

18MPA25E - COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

- **SUBJECT CODE: 18MPA25E**
- **PREPARED BY: DR.P. MAGUDAPATHY,**
Asst. Professor
- **DEPARTMENT: PG & Research Department of Public**
Administration
- **CONTACT NO.: 9994672379**
- **E-MAIL ID: magudapathypalanisamy@gmail.com**

The content is prepared according to the text book and reference book given in the syllabus.

Year	Subject Title	Sem.	Sub Code
2018 -19 Onwards	Elective II:Comparative Public Administration	II	18MPA25E

Objective

To increase the knowledge of the students about the Comparative Public Administration and Administrative System which are prevailing in the various parts of the world namely U.S.A., U.K., France.

UNIT I: INTRODUCTION

Meaning, Nature and Scope of Comparative Public Administration - Evolution of the Study of Comparative Public Administration – Approaches to the Study of Comparative Public Administration – Traditional- Structural-Behavioral – Functional – System , Institutional, Ecological and Modern Approach.

UNIT II: COMPARISON OF LAW AND POLICY MAKING PROCESS

Comparative Study of Legislature and Policy Making Process in UK, USA and France

UNIT III: FUNCTION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCHES

Comparative Study of Executive Branches in UK, USA and France

UNIT IV: METHODS OF JUDICIAL SYSTEM:

Comparative Study of Judicial System in UK, USA and France

UNIT V: TYPES OF CIVIL SERVICE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

Comparative Study of Civil Services in UK, USA and France Comparative Study of Local Government Institutions in UK, USA and France

Textbook

1. Arora R.K. Comparative Public Administration. Unique Publishers, New Delhi , 2007

Reference Books

1. S.S Pahlya, Ravindra Singh, New Delhi , Sterling Publishers Pvt,Ltd, New Delhi,2012
2. RathodP.B . Comparative Public Administration, Abd Publishers Jaipur -2007
3. Juditha Bara And Mark Pennigton Comparative Politics, Sage Publication New Delhi, 2009.
4. Chatorvedi . T.N. Comparative Public Administration Associated Publishing House , New Delhi 2002.

MEANING, NATURE AND SCOPE OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Comparative public administration is the study of two or more public administration systems, and then drawing parallels from them. It has to do with an analysis of the operations of the system in question, for the purpose of finding the strengths and weaknesses. Generally, comparative studies present problems of a general nature (Rodgers, Greve and Morgan 1968, 11), not necessarily concerned with one particular society. It brings out a general view of phenomena, drawing parallels for betterment of the system in question. Through the study, new ideas are generated thus according new solutions to existent problems on the basis of an analytical approach. As the society is dynamic, it becomes imperative to reinterpret and re-evaluate administrative structures to be in line with the ever changing trends in life. This is best done through Comparative Public Administration. A comparative study is usually done on an interdisciplinary format, thus encouraging more analysis on social phenomena. In discussing the subject, it is imperative that Public Administration be defined.

The government has the responsibility of providing security, safeguard the fundamental human dignity and happiness for all. It is therefore charged with serving the proletariat against bourgeoisie exploitation and vice versa (the dictatorship of the proletariat). Anticorruption and antipoverty campaigns are a part of the commitment of public administration in a political system. However, here is a global clamour for democracy, a nebulous concept connoting communalism and pluralism which may be based on irrational decisions. This sharply contrasts bureaucratic coordination on the basis of professionalism, elitism and hierarchical system of operation. The nexus between bureaucracy and democracy is thus provided by public administration (Henry 2007, 3).

Public Administration is the act of implementing public policies, as feedback is relayed to the policy makers. It is government in action, a collective effort of getting things done in accordance with the laid down procedures and within the legal framework. Various scholars have come up with various definitions, all of which have a hinge on the public. It "pre-supposes planned human activities by organizing human and material resources" (Mukhi 1998, 2). L. D. White says it is that which "consists of all those operations having their purpose fulfillment or enforcement of public policy." In his words, former American President Woodrow Wilson defined it as a detailed and systematic application of law (Wilson 1941). To him, therefore, any application of law amounts to public administration.

Corson and Harris define public administration as "... decision making, planning the work to be done, formulating objectives and goals... establishing and reviewing organizations, directing and supervising employees ... exercising control and other functions performed by government executives and supervisors. It is the action part of government: the means by which the purposes and goals of government are realized" (Harris and Corson 1963). It has been argued that public administration should be considered as the fourth arm of government, in addition to the known executive, judiciary and legislature (Barber 1972). This is because administration is quite different from the executive, as it comprises of bureaucrats. This is the full time professional civil service, with technical expertise in policy.

Nicholas Henry talks of public administration as

... a broad ranging and amorphous combination of theory and practice; its purpose is to promote a superior understanding of government and its relationship with the society it governs, as well to

encourage public policies more responsive to social needs and to institute managerial practices attuned to effectiveness, efficiency and the deeper human requisites of the citizenry.

From the above definitions, one thing is clear. Public administration has to do with the policy process in general, and policy implementation in particular. However, there is no single definition so far of the concept except that it is government in action. It therefore becomes both a government as well as a public machinery of operation.

Different scholars still have different views on coverage of public administration. Some see it first and foremost as a policy science, thus categorizing it as Political Science. These hold the integral view as they also believe public administration concerns itself with all activities and policies that go with administration. As a result, they lump ministers and legislators into one category of 'administrators.' Others conceptualize it as an art. Administrators are thus people who get things done through others, as managers. On their own, they cannot do the work.

As such, public administration provides a link between the three traditional arms of government, namely the legislature, executive and judiciary. It may be said to be supportive in each case, without which the arms cannot operate. As the establishment that interacts with the general public, public administration is part of the political process, and therefore helps in policy formulation through feedback mechanism.

Luther Gullick contends that functions of public administration include the following:

- Planning- setting the broad agenda and fixing the targets to be met by the staff.
- Organizing- establishing formal structures of authority, coming up with a chain of command.
- Staffing- getting the correct people for the correct job specifications in a public office.
- Directing- giving orders and providing guidelines to the responsible staff.
- Coordination- creating harmony between and among different departments for optimum functioning. It reduces duplication and wastage.
- Reporting- getting the right information to the right persons within the organization, for record management.
- Budgeting- this function deals with financial planning and controls as well as budgeting, as the name suggests.

This traditional view has not gone without criticism that it is a shallow view of the concept of public administration. It has been criticized for neglecting human relationship. It is also silent on assigning of roles to trade unions and other organized working classes. Modern view of PA considers the subject in terms of administrative theory (the knowledge) and applied theory (the practice), both of which a public administrator should possess. It lays much emphasis in interdisciplinary approach as it deals with human behavior which is affected by a whole complexity of issues.

Elements of Public Administration

- Public administration holds the administrative machinery and this is based on the principle of organization.
- The subject deals with the staff, that is, the public servants and individuals.
- Finances are also a part of the commitments of public administration.
- Work study includes research of administrative resources and where they are available. This brings in material management as an element of public administration.
- Managerial techniques.

Comparative public administration

After the World War II, there was a misconception that public administrative system could be applied uniformly across the world. However, this was not the case as the western kind of weberian bureaucracy could not apply in some areas. This then brought a need for a comparative study, considering the environment that the system is to apply, a study of which brought the advent of Comparative Public Administration. This is the study and analysis of different administrative systems from different social, geographical and cultural backgrounds, then putting them on a balance. Robert Jackson believes that there is need to come up with a science of Public Administration. To achieve this, the various patterns of administrative behavior across different administrative systems need to be brought together then subjected to rigorous systematic analysis. This would bring about a body of knowledge in Public Administration.

Jackson argues that there should be a full exploration of the administrative systems across other cultures for purposes of analysis with empirical findings being put together for scientific analysis. By doing this, hypotheses may be drawn on administrative patterns, and then those that are found to be universally applicable integrated into a general Public Administration theory.

The Comparative Administrative Group has expanded their definition of Comparative Public Administration to include the practice and the theory of the subject. They define it in terms of theory of applied Public Administration across cultures and national sceneries, as well as the accurate data by which it can be inflated and tested.

Nature of Comparative Public Administration

Ferral Heady has categorized Comparative Public Administration into four. The first category is the modified traditional focus of research, and has to do with administrative institutions and organizations, organizational structure, local administration and administrative system of public sector industrial units. This is characterized by a comparison of administrative functions and systems in the west on the basis of their civil service.

The second focus is on the development oriented research. This deals with the omnipresent socio-economic and political changes. Due to the current trend of globalization, these changes have to find a way of being harnessed for the better of society: public administration has to provide a solution for this.

General system model building is the third focus. It has no specific area or system of focus, but rather the whole complexity of Public Administration. It studies the whole administrative system relative to the environment in place. The middle range theory is then the last focus and this considers a particular administrative system. It is the mirror image of the general system model building.

Fred Riggs has laid three trends he believes are taking place in the study of Comparative Public Administration. The first one is the shift from normative to empirical orientation. According to him, traditionally the study was centered on norms rather than factual basis. Thanks to Behaviouralist Revolution, current studies are based on hard facts.

The second shift is one from ideographic to nomothetic orientation. Ideographic concentrates on particularities or unique cases, as opposed to nomothetic which focuses on generalities and regularities.

The final one is the shift from non-ecological to ecological orientation. Initially, administration did not consider environment in its study. There is always interaction between the people and the environment, and so a society cannot be understood without regard to environments, thus the need for the shift.

Scope of Comparative Public Administration

Just like the scope of Public Administration, the scope of Comparative Public Administration is in doubt, though the ubiquity is not. However, attempts have been made at setting the scope, with scholars arguing that it studies public administrative system of a country or a culture and of different countries and cultures.

Comparative public administration studies the democratic institutions and systems of different countries, the causes of success or failure of distinct democratic institutions, how the concept is applied and the level of success of a democratic system. Political systems are also studied, as of the working of a parliamentary system in one country, as compared to another with the same system or different like the presidential in the United States.

The different methods of controlling administration are also studied. Different political systems have different ways of administration. The way administration in a unitary totalitarian regime works is different from the way operations of administration are run in a decentralized liberal democracy. The workings of the three traditional arms of government also vary with the political system in place.

Control and management of human resources is also within the scope of the study. It does not only consider methods of employee administration but also individual employees in their social life. Thus problems and grievances are addressed in Comparative Public Administration. In the developing world, there are often cases of industrial action on the base of working conditions and remunerations, issues which are not pronounced in the affluent societies. Work place discipline is also relatively higher in the developed world as opposed to the least developed countries which wallow in the miasma of poverty, corruption and political impunity.

In the hobbesian state of nature, life was brutish, short, and characterized by fratricidal bloodletting. The state came in to bring sanity and order. A welfare state therefore emerged to take care of its citizens, and so Comparative Public Administration studies the different ways of administering a welfare state with due cognisance of the social, economic and cultural environment.

The workings of the traditional three arms of government are studied relative to different political systems. The role of the head of state in a parliamentary system like in the United Kingdom where real power rests with the monarch, and that of, say, the United States where real power is vested in the President. In such cases, the study considers the influence of the head of state in administration of the state. The subject also studies administrative systems in presidential systems, like in France and the United States, where power rests with the president, but applied differently. Studies on the interaction between the three arms of government are also made. Whereas the United Kingdom has a fused system, the United States has separation of powers with a strict system of checks and balances.

Comparative Public Administration studies institutions at international levels. The changing paradigms in international relations brought about by globalization, terrorism, piracy, global warming, etc all are within the scope. It studies the operations of local self institutions in different countries, as well.

As the study intensifies, the scope of study widens. With globalization developing at an ever faster rate, so is the exchange of ideas on public administration reforms. International conferences and seminars have been organized around the world to have a way for public administration and has worked to widen the scope of study. An example is the introduction in Kenya and Zimbabwe of a mixed system of a president and a prime minister.

Comparative Public Administration

Comparative public administration is defined as the comparative study of administrative systems of different countries. It has been broadened and deepened by the interest of scholars in the administration of Third World countries, especially after World War II.

It is also considered as a movement that seeks to transform the idea of public administration from idealist to empirical and pragmatic. It seeks to make public administration universal, free from particular country-centric tendencies. It has made public administration ecological.

By the study of the comparative public administration, you can understand the administrative structure and their functioning in different settings and associations or countries and what it does and why it works. It also helps to add and improve theories so as to lead to a strong and practical theory of the subject with the help of empirical experiments and analysis.

Evolution of Comparative Public Administration

The comparative perspective in any branch of social science is not very old. Although in ancient times Aristotle initiated a comparative discussion between the city-states of Greece. Nevertheless, it can be said that this view did not become very popular in later discussions of political science.

The real discussion of comparative governance began in the aftermath of World War II, especially in the 1950s. Almond, Powell, Coleman, Apter, Lucian Pye, etc., present comparative analysis in a larger field of comparative politics.

Undoubtedly, this view of comparative politics has encouraged the interpretation and analysis of comparative public administration. Many countries gained independence after the Second World War.

The first challenge of those newly independent countries was rapid socio-economic development. This requires a development administration.

A clear comparative discussion between the administrations of different countries in a particular environment was needed to dispel doubts about what that development administration would look like. Because the administrative model of the West can never be applied to these newly independent countries to get good results. As a result of comparative public administration, it is possible to arrive at what kind of administration is most conducive to the environment of those countries.

Three Different Processes of Comparative Public Administration

There are three different processes that contributed to Comparative Public Administration (CPA).

1. Normative to Empirical

Before the rise of CPA, public administration was a very norm conscious. There is a kind of set of formula and public administration in any country that has to adapt to that kind of formula for making public administration efficient.

But after the world war, public administration focused on empirical reality. On the basis of that reality, public administration would be set up. So it was more focused on context rather than the norm.

2. Idiographic to Nomothetic

Idiographic means an understanding of a specific situation and identifies the unique characteristics of a particular administration. Instead of finding the uniqueness of a particular administration now, the focus is more on generalization. So that we can understand reality from a very abstract point of view.

3. Non-Ecology to Ecology

Instead of only focusing on administration it needs to be understood with the reference of social, political, and cultural context. Unless or until you know the ecology (Social, economic and cultural environment), it is very difficult to understand the nature of the administration.

Comparative Administrative Group (CAG)

Comparative public administration gained prominence in 1962 when the Ford Foundation received significant funding to run the Comparative Administrative Group (CAG) within the American Society for Public Administration.

Throughout the sixties, the CAG organized many research, essays, experimental lectures, and special seminars with administrators.

This CAG was led by Fred Riggs. He gave a theoretical form to comparative public administration.

He spreads the discussion of public administration outside the United States, especially in Third World countries. And facilitates the path of comparative analysis within the administrations of Third World countries. That is why Fred Riggs has been called the father of comparative public administration for his outstanding contributions.

The other contributors to this field are Leonard White, Robert Dahl, Feral Heady, Ramesh Arora, Paul Mayer, etc.

But in 1971 the Ford Foundation stopped funding because they felt that field surveys, identification of various real problems, and their solutions were not important in the CAG's research. Their complaint was that the CAG was more inclined to focus on theoretical discussions or new theories.

Objectives of Comparative Public Administration

The main objective of comparative public administration is the classification of administrative systems. In the question of classification, there is cause-and-effect research to know the administrative similarities and differences of different countries based on experience.

As new public administration takes refuge, comparative public administration does not. It believes in the notion of value neutrality.

With Farrell Heady's analysis in mind, the objectives of comparative public administration can be listed in the following points.

1. One of the aims of this is to build an enlightened knowledge by changing the previous statements about public administration.
2. Public administration research should be expanded with development administration in mind. The nature of development administration will be determined by a precise comparative discussion of the administration in different countries.
3. One of the purposes of comparative public administration is to build a general management model.
4. A comparative analysis will be done on the ongoing problems of public administration.
5. Another important objective is to search for theory by doing comparative research of public administration in different countries and to put those theories into practice.

Characteristics of Comparative Public Administration

From the above discussion, some features of comparative public administration can be identified. They are –

1. This is a relatively new topic in public administration.
2. Comparative public administration has a large number of contradictory discussions. Researchers from different disciplines may have come here, but there is a lot of discussion on the subject.

3. The application of the scientific method in the discussion of comparative public administration is particularly noteworthy.
4. Since the Ford Foundation of the United States contributed financially to its development, U.S. researchers and administration experts dominated this particular discipline.
5. Comparative public administration has been interested in theory building and moving towards the administrative problems of the developing state and its possible solutions.
6. Apart from these, it makes students, teachers, researchers, administrators, and experts aware of the public administration of other states. In addition, another state can be established by bringing administrative institutions and administrative procedures from other states and this is possible only through comparative public administration.

Significance of Comparative Public Administration

Comparative public administration is probably one of the most discussed and enriched topics in the modern discussion of public administration. At the same time, comparative public administration has established its importance and significance in intellectual discourse and in the practical world.

The comparative discussion of the administrative structure of different political systems and its functions helps to form the theory. Many people think that if the theoretical discussion is taken forward through this kind of discussion, then the matter also becomes scientific. In addition, the characteristics of the administrative system of different states can be easily mastered through comparative public administration.

The significance of comparative public administration can also be noticed in practical matters. Through comparative public administration, administrators, policy makers and researchers can understand the successes and failures of administrative structures in different environments. It is possible to know what kind of administrative structure can be successful in any environment through comparative public administration.

Thus, in different states, in different environments, in different political and cultural contexts, it is possible to build a political system that is useful or consistent if one knows what kind of administrative structure has succeeded, what kind of administrative feature has succeeded or what administrative feature has failed.

From the above discussion on Comparative public Administration, it can be concluded that the contribution of the comparative approach to administrative research at present is particularly significant.

However, when the CAG closed in the 1970s and merged with the International Committee of the American Society for Public Administration, it was doubtful that the practice of comparative public administration would cease. But it turns out that the potential for comparative research is growing in the modern era.

In the context of globalization, exchanges between states have also increased. That is why different states are deepening the relationship between them. As a result, the possibility of comparative discussions is increasing. The bureaucracy of different political systems, government management systems, relations

between government and non-government organizations etc. can be discussed with great success in today's age.

Comparative Public Administration: Definition, Sources and Problems

The time-old concepts of political science such as government, administration, sovereignty etc. had a meaning and significance in the developed nations. But these conceptions lost some of their relevance when they travelled to the new states of Asia and Africa. But these new states were administered and governed according to local systems, culture, customs and procedures. To be more specific, the processes changed but the administration was conducted. In this background some political scientists started to think of comparing political systems of different countries.

They deliberately avoided the terms such as state, sovereignty etc. They also thought that for a comprehensive and fruitful analysis of the various aspects of state administration it was necessary to compare the political systems of different states and from this approach emerged the conception- "comparative government" or "comparative politics". The term "comparative politics is the study of political systems, not as isolated cases, but through generalizations and comparisons".

If the political and governmental structures of countries are different the administrative systems or structures are supposed to be different. The public administration of USA and that of the most undeveloped regions of Africa can never be of the same type or character. The developed and undeveloped states are administered but the methods of administration are not same and here we are confronted with the term comparative administrative systems or, specifically, the comparative public administration (hereafter only comparative public administration).

In this regard the considered opinion of a large number of scholars is if we do not compare the administrative systems of different countries. We will fail to reach a definite opinion and conclusion. Towards the end of forties of the last century Robert Dahl said: "as long as the study of public administration is not comparative, claim for a science of a public administration sound rather hollow" quoted by Ramesh K Arora-Comparative Public Administration.

For a proper analysis of governmental structure and administrative systems a comparison is the best way. For this reason, in recent decades, the comparative government has earned wide popularity—so also the comparative public administration.

We have now reached a stage when we can define comparative public administration in fair way When the administrative systems or structures of different states are compared for the proper understanding of the subject we call it comparative public administration. In his famous essay "The Study of Administration", Woodrow Wilson said that some principles of public administration might be borrowed from the administrative systems of Europe, but caution and intelligence must be adopted. In this view Wilson referred to the comparative aspects of public administration.

The public administration of a state must be in consonance with the socio-economic-political structures of the state concerned. Hamilton in his essay (No. 72 published in The Federalist Papers) said, "The administration of government in its largest sense comprehends all operations of the body politic, legislative, executive and judiciary, but in its most usual and perhaps in its most precise signification it is

limited to the executive” Since the executive systems of various states are different the administrative forms are bound to be different. This constitutes the central idea of comparative public administration.

Comparative government and comparative public administration are not same. Comparative public administration focuses its attention on administrative structure, bureaucracy patterns of administration, decentralization of administration, civil service system and recruitment of government employees.

The public administration is a part of government and so also the comparative public administration is a part of comparative government. But administration and government are not identical concepts. The public administration is a part of government. The public administration is according to the type of government. For example, we say capitalist state, we also say capitalist administration.

The study of comparative public administration has gained momentum in recent years because of the fact that the emerging nations of Asia and Africa are trying hard to develop their economy and political system. The simple objective is to meet the growing needs of people. The Great Depression of the thirties of the last century drastically changed the entire administrative system of USA.

In the same way the challenges posed by the attainment of political freedom of the Third World states force the leaders and administrators to bring about necessary changes in the colonial administration. There is no such term like indigenous administration. But every administrative system must be tuned to the local needs and aspirations’ of the people.

Sources of Comparative Public Administration:

(1) The World War II brought about radical changes in academic and other fields and comparative public administration is one of them. During and after the War many eminent political scientists and administrators were appointed to the policy determination department of US government and especially in the public administration department. They observed that the public administration with which they are well acquainted and the public administration they have taught in colleges and universities has very little relevance to the practical side of public administration.

They desired to formulate new policies of public administration and studied the administrative systems of different countries. These two provided solid bases for a new approach to public administration which later on came to be called comparative public administration. These did not entirely provide the materials for comparative public administration, but major parts came from this new change.

(2) We know that World War II completely devastated the economic and social basis of Western European states and their rebuilding was badly needed. But at the same time it was felt that the existing structure of public administration was incapable in meeting this necessity. A new type of public administration must be built up. At the same time America came forward with large amount of financial help under the Marshall Plan.

The authorities of these states with the existing system of public administration could not handle the aids under Marshall Plan and its proper utilization was beyond its capability. The planners and administrators proceeded to reformulate the general principles of public administration and this supplied materials for a new public administration.

(3) In building up a structure of a new public administration the role of United Nations cannot be overlooked. From the various types of the activities of UNO we come across the idea that the existing system of public administration of the developing nations of Asia and Africa do not possess the capability of handling the United Nations aid programs and its activities in various countries. This new situation put a demand upon various authorities for overhauling the administrative system.” The old order changes the yielding place to new.”

(4) Under the pressure of new circumstances created by World War II and modernization of economy caused by the War it was strongly felt that the existing form of public administration shall be changed to meet the needs of the new era. The old system of public administration was not aware of the modernization of economic system and the advent of new economic principles. The new situation called for a new structure and principles of public administration.

(5) Though Easton’s General System Theory is not directly related with Comparative Public Administration theory the indirect relation is not insignificant. Easton, in his theory, has stated that political system is an open system. Its implication is political system is closely connected with the other system, and environment. The implications in both political system and other systems or environment are interdependent. If so, the public administration of a political system or state can never remain unaffected if the forces of other systems put pressure on it.

Let us explain it further-being an open system the public administration of a particular state (or in Eastonian phrase political system) is bound to be affected by the public administration of other states. The classical theory of public administration was quite free from this factor. The analysis of comparative public administration in this way is claimed to be scientific, because it passes through the ordeal of various tests and scrutiny. Comparison also brings about perfection.

Comparative Public Administration and Comparative Administration Group:

Nicholas Henry observes: “Cross cultural public administration, as the comparative approach also is called, is a fairly new development in the field” . The comparative public administration and its rapid rise in popularity opened new vistas of thought and analysis. To put it in other words, cross-cultural relations among the nations inspired the administrative authority of states to open new avenues of comparative analysis.

The comparative public administration became highly popular in the high tide of cold war period. The top administrators of White House and other offices of Washington thought that the public administration must be made appropriate to meet the challenge posed by Cold War. Henry has given a very beautiful analysis of this in the following words: “As a result of the revised thinking, courses in comparative public administration began appearing in university catalogues, and by the early 1950s the American Political Science Association, the American Society for Public Administration, and the Public Administration Clearing House were forming special committees or sponsoring Conferences on Comparative Public Administration. The real impetus came in 1962 when the Comparative Administration Group (CAG founded in 1960) of the American Society for Public Administration received financing from the Ford Foundation that eventually totaled 500,000 dollar”.

We now have Comparative Administration Group along with comparative public administration. The top policy makers, during the Cold War period decided that in order to streamline the- public administration more money, material and energy are to be invested. The interest of the Ford Foundation reached highest peak at the height of the Cold War. In the sixties of the last century the Ford Foundation took special interest in the political and administrative affairs of the Third World states.

It is because the erstwhile Soviet Union took special interest in the political and economic affairs of states and the clash of interest and ideologies was aggravating day-by-day. So we find that Cold War was substantially responsible for the growing interest in comparative public administration and Comparative Administration Group. American administrative system in general and the Ford Foundation in particular were responsible for the renewed interest in comparative administrative system.

The Comparative Administration Group emphasized the following fields which are closely related with comparative public administration. Comparative Administration Group says that research work in comparative public administration and other related fields should be encouraged. In the second place there must be elaborate arrangement for teaching the various fields of comparative public administration. Thirdly, the principle devised or suggested shall have ample scope of application in practical fields. Finally, the Comparative Administration Group emphasized the building up of theory. We have already noted that the primary objective of Ford Foundation was to encourage the public administration research and investigation of the Third World states.

The authority of the Ford Foundation reminded the Comparative Administration Group of this purpose. It has been found that Comparative Administration Group sent number of researchers to the practical field to gather knowledge about the nature of public administration of the developing nations. By doing this Comparative Administration Group established a fruitful link between the public administrative of industrially developed nations and the developing states of Asia and Africa.

So far as comparative public administration is concerned the Comparative Administration Group performed a very important job and, subsequently, this enriched the contents of the comparative public administration. This attempt of Comparative Administration Group surely performed a seminal task and it is called intellectual emergence.

Comparative Public Administration is a Movement:

The comparative public administration is now regarded by many as a movement. The public administration in its classical form was primarily concerned with the administrative system, principles and structure of any particular state. But today —after the rapid progress of liberalization, globalization and growing dependence among different nation states —the public administration has assumed unprecedented dependence upon the administrative systems of different countries and this has brought the public administration in the forefront of administrative systems.

Here I quote a relevant observation of a critic—comparative public administration is the theory of public administration as applied to diverse cultures and national settings and the body of factual data, by which it can be tested and expanded. Hence we find that there is a difference between public administration and comparative public administration.

The general principles of public administration, when applied to particular fields or situations comes to be known as comparative public administration. There is growing demand in various corners of the globe of the basic principles of public administration which ought to be tested through their application in various political systems and cultures. This demand first emerged in embryonic form in the United States and later on the demand spread its wings in various parts.

From the middle of the last century the comparative public administration as a movement is gradually gaining-momentum. A Conference on International Political Association was held in Paris in 1953 and in that Conference it was demanded that public administration should be studied comparatively otherwise its exact nature will never come out. The comparative public administration was not confined only in Paris.

The movement spread in many other states of Europe. It was due to the fact that no relations among nations were gradually increasing the comparative public administration was becoming more and more popular. The newly states of Asia and Africa in their zeal to build up a basis of a new and developed state were willing to modernize the public administration but they were not willing to adopt the policy of copycat. This practically resulted in the adoption or creation of new principles of public administration and this urge continues. Hence there is a movement of comparative public administration.

The Comparative Administration Group has inspired the comparative public administration movement in a considerable way. The general public administration has a theory and the sponsors of the Comparative Administration Group also demanded that the comparative public administration should also have its own theory and, in order to achieve this, the specialists must continue research work. The principles established by research shall be applied to practice in order to establish its acceptability and viability.

The administrative systems of all states especially of developing nations should be properly analyzed and the differences between public administration of developed and developing nations should be compared. In this connection the contribution of Fred Riggs should be remembered.

He thought that the administrative systems and principles of the developed nations cannot be profitably applied to the backward or developing nations. Riggs's approach to the public administration, "captured" the attention of a large number of persons interested in public administration. Referring Fred Riggs's contribution to comparative public administration Henry says that his strenuous efforts brought comparative public administration to the limelight. He also said that while studying public administration of a country the ecology of a country must be carefully studied. Today Riggs's suggestion has been accepted by all.

Problems of Comparative Public Administration:

The fate of comparative public administration was faced with a problem towards the first years of the seventies. In 1963 the Comparative Administration Group was formed and both comparative public administration and Comparative Administration Group made joint efforts for the progress of the former. But the comparative public administration "does appear to have reached a critical point of development. In 1973 the Comparative Administration Group was disbanded" .

The American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) was founded in 1962 and the ASPA was the real source of finance for the functioning of CAG. But the ASPA thought that the separate existence of CAG was unnecessary and it was merged with ASPA. The separate existence and importance was felt unnecessary or it was made superfluous. The persons who were once interested in comparative public administration after the mid-seventies they lost their interest. In the seventies many persons were eager to have degrees in comparative public administration and by the end of 1990s only few persons displayed interest.

Several reasons have been adduced to the decline in the importance and interest of comparative public administration. One such reason is many eminent persons began to think that only Public Administration was enough. And, if so, why Comparative Public Administration. Many persons associated with the comparative public administration movement could not give any satisfactory reply to this question.

During the Cold War period and even after the relaxation of tension many top-ranking administrators of USA began to think of development administration and not about comparative public administration. This is a potent cause of the decline of comparative public administration. Again it was thought that only public administration was enough and comparative chamber or approach is unnecessary.

There is another reason. In order to be a separate subject and important discipline, it must have separate groups of research and its researchers must build up models and paradigms. Unfortunately, the comparative public administration has no such models. The Comparative Public Administration earned goodwill and wide publicity under the aegis of Comparative Administration Group and many organizations.

But in the eighties and nineties of the last century many showed their utter disinterestedness in the subject. The Comparative Administration Group and the financial help provided by the Ford Foundation made some people interested in the subject. But when the source of fund began to dry or dried people's interest in it also began to dry slowly and steadily.

Nicholas Henry has called the ill-fate of comparative public administration as a "dilemma". Henry quotes sporadically from two or three writers. He says: Public administration should take full notice of the fact that comparative administration's failure rests substantially on a self-imposed failure experience. It set an unattainable goal, that is, in its early and persisting choice to seek a comprehensive theory or model in terms of which to define itself.

We, however, do not think that the comparative public administration is dead or the administrationists do not show any interest in the subject. While studying public administration it is required that it should be studied, if required, in a comparative way. But that does not mean that the comparative public administration should or ought to be given the status of a separate subject or paper of social science.

The students of public administration still study comparative public administration whenever any necessity arises. The meteoric rise of comparative public administration was due to the formation of Comparative Administration Group and financial help given by the Ford Foundation. Today, students of public administration do not display excessive interest in the subject. But sometimes they say that the administrative systems of different countries should be studied in a comparative way in order to have a full understanding of all aspects of the subject.

Introduction

At the outset, it may be useful to identify the several types of study which have been used public administration. In the study of public administration at least three approaches may be singled out:

1. Institute(oral Description Studies-Studies of this character involve an intensive examination of the structures and functions of the administrative apparatus. Such investigation will yield detailed information about the institutions under study.
2. Analytical Study-Enquiring along these lines, using gross quantitative data has become more common in recent years. As a result of this, there is growing literature on administrative process and administrative behavior.
3. Case Studies-This is usually applied to committees or in the study of administrative leadership. This book, it should be made explicit, will be concerned particularly with the comparative study of public administration. Comparative public administration is totally different from the traditional academic science of public administration. It does add new and important dimensions to the study of public administration.

The practicing administrator can get immediate aid from comparative study in many facets of his work. The most fundamental factor limiting the usefulness of comparative study is the fact that administrative experience of different institutions at cross-national, regional and local levels are based upon judgment of values and cultural bias. However, emphasis on comparative approach in public administration was paralleled by an emphasis on ecological aspects of administration. This emphasis led, in turn, to a broader universal methodological enquiry. It has produced a vast literature rich in explanatory insights.

Although the field of comparative administration has been largely devoted to description of foreign system (Western countries) recent trends indicate more, attention to methodological questions, especially as the field has been widened to include non-western systems. There are also a number of articles and governmental reports stressing the importance of comparative study which has grown due to various politico-administrative reasons. Comparative public administration is undergoing different period of reflection, scholars are wondering what the configuration of the discipline really is, and which direction holds the most promise for the future. The purpose of this volume is to subject the comparative field to rigorous self-examination, with major emphasis on methodological approaches and to provide brief comparative studies of major administrative institutions and practices.

Paul H. Appleby once remarked that comparing and contrasting the administrative set-up in different contexts would help to devote commonality of public administration. Academic institutions in the USA, the UK and international agencies like the UNESCO, WHO, ILO, etc., have developed significant world programs in public administration thus enriching the disciple professionally and academically. However, the study of comparative administration in university classes and in publications throughout the world was very much restricted to the institutional studies and legalistic theory.

More extensive research has to be made to compare different dimensions of administration at different levels. But such comparative study information's and inference should not be blindly copied. Transplanting an alien administrative institution would be successful only if it is modified to suit the historical and social background of the country in which it is to be adopted. It should be noted that even

under British colonial rule, Indian administration was not the exact blueprint copy of the British administration.

Indeed, it is interesting to find out through comparative analysis as to which important factors help in the promotion of administrative effectiveness. It can also improve our knowledge of the administrative practices and other countries and to adopt these practices which can fit in with our own nation and its systems. Besides our own interest in developing comparative research attitudes, there has been a pressure exerted by external forces to move in the direction of comparative study. One such important pressure is the globalization of economy.

Today, no nation can boost its economy in self-isolation; the interdependency for the sake of economic development made us rely on comparative study. It is only through comparative research that we will be able to allow new institutions into the changed international economic scenario. Further, economy and efficiency are the watchwords for development administration. Exchange of administrative ideas, institution, and techniques of training, rules and procedures are something much needed to work within the context of International Economic Order. While there are some common factors and elements which may transcend the political, economic and social context of administration, there are certain important factors which are shaped by international economic situations.

World economy has played a crucial role in bringing nations together. Increased awareness of administration across the nations can be possible only through comparison. Social and technological advancement is another reason for the development of interest in comparative public administration. Even some of the Third World nations have developed systematic data and information's that are essential for comparison. The urge to develop evaluative criteria or a frame of reference with which to identify and classify administrative systems and the behavioral patterns in different administrative set-up was made to search for alternative research methodology in public administration.

Criteria has been identified, and it is with this mind, that an outline of a classification of administrative systems has been made. The focus on the term 'bureaucracy' as it represents a central factor in public administration, a dependent variable mostly in the interaction of societal, economic, politics, religions, racial, military and other factors peculiar to countries, regions and areas.

There has been a radical change in administrative fashion after the Second World War in most of the post-colonial governments. These nations in order to keep pace with developed nations desperately in need of comparison thereby inculcated new features in their administrative set-up. It is in this way newly developed countries sought to legitimize the bureaucracy. The dysfunctions observed in actual working of administration made our research scholars to hunt for different 'models' in comparative study. The basic assumption in Third World is that the under development is primarily due to lack of 'new administration'.

Therefore, a special type of administration 'Development Administration' has become the focal point of comparative public administration. In these countries, public administration is conditioned by the social and economic circumstances of the society to which it relates. Thus, the coverage and the frontiers of comparative administration are much wider and encompass even Development Administration.⁹ As such, development administration and comparative administration seem to have something common in both their genesis as well as in their subsequent orientation, but it has to be realized that the focus of

development administration, though deep, is in a way limited. The quest for comparative administration study resulted in the interdisciplinary approach of the discipline. Many theories, concepts and models were borrowed from related disciplines. Riggs even went to the extent of borrowing terms and terminology from biological discipline.

Critics point out that he over-reacted in borrowing technical terms from the most unrelated subjects. However, such a trend led to new conceptual framework and various studies of operational situations were made. Here the comparative administrative scholars sometimes speak a language strange to the ear of practicing administrators. But, today the practicing administrators, as well as academic specialists in public administration, have found comparative research of first importance to their work.

The new task for public administration in developing countries is to overcome the nature of ethnocentric administrative practice and culture. A more balanced study of our own system of administration can be possible only when we look at administration in other countries. Thus, a balanced treatment of public administration is necessarily studied from a comparative framework. In the world system, it is necessary to develop theories for the study of public administration that are truly universal in nature or scope. It will be based on a comprehensive ecological understanding of the place of public administration in all governments, historical as well as contemporary.

Systematic improvement of theoretical knowledge in the discipline should answer the changing properties and problems faced by governments. What is being emphasized here is the shift from descriptive information case studies to nomothetic studies of administration. In nomothetic studies there will be traditional way of explanatory but supported by empirical knowledge of the institutions and dynamics of the society under study. Ethnocentric explanation of public administration phenomenon can thus be effectively checked if not altogether controlled. Though there has been great interest in comparative research in public administration, it cannot be claimed as a panacea of administrative problems. There are practical limitations to comparative methodology. As a creative process, it can be used only in certain situations. Firstly, the units selected for comparison must have the same conceptual framework. Secondly, the levels of comparison must be the same. Thirdly, there should be an agreed definition on the things to be compared, and fourthly, the definition of the focus of inquiry makes analysis more meaningful and useful, leading to generalization. This method can be applied at two levels.

Micro level and Macro level.

Apart from these levels of analysis, the researcher must also select the choice level. The choice level depends on:

1. The objective of the comparison;
2. Resources of the researcher;
3. The nature of study, and
4. The choice of identifying comparative variables. (Comparative method is a means of establishing empirical relationship between variables.)
5. Selecting the general framework.

Comparative study of public administration necessarily associates itself with the other mainstream of social sciences whereby conventional systematic comparison can be made. The mainstream includes

economics, political science, sociology and psychology. Interestingly, it is because of comparative approach of public administration, that the American oriented study of the discipline is checked. No longer will public administration theories be based on the exceptional American . 1 c; expence

Initially, the Comparative Administrative Group (CAG) has focused development administration as the Third World problem. But, today it also includes understanding of a country's public administration in its global context. In 1987, Ferrel Heady demonstrated how comparative analysis imported foreign models and practices which have contributed in the shaping of the American political and administrative institution. It was estimated between 1980 and 1990 that nearly 253 comparative public administration articles appeared in 20 different journals across the world. Comparative methods have also been adopted in many articles published in some of the Indian journals. The Indian Journal of Public Administration has published a volume on comparative public administration in 1985

The area for comparative research is wide enough to accommodate the problems of developed and underdeveloped countries. The major areas of research are bureaucracy, public policies, behavior of employees, motivation, fiancé, developmental aspects of administration, administrative set-up, etc. The validity of comparative study in these broad fields of public administration depends much on empirical support. In this context, a note on Indian statistical data is needed. Despite the massive size of public bureaucracy, widespread illiteracy, and rural nature of population, Indian demographic and socioadministrative statistics have been found remarkable. Data required for comparative studies which includes India are obtained from

1. Decennial census enumerations,
2. National sample survey,
3. The sample registration system,
4. Central and state government reports,
5. Reports of constitutional and parliamentary bodies,
6. Statistical gathering by individual government offices,
7. Sample survey by private research organizations such as operation research group (Kolkata),
8. World Bank reports,
9. UN agencies reports, and
10. Individual fieldwork.

The availability of rich data from different countries and the relevance of comparative study will certainly pay dividends in public administrative knowledge. Thus, the comparative perspective has become so inevitable and prominent that understanding of one's own national system of administration will be enhanced by placing it in a cross-cultural setting.¹⁸

Meaning of Comparative Public Administration

Comparative public administration is a sub-field of broad public administration discipline. It is true that such an established subfield exists in political science entitled, "Comparative politics" or "Comparative governments." Although the subject is not construed as consisting of theories, but there is ample evidence of current interest in Comparative Public Administration in the form of bibliographies, conferences, new

courses and a wide range of scholarly articles, and books. Even the American Political Science Review recognized this subject by inaugurating, as on March 1963, a bibliographical section entitled Comparative Public Administration. New interest was shown by the American Society of Public Administration, when the comparative public administration group was established.

It is evident and self-explanatory that the future of the discipline of public administration is hinged with the everexpanding directions of comparative studies. Cross-cultural studies would eventually place the discipline on a firm footing and supply sufficient material for providing satisfactory explanation to administrative problems, establishing it on the solid bed-rock of scientism. In comparative public administration, cross-cultural analysis is essential.

Robert A. Dahl says, "The comparative public administration specialist is first and foremost a scholar who is in pursuit of greater knowledge and understanding." Further, R.A. Dahl once remarked that in order to establish science of public administration, it has necessarily to be comparative.

Similarly, there are other social scientists such as Edwin Stene, Herbert Simon and Dwight Waldo who believed that in order to make public administration a scientific discipline, it has to make its explanations comparatively rational. Rationality and scientific investigations make any subject capable of providing satisfactory solutions to the problems of public administration in different cultures.

In the past World War period, the scholars who studied the administrative systems of different countries, "concentrated on central administrative machinery, decentralization pattern, control over the executive branch of government, civil, service structures, public finances, financial administration and the functions of administrative officers. Arora is of the view that traditional public administration literature is primarily descriptive rather than analytical, explanatory and problemoriented. Essentially, it is "non-comparative" in character for despite the study of governments of several countries, crosstemporal analysis and explanations were rare. It also lacked techniques and concepts to undertake such studies, especially of the non-western areas. It is accepted that control, communication, planning, organization, co-ordination, and even efficiency and economy have major relevance to the study of comparative public administration.

Or the first time, in 1952, a sincere effort was made in the USA when a conference was organized on comparative administration in Princeton University. It was during this conference that a sub-committee under the Committee on Public Administration, entitled Comparative Public Administration was established, to develop a criteria of relevance and a design for field studies in foreign countries. Even the American Political Science Review had recognized the comparative public administration movement by inaugurating in March 1963 a bibliography section entitled Comparative Public Administration.

In the comparative public administration movement, the most commendable work has been done by the Comparative Administration Group (with Professor Fred W. Riggs as its Chairman) of the American Society for Public Administration. The CAG has already brought out a number of research books. The development of the comparative public administration movement has to be viewed in the light of severe criticism by three stalwarts of political science who unintentionally have done more damage to the discipline of public administration than anybody else. It was the case of an infant discipline (public administration) being subjected to surgical trimming by competent medical practitioners. In 1947, Robert A. Dahl bemoaned the absence of a universal public administration.

The other critics of public administration were Simon, Waldo and Stene. The student of public administration has to come up to the expectations and look to the deficient areas of public administration, as pointed out by the senior teachers in order to make the discipline convincingly relevant, scientific and useful to humanity at large.

- In order to enrich the discipline of comparative public administration, and make it more scientific, it has to be critical, analytical, cross-cultural and not merely descriptive. The younger administrative thinkers need to realise the desirability of comparative administrative studies to be critical, analytical and based upon sound judgments supported by "true" data collected from different countries of the world. The most significant development in public administration currently engaging the attention and energies of a large number of students both young and mature is the focusing of attention on comparative public administration and the related problems of development administration.

Why the young student's "attention" is attracted towards comparative public administration? This is because of their "personal interest or experience," "world-wide developments" in administration by developing countries and also because one is addressed to "wide spectrum of interests" from concrete policy questions to the abstractions of pure social sciences.

In the comparative public administration movement the essentials to be precisely defined are the following: 1. Concepts to be used in understanding of administrative phenomena. 2. Comparable variables to be identified by the scholars to be used to differential one category of administrative system from another, and New reliable techniques for investigation and inquiry. For the most part it is the younger students in public administration who are active in the comparative movement and certainly, it is they who are chiefly interested in the theoretical scientific question. For the most part, and in a general sense, these younger students are behaviorally-oriented with the central problems of social sciences.³¹ They are not essentially attracted by the formulations and interests of Simon, but find their inspiration in models, and techniques in other parts of the contemporary social sciences, most notably in the companion movement in political science, comparative politics, and in sociology.

It is an established fact that the cross-cultural dimension of public administration has a promise and a future in the development of a science of public administration. Comparative administration is the only hope for the growth and development of public administration in the near future. Exposure to foreign, often non-western, governmental systems, and cultures has stimulated a sense of "comparativeness" in general and in particular raised questions either about the appropriateness or the sheer possibility of transferring familiar administrative devices or applying what had been presumed to be good or scientific principles of administration.

It is now clear that those students of comparative politics and comparative public administration who were engaged in the study of political institutional processes and socio-economic environments were actually studying public administration from the point of view of comparison. This comparativeness from the cultural point of view or ecological points of view forms part of this sub-discipline.

While delivering a most fascinating series of lectures at the Indian Institute of Public Administration in 1969, Professor Fred W. Riggs had chosen the subject, "The ecology of public administration." He had selected the United States, Thailand and the Philippines—three countries—for the purposes of comparing the ecological objects of these three different administrative systems. What appeared to be a "concern" as

well as difficulty of professor in 1980, was expressed by him in these words. "How can one associate different countries? Some of my colleagues would surely say that they are not 'comparable,' each is distinctive and unique to such an extent that it can only be studied or approached as something apart, yet think that we can find common elements in these three countries or at least common variables in terms of which they can be compared".

Comparative public administration deals with administrative organizations or systems pertaining to different cultures and settings whose similar or dissimilar features or characteristics are studied and compared in order to find out "causes" or "reasons" for efficient or effective performance or behavior of administrators, civil servants or bureaucrats.

In the third world countries, single variable dominated studies as possible. This Single variable is "development." Development itself is a sub-approach of the ecological school. Development may be economic or social but it forms part of the ecological approach. The ecological perspective is, thus, the main concern of comparative administration scholars.

The economic, social and political aspects explain the way administrative systems operate. The scholars wrote right about comparative public administration agrees on the broad context or concern of comparative public administration. In the Princeton University, the public administration clearing house hosted a conference on comparative administration in the year 1952.

The conclusions of the conference are summarized below:

1. Distinction should be drawn between Policy values in government programs and academic values in understanding administration,
2. Focused research would be more rewarding than reclassifying existing data, and
3. Criteria of relevance are indispensable. Later, a sub-committee of the Committee on Public Administration of the American Political Science Association was formed to develop a frame of reference of the "criteria of relevance" which would guide researches in public administration in future.

Wallace Sayre and Herbert Kaufmann had prepared a summary frame of reference for Princeton University. This frame of reference included questions relating to the following.

1. Organization of the administrative system;
2. Organization control and organization ability to secure compliance; and
3. Criteria of adequate performance of the administrative system as a guide to practitioners.

According to Fred W. Riggs, there are three trends prevalent in comparative study of public administration during the last 55 years. The first is a movement from the normative to the empirical approach. This reflects the emphasis of the "how to" writings recommending changes in administrative structure and functioning and laying an emphasis on description and analysis of actual administrative situations.

The empirical writings are not yet truly comparative. The empirical writings express both the "ideographic" and "nomothetic" approaches and it is the movement from the first to the second of these which constitutes another, i.e., "non-ecological" to "ecological" approaches. All these shifts or trends are seen in F.W. Riggs theory. The nomothetic approach is genetic and law-seeking, although it is not necessarily concerned with any inviolable patterns. The third trend, also less distinct than the first, is from the non-ecological approach which describes administrative institutions as separate entities existing apart from their cultural settings, whereas the ecological approach is concerned with the full patterning of relationship, and inter-relations in the total social system.

According to Riggs, the non-administrative factors need to be related to the administrative, and in his view the only studies which are truly comparative are those which are empirical, nomothetic and ecological. Keith Henderson admits that "Fred W. Riggs stands at the forefront of the comparative public administration movement. All Rigg's works are ecologically-oriented and his theory building is mostly confined to the ecological perspective. We can say that the Riggsian Theory of Comparative Public Administration is mostly the "ecology of administration approach."

Ferrel Heady has given the following four approaches to the study of Comparative Public Administration:

1. Modified traditional approach,
2. Equilibrium or input-out-put approach,
3. Bureaucratic orientation approach, and
4. Ecological approach.

Keith Henderson accepts only three approaches in Comparative Public Administration:

1. The bureaucratic system,
2. The input-out-put system, and
3. The component system.

Bureaucratic system approach is an attempt to study bureaucratic organizations of different countries. It is a wellknown fact that Prof. W. A. Robson had earlier contributed to the study of civil services of France and Great Britain Professor Herman Finer had also attempted a comparative analysis of bureaucratic organizations of several (seven) European bureaucratic organizations and their behavior.

Murroe Burger in his book, *Bureaucracy and Society in Modern Egypt*, tried to test Weber's ideal-type model of bureaucracy. Burger later tried to explore the structural functional theory of bureaucracy as applied to the developing countries. Robert K. Merton and Professor Robert V. Prethuis had tried to test the value theory of bureaucratic behavior in western and non-western countries. Robert K. Merton developed a middle-range theory for the study of bureaucratic organizations which explains a manageable set of relations rather than the broad-gauge special theories at one extreme, and non-comparable individual cases on the other.

Similarly, Alfred Diamant's "The Bureaucratic Model: Max Weber Rejected, Re-discovered, Reformed" in Ferrel Heady and Cybill Stoke's book is an effort to explore the value of Weberian theory in research of modern democratic organizations. It will be of much use to suggest to the students of bureaucratic organization as an approach to comparative public administration they need to read Joseph La Palombara. They should also read Leonard Binder to have a clear picture of bureaucracy in different cultural settings.⁴⁷

Leonard Binder revealed three major types of political processes of development which must necessarily proceed before the development of bureaucratic organizations as noted by La Palombara. Some students of Professor Talcott Parsons, namely Philip Selznick and Reinhart Bendix had pursued the organizational theory of "Structure-Functionalism" while studying bureaucracies. Amitai Etzioni also studied organizations from a similar perspective, followed by the study of bureaucratic organizations by Blau and Scott who had shown considerable interest in the organization theory of bureaucracy.

The input-output approach is an outcome of the systems approach. Through the conversion process, the inputs are transformed into outputs and a balance sheet is prepared with the expectation that outputs will always amount to more than the inputs. It is also sometimes called the "input-conversion output system approach." It is described as less organic than the famous structural functional bureaucratic model.⁴⁹ In this input-output system approach there is no reference to the relationship between the parts and the whole, i.e., the component parts are not "explained" to be inter-related functionally, although they are, i.e., the parts are always organically interrelated as elements of the whole. In the case of the input-output approach, there is more emphasis on the input-output equation, upon boundary exchanges between system and environment.

Fred W. Riggs *industria* and *agraria* also postulates an input/output scheme although he does not emphatically state this in his model. The "Input Conversion Output" approach is more an outcome of David Easton's model. In *Comparative Public Administration*, David Easton has contributed more than any other scholar. In comparative politics, the Eastonian model, has also been improved by Almond and Coleman of politics of developing areas fame. Easton mostly borrowed concepts and basic materials from the master sociologist-Talcott Parsons. Almond had identified four basic inputs of a political system which are transformed through the conversion process into three outputs. Dorsey says that in comparative public administration research focus may be upon transigent factors e.g., stresses and strains, affecting the conversion processes. Ira Sharkansky had used the input-conversion output approach to the study of public administration.

The framework of her book regards environment as the inputs, and laws, policies, orders as the outputs, the concession processes as the feedback. Professor Henderson's *The Component Approach* calls a "catch-all" for historical and other materials not classifiable as a bureaucratic system or input system. James Fesler had applied Component Approach in *Comparative Field Administration*. There is an emphasis on power, and communication linkages between the centre and fields which are suggestive of integration into a model. This approach takes into consideration the main points of Dorsey and Almond.

Similarly, Fritz Morstein Marx had studied the external varieties of control and responsibility. In studying administrative systems of different countries, a comparative scheme can be employed which includes the study of structure, purpose, process and environment the comparative administrative systems approach. Professor Gerald Caiden explains the comparative scheme as given below:

Although each administrative system is unique, administrative system can be compared according to their (a) processes, (b) purposes, (c) structures and environmental interaction, transcultural administrative processes, that is, how different cultures get things done-can be examined at many different levels, from individuals to international arrangements, and according to race, sex and other ascriptive criteria.

It is Widely believed that Comparative Administrative Systems are studied on the model of comparative governments. The comparative public administration approach had more or less closely followed the comparative political analysis. Comparative analysis had not to be descriptive of formal institutions. To be formally descriptive of organizations, rules and regulations are not comparative but unreal, narrow, egocentric, subjective and static. Comparative public administration has recently progressed fast, but it has not yet provided the "thoroughness or breadth of coverage" that is available from international comparisons.

A cross-national comparison informs us about the global range of differences in some administrative forms and processes. A system framework may appear to a scholar-researcher to be more useful in cross-national comparisons. The systems orderly of environment inputs, outputs, and feedback can highlight the features of administrative systems that are related to each other. From the standpoint of evolving a scientific and useful body of administrative knowledge, value is derived from careful comparative study.

Despite exhortations from scholars, students of public administration have not been exclusively and extensively involved in studying comparatively numerous administrative systems. As a result of this lack of research activity, comparative public administration has not evolved an adequate body of knowledge which could form part of a "theory of public administration" so direly needed. Scholars from different cultures should devote time earnestly in comparative studies of administrative systems. Despite all scholarly efforts to strengthen development administration abroad and also emphasizing the ecological perspective, it is yet not clear what are the objects to be compared under comparative public administration.

But it is clear that comparisons" could be made by assessing structure, processes, values, regulations, codes, patterns of behavior and votes of all those that consist in an administrative system in the cross-cultural context. It is now a highly accepted proposition that there should be a multidimensional approach to the study of non-western public administration systems. The American Political Science Association had appointed four-member team consisting of Sayre, Kaufmann, Sharp (as Chairman) and Riggs. Sayre-Kaufmann draft was re-worked into a conceptual scheme to be applied to three similar cultures on a general ecological approach advocated by Riggs. As funds could not e made available to pursue the research design this hampered investigation in the comparative public administration movement. Professor Caiden believes that "ideographic studies have tried to meet Dahl's 1947 criticism by hypothesising at narrow- and middle-range theory level, although much ideography has followed traditional lines. These studies have borrowed extensively from other social sciences and theory, have incorporated, both consciously, and unconsciously the theoretical models and conceptions of comparative politics.

EVOLUTION OF THE STUDY OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The origin and development of public administration as a distinctive subject can be traced from 1887 onwards. Prior to 1887, almost no written materials existed on the management of public administration. In India, there are evidences to suggest that there existed a good literature on the aspects of administration even before 1887. Kautilya's Arthashastra described the tactics of foreign policy and defence. Kautilya called for science of public administration but most of his conceptions about the science of administration were limited to his times. As a result, it failed to attain a universal recognition. In Europe political philosophers like Plato (348 or 347 BC) and Aristotle (384-322 BC) described the style of administration in the Greek city-states. Machiavelli (1513) in his celebrated book *The Prince* mentioned about the character and conduct that are essential for public servants in the Chapters 22 and 23.1 During mercantilistic era, Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) viewed that administration could be ignored in the context of the newly emerging polity. It is only with the advent of Montesquieu (1748) that distinctions between administration and politics were clearly made. The author in his book *The Spirit of Laws* mentioned that administrative functions can be guided by regulations of the state and not necessarily by laws. Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) predicted the expansion of administration upon the polity as states expand in its activities.

In India, early political writings considered the entire societal divisions for administering them collectively. Hindu political writers were guided by certain common considerations. Dharmasastra and Vedas infused the 'division of labour' in society, which later became rigid social stratification. They have also distinguished between authority and power. The 'amatyas' were men of independent social status and were executive officers in charge of day-to-day administration. Hindu philosophers advocated the importance of efficient administration, constant checks of subordinate officials, programs of welfare provision, and so on. The establishment of East India Company in 1600 and the subsequent British Colonial administration in India resulted in transporting the western administrative practices to India. It has resulted in the deathknell of ancient Indian indigenous administrative practices. It was further marred when the Americans made more systematic and scientific analysis of administration³.

Wilson Era

The present scientific status of public administration can be traced from the early writings of Woodrow Wilson, the former American President. Wilson's perspectives of public administration have strongly influenced the rest of the world during the eighteenth century. Even Wilson never failed to recognise the importance given by the French and the Germans in proper understanding of the machinery of the government. Certainly, Wilson was the first administrative thinkers who argued that politics and administrative were different functions. In his speech before the Historical and Political Science Association at Cornell University on November 3, 1866, he issued a call to political scientists to study more effective techniques for administration. His first speech on the techniques of administration was published as an article in *Political Science Quarterly* during July 1887. May be it was the first known academic publication on the 'art of administration' in a more technical sense. In this article he traced the evolution of government through three phases. They are absolute rule, constitutional government and the administration of constitutional government.

Comparative Perspectives

Interestingly, it was again Woodrow Wilson who can be credited with introducing comparative study of public administration. He was the first comparative, who compared American government system to the Cabinet System in the United Kingdom to demonstrate that the USA lacked unified authority in several fields of administration. His comparative study was basically concerned with the issues of maintenance of democratic polity.

The Comparative Paradigm set by Wilson has the following features:

1. The science of administration for the United States should be focused from the democratic point of view. 2. A good government is synonymous with the practices of public administration. 3. Civic issues were equally significant to those who conduct the everyday affairs of the government. 4. Administration can be evaluated in its best only by removing the political aspects of administration.

The last point made by Wilson needs self-examination. Undoubtedly, politics runs all the way through administration and the study of comparative administrative in a non-political perspective is totally unrealistic. In the same tone Marshall E. Dimock criticized that Wilson was unrealistic in saying that the field of administration is a field of business and there is no scope for politics. We can presume that during Wilson's time the subject was only in a rudimentary form which he interpreted in a different way. We must understand that politics and administration being sequential parts of the same process are actually inseparable. In fact, the major concern for Wilson was to create a professionally trained, hierarchical bureaucracy that could be responsible for a unified political system. Such division of politics from administration is neither good for public administration nor it can serve the best interests of democratic polity. However, by early 1880s Wilson slightly changed his views on politics-administration dichotomy and to a certain extent accepted -that there is no scope for administration without the influence of politics in democratic system.

Initially, comparative study on a small scale began in the nineteenth century. It started with various reform movements in the United States. The Municipal Reform Movement Civil Service reforms and other government changes of the latter part of the nineteenth century made several comparisons with the United States. Such comparative studies were aimed to increase the efficiency of public administration in the USA. Some important landmarks in these directions were made by the reports of the US Senate and various commission reports. They are follows:

1. US Senate Report-the Select Committee of the US March 8, 1888. 2. Additional Report of the Select Committee-March 28, 1889. 3. The Cockery-Cockrell Commission--September 30, 1893. 4. Committee on Department Methods-1905-1906. 5. Commission on Economy and Efficiency-1912. 6. Report of the US Bureau of Efficiency for the period from March 25, 1913 to October 1916. 7. Joint Committee on Reorganisation-1920. 8. Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch Government-A Report of the Congress-1949.

The reports we mainly concerned only with a limited extent of comparison that too within the United States federal government agencies. Its just reflected the Americanised reforms of public administration. There was a complete neglect of crossnational studies to improve the American standard of public administration. Perhaps, the Americans thought that there would not be any system available outside the United States to be compared and introduced in the USA. This has been one of the greater weaknesses of American administration at that time?

Post-War Development

Almost all literature in political science that appeared after the Second World War justified the role of government as an agent of socio-economic transformation. Governmental intervention was more sought by the newly emergent nations of the Third World. The parameters of governmental activities even then were dictated by the political elites in these countries. They adopted a governmental structure that was influenced by the historical accidents. However, the leaders of the Third World who received western education never failed to accord an important role for public administrations

For instance, in India even before independence the Congress Working Committee favoured for a planned economic development. This was an idea borrowed from the Soviet experience of planned economic development. The famous Mahalanabis Model was influenced by the Soviet Economist Fieldman. This model particularly ignored the effects of exports and imports. A mixed economy type in India gave the public administrators to play significant role. In the same way the independent Chile followed a socialistic path based upon Marxist - Leninist principles.

Through socialism, the Cuban government under a charismatic leader, Fidel Castro exercised a far more governmental control over the economy and thus provided a wider scope for public administration. Syria armed for a social transformation of the society on the democratic basis with participation of popular masses. This has been the same case with other Middle East countries. Military bureaucracy in Iran and Iraq effectively checked the growth of modern bureaucracies in these two countries. Most of the African countries because of the political instability factors opted for limited role for the national and regional bureaucracies.

The growth of governmental intervention, the Great Economic Depression, and post-war reconstruction process have caused the dramatic growth of public administration. This trend is also reflected in the academic discipline of public administration. In the beginning the 'public' part of the subject received greater emphasis and importance. Principles of public administration centered around increasing efficiency and productivity of large scale industries. American industrial experiences were applied throughout the world with some modified version to cope with local needs and conditions.

The scope of public administration was limited by Luther Gulick by the term 'DOSDCORB'. Mechanical engineers study became the study of managerial problems. Taylorism or Scientific Management Movement developed the 'machine model' for the sake of increasing efficiency and productivity.¹⁰

Era of Scienticism

Scientific approach to management was considered to be the central focus of invention between 1910 and 1930. Taylor and the advocates of scientific management movement showed little interest in the development of public bureaucracies for modern governments. They were more concerned with job design. There was a little bit of comparison during era of scientific management. The early methods of comparison was strictly confined to individual jobs alone. Scientific management qualitatively measured people within positions, but comparisons were verbal, u Benge in 1926 developed a new approach of comparison which is known as 'factor comparison'.

The technique consists of a set of factors which are defined in such generic ways that comparisons for rankings can be made across the class lines used in point factor systems. The technique was subjected to

revisions on many occasions and it was used for job analysis also. Such comparative studies were more general in nature and was applied only in selected large-scale industrial organizations in the United States. Studies conducted in successful industrial complexes in the USA.

Later became the most celebrated universal principles of public administration. Such culturally specific principles were criticized by Herbert Simon as 'proverbs of administration' and thus he paved the way for new orientation in the discipline. He re-evaluated the so-called principles and shifted the emphasis from mere principles to rational decision-making as the basis of public administration enquiry. A common paradigm for comparative analysis was made at least at the policy-making level and also paved way for more rational theory making in public administration.

These developments have closely associated people in the study and practice of public administration and have shown little interest in the role of citizens in a democratic set-up. Democratic theory and ethics played a minor role in public administration. By the 1960s and 1970s public administration was facing an identity crisis. Civism was absent from public administration. The rebirth and recovery of civism in public administration provided a firm and solid anchor to the practice and helped to regain its original footing. Thus, evolution of theoretical knowledge in public administration can be broadly classified as follows:

(a) Public administration based on some leading ideas commonly acknowledged as principles of administration. The most well-known theorists and practitioners were Frederic W. Taylor, Lyndall F. Urwick, Luther Gullick, James Mooney, Alan Reilly, and Henry Fayol. What united these theorists was their belief that administration was a science and that uniform applicable laws and principles could be identified and would result in the best.

(b) Social psychological model appeared during the Second World War. While classical public administration is basically prescriptive, this was essentially descriptive. Elton Mayo, Fritz Roethlisberger and William Dickson were the forerunners. This is also known as Humanist School which later also included Max Weber, Robert Golembiewski, Chris Argyris, Rensis Likert, Warren Bennis, Douglas MacGregor, and Robert Prethuis.

(c) , Behaviouralism in the study of public administration was well started with Herbert Simon. Decision became the unit of analysis for him and he further added that administrative man arrives at rational decision for which he should have access to a carefully designed and computerised management information system.

(d) In the seventies and eighties the two new approaches are comparative public administration and developmental administration. These approaches viewed administration as a sub-system of political system. Administration as a sub-system in different countries has its own cultural values, norms, folkways and socialization process. There is an effort for interdisciplinary studies and techniques followed to arrive at concepts, formulas and theories that are truly universal, bridging and embracing all cultures. Riggs, Weidner, Diament and Eisinger played a major role in this regard. The model is known as ecological and developmental model and can be used in cross-cultural analysis. The study primarily aimed to understand the interaction of bureaucracy with other aspects of sociopolitical system.

Before the 1970s the textbooks in public administration were generally organized on a 'country-by-country' basis. This approach is known as the configurative approach. In this approach, each administrative system was taught separately. No attempt was made to link various aspects of one administrative system to the other. It is only after the 1970s, that the comparative method became popular and fashionable. Certainly the influence of comparative approach followed in political science by David Easton, Almond and Powell had an impact on public administration discipline also.

When comparative methods were adopted by the scholars of public administration there were some criticisms. They found that most of the comparative work in public administration was parochial. The study of comparative administration meant study of western administrative system. By late 1980s the pressure was that non-western administrative system be given a place of pride in teaching and research of comparative administration.

Secondly, the criticism was against configurative approach. Because of this, attempts were made to do some theory building in the field of comparative administration. Thirdly, the criticism was that the study of comparative administration was too formalistic. The approach had been historical, legal, institutional and formal. Behavioral aspects of comparison were altogether neglected. Thus, it became necessary to comment upon the methodology adopted to discover the gaps that still remains to be fulfilled in the field of comparative research.

The purpose of this book is not to create young comparative research scholars out of college sophomores. But, rather to present comparative administrative study as an important aspect of public administration, a usually neglected field which we should make available to young scholars. The gap which needs to be in public administration is the neglect of comparative element. In our increasingly bureaucratic society, more and more writings should appear on the subject of comparative public administration. This book treats public administration not as a 'pure' subject.

Definitely not as some of the pure social sciences like economics or psychology. At the most, public administration can be considered as a hybrid or applied science, importing concepts and insights from other social sciences and the administrative practices of different nations. This can be possible only by an attempt of a comparative study of administration. Comparative study of public administration necessitates borrowing its vocabularies or concepts from political science, law, economics and industrial management. This book on comparative public administration is approached from a more interdisciplinary view point.

As noted earlier, comparative account of public administration since 1980s centers on public bureaucracies. More specifically it has been directed to questions like: What power do bureaucrats exert over the machinery of government? What is influence of bureaucrats on political decision and the quality of public services in different national societies? Earlier, comparative work on public administration draws on the work of Max Weber to present a comparative analysis of bureaucracy. In modern society, bureaucrats acquire political significance because they are indispensable. Yet, their position in democratic political systems remains problematical since the role assigned to them by democratic theory is subordinate and instrumental, they are expected to be the handmaidens of the people and their elected political representatives.

To a remarkable extent, the USA has no permanent and professional bureaucracy at the level of policy-making' where all issues become political, but in contrast to the USA, Civil Bureaucracy in the UK and to some extent in India have a powerful professional and permanent bureaucracy at the policy-making level.

In France and the United Germany, there are different methods of using administration and politics at the top. In Japan, bureaucracy enjoys the confidence of politicians and keeps party political intervention in its career system at bay. In Italy, the bureaucracy has highly vested interests and its role is very unimportant. Generally, it can be said that bureaucracy is more powerful in non-democratic governments and less powerful in democratic countries.

Why Comparative Method?

A well-known political scientist James Coleman remarked that "You cannot be scientific if you are not comparing." Administrative systems of countries are not unique, they are comparable with other countries. When we say, for example, that the administration of country X has become a rubber stamp for the political executive, this is not a very meaningful statement until we note, that it is also the tendency in countries Y and Z. We often hear statements such as-Rao's administration was very corrupt. Compared to what? To Mrs. Indira Gandhi's administration (1980-84) or to V.P. Singh's administration. We hear statements like this one. The trouble with West Bengal administration is that the government servant's union is very strong. But what percentage of the West Bengal Government Servants Unions are unionised? How does this compare to Tamil Nadu and Haryana?

Our thinking on administrative process will be greatly clarified if we put ourselves into a comparative perspective by frequently asking, "Compared to what?" A little bit of theory building has also taken place. It further suggests remedies for the administrative ills of various foreign and our own administrative system."

Robert A. Dahl contended that if public administration has any conceptual validity, it must address three major obstacles: 1. The inherent normative implication of public administration, 2. What a science of public administration must be based upon a study of human behavior, and 3. That "as long as the study of public administration is not comparative, claims for a science of public administration sound rather hollow."

Dahl's Last Point Warrants Attention Here

There are some limitations for comparative methods. Firstly, we must remember that comparative method is not a universal method. You cannot compare everything. We can compare only what is comparable. For instance, we can compare Indian administration with British administration, but we cannot compare Indian administration with Chinese administration because a comparison between the two would be misleading because of the system differences. Comparative analysis even among several advanced countries is problematic since data tends to be available only in the most general or the most particular sense.

The Indian scholars of public administration have paid little or scant regard for comparative methods of study in public administration research. What we failed to understand is that generalizations relating to administrative structures and behavior emerging out of comparative studies in different nations and culture help in formulating theoretical constructs which can provide a scientific basis to the study of

public administration. Comparing public services across the national boundaries is not meant to imply that what is being studied is the same in every country. Rather, it is to explore whether and under what circumstance public services for welfare are similar or different.

Comparison starts with a set of common questions and research which tests whether or not the answers are the same. Through a study of comparative public administration, administrators' policy-makers and academicians can examine causes for the success or failure of particular administrative structures and patterns in different environmental" settings.

Rationale of Comparison

The message is clear and vital. The study of administration must proceed with attention to how administrative behavior and relationship vary under different conditions. Public administration like political science is fundamentally comparative in nature. Our comparison may focus on different administrative organizations or within different regions. In addition, we may wish to compare the same administrative system at different points in time, in effect, to compare an administrative system "within itself" over time. But whatever the form of framework, comparison is essential to our understanding of public administration."

It has been claimed that one important dimension of science is compared. In the process of theory building and in the process of interchange of ideas among human beings, comparison is quite imminent. Through comparison a scientific development of knowledge is quite essential or possible. According to the political scientist W.A. Welsh "comparison is the basis of concept formation." People assign some characters (term or concept) to things that seem similar to one another. For instance, we call organizations that are under the total control of the government as departmental organizations that offer service to the public at large.

We also separate 'public corporations' from departmental organizations that also lend service to the people, but which do not come under the total control of the government, obviously, in order to differentiate these two different types of organization, we have comparative domain of control exercised by the government. Here 'control by the government' is the common framework of analysis of these two organizations or what we refer as 'concepts' that binds upon these organizations. 26

The second rationale for comparison is for the sake of classification. Once we have decided that we are going to talk about organizations, we need to determine what characterizes an organization. We want to use basis for classifying them. Traditionally, we have classified organizations primarily into three types- departments, public corporations and independent regulatory commissions. How we decide to classify our concepts depends largely on our theoretical interests, that is, on what we are hoping, to explain. When we want to differentiate the public organizations in terms of their sphere of autonomy from the government ('control, it means that we establish a reasonable paradigm for comparison. First, we go on to classify them into several categories. Then we have to compare them to identify similarities ~and differences among them.

After establishing the concepts and categories of classification, we can move on to put them in a particular theoretical framework that we can use for our research purpose. A theoretical \framework is really just an explicitly stated set of explanations and hypotheses about how we think certain selected

aspects of reality operate. These expectations and hypotheses must be verified, i.e., they should be compared with reality. They must be repeated several times to test accuracy. Therefore, comparison is crucial when we test accuracy in different situations or conditions. It must be remembered that we are comparing certain things only within a similar framework.

Thirdly, the process of deriving general statements of relationship between specific administrative phenomena with various settings is known as induction. Comparison is an important part of induction. Sometimes research scholars by a logical process move from a more general statement to a more specific one. Obviously, comparison is crucial to deduction since the validity of using a given deduction to test a general proposition depends substantially on the degree of comparability between concepts of the general statement and the concepts of specific statement. The above discussed matter is the process of scientific inquiries. It is undeniable that the scholars of public administration have relatively little knowledge of public administration in other countries.

This is unfortunate because the increasing amount of interaction across national boundaries demands a considerable understanding of the administrative practices of others.

Comparative Research Movement

It all started when the US army landed in alien soil during the Second World War. The army personnel and the military administrators found it very difficult to work in different cultural contexts and became conscious of the multifunctionality of structures, and this awareness led to greater interest in systematic comparative studies. The attempt by the USA for European economic recovery through Marshall Plan and the point four programs for developing nations had initiated comparative study of public administration. Besides these, the American scholars under the UN technical assistance make serious attempts to study the socio-political and administrative set-up in the third world countries. Thus, comparative research in public administration developed gradually with American scholar's initiative. The UN itself has developed a significant world program in public administration.

Joint ventures by nations and regional groups increasingly relied on comparative approach to common problems. The Colombo Plan and the Technical Assistance Missions stressed administrative development appropriate to new dimensions of public undertakings. The Australian government took interest in exploring administrative organizations and practices in many areas of the world. All these activities drove towards administrative advancement and increased learning both theoretical and practical.

The American Political Science Association has done a commendable job in establishing a committee to probe into the areas under which comparative research can be made use of. The establishment of Comparative Administrative Group (CAG) in 1960 with the help of Ford Foundation was a milestone in the annals of public administration. F.W. Riggs conducted many research programs, seminars, experimental teaching projects and fieldwork. The group members borrowed concepts extensively from social science disciplines like sociology, economics and psychology. It further attempted to identify more essential elements of public administration so that various studies could be organized to present really comparable and significant material.

It is because of this Committee that, common terminology in public administration evolved. The committee has also recognized the importance of cultural ecology of public administration-the environmental variations afforded by differences in history, mores, attitudes and ideologies.

The studies covered by the committee were based on geographical orientation relating to Asia, Europe, Latin America and Africa. Some followed subject matter focus such as comparative urban society, national economic planning, comparative educational administration, comparative legislative studies, etc.

The committee had prominent members of political science such as Gabriel Almond, Leonard Binder, James Coleman, Joseph La Palombara, Lucian Pye, Sidney Verba and Myron Weiner. They studied public administration as a subordinate aspect of political activity. Later a conference organized by the Centre for Advanced Studies in the Behavioural Sciences provided a considerable impetus towards the study of comparative research in public administration. In the year 1972, the comparative administrative group was merged with the International Committee of the American Society for Public Administration to form Section on International and Comparative Administration (SICA). It can be said that the period in between 1960 and 1976 was the 'golden era' of comparative public administration. This period was mostly dominated by American and European scholars. It exposed to the Americans the knowledge of third world administrative practices, cultures, political behavior and the problems of state building and nation-building.

Influence of Comparative Politics

Conceptual framework in both political science and public administration emerged by common stimuli and developments in the respective studies or subjects. For both the disciplines 'bureaucracy' has been a common theme for discussion. Both assigned a subordinate role for the bureaucracy in relation to political system. However, comparative models and approaches for public administration are borrowed from the study of comparative politics. In a chronological sense, the movements in comparative politics and comparative administration have been mutually cooperative.

In 1953, the American Political Science Association established an ad hoc sub-committee on comparative administration which lasted until the creation of the Comparative Administration group (CAG) in 1963. Thus, common comparative conceptual framework, growing interest in politics and administration. Of the third world countries and the growing concern for an inter-disciplinary approach in social sciences were together responsible for the development of comparative interest in public administration.

Comparative politics was a well-established and reasonably well-ordered branch of political science. The same cannot be said for comparative public administration. A survey of comparative political study is more useful to understand the impact of comparative politics on comparative public administration. Both western and Indian scholars pursuit are analyzed here. Despite a well-known development of comparative studies in politics, its development has been not fully exploited by comparative scholars in public administration.

Eric Straus who studied the nature of bureaucracy and the role of civil servants in Russia, France and Britain has used the approaches and models of comparative politics. In his study he concluded that bureaucracy is an outgrowth of industrialization and advanced technology and it's inevitably deteriorates through bureaucratic degeneration. The levels or the degrees of degeneration can be assessed only from

the standpoint of political behavior and political system of the country. Politics is the directive force in equating public administration from comparative perspective.

Ferrel Heady who surveyed putative sub-field of public administration concluded that after a period in the 1960s and early 1970s matters are now pretty much in disarray. Guy Peters in his work *The Politics of Bureaucracy: A Comparative Perspective* managed to tackle successfully one particular aspect of comparative studies of administration and bureaucracy, that is, patterns of bureaucratic politics.

In the comparative and developmental literature, Esman and Uphoff's analysis of the role of community based organization in the development process clearly stands out as one of the most significant studies published to date. The authors survey systematically the universe of local organizations of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In comparative politics, political scientists used various typologies, viz., those based on political economy (Peter Lange and Hudson Meadwell), the dependency approach (Tony Smith), the rejection of western models of development by third world scholars who experimented with alternative views of the process (Howard Wiarda), neo-Marxist emphasis on class analysis (Ronald Philcote), and comparative public policy (Lawrence Graham) in *Comparative Government and Politics* edited by Dennis Kavanagh and Gillian Peelee and in *New Directions in Comparative Politics* edited by Howard J. Wiarda.

Government and Politics in Western Europe: (Yves Meny translated by Janet Lloyd 1990) is a thematic comparative study rather on a country-by-country basis. The chapters on bureaucracy and on executive power are of considerable interest to public administrators. In *How to Compare Nations*, Dogen and D. Pelassy have constructed an unconventional guide to the conduct of comparative analysis and the construction of social science theory. The above-mentioned perspective comparison is yet to take place in public administration study. The New International Economic Order (NIEO), the benefit of behavioural studies in political Science and the most sophisticated communication network have provided new impetus in the field of comparative public administration since 1980.

New theoretical search by political scientists like Almond, Binder, Coleman La Palombara, Pye and Weidner has made public administration a sub-field of political system. Political aspects of administration was given a new thrust in La Palombara's *Bureaucracy and Political Development*. In fact, this era called to an end the politics administration dichotomy and felt that both politics and administration are experimenting with the same problems from different perspectives. No meaningful study of comparative administration is possible without taking the cue from the knowledge of politics.

'Bureaucracy' as mentioned earlier is the central theme that is quite often discussed in comparative public administration. In comparing the governments of the world, Morstein Marx isolated four major types of bureaucracies-guardian bureaucracy as popularized by the British, caste bureaucracy as it evolved in Germany and elsewhere, patronage bureaucracy from the United States, and the more modern merit bureaucracy. The fourth type is the best for modern governments because of its fitness to the technological world. Bureaucracy in general is more effective if it is a partner in political decision-making. No bureaucracy can function without organizational structure.

As such bureaucratic organization became a prime focus for comparative study. Based on who the primary beneficiary is Blau and Scott identified four types of organizations mutual benefit organization, business concerns, service organizations, and Commonwealth organizations. A good comparative study in Ralph Braibanti's (ed.) *Asian Bureaucratic System Emerging from the British Imperial Tradition*

(1966).⁴³ Research on the origins, structure, evolution and performance of public bureaucracies can help both scholars and bureaucrats to understand better the nature of some of the contemporary problems facing the bureaucracies of the world countries.

The most important thing to be noted in comparative study of bureaucracies is the distinction between bureaucracies in advanced states and the bureaucracies in the less advanced states. The distinction is the general perception about the subordinated position of the bureaucracy. In less advanced countries due to weakness of political system or political stability, the political system plays a subordinate role and the bureaucracy has the upper role in policy-making and resource allocation. The relative position of bureaucracy can be well understood only with the knowledge of political dynamics of countries to be compared.

This particular aspect has been neglected by both scholars from political science and public administration. For example, in political development theories there is an absolute blackout of the role of administrations and their behavior. To consider 'administration' as applied politics and thereby separating politics altogether is a wrong direction in the field of comparative public administration. Specialized knowledge of politics-normative, theoretical and empirical are still guiding star of comparative politics.

An integrated knowledge of politics and administration is the pre-requisite of comparative administration. Depoliticisation of public administration may lead to self-inflicted injuries and wrong theories. The 'Science' of administration is solely concerned with the most efficient means of achieving any given set of political objectives. Further, at the higher levels of administration, a realistic distinction between the boundaries of politics and administration is something very difficult as well as unnecessary. Any distinction if all there is between politics (policy-making) and administration (policy execution), it is just for the sake of institutional convenience.

For example, in Britain, France and in India sometimes the top professional administrators, wield more powers than the politically elected members as far as policy-making is concerned. To conclude, we must safely say that politics is an area of change and indeterminacy and administration provides stability for political actions and both are mutually dependent. Thus, comparative public administrative research must consider those factors which emerged from politics and thereby give a meaningful explanation for administrative phenomena. Besides, it must also take into consideration the various social and economic forces that shape modern administrative system or behavior. But influence of politics is something more than social and economic forces.

The political aspects of administration was discussed in earlier times by Hegel, Marx, Wilson, Weber, Goodnow, Burnham and the CAG group. They were especially interested in the problems of politics and government and less interested in administrative problems. Public administration as a discipline may provide certain general theories of management of men and resources under a diversity of conditions, yet efficiency and direction of administrative process cannot be rightly judged only in terms of political objectives. Ethical needs of administration are supplied by the preferential order of political ideologies.

Weidner notes that political factors may constrain administration in at least two ways: 1. Political development goals may clash with a wide variety of administrative techniques and methods. 2. Political development goals may run counter to ideas of bureaucratic professionalization or general concepts of an administrative class.

It is worth noting the comments of Gerald Claiden on the inseparable aspects of politics in administrative study. He viewed that depolarization is like that of denying political activity to officials and expecting absolute loyalty from them. He further adds that no public bureaucracy exists in a vacuum, none can be abstracted from its social context. Thus, public administration is a tangible mix of the organizations, laws, physical plant and people, conduct observable and identifiable activities, drawing resources from society and transforming them into public services. It is under pressure from many different sources and more so from political side.

In public administration, the bureaucrats list out priorities at the direction of the politicians. Selection of priorities for administrative sake implies value judgments and these value judgments are based on facts which have evolved out of some propositions. Every administrative decision has value component and it is this 'value component' which necessarily integrates administration with politics. As 'value component' becomes an important inquiry in comparative study of administration it is not realistic to ignore values, which have been supplied by the political process of countries under comparison. This is more complicated for third world countries where there are rapid changes in the socio-political milieu.

APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

This gives attention to some important models used in studying comparative public administration. Some confuse models with approaches. There are significant differences between the two. An approach is based primarily on one central concept that is thought to be especially useful in studying basic features of public administration. Models can be thought of as refined and more specific versions of approaches. Within one approach different models can be developed. Models are very specific towards a particular study. On the other side, approaches are general in nature. The world model is treated in this book as treated by Waldo, to mean simply the conscious effort or attempt to develop and define concepts or cluster of related concepts. It is useful in classifying data, describing reality and hypothesizing about it. We must also distinguish between the term 'model' and 'theory'. In fact, both 'model' and 'theory' are used interchangeably. Generally speaking, 'theory' is more sophisticated tool than 'model'. However, Herbert Simon, Allen Newell, Waldo and Nimrod Raphaeli used 'model' and 'theory' interchangeably in practice.

Use of Models in Public Administration

It is not our concern here to discuss various models used in comparative public administration and its several uses. The general use of models are discussed. Our strategy shall be to look at seven models that are frequently used or referred to in studying comparative and development administration. Max Weber's bureaucratic model has the most popular use in comparative study of bureaucracies. The model advanced by Downs emphasized the importance of career interests as determinants of administrative process. Rigg's 'prismatic-sala' model is an intellectual creativity of the model building clan in comparative public administration, particularly with reference to third world governments. Dorsey's information-energy model, the developmental model and Mathur's, model do represent distinctly different and yet in broad sense intellectually compatible models, each of which has proved to be useful in studying comparative administration.

Before going for a detailed study of these models, it should be noted that apart from the above-mentioned types, there are considerable number of new models offered. Secondly, there has been a substantial degree of basic similarity in the assumptions and general approach of these numerous models.

Generally, we may point out that models used in studying public administration share the following tendencies: 1. To study the social, cultural, political and economic factors that influence comparative studies (Ecological Model).

2. To use concepts that characterize public administration as a series of actions or behaviors, involved in meeting changing environmental demands. 3. To conceptualize administrative activity in a system way with particular attention to the goal of political system. 4. To deal implicitly or explicitly with the requisites for effective operation of administrative system. 5. To be presented in such a way as to imply their general relevance for the study of public administration.

1. Weber's Bureaucratic Model

Max Weber (1864-1920) presents an 'ideal type' of bureaucracy, which is capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency and the most rational form of administration. His ideas about bureaucracy first published in 1921 based on legal-rational authority was destined to dominate all other forms of bureaucracy because of its technical superiority over others. Weber's model of bureaucracy was based on the political questions that dominated the nineteenth century scholars. He had integrated bureaucracy into the larger scheme of the three ideal types of authority.

It is legal in the sense that it is based on a style of authority that is legitimated through legal processes. It is rational in the sense that it controlled on the basis of knowledge. It is learnt that Weber was firmly committed to parliamentary democracy. He supported strong leadership and expected the leaders to protect the mass against its own irrationality, and the individual against mob psychology. The identifying characteristics of bureaucracies were:

1. Fixed and official jurisdictions areas, controlled and . Ordered by written rules and regulations,
2. Clear division of labor with authority and responsibility equally clearly designated, maximizing specialization and expertise,
3. The arrangements of all positions into a hierarchy of authority,
4. All officials appointed on the basis of qualifications,
5. Work viewed as a vocation, a full time occupation, and
6. Uniformity and impersonality "without regard to persons."

2. Down's Model

Anthony Downs explains the lifecycle of bureaus by first specifying the four ways in which bureaus are created. In his explanation he refers to the reutilization of charisma as one of the type of bureau-genesis. Thus, according to Anthony Downs bureaucracy is the result of the common consequences of reutilization of charisma. Secondly, he mentions about the creation of bureaucracy by social groups in order to perform specific functions. The third kind of bureaus is due to splitting of the existing ones and the last kind of bureau as a result of entrepreneurship of a few zealots. His central hypothesis is that bureaucrats are motivated by self-interests.

He goes on to list the various functions performed by nonmarket-oriented organizations, namely, those social functions incurring external cost of benefits, the allocation of resources to collective good which provide indivisible benefits, the implementation of policies dealing with redistribution of incomes, the regulation of monopolies and the maintenance of framework of law and order in the society

3. Riggs's Ecological Model

Contemporary studies in comparative public administration made use of the ecological model developed by Riggs. This model can be used in cross-cultural analysis. He has been concerned primarily with conceptualizing on the interaction between administrative system and their environment. His main focus was on 'developing' institutional societies. Riggs further developed prismatic-sala model. The most prominent model builder in the comparative administrative movement is Fred W. Riggs. In fact, as his thinking evolved Riggs a series of overlapping and inter-related models extending Sutton's two ideal models of agraria and industria to illustrate the relationship between societal structure and whole cultures.

Riggs set forth his first major model in a lengthy way entitled agraria and industria towards a typology of comparative administration. He suggested illustrative typology of comparative administration systems in 'agraria' and 'industria' and claimed that similar types could be constructed at various transitional stages between the two with similar categories illustrating the interdependence of administrative systems and societies. As his conceptualisation proved too abstract to apply he turned away from general systems models to middle range theory based on his empirical research in South-East Asia.

4. Dorsey's Information-Energy Model

Another prominent source of comprehensive model building was equilibrium theory by Dorsey postulating as system with inputs and outputs as basis of analysis. He believed that it might be useful in the analysis of social and political system in general as well as for a better understanding of administrative system. It is popularly known as 'Information-Energy Model.' Johan F. Dorsey's Information-Energy Model is based on a synthesis of concepts of general system theory of communications and cybernetics and of energy and energy conversion.

Dorsey's model conceptualizes individuals, groups, organizations and societies as complete information-energy converters. Energy is defined as the ability to affect some change of form, time or space in physical relationships, that is, to do work. Energy conversion, conversely, is the manifestation of this capacity or the process of affecting such changes. Information can be viewed as energy in certain forms or configurations. A system converts inputs such as demands and intelligence through various conversion processes of screening, selecting and channelizing into outputs. Generally, high levels of information input, storage and processing permit a high energy output. An administrative system produces outputs in various forms, for example, regulation of services for sub-systems and systems forming part of its environment.

5. Mathur's Model

Mathur in his study analyzed Block Development Officers (BOOs) of two different states in India. Before the analysis, he first clearly identified certain geographical, socio-economic and political factors which present a different background for the BOOs of the two states. Employing 'factor analysis' technique, he developed the major dimension of bureaucratic thinking and perceptions so as to establish an empirical

pattern of the reactions of the bureaucrats to the changing environment. Thereby, he developed a typology and a profile of the local administrators in a near similar cultural pattern to find out the differences in the perceptions and reactions of the bureaucrats of one state from the other and correlate such differences.

In this study, the inferences drawn are as follows: 1. The same class of officials (BOOs) of different environmental settings are different. 2. Such differences are due to their different socioeconomic and political background. 3. Their behavioral patterns are different because of their different environment settings, 4. Such behavioral pattern differences are also due to their differences in education, recruitment and training .methods.

6. The Development Model

Closely related to the study of comparative public administration an indispensable tool in the attainment of the goals of the 'I good' society has attracted the mainstream of comparative administrators seeking ways and means to improve administrative performance and to strengthen the planning and execution of developmental programs. The idea has its origins in the desire of wealthier countries to aid poorer countries and more especially in the obvious needs of the newly emerging national states to transform their colonial bureaucracies into more responsible instruments of social change.

It should be noted, however, the developmental administration is not the same as administrative development. Essentially, it is that aspect of public administration that focuses on government influenced change towards progressive political, economic and social objectives, once confined to recipients of foreign aid but now universally applied. Developmental administration thus encompasses the organizations and development corporations, the reorientation of established agencies such as departments of agriculture, the delegation of administration powers to development agencies and the creation of cadre of administrators that can provide leadership in stimulating and supporting programs of social and economic development.

It has the purpose of making change as attractive as possible. Strictly speaking, it may not be referred to as the applied side of comparative public administration as there is no sharp distinction in intent, concept and involved personnel between the two. Those interested in developmental administration are interested in and draw on many sources other than comparative public administration and some of them are trained in disciplines other than political science or public administration.

Factor Analysis

The above analysis reflects the inclination of the scholars to the revival of comparative public administration for the study of administrative system form micro-level and at a macro-level perspective. Such studies can be made by employing factor analysis technique. This techniques can reduce the original number of variables to smaller number of independent factors in terms of which the whole set of variables can be understood to provide a simpler and more compact explanation of the regularities apparent in the attitudinal space of interest.

Problems in the Applications of Models

The foregoing brief review of some of the models constructed by American public administration for the study of public administration on a comparative basis raises a number of questions about their

applications in understanding the administrative systems in the developing world. Which particular model is most appropriate and for what purpose and where should it be applied? The central problem in the study of comparative public administration is that it is large enough to embrace all the phenomena that it should be studied. The second problem is of relating the universal model and the unique in one system. The idea of universal model runs through administrative study for example in the assertions of the founding fathers to the most sophisticated of our contemporaries in the field.³⁴ But to make comparisons implies not only the identification of the universals but also discovering criterion of differentiation.

TRADITIONAL – STRUCTURAL - BEHAVIORAL - FUNCTIONAL - SYSTEM – INSTITUTIONAL – ECOLOGICAL - AND MODERN APPROACH

A) Traditional approaches

Public Administration is a generalized human activity concerned with the ordering of men and materials required to achieve collective social ends. Since its birth, the study of Public Administration has been growing in different directions and today it involves complex concerns and functions. There have been numerous attempts by different scholars to explain the different aspects of public administration. The result is that public administration consists of relatively distinct approaches that grow out of the different perspectives that shape its structures and functions. Each approach gives a particular point of view of administrative activity. In a broad sense, one can divide the approaches into normative approach and empirical approach. The normative approach concentrates on what public administration should be, while the empirical approach analyses the actual administrative situations. The traditional approaches include philosophical approach, historical approach, institutional approach, legal approach and comparative approach.

1. Philosophical approach

Like all other social sciences, philosophical approach is perhaps the oldest approach in the study of public administration. Santhiparva of Mahabharata, Plato's republic, Hobbes' Leviathan, Locke's treatises on government are examples of the approach. This approach takes within its purview all aspects of administrative activities. Further it enunciates the principles or ideals underlying those activities. Essentially its range is very comprehensive.

2. Historical approach

The historical approach seeks to recreate a chapter of history as it attempts to study the public administration of the past within particular timespan and interpret the organization and information in chronological order. A society having a rich past caters to this approach as the uniqueness of its administrative system is thus identified. In fact quite a sizable number of administrative institutions can be comprehended in the light of their past by adopting this approach.

3. Comparative Approach

Woodrow Wilson has examined the methods best suited for the study of administration. He rejected the philosophical method and emphasized the historical and comparative methods. According to him, nowhere else in the whole field of politics, one can use these methods more safely than in the province of administration. Without comparative studies in government, we cannot rid ourselves of the misconception

that administration stands upon different bases in democratic and other states. A comparative approach to public administration structures of differentiations with different cultural settings. The Comparative Administrative Group (CAG) has defined it as the public administration applied to diverse cultures and national setting and the body of actual data by which it can be examined and tested. The purpose of such comparisons is to find out the universal elements in public administration and build a theory of public administration. As mentioned earlier, Woodrow Wilson was the first who stressed the need for a comparative study of public administration. In 1947, Robert Dahl, in his essay, "The Science, of Public Administration," "Three Problems" also emphasized the utility of comparative public administration to develop a science of public administration. However, the comparative approach to public administration became popular only after the II World War with the emergence of new nations in Asia, Africa and Latin America. These nations were facing the challenges of modernization and technological development. It was hoped that a science of comparative public administration would provide insights into such problems and yield some useful hypotheses about administrative behavior in general. Two important figures in this field are Ferrell Heady and Fred Riggs. The comparative approach to public administration is not only useful to strengthen the theory building process in public administration but also helps us to know whether the administrative practices in a particular nation are applicable to other nations or not. On the basis of this, the applicability of the administrative models can be judged and practiced in other political systems

B) Modern Approaches

1. Marxist Approach

Karl Marx, the father of scientific socialism, never attempted a full length discourse on public administration or bureaucracy. His interests were largely peripheral in the sense that he dealt with public administration only as complementary to capitalism. Yet, as a keen observer of the European Public administrative systems of his times, Marx could not ignore the significance of bureaucracy in the society.

Unlike Weber, Marx did not write extensively on bureaucracy. But he made more than passing reference to bureaucracy in his critique of Hegel's "Philosophy of Right". In it he had clearly expressed his views on the structure and behavior of bureaucracy and its relationship with State and Society. Marx's usage of bureaucracy refers both to the system of administration and to the men who implemented that system. He examined it as a set of relationships that arise in a specific socio-economic context. Therefore Marx's interpretation of bureaucracy must be understood within the conflict, the crisis of capitalism and the advent of communism.

Marx had no intention to present a systematic exposition on bureaucracy. His theory of bureaucracy should be read in his overall schematic framework of social change. He had identified bureaucracy as an appendage of the ruling class, which had worked in tandem with the state to perpetuate the existing rule. Citing the example of French bureaucracy during the revolution of 1789, he had shown how bureaucracy had facilitated the ruling bourgeois class. In his view, bureaucracy is often acted as a buffer which absorbs shocks that might hit the state. Therefore, as a true, scientist of social change he had identified the crucial importance of bureaucracy in sustaining the status quo and prescribed the simultaneous abolition of bureaucracy and the state.

Even though Marx dealt with public administration only as complementary to capitalism, his ideas are profound in two respects (1) while elaborating his argument concerning the rise and decline of capitalism, he was more and more engaged in the real momentum of developed capitalism, as evidenced in the struggle between those upholding capitalism and those who are opposed to it. In this process, bureaucracy had no choice but to act formally as an appendage to the system of production contributing to the division of classes and (2) by identifying the institutional roots of bureaucracy. Marx provided a contextual explanation of public administration contrary to the Weberian universal model of administration. Bureaucracy is 'rational' provided it is conceptualized within a socio-economic format. Therefore, there cannot be a meaningful universal design. This is where Marx stands out as a creative theoretician of public administration, which is not merely a structure, but is ideological in the sense of its behavior, specific to the socio- economic and political milieu within which it is located.

2. Ecological Approach

Administration and its environment influence each other and the understanding of the dynamics of this process is necessary to understand administration. This approach is known as ecological approach. The word 'ecology' is borrowed from biology where it suggested the interdependence between an animal species and its natural environment.

The Ecological approach to the study of public administration was initiated (in the order) by J.M. Gans (1947), Robert. A. Dahl (1969), Roscoe Martin (1952) and FW. Riggs (1961). Fred W . Riggs is currently the fore most exponent of the ecological approach in public administration.

In 1961, F.W. Riggs in his book, "The Ecology of Public Administration" explored from a comparative perspective the interaction between public administration and the environment in which it develops. In analysing the administrative system from the ecological point of view, Riggs mainly used the structural-functional approach. Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton, Marion Levy, Gabriel Almond and David Apter are the other thinkers who adopted this approach in their works.

The ecological approach views public bureaucracy as a social institution which is continuously interacting with the economic, political and socio-cultural sub systems of a society. Bureaucracy is not only affected by these environmental systems but also affects them in turn. Thus, this approach emphasizes the necessary interdependence of public bureaucracy and its environment. In the opinion of Riggs, administrative institutions are shaped and affected by their social, economic, cultural and political environment. Therefore, he emphasizes that in order to understand better the real nature, operations and behavior of a particular administrative system, one should identify and understand deeply in various environmental factors influencing it. The ecological approach determines how an administrative system operates in practice. Thus it is useful to understand administrative realities.

3. Behavioral Approach

The growing dissatisfaction against the institutional structural approach crystallized into what has come to be called the behavioral approach to the study of Public administration. This approach, which dates back to the forties, focuses on the actual behavior of persons and groups in real organizations. This approach argues that one cannot understand the actual functioning of organizations without understanding why people act as they do. Hence, the behaviorists have come to apply the knowledge of social psychology,

anthropology, psychology and many other disciplines in an effort to secure a better understanding of the actual human behavior within organization. The main aim of this approach is to establish a body of knowledge that facilitates understanding, explaining and prediction of human behavior in administrative situations.

In contrast to the earlier approaches, the behavioral approach tends to focus quite strongly on methodological problems, the use of survey analysis to determine organizational reality, and is concerned with human aspects of administration and decision making. It attempts to build descriptive and analytical generalizations about organizations and administrations. One of its normative assumptions is that it is possible to build an administrative science through careful research on organizations and the behavior of those who work in them. Herbert Simon and Robert Dahl have been among the pioneers of the approach to the study of public administration.

4. Developmental Approach

The term 'developmental administration' was first coined by U.L. Goswami in 1955 and later popularized by scholars like Riggs, Edward W. Weidner, Joseph La Palombara and Albert Waterson. Weidner was the first to introduce the concept of development administration. Edward Weidner defined development administration as an "action-oriented, goal – oriented administrative system". It is the process of guiding an organization towards the achievement of progressive political, economic and social objectives that are authoritatively determined in one manner or another.

The term development administration has been used in two inter related senses. First, it refers to the administration of development programs, to the methods used by large scale organizations, notably governments, to implement policies and plans designed to meet their developmental objectives. Second, it indirectly involves the strengthening of administrative capabilities. These two aspects of development administration that is the administration of development and development of administration are intertwined in most of the definitions. To Riggs, "development administration" and 'administrative development' have a chicken-and-egg kind of relationships. Today, development administration is concerned with the formulation and implementation of four P's- plans, policies, programs and projects.

Characteristics of development administration

1. Change-orientation- The distinctive feature of development administration is its central concern with socio-economic change. It is this special orientation which distinguishes it from traditional administration which is basically concerned with the maintenance of status-quo.
2. Result-Oriented:- Development administration has to be result-oriented since changes have to be brought about rapidly and within a definite time schedule.
3. Commitment to work – In development administration the organizational role expectation involves commitment to socio-economic change and concern for completing time bound programs. The bureaucracy is expected to be 'involved' and emotionally attached to the jobs they are called upon to perform.

4. Innovativeness: Development administration focuses on replacing or improving the existing governing structures and norms with the ones that suit the changing political and social environment. In other words, development administration is one that is dynamic and progressive in thought and action.

5. Client orientation:- Development administration is positively oriented towards meeting the needs of marginal farmers, landless agricultural labourers and rural artisans in developing countries. The socio-cultural and politico-economic progress of these sections forms the essential basis of the performance appraisal of development administration.

6. Citizen-participative orientation:- Development administration accepts for its purposes the principle of associative and participative system of administration. Here people are taken as active participants in the formulation and execution of developmental plans, policies and programs.

7. Temporal dimension:- Since socio-economic changes have to be brought about as quickly as possible, time assumes considerable importance in development administration.

8. Effectiveness of co-ordination:- Since development implies increasing specialization and professionalization, a number of agencies and organisations involved in development tasks has considerably gone up. Co-ordination between various administrative units and activities is essential for attaining the maximum benefit.

9. Ecological perspective:- Development administration shapes the political, social and economic environment and also gets affected by it in turn. It is not a closed system. It receives feedback from the social system and responds to the demands put on it by the system.

5. Decision Making Approach

Decision making approach is generally associated with the pioneering contribution of Herbert Simon. The decision making approach usually equates administration with decision making. Decisions are made at every stage of the organization and are considered as fundamental steps in the process of policy formulation. However, decision making is not a single person's task, it involves a series of steps including feed back and follow up actions and obviously multiple actors. Herbert Simon gives importance to rational decision making. Decision making is a complex process involving several steps. They can be sequenced the following manner:-

1. Identification of or locating the problem.
2. Getting related information and data and figuring out tentative options.
3. Weighing the tentative steps by seeking the opinion of the subordinates.
4. Zeroing in on a particular option.
5. Evaluate the efficiency of the decision reached at.
6. Getting the feed back and make necessary modification if situation so demands.

Hence decision making requires a total team work starting right from the chief executive down to the personnel stationed at the ground level. Then only the objective of the organization can be achieved in a satisfactory manner.

Herbert Simon's rational decision-making theory

Decision making approach is popularly associated with Herbert Simon, who has introduced the rational decision making approach. Simon views organization as a structure concerned with decision making. Decisions are made at every level of the organization. With an objective of ensuring that decision making is more effective and scientific, Simon tried to uncover the complicated inner dynamic of a decision in order to see how multiplicity of value premises determines the ultimate decision making. Simon breaks up decision making process into three phases namely, intelligence activity, design activity and choice activity. By intelligence, Simon referred to those activities by which one scans the environment and identifies occasions to make a decision, by design, he referred to finding or developing alternative options; and by choice, he referred to finding or developing alternative courses of action from those available options.

To Simon decision making involves choice between alternative plan of actions, and the choice in turn, involves logical co-ordination between fact and value propositions. Thus, Simon's decision making approach has other criteriaie the 'rationality' criteria. Simon views that total rationality in an administrative situation is almost impossible. Hence he has prescribed a moderate level of rationality (bounded rationality) based on a practical level of satisfaction. Simon's contributions are undoubtedly a major breakthrough in the evolution of administrative theory. His model has greatly encouraged the need for the use of various management techniques in public policy making and policy science has received the initial impulse from his formulation.

6. Structural- Functional Approach

F.W. Riggs mainly used structural-functional approach in analyzing the administrative systems. This approach envisages that in every society certain important functions have to be carried out by a number of structures with the application of certain specified methods. To Riggs, in every society five important types of functions are discharged, viz. economic, social, communication, symbolic and political functions. The same set of functional requisites applies to an administrative sub-system in which various structures carry out a number of functions in a specified manner. In the field of public administration, it was first suggested by Dwight Waldo in 1955. Waldo's suggestion was first followed by F.W. Riggs when he came out with his The structural functional approach "agrarian-industria" (that is, agricultural and industrial societies) typology in 1956. These models were developed keeping in view the societies of imperial China and the United States. According to him, all societies transform from 'agraria' to 'industria' at a given point of time.

Later in 1957, he developed an intermediate model named "transition" which represented the transforming societies and possessed the characteristics of both "agrarian" and "industria" But the typology of "agrarian-transitia – industria" was criticized as having many limitations. Later, Riggs developed another set of models to analyse the administrative systems in developing countries. It came to be known as the fused-prismatic-diffracted model. The ideal models of Riggs analyse the administrative systems, in developing countries. It came to be known as the fused- prismatic-diffracted model. The ideal

models of Riggs administrative systems – fused, prismatic and diffracted are hypothetical assumptions aimed at analysing pre-historic developing and developed societies.

Riggs created models on the basis of the structural – functional approach. In his view, in a fused society, a single structure carries out various functions. Contrary to this, in a diffracted society separate structures are created to carry out specific functions. But between the two, there exist a number of societies in which the characteristics of both fused and diffracted societies exist side by side. These are called prismatic societies.

The focus of Riggs’s analyses is the study of certain key elements of the social structures in a prismatic society and their interaction with “sala”, ie, the administrative sub-system in such a society. His treatment of the fused and diffracted societies is sketchy, and has relevance only to the extent that it aids the analysis of prismatic societies. It is to explain the ‘administrative ecology’ of prismatic societies that he has constructed the “Prismatic-sala” model. He identified three features of prismatic-sala model:- (1) Heterogeneity(2) Formalism, 3) Overlapping.

Later on in his book “Prismatic Society Revisited “ (1973), Riggs revised his prismatic theory. He replaced the ‘one dimensional approach’ (differentiation) with “two dimensional approach’ (differentiation and integration). Thus, he reconceptualised diffracted societies as, “co- diffracted”, “Ortho diffracted’ and ‘new diffracted’ and prismatic societies as ‘co-prismatic’, ‘ortho-prismatic’ and ‘neo prismatic’. His analysis of the process of administrative development can provide guidelines to the policy makers in different nations.

C) Contemporary Approaches

1. Contingency Approach

The contingency or situational approach attempts to bridge the gap between management theory and management practice. Mary Parker Follet used the phrase “Law of the situation” in 1919 to emphasise that different situations require different kinds of leadership. But the contingency approach developed mainly during 1970’s. After a review of leadership studies, Ralph Stogdill concluded that the traits and skills required in leadership are determined by the situation in which an individual is exercising leadership. The basic premise of the contingency approach is that managerial actions and organizational design must be appropriate to the given situation and a particular action s valid only under certain conditions. There is no one best approach for all situations. In other words, managerial action is contingent upon external environment. Thus the contingency approach takes into account not only the given situations but the influence of given situations on behavioral patterns of organization.

2. The Rational choice approach

The rational choice theory, also known as choice theory or rational action theory, is a theory for understanding and often modeling social and economic as well as individual behavior. It is the main paradigm in the currently-dominant micro economics school of thought. Becher (1976) recorded that “the rational choice theory was early popularized by a 1992 Nobel Memorial Prize Laureate in Economics Science, Gary Becker, who was one of the first to apply rational actor models more widely”. Elster (1989) stated the essence of rational choice theory when he said that “when faced with several courses of action, people usually do what they believe is likely to have the best overall outcome”. The “rationality” defined

by the rational choice theory adopts a more specific and narrower definition, which simply means that “an individual acts as if balancing costs against benefit to arrive at action that maximizes personal advantage”.

3.Public Choice Approach

A great landmark in the evolution of Public Administration was the emergence of ‘public choice’ approach. Since the early 1960’s the public choice school has been developed by a number of eminent scholars in a variety of ways. Essentially a critique of the bureaucratic model of administration, the public choice approach deals with the possibility of institutional pluralism in the provision of public goods and services. Plurality of governments and public agencies is supported on the grounds of consumer preferences. Vincent Ostrom, the chief protagonist of the public choice school, has developed a concept of “democratic administration’ alongside the conventional idea of bureaucratic administration. The bureaucrats, in his view, prefer self-interest to public interest. Ostrom says, bureaucratic structures are necessary but not sufficient for a productive and responsive public service economy”.

Ostrom’s democratic administration paradigm earned popular acceptance because of its forceful emphasis on democratizing administration. He argued the need for diverse democratic decision making structures, popular participation in administration and dispersed administrative authority. In brief, Ostrom argues, perfection in the hierarchical ordering of a professionally trained public service accountable to a single centre of power will reduce the capability of a larger administrative system to respond to diverse preferences among citizens for many different public goods and services and cope with diverse environmental conditions. A variety of different organizational arrangements can be used to different public goods and services. Such organizations can be co-ordinated through various multi-organizational arrangements.