paradigms (PAP) are organizational and relational models adopted by the Public Administration with a reasonably coherent set of values, doctrines, and justifications (Hood & Jackson, 1991; Barzelay, 2001). The four dominant paradigms adopted in different countries, and recognized in the international literature, are the patrimonialist public administration, the Weberian Bureaucratic model, the New Public Management, and Public Governance.

Policy Analysis Traditions (PAT) are methodological approaches to the formulation of policies, adopted by policymakers to understand a public problem and to build a corresponding policy recommendation (Dunn, 1981; Weimer, 1998; Fischer, 1998). Three prescriptive policy analysis traditions have established in theory and governmental practice: incrementalism, rationalist policy analysis, and argumentative (post-positivist) policy analysis (Lindblom, 1959; Weimer & Vining, 2011; Fischer & Gottweiss, 1993).

Latin America countries share similar cultural and political-administrative characteristics (Spink, 1997; CLAD, 1998; Marini, 2002; Nef, 2003; Klinksberg, 2005; Ackerman, 2007; Ramos & Milanese, 2017; Motta & Bandeira, 2018; Peters, Fontaine & Mendez, 2018). At the same time, Latin American countries present a variation in population and territory size, which reflects on how centralized/decentralized

national administration are and their responsibilities for designing and implementing public policy. To reach common denominators of analyzes, this study focused on the most populated countries in Latin America: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, México, and Peru.

After this introductory section, this article is organized in the following sections: theoretical references on Public Administration Paradigms and Policy Analysis Traditions, the methods for data collection and analysis, the empirical analysis, and conclusions.

Public administration paradigms

Public Administration Paradigms (PAP) are composed by theories, methods, and tools for the management of public organizations. PAP is backed by doctrines, justifications, and values (Hood & Jackson, 1991). The doctrines are prescriptions for actions, the justifications are the reasons for the application of doctrines, and the values are normative directions that inform both justifications and doctrines. To give an example, a prescription for privatization of a certain public agency, must be accompanied by a justification that a private entity is potentially able to provide a less expensive service to a target population. The “less expensive” justification for the privatization doctrine has an underlying efficiency value attached to it.

The theories, methods, and tools to implement a PAP are related to public management policies, and the design of programmatic organizations (Barzelay, 2001). Public management policies are institutional rules and routines related to areas such as expenditure planning and budgeting, human resource management, organization and methods, procurement, and audit and evaluation. The design of programmatic organizations is related to how the public entity chooses to deliver public service, in variations of centralization/decentralization of direct provision, privatization, marketization, interorganizational/networked policy implementation. (Barzelay, 2001).

The theory of public administration has established four ideal-typical PAPs that have been

implemented by national or subnational public entities worldwide. They are patrimonialism, the Weberian bureaucratic administration, New Public Management, and Public Governance (Pollitt & Bouckaert, 2002; Denhardt, 2012).

Patrimonialism

Patrimonialism is a pre-bureaucratic public administration paradigm in which the administration is deemed as property of the monarch. In an old patrimonialist public administration, the public patrimony was mixed up with the patrimony of the Crown. The authority is based on tradition, and the criteria for appointment of administrative positions is proximity and dependability, which gives margin to corruption and nepotism (Bresser-Pereira, 2004). It highlights clientelism, the exchange of favors, the prevalence of private interests over the public interest.

Patrimonialism was widespread in Absolutist States in Europe in the 17th and 18th Centuries, as well as in feudalist, sultanate or ecclesiastical systems (March, 1961; Campelo, 2010).

According to Campelo (2010), there are two types of patrimonialism. The first is the political-administrative, which takes shape through the behavior (or misbehavior) of public servants, resulting in individualistic actions that harm the public interests. The second, known as institutional patrimonialism, embodies institutionalized outdated structures and administrative systems that perpetuate patrimonialist practices.

The building of Public Administration in Western Countries has been influenced by political-administrative and institutional patrimonialism. The use of aristocratic or blood criteria, for the appointment of civil servants, or hereditary transfer of political power, gerontocracy, and gender related criteria favoring males, are examples of remnants of pre-bureaucratic patrimonialism in public administration.

Perhaps the most lasting characteristic of patrimonialism in Public Administration is a spoils system to the appointment of higher or middle rank management positions, based on trust, loyalty to the politician, or party alignment (Bres-

ser-Pereira, 2004). The absence of a professional bureaucracy, or the invasion of political appointees on technical and managerial duties are still present in contemporary administrative structures. In addition, the private appropriation of public offices by politicians, and their appointees, to pursue private goals/corruption are still recurrent in today's public administration practice.

The bureaucratic model

The Weberian bureaucratic model is a socio-economic paradigm based on rational-legal authority applied to organizations. Even though applied in religious, military and public institutions since the 16th Century, the theoretical bases of bureaucracy were assembled by Max Weber in the beginning of the 20th Century (Weber, 1992).

The Bureaucratic model brought to public organizations some features to tackle the old patrimonialism. In his description of the ideal typical models of domination, Weber (1922) identified rational-legal authority as the source of power inside bureaucratic organizations. In this framework, power emanates from formal institutions, instead of charisma or tradition.

Its key doctrines are formalism, neutrality, and professionalism. The formalism helps to guarantee the continuity of services, avoid personal discretion, and enhance administrative efficiency by standardizing working protocols. Neutrality means impersonality in the treatment of public employees and citizens, to avoid privileges or discretionary preferences, and to overcome the confusion of public and private spheres. Professionalism means a contractual relationship between the organization and the public servant, mediated by description of tasks, meritocracy, salary, and a structured career path.

The separation of politics and administration, envisioned by Wilson (1887) is also attributed to the bureaucratic model. The elected political class is expected to formulate and decide policy, while bureaucrats are meant to implement them, regardless of their interests or personal preferences.

The Weberian bureaucratic model was adopted as the base for public administration in Western democracies. Some of its visible artifacts are written communications and decisions, formal hierarchy, merit-based selection of public employees, public tendering and procurement of goods and services, functional organization and specialization of administrative tasks, impersonal treatment of policy takers by public employees, establishment of a trained, permanent, and professional careers in public service.

As widely used, the Bureaucratic model also received sharp criticism, especially after the Second World War. Economists, sociologists, and public administration theorists like Waldo (1948), Simon (1947), Merton (1949) pointed to the so-called bureaucratic dysfunctions: red tape, resistance to change, corporatism, arrogance of employees, and disregard to citizen's needs. This intellectual criticism, allied to a general sense notion of bureaucratic inefficiency and incapacity of the Keynesian State to respond to the growing and complex societal needs, have prompted the experimentation of models like the New public Management and Public Governance.

The New Public Management

Following the limitations of the Bureaucratic model, intellectual and political movements in favor of Administrative and State reforms emerged, especially in Anglo-Saxon countries in the 1980's (Christensen, Lagraeid & Wise 2002). The managerial movement had the private sector efficiency and flexibility as benchmarks to public service, championing values of productivity, performance management decentralization and autonomy to managers, customer-orientation, economic efficiency, and competitiveness (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992; Kettl, 2005).

The New Public Management was tied to a liberal notion of the State, in which private enterprise should be responsible for the provision of services as healthcare, education, transportation, provision of utilities as energy, water, and telecommunications. The claim was that a Schumpeterian Workfare State should replace

the Keynesian Welfare State (Jessop, 1994). Hence, the design of programmatic organizations should include privatization, marketization of public services (i.e. vouchers), and the creation of regulatory agencies to assess performance of providers of public service.

After its initial adoption, the New Public Management paradigm was copied or adapted in different countries, in different continents. Organizations as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OCSE) championed post-bureaucratic management tools and methods, especially in the 1990's and early 2000's (Manning, 2001). In some cases, as in Latin American, conditional loans and capacity building were tied to NPM-inspired tools of public planning, policy design, and evaluation.

As the former Public Administration Paradigms, NPM also received harsh criticism, especially for its ideological leaning and preference for market-driven solutions, the treatment of citizens as customers, and government fragmentation (Christensen, 2012, Klenk & Reiter, 2019). NPM was deemed a limited model, because of its disregard to the "political" nature of Public Administration and preferential recommendation on competition, instead of cooperation, as the primary mechanism to foster motivation among bureaucrats and public service providers.

Public governance

Public Governance or the New Public Governance is a relational model that presupposes the multiplicity of public and private actors in coordinated action to solve public problems. Even as a Public Administration Paradigm, Public Governance pays less attention to managerial tools and practices of government operations, focusing instead on collaborative, horizontality, and open approaches to designing and implementing public policies (Pierre & Peters, 2000).

Public governance also brought back the political trait to the debate of public administration, reducing the prevalence of technical criteria in decision-making processes, in addition to

strengthening the participatory mechanisms of deliberation in the public sphere. According to Heidemann and Kissler (2006, p. 485) "the State ceases to be an institution that differentiates itself clearly and distinctly from the market and society, as it did in the case of the traditional government".

Public Governance has been prescribed and adopted in many countries since the 1990s, triggered by several driving forces (Kooiman, 1993; Richards & Smith, 2002). The first is the increasing degree of complexity, dynamics and diversity observed in contemporary societies, which ends up stressing government structures and resources (Kooiman, 1993). Another catalyst is the modern State's inability to deal with "wicked problems", like global heating, pandemics, proliferation of nuclear weapons, and so forth, increasing the relevance of cooperation by nation states, international institutions, and non-governmental organizations. The third was a reaction to the implementation of NPM, which led to a hollowing out of the state and its capacity (Rhodes, 2017).

The criticism towards the idea of Public Governance is a perceived reduction or displacement of the state as protagonist in policymaking. Public Governance creates multiple decision knots in policy networks, lessening its implementation capacity and leadership in public coordination and control (Richards & Smith, 2002). There is also a friction with traditional representative democracy, as direct and indirect deliberative mechanisms obtain a greater role with the participation of non-elected actors in policy formulation and decision-making.

Policy analysis traditions

for delimitation's sake, we use Dunn's definition of policy analysis as "a practical activity that uses research and argumentation to produce and transform relevant information that can be used in the political process to solve public problems" (1981, p. ix). This is a sufficiently broad definition that encompasses all Policy Analysis Traditions (PAT), and places policy analysis as

knowledge-in-action used by government officials, individuals, and organizations.

By definition, prescriptive policy analysis is different from descriptive policy analysis. Both activities belong to the field of Policy Studies. While prescriptive policy analysis refers to a practical activity to support public decision-making using techniques of policy design, projections, argumentation, and recommendation, descriptive policy analysis (or policy research) is a scientific research activity to produce and organize knowledge about the policy process, its actors, and institutions.

How do political actors build public policy in the real world? How should they do it for a better world? These are two questions that are key to distinguish Policy Analysis Traditions. Since Lerner & Laswell wrote the seminal book “The Policy Sciences” in 1951, scholars and practitioners have struggled to understand and improve policymaking, by using knowledge from a myriad of disciplines, from economics, political science, public administration, sociology, design, psychology, and more. As in any professional activity, the science and craft of policy analysis has evolved, created its own epistemic community, its codes and languages, methods, and traditions. The three relevant traditions to this study are incrementalism, rationalist policy analysis, and argumentative policy analysis.

Incrementalism

The “science of muddling through”, or incremental model of policy analysis, is the most basic, and perhaps the most used, method of public policymaking (Lindblom, 1959). According to Heidemann and Salm (2009), it is neither revolutionary or idealistic, but it is perhaps the most pragmatic by using imitation, adaption, trial and error, political negotiation, successive comparisons of limited sets of policy alternatives, and reliance on past experience.

As patrimonialism is not considered a model of Public Administration, in its prescriptive sense, incrementalism is neither a model of Policy Analysis, as it is an intuitive straight-

forward way of policymaking. It is a tradition, however, because it is institutionalized in organizational culture, and it drives the behavior of political actors. The principal characteristics of incrementalism are: a) it does not properly distinguish policy means and policy goals, as they are defined simultaneously; b) decisions today are highly determined by decisions taken in the past (path dependence), with little margin for creativity or disruption; c) decisions are highly dependent on the interests and perceptions of political actors involved in policymaking, which ends up by promoting politically feasible alternatives over technically optimal ones (Secchi, Coelho, Pires, 2019).

Also named by Lindblom as the branch method for policymaking, it is used by political actors and administrators around the globe, for example, when they negotiate pork barrel policies in Congress, in daily organizational choices at the municipal level, or when planning the size of a state agency budget based on past budgetary decisions.

Rationalist policy analysis

Diametrically opposed to the branch method, or incrementalism, lies the root method, or rationalist approach for policy analysis (Lindblom, 1979, Weimer, 1998).

The rationalist, or rational model, is a tradition of policy analysis of positivist inspiration that clearly separates means and goals, public problems, and policy alternatives, in an attempt to find the best solution to improve social welfare. This is a structured model of analysis following determined steps: problem analysis, definition of goals and evaluation criteria, solution analysis, projection of results for each policy alternative, and policy recommendation (Bardach, 2009; Weimer & Vining, 2011; Secchi, 2016). This type of policy analysis heavily depends on economics and statistic methods for projection of results, such as cost-benefit analysis, cost-effectiveness, risk analysis, impact evaluation, among other quantitative methods.

The policy analyst is expected to be a highly trained expert, that applies competent policy analysis knowledge and methods to find solutions in any policy area, either in complex economic development problems or in simpler issues, as dilapidated sidewalks in urban areas.

Rationalist policy analysis has been widely used in advanced economies since the post-war Era. In the United States, methods of policy analysis are used by federal agencies, the Congress, state and municipal government. Its use has spilled over internationally to multilateral bodies, non-profit organizations, and think tanks. The rational approach is taught in top ranked graduate programs in university across the globe, as well it has established communities of practice and research, scholarly publications, and international conferences. Sometimes called traditional policy analysis or evidence based-policy analysis, it has been the hegemonic approach to public policymaking until today, only contended by the argumentative/deliberative approach that germinated in the 1990s.

Argumentative policy analysis

The argumentative approach of policy analysis is a post-positivist collection of methods and prescriptions to the social construction of participatory policymaking. Although there is no single or structured methodology, the argumentative policy analysis uses qualitative methods from the social sciences, ethnography, and linguistics to build and transmit conflicting narratives, and deliberation among political actors. Instead of evidence and specialized technical knowledge, the argumentative analysis is based on the collective wisdom and political concertation (Fischer & Gottweis, 2012).

The argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning, by Fischer and Forester (1993), is the seminal book that consolidated sparsely connected knowledge at the time, ranging from critical studies, narrative building, civic engagement in the public administration, interpretive, and discourse analysis.

In the argumentative approach, the policy analyst is trained in qualitative analysis, eth-

nography, narrative building, and mediation of conflicts. Her role is to provide and interpret policy arguments in the political arena, as policy forum, policy council, or in participatory setting. This socio-political profile is expected to foster deliberation, consensus building, and legitimization of policy alternatives between state and non-state actors.

Using the argumentative approach of policy analysis, the formulation of public policies is based on the participation of political actors, debates, collegiate deliberations. With an interpretive-constructivist epistemological matrix, it treats public problems and policies dialogically, with adjustments in their definitions according to the interest and mental models of participants (Stone, 1989; Capella, 2015).

The argumentative approach has also received criticism. When compared to the rationalist approach, it clearly lacks guidelines and structure to the policy analysis, as it is based on a post-structuralist and contingent methods of policy analysis. Another shortcoming of the approach is that social constructions and deliberation tend to find politically feasible solutions, which can empower interest groups in capturing decision-making, jeopardize the general welfare, and the sustainability of economic and social policies in the long run.

Methodology

This is an exploratory-descriptive research that aimed to analyze the adoption of Public Administration Paradigms (PAP) and Policy Analysis Traditions (PAT) in Latin American countries. Its exploratory character concerns the search for general and comprehensive information on Public Administration and Policy Analysis conventions and practices in the following countries Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, and Peru. The descriptive nature refers to the intention to further understand the essential characteristics, its historical background, the drivers of such adoptions, and the institutional resistances to change.

To better understand its particularities, and at the same time to draw a general overview of the region, the seven national governments were chosen according to their population size. Therefore, the selection of cases aimed to choose the seven largest countries in Latin America, which reflects explicitly or implicitly the dimensions of national Public Administration, to guarantee a fair and feasible comparison of traits. The selected cases, and their populations in descending order, were a) Brazil: 211.05 million; b) Mexico: 127.58 million; c) Colombia: 50.34 million; d) Argentina: 44.9 million; e) Peru: 32.51 million; f) Chile: 18.95 million; g) Ecuador: 17.37 million (Statista, 2019). Venezuela, with 28.52 million inhabitants, and Guatemala, with a population of 17.58 million, were left out of the study due to the difficulty of accessing information, practitioners, and scholars.

The data collection relied on a literature review of books and articles on Latin American Public Administration and Policy Analysis, and semi-structured interviews with 14 specialists (scholars or practitioners), via web conferencing, in Spanish, from November of 2020 to February of 2021. The access to interviewees was made via the Latin American Group of Public Admin-

istration (LAGPA). A web conference with the Executive Secretary of LAGPA was conducted to identify available specialists from each country.

The interviews with 14 specialists were conducted individually and recorded on-line, via Google Meet platform, in the mother tongue of the specialists (Portuguese for Brazil, and Spanish for the remainder of countries). The interviews were scheduled according to the availability of the interviewees, with an average duration of 45 minutes. An interview protocol was used to guide the conversation, using the following analytical dimensions: 1) Presence of the PAP and PAT typology in the countries' literature; 2) background of diffusion of PAP and PAT in each country; 3) Adoption of PAP and PAT at the national level of government; 4) Variations or degrees of adoption of PAP and PAT in ministries and federal agencies; 5) Drivers for the adoption of PAP and PAT in the country (international organizations, literature); 6) Perceived institutional/cultural resistance to the adoption of PAP and PAT. At the end of every interview, the researchers asked for indication of literature or national governments' documents on PAP and PAT, to supplement the information provided by interviewees.

Table 1. List of interviewed experts.

Country	Position
Argentina	Sub-secretary for International Financial Relations for the Development of Argentina – Federal Government Office
Argentina	Professor at the Escuela Superior de Administración Pública (ESAP) – Colombia (expert on Argentina)
Brasil	Professor of Administration at Universidade Federal Fluminense (UFF)
Brasil	Director of Audition for Infrastructure Policies, Controladoria Geral da União (CGU) – Federal Government
Chile	Professor at the Instituto de Asuntos Públicos (INAP) - Universidad de Chile
Chile	Professor at the Instituto de Asuntos Públicos (INAP) - Universidad de Chile
Colombia	Professor of Political Science at the Universidad Nacional de Colombia
Colombia	Professor of Administration and Organizations at the Universidad Nacional de Colombia
Ecuador	Professor and Dean of the Instituto de Altos Estudios Nacionales (IAEN)
Ecuador	Professor and Research at the Faculdade Latino-Americana de Ciências Sociais (FLACSO)
Mexico	Professor and Principal Investigator at El Colegio de Jalisco
Mexico	Professor of Public Administration at the Center for Research and Teaching in Economics (CIDE) in Mexico City
Peru	Former Minister of Health – National Government of Peru
Peru	Researcher and Consultant of the Universidad Católica Sedes Sapientiae

To carry out the analysis of the collected data, the following steps were taken: (I) critical essays of the selected literature; (II) pre-analysis of interview recordings; (III) analysis of the content of the interviews using the sensitizing concepts (Patton, 1990); (IV) triangulation of the participants' responses with the literature review to find consistencies and inconsistencies (Triviños, 1987); (V) formulation of a summary table containing the main aspects of each country and each dimension of analysis; (VI) writing of descriptions and analysis.

To obtain a better understanding of the articles, records were made of them, containing the main concepts and points deemed important on the subject, creating a theoretical framework that guided the whole research. It is important to note that the bibliography indicated by the specialists was also used in the preparation of the following analysis and presentation of results.

Data analysis and results

Latin American countries share similar cultural and historical patterns. They share Iberian colonial roots and culture, a similar legal-administrative model (civil law), presidential systems of government, and current human development indexes at the same level. Retrospectively, the studied Latin American cases underwent strong economic and social crises in the 20th Century, and oligarchic, and populist governments. The early steps toward democracy and welfare states were interrupted by Military coups in the 1960s and 1970s in several countries. Those military regimes would last until the mid-1980s (O'Donnell et al. 1986 apud Peters, Fontaine & Mendez, 2018). The countries went through a transitional process to redemocratization in the region almost simultaneously in the 1980's and 1990's, followed by neoliberal privatization policies.

In the beginning of the 21st Century, and because of the widespread discredit of traditional political parties, there was a resurgence of populism and nationalism, as well as the election of leftist figures in countries such as Argentina, Brazil, Ecuador, Peru and Mexico (Peters, Fon-

taine & Mendez, 2018). These processes were constantly coupled with the progress of these democracies, albeit often together with corporatist political structures. These governments implemented policies aimed at social redistribution and State induced economic growth.

Background of public administration and policy analysis in latin american countries

In the case of Argentina, the military Junta governed the country from 1976 to 1983, formed by a heavily militarized bureaucratic state; there was a strong tendency to use more incremental and rationalist models. After that, during the 1990s, neoliberal ideals operationalized by New Public Management were introduced to focus on effectiveness and efficiency, regulation of private providers of public service, and a less interventionist state. Argentina has a history of particular interest in policies of a social nature, such as microcredit financing, social taxes, subsidies to citizens for electricity, among others. The building of such policies was driven by participatory policy-making, involving deliberative practices. Public policy formulation models responded in the same way to these trends, addressing cross-cutting issues such as citizen participation, transparency, gender equality and climate change.

The Brazilian historical context shows that patrimonialism has been inherited since the Old Republic (1889 to 1930), characterized by an oligarchic and extremely centralized state, where the models of analysis happened incrementally. The dictatorial government of Getúlio Vargas (1930 to 1937) imported bureaucratic methodologies to Brazil, adopted because of its superiority to patrimonialist administration, according to Bresser-Pereira (1999). To corroborate and institutionalize bureaucracy in the country, decree law 200 of 67 brought a framework with a wide range of instruments that allowed a more professional framework for public administration, adopting the organization by systems and increasing doses of rationalism. However, this

model came to be strongly criticized because it gives primacy to the process, and to the ultimate ends of public policies. The need for modernization became more apparent, being realized with the State reform of 1995, which brought managerialist ideals to Brazil as a response not only to the crisis of the state of 1980s, but also to the process of globalization (Bresser-Pereira, 1999). With the election of ex-President Lula, and later his successor Dilma Rousseff, both from leftist Workers' Party (PT), there was an attempt to wipe out liberal beliefs, not neglecting rationality, but with an expansion of spaces of collective construction, encouraging deliberation and participation as methods for social policymaking. Furthermore, according to Lustosa da Costa, one of the Brazilian interviewed experts, "the bureaucratic model prevails, opening spaces for managerial practices and, to a lesser extent, for public governance".

Exploring the Chilean timeline, it appears that in the decades of the 1990s and the 2000s, there was a strong shift towards the managerial model (NPM) and public governance, along with efforts to implement more rationalist models of policy analysis. This priority, according to Alujas (2001), materialized in an attempt to optimize the management of financial resources, to improve the reach and quality of public services and the qualification and professionalization of civil servants. In addition, this movement sought to encourage the modernization of public administration in general, as stated Cesar Rojas, a Chilean interviewee, "the presence of many features of the bureaucratic model is denoted, especially in more traditional institutions".

At the end of the 1950s, Ecuador started to have the best external indicators (GDP, HDI, etc.) in Latin America, in addition to becoming the largest banana producer in the world, a fact responsible for the creation of a public planning in the heydays of the 1970s. In the same decade, Ecuador went through a military dictatorship that created large public companies (airports, electricity, ports, etc.), all those guided by the bureaucratic model. In the interview with Fontaine, it became clear that what persists nowa-

days in Ecuador is a "technocratic and little institutionalized model, with a tendency towards authoritarianism, emphasizing a very strong central government".

Until the current paradigm was established, the Mexican public administration went through several stages. After the one-party regime of the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI), which lasted 71 years, there are important academic and external influences to bring in the New Public Management. Since the 1980s, Mexico adopted a technocratic system (with its late modernization) with more systematic models of public policies, which generated an interesting process and focused on the professionalization of public administration.

When analyzing the historical connections of Peru, it appears that it was only in the 1980s, in the midst of a strong fiscal and economic crisis, that the development of public careers began. Furthermore, in 1993, already under the government of Alberto Fujimori (1990 to 2000), the Peruvian government developed a vast State Reform, based on more liberal policies, responsible for the reduction of the public machinery and delegation of provision of public goods to the private sector. Peru, since then, became a more centralizing and regulatory entity, very concentrated in Lima. From the 2000s, universities began offering courses focused on public management, which enabled the professionalization of the body of civil servants at the time. Nevertheless, the assessment by ex-Minister for Health in Peru, Guido Maggi, points to "a low level of efficiency and continuity in the maintenance of the national civil service, with low continuity in the positions held".

Finally, the cases revealed similarity of traits, especially on the historical background PAP and PAT adoption. All the cases went through dictatorial governments, some more severe and longer than others, however, with an excessive degree of centralization and with a strong social and institutional control, intrinsic characteristics of the bureaucratic Weberian paradigm and rationalist analyses tradition. Likewise, Rodriguez-Acosta and Rosenbaum (2020) corroborate that, during

the 1960s and 1970s, several Latin American countries moved through highly authoritarian and often very centralized governments - both military and civilian led. In the late 1970s and 1980s, many of these dictatorships collapsed, making room for the adoption of new managerial and analytical practices.

The adoption of public administration paradigms

Initially, it should be noted that all national Latin American governments are managed with a certain degree of centralization, with a strong institutional control embodied in rigid legal processes and systems. The administrative pattern is Weberian bureaucratic paradigm. These traits are inherited by the authoritarian regimes that promoted hierarchical governments. In the mid-1980s, many of these dictatorships collapsed, because of their economic inefficiency, political incompetence and the growing social resentment stemming from their abuse of human rights. In this way, national governments in Latin America realized that they had to balance their budgets (Bresser-Pereira, 2001). According to this author, civil society evolved, and the Weberian bureaucratic paradigm was heavily contested, making room for the introduction of New Public Management principles and tools. The main driver was the reduction of the State through deregulation, decentralization, privatization, outsourcing, and rollback in public personnel prerogatives (Ramos & Milanese, 2017).

Nevertheless, the bureaucratic paradigm is deeply rooted in the region, perhaps granting to Colombia and Peru a differentiated picture. Colombia is characterized as an exception within the adoption of PAP. There, the appealing discourse is the one focused on efficiency and effectiveness. The policy instruments are basically driven to streamline the Public Administration. On the other side of the spectrum, in Peru, there is still a widespread existence of commissioned appointed positions in managerial tasks, which ends up generating a lack of professionalism in management. Political appointments, as in

most Latin American countries, do not follow technical criteria, and end up creating a mass of politically designated people loyal to the politicians. Consequently, public policies are harmed by strong patrimonial ties and government discontinuity.

However, the overall assessment on the adoption of PAP is the coexistence of Paradigms. The Weberian bureaucratic is considered, by all interviewees, as the common ground in national governments, although, there is a nuanced introduction of tools and practices from other paradigms. It is also worth noting that the paradigms do not have a well-defined end and beginning, they come together, forming an institutional hybridity that encompasses countless characteristics of all PAP studied.

Most present policy analysis traditions

When analyzing the PAT, we identified a remarkable homogeneity across Latin American countries. There is a coexistence of the three policy analysis traditions, with a strong presence and influence of the incrementalist tradition and the rationalist policy analysis. The deliberative policy analysis is less referenced by the interviewees and documents.

In the case of Argentina, unlike the other countries covered, a greater tendency was identified to use more deliberative analysis traditions, closely linked to a continuing influence of left-wing parties in the national government and citizen participation in the design of social policies. The country has a very particular interest in social policies, such as microcredit lines, subsidies to citizens for electricity, among others, which has recently brought about a greater tendency to use argumentative policy analyses, which involve greater participation by society.

Similarly in Brazil, the 1988 Constitution and left-wing governments at the federal level in the early 2000s boosted participatory mechanisms to engage citizens in the design of public policies, even at the national levels like National Policy Councils (*Conselhos Nacionais de Políticas Públicas*) and National Conferences (*Con-*

ferências de Políticas Públicas) (Avritzer, 2008; Pogrebinsky, 2010). Even though not referenced as deliberative policy analysis, these instruments were used to open national policymaking to the participation of civil society and institutions along with public officials.

When analyzing the general context, it is possible to see a common ground is the incrementalist tradition in several policy areas, and the introduction of rationalist policy analysis as method for policy formulation in more technical areas like monetary policy, fiscal policy, and economic development. Argumentative policy analysis is also present in some countries, although their implementation is highly depend on the political leadership in charge of the National Government to promote this type of participatory and integrative approach to public affairs.

Difference in the adoption of pap and pat in different government agencies

The present analysis leads to a conclusion that the PAP and PAT are related to each other, and their adoption follows a consistent pattern in Latin America. While incrementalism policy analysis is recurrent in cases of patrimonialist and in Weberian bureaucratic structures, rationalist policy analysis is often used by bureaucratic governments, and those that adopted NPM. In addition, argumentative/deliberative policy analysis is found where Public Governance principles applies, as networked collaboration and participation of societal actors in policymaking.

However, it was found that there is a variation between the economic sector and the social sector. On the one hand, ministries such as the Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Finance and National Security, use a rationalist analysis to base their guidelines with a predominance of the bureaucratic and NPM paradigms. On the other hand, the ministries most connected to social areas and sectors such as the Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Social Justice may choose, even if symbolically, a more argumentative and deliberative style of policymaking, involving so-

cietal actor from the bottom-up and coherent to the pillars of Public Governance.

When dealing with the topic in a more widespread way, observing government ministries and agencies, it is possible to notice that public governance is in greater force in social policies due to the scarcity of resources and the need for articulation through collaborative networks. In the sphere of public companies, the NPM tradition is the most apparent, being based on the ideals of efficiency, effectiveness, and cost-benefit analysis.

However, in many other ministries, what prevails is the old establishment. PAP resembles a rational-bureaucratic control for the achievement of the government's objectives. Nevertheless, some simple attempts to insert society in the formulation and analysis of public policies are present. Finally, according to Ramos and Milanese (2017), a government may contain agencies and organisms with Weberian characteristics only in form, while other areas may have characteristics based on meritocratic appointment of public officials, transparency, impact evaluation, and focus on public policy results.

The influence of international organizations for diffusion of paradigms and traditions

The influence of international organizations on PAP and PAT is also evident. There is almost a pattern in the block, but they are embodied at different times. Since the 1980s, countries' external debt has been negotiated directly with international financing organizations, through conditional debts and the mandatory reform booklets of these organizations. The main institutions that intervened, being observed in the context of all the countries portrayed in this research, was the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). Such entities have influenced not only LA, but hundreds of countries around the world. Furthermore, according to Rodriguez-Acosta and Rosenbaum (2020, p. 86), these countries have also been strongly sup-

ported by these institutions, as well as the help of national agencies as a means of improving the quality of public service delivery.

Another important policy and administration institution is ECLAC, that actively participated in the implementation of new paradigms in public administration through seminars and meetings with experts. However, these specific events did not receive a sequel, being reported simply as meetings, seminars and workshops (Spink, 1997).

In Latin American countries, there was a notable diffusion of the New Public Management paradigms by international organizations. Institutions such as the ECLAC, the World Bank, the IMF were bodies that influenced not only LA, but the whole world in some way. In this way, the European and North American literature on Public Administration Paradigms and Policy Analysis Traditions, and their variations, are widely used as reference for Latin American scholars and practitioners.

Another example was the Loan Contract 2919 / OC-BR to the Program for Strengthening Prevention and Combating Corruption in Brazilian Public Management – Proprevine, signed between Brazilian's Office of Comptroller General (CGU) and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). As noted by Caldeira et. al (2020), "It made it possible to carry out the most diverse projects for the implementation of new institutional capacities, including those linked to international cooperation".

More recently, Mexico, Chile and Colombia have received influence from OECD, that has played a key role in disseminating methodologies for policy analysis and best practices to public management. Mexico joined the organization in 1994, Chile in 2010, and Colombia in 2020. Argentina, Brazil, and Peru are OECD's prospective members (OECD, 2021).

Resistances to change

with some reforms and external influence, there were three major types of resistances identified. The first was in the organization culture,

where civil servants had been used to bureaucratic/incremental paradigms and traditions, and were driven to adapt to the new rules and procedures. The second resistance to change came from the political class, because changes could inflict a loss of influence to politicians and parties used to distributing positions to their rank and files. The third perceived resistance came from formal institutions, where was possible to find a very legalistic self-centered public administration structure, and in some cases regulations, statutes and the Constitution was used as a defense against change.

With perhaps the least structured bureaucracy in national administration, Peru suffers from persistent corruption in the public administration, seen mostly on public procurement, and selection/appointment of public personnel. Many of the proposed reforms were barred at the Congress, as parliamentarians strive to maintain *status quo*. It is also worth noting that there is no cultural resistance, as the vast majority of foreign reforms are well regarded by the population, but as a permanent bureaucracy is still under implementation, it has not crystalized resistance.

Finally, issues like Public Administration Paradigms and Policy Analysis Traditions are far away from the perception and priority to constituents. As political energy is driven to social and distributive policy, there is little room for PAP and PAT in the governmental agenda.

Conclusions

This article sought to analyze the adoption of Public Administration Paradigms and the Policy Analysis Traditions in Latin American national governments. The seven analyzed cases have several similarities and only subtle differences among them with respect to the six dimensions of analysis. Furthermore, in a study carried out by Clad (2010), the fundamentals and deeper historical similarities about the countries of Latin America were raised. There are seven legacies that mark this history, to list: (I) patrimonialism; (II) bureaucratic formalism; (III) the incomplete modernization process generated by bureaucrat-

ic isolation; (IV) the fragility of public management in the social area; (V) excessive centralization; (VI) imitation of foreign formulas; (VII) and the democratic deficit.

By reading articles, documents, and books, and by conducting interviews with specialists of each country, it is visible that the influence of international organizations played a major role in disseminating PAP and PAT in the region. Thereby, as explained by Alujas (2001), in the 1980s and 1990s the mantra has been the reduction or dismantlement of the State's role in delivering public service, to guarantee a faster economic growth. Multilateral organizations such as the IDB, the World Bank and the IMF have made the spread of pro-market (and implicitly anti-state) thinking the cornerstone of their policy for the development of Latin American countries. Although, there is a preponderance of the Weberian bureaucratic model in the public administration, and a mix of incremental and rationalist policy analysis traditions.

In general, cultural, legal-institutional and political resistance have been blocking changes in public administration and in policy analysis in Latin America. The presence of a large vertical structure and a high degree of centralization generated strong social and institutional control. Despite this, it was possible to perceive that the Weberian bureaucratic paradigm and the incrementalist policy analysis are challenged by external influences from multilateral organizations and scholarly publications to promote methods and tools related to rationalist policy analysis (attached to New Public Management) and deliberative policy analysis (attached to Public Governance).

Thus, academic circles and government officials in Latin America recognize the importance of Public Administration Paradigms and Policy Analysis Traditions, but they admit that reality lags behind. In none of the cases there is an implementation of a pure clear-cut PAP or PAT, and we conclude there is a kind of hybridization and coexistence of the models. Thus, the models are historically characterized by a globalist and integrative perspective. In general,

these models do not have an immediate and direct correspondence with a particular theory or current of thought. Rather, they result from an agglutination of practices (Ozlak, 1977). Some policy areas end up accepting and implementing these changes faster, as was seen in Ministries of Finances and Economy, which in all countries have qualified technical staff and more resources to push for reforms.

As a conclusion, there is no single model in Latin America, although the hybridization is common to all studied cases. The history and culture of each country, its mistakes and successes are decisive in how these analytical methods are applied and further studies on the theme are necessary to better understand the content and diffusion of benchmarks to the rest of Latin America.

References

- Alujas, A. V. R. (2001). Modernización de la gestión pública: el caso chileno (1994-2000). *Universidad de Chile, Facultad de Ciencias Físicas y Matemáticas, Departamento de Ingeniería Industrial*.
- Avritzer, L. (2008). Instituições participativas e desenho institucional: algumas considerações sobre a variação da participação no Brasil democrático. *Opinião pública, 14*, 43-64.
- Bardach, E., & Patashnik, E. M. (2019). *A practical guide for policy analysis: The eightfold path to more effective problem solving*. CQ press.
- Barzelay, M. (2001). *The new public management: Improving research and policy dialogue*. New York: Univ of California Press.
- Bresser-Pereira, L. C. (2004). *Democracy and public management reform: building the republican State*. Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Bresser, L. C. (1999). From Bureaucratic to Managerial Public Administration in Brazil. *Reforming the State. Managerial Public Administration in Latin America Lynne Rienner Publishers*.
- Bresser-Pereira, L. C. (2001). New public management reform: now in the Latin American agenda, and yet.... *International Journal of Political Studies, 3*(1), 117-140.
- Caldeira, D. M., Oliveira, P. A. de A., & Santos, C. H. F. (2020). A Influência da Cooperação Internacional na Modernização da Auditoria Interna Governamental Brasileira e Seu Impacto

- to na Política de Governança Pública Federal. *XXV Congreso Internacional del CLAD sobre la Reforma del Estado y de la Administración Pública*, p. 7.
- Campante, R. G. (2003). O patrimonialismo em Faoro e Weber e a sociologia brasileira. *Dados*, 46, 153-193.
- Clad. (1998). A new public management for Latin America. *14th CLAD Annual meeting. Madrid, Spain*, pp. 43-60.
- Clad, C. (2010). Gestión Pública Iberoamericana para el siglo XXI.
- Capella, A. C. N. (2015). Análise de políticas públicas: da técnica às ideias. *Agenda Política*, 3(2), 239-258.
- Christensen, T., Lægreid, P., & Wise, L. R. (2002). Transforming administrative policy. *Public Administration*, 80(1), 153-178.
- Christensen, T. (2012). Post-NPM and changing public governance. *Meiji Journal of Political Science and Economics*, 1(1), 1-11.
- Denhardt, R. B. (2012). *Teorias da administração pública*. Cengage Learning.
- Dunn, W. N. (1981). *Public policy analysis: an introduction*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Fischer, F., & Forester, J. (Eds.). (1993). *The argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning* (p. 214). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Fischer, F. (1998). Beyond empiricism: policy inquiry in post positivist perspective. *Policy studies journal*, 26(1), 129-146.
- Fischer, F., & Gottweis, H. (Eds.) (2012). *The argumentative turn revisited: public policy as communicative practice*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Geva-May, I., Hoffman, D. C., & Muhleisen, J. (2018). Twenty years of comparative policy analysis: A survey of the field and a discussion of topics and methods. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis: Research and Practice*, 20(1), 18-35.
- Kissler, L., & Heidemann, F. G. (2006). Governança pública: novo modelo regulatório para as relações entre Estado, mercado e sociedade?. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 40, 479-499.
- Salm, J. F. (2009). *Políticas públicas e desenvolvimento: bases epistemológicas e modelos de análise*. Ed. Univ. de Brasília.
- Hood, C., & Jackson, M. W. (1991). *Administrative argument*. Dartmouth Publishing Group.
- Jessop, B. (1994). The transition to post-Fordism and the Schumpeterian workfare state. *Towards a post-Fordist welfare state*, 7, 13-37.
- Jreisat, J. E. (2005). Comparative public administration is back in, prudently. *Public Administration Review*, 65(2), 231-242.
- Jreisat, J. E. (2011). Commentary-Comparative Public Administration: A Global Perspective. *Public Administration Review*, 71(6), 834-838.
- Kettl, D. F. (2006). *The global public management revolution: A report on the transformation of governance*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Klenk, T., & Reiter, R. (2019). Post-new public management: Reform ideas and their application in the field of social services.
- Kliksberg, B. (2005). Public administration in Latin America: promises, frustrations and new examinations. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 71(2), 309-326.
- Kooiman, J. (Ed.). (1993). *Modern governance: new government-society interactions*. Sage.
- Lasswell, H. D., Lerner, D., & Fisher, H. H. (1951). *The policy sciences: Recent developments in scope and method*. Stanford University Press.
- Lindblom, C. E. (1959). The science of "muddling through". *Public administration review*, 79-88.
- Lindblom, C. E. (1979). Still muddling, not yet through. *Public administration review*, 39(6), 517-526.
- Manning, N. (2001). The legacy of the New Public Management in developing countries. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 67(2), 297-312.
- Marsh, R. M. (1961). Formal organization and promotion in a pre-industrial society. *American Sociological Review*, 547-556.
- Marini, C. (2002). O contexto contemporâneo da administração pública na América Latina. *Revista do Serviço Público*, 53(4), 31-52.
- Merton, R. K. (1949). *Social theory and social structure: toward the codification of theory and research*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.
- Motta, P., & Bandeira, M. (2018). Innovation Challenges in Latin American Administration. *Public Management and Administration*, 75.
- Nef, J. (2003). The culture of distrust in Latin American public administration. In *Proceedings of the International Association of Schools and Institutes of Administration Conference, Miami, septiembre*.
- Oecd. (2021). Supporting LAC countries in their reform efforts. Available on-line: <https://www.oecd.org/latin-america/countries/>, Access on June 10, 2021.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: how the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Oszlak, O. (1977). Notas críticas para una teoría de la burocracia estatal.

- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. SAGE Publications, inc.
- Peters, B. G., Fontaine, G., & Mendez, J. L. (2018). Substance and methods in the comparative study of policy change.
- Pierre, J., & Peters, B. G. (2000). *Governance, politics, and the state*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2002). Avaliando reformas da gestão pública: uma perspectiva internacional.
- Pogrebinschi, T. (2010). Conferências nacionais, participação social e processo legislativo. *Série Pensando o Direito*, 27.
- Ramos, C., & Milanesi, A. (2017). Public Management Models, Latin America. *Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 70-79.
- Rhodes, R. A. (2017). *Network governance and the differentiated polity: Selected essays* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press.
- Rose-Ackerman, S. (2007). Public Administration and Institutions in Latin America. *Law and Economics Programme, Faculty of Law, University of Toronto*.
- Rodríguez-Acosta, C. A., & Rosebaum, A. (2020). Decentralization, Local Government and Democratic Political and Economic Development in Latin America: An Overview and Assessment. *Journal of Public Administration of LAG-PA*. Vol. 4. No. 6. p. 85-100.
- Secchi, L. (2016). *Análise de políticas públicas: diagnóstico de problemas, recomendação de soluções*. Cengage Learning.
- Secchi, L., Coelho, F. D. S., & Pires, V. (2019). Políticas públicas: conceitos, casos práticos, questões de concursos. *Políticas Públicas: conceitos, casos práticos, questões de concursos*, 3.ed.
- Simon, H. A. (1947). *Administrative behavior: a study of decision-making processes in administrative organization*. New York: Macmillan.
- Spink, P. (1997). Technical possibilities and political imperatives in 70 years of administrative reform. *Comunicación presentada en la reunión de la Latin American Studies Association*. Mexico.
- Statista. (2021). Number of inhabitants in Latin America and the Caribbean in 2019, by country. Available on-line: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/988453/number-inhabitants-latin-america-caribbean-country/>, retrieved on June 06, 2021.
- Stone, D. A. (1989). Causal Stories and the Formation of Policy Agendas. *Political Science Quarterly*. 104(2), 281-300.
- Triviños, A. N. S. (1987). *Introdução à pesquisa em ciências sociais: a pesquisa qualitativa em educação*. São Paulo: Atlas.
- Waldo, D. (1948). *The administrative state: a study of the political theory of American public administration*. New York: Ronald Press Co.
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology* (Vol. 1). Univ of California Press.
- Weimer, D. L. (1998). Policy analysis and evidence: A craft perspective. *Policy Studies Journal*, 26(1), 114-128.
- Weimer, D. L., Vining, A. R. (2011). *Policy analysis: concept and practice*. 5. ed. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Wilson, W. (1887). The study of administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 2(2), 197-222.