



**NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA**

**SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES**

**COURSE CODE: BHM 783**

**COURSE TITLE: COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

# **BHM 783 COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

## **COURSE GUIDE**

# **NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA**

## **CONTENTS**

	<b>PAGE</b>
Introduction .....	3
What You Will Learn in This Course .....	4
Course Aims .....	4
Course Objectives .....	4
Working through this Course .....	5
Course Materials .....	6
Study Units .....	6
Assignment Files .....	7
Presentation Schedule .....	8

Assessment .....	8
Tutor-Marked Assignment .....	8
Final Examination and Grading.....	9
Course Marking Scheme.....	10
How to Get the Most from this Course.....	12
Facilitators/Tutors and Tutorials.....	16
Summary.....	17

## **INTRODUCTION**

BHM 783: Comparative Public Administration is available for students offering PGD in Comparative Public Administration. The course provides an opportunity for students to acquire a detailed knowledge and understanding of the concepts and theories in Comparative Public Administration as they affect business organizations in Nigeria and other countries of the world. It will assist you to be able to apply these concepts and theories to the task and roles that you perform as an administrator in public sector setting.

This course guide provides you with the necessary information about the contents of the course and the materials you will need to be familiar with for a proper understanding of the subject matter. It is designed to help you to get the best of the course by enabling you to think productively about the principles underlying the issues you study and the projects you execute in the course of your study and thereafter. It also provides some guidance on the way to approach your tutor-marked assignments (TMAS). You will of course receive on-the-stop guidance from your tutorial classes, which you are advised to approach with all seriousness.

Overall, the course guide tells you briefly what the course is about, what course materials you will be using and how you can work your way through these materials. It suggests some general guidelines for the amount of time you are likely to spend on each unit of the course in order to complete it successfully.

## **WHAT YOU WILL LEARN IN THIS COURSE**

BHM 783 Comparative Public Administration introduces you to various techniques, guides, principles, practices, etc. relating to public administration as it is practiced elsewhere.

### **COURSE AIM**

The aim of the course can be summarized as follows:

This course aims to give you an understanding of the meaning of comparative public administration, approaches and issues, what they are and how they can be applied in everyday administrative activities. It also aims to help you develop skills in the public sector management. You can also apply the principles to your job as policy makers, top management of public organizations in both the private and public enterprises. All these will be achieved by aiming to:

### **COURSE OBJECTIVES**

To achieve the aims set out, the course sets overall objectives. Each unit also has specific objectives. The unit objectives are always included at the beginning of a unit; you should read them before you start working through the unit. You may want to refer to them during your study of the unit to check on your progress.

You should always look at the unit objectives after completing a unit. In doing so, you will be sure that you have followed the instructions in the unit.

Below are the wider objectives of the course as a whole. By meeting these objectives, you should have achieved the aims of the course as a whole. On successful completion of the course, you should be able to:

- (1) Explain the evolution, meaning, importance and theoretical perspectives of comparative public Administration.
- (2) Understand the major approaches of comparative public Administration;
- (3) Understand the behavioural approach to comparative public Administration
- (4) Describe the approaches of structural-functionalism
- (5) Understand the nexus between bureaucracy and Development Administration
- (6) Understand the role of bureaucracy in nation-building in Nigeria
- (7) Understand the role of bureaucracy in nation-building in developing countries
- (8) Understand the role of bureaucracy in nation-building in developed democratic countries;
- (9) Compare the role of bureaucracy in nation-building between developing countries, Western democratic and socialist countries;

### **WORKING THROUGH THIS COURSE**

To complete this course, you are required to read the study units, read set books and read other materials provided by the National Open University of Nigeria (NOUN). Each unit contains self-assessment exercises, and at a point in the course, you are required to submit

assignments for assessment purposes. At the end of the course, is a final examination. The course should take you about 16 - 17 weeks in total to complete.

Below you will find listed all the components of the course, what you have to do, and how you should allocate your time to each unit in order to complete the course successfully on time.

Below are the lists of all the components of the course:

### **COURSE MATERIALS**

Major components of the course are:

- Course Guide
- Study Units
- References
- Assignment
- Presentation Schedule

### **STUDY UNITS**

The study units in this course are as follows:

#### **Module 1 Emergence of Comparative Public Administration**

Unit 1 Evolution of Comparative Public Administration

Unit 2 Meaning of Comparative Public Administration

Unit 3 Importance of Comparative Public Administration



Unit 4 Theoretical Perspectives

Unit 5 Criticisms and prospects of Comparative Public Administration

## **Module 2 Approaches to Comparative Public Administration**

Unit1 The Behavioural approach to comparative public administration

Unit 2 Systems approach to Comparative Public Administration

Unit 3 Structural-functional approach to comparative public administration

Unit 4 The Development Administration approach to comparative public administration

Unit 5 The Bureaucratic approach to Comparative Public Administration

## **MODULE 3 Cross-National comparison of Bureaucracy and Development Administration in Developed and Developing Countries.**

Unit 1 Bureaucracy and Development Administration

Unit 2 Comparison of Administrative system between developed and developing countries

Unit 3 Comparison of the role of Bureaucracy in nation-building in developing countries and Nigeria

- Unit 4    Comparison of the role of Bureaucracy in nation-building among the developed countries
- Unit 5    Comparison of the role of bureaucracy in nation-building between Socialist countries and Western Democratic countries.

The first two Modules explain the emergence and approaches of Comparative Public Administration; while the third Module examines the cross-national comparison of bureaucracy and development administration in developed and developing countries.

### **ASSIGNMENT FILES**

There are fifteen assignments in this course. The fifteen-course assignment which cover all the topics in the course material are there to guide you to have proper understanding and grasp of the course.

### **PRESENTATION SCHEDULE**

The presentation schedule included in your course materials gives you the important dates for this year for the completion of tutor- marked assignments and attending tutorials. Remember, you are required to submit all your assignments by the due date. You should guard against falling behind in your work.

## **ASSESSMENT**

There are three aspects to the assessment of the course: first is the self-assessment test; the second is tutor-marked assignments; and third, is a written examination.

In tackling the assignments, you are advised to be sincere in attempting the exercises; you are expected to apply information, knowledge and techniques gathered during the course. The assignments must be submitted to your tutor for formal assessment in accordance with the deadlines stated in the Presentation Schedule and the Assignment File. The work you submit to your tutor for assessment will count for 50% of your total Course mark.

At the end of the course, you will need to sit for a final written examination of 'three hours' duration. This examination will also count for 50% of your total course mark.

### **TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMAs)**

There are nine tutor-marked assignments in this course. You only need to submit five of the eight assignments. You are encouraged, however, to submit all eight assignments in which case the highest five of the eight marks will be counted. Each assignment counts 10% towards your total course mark.

Assignment questions for the units in this course are contained in the Assignment File. You will be able to complete your assignment from the information and materials contained in your reading, references

and study units- However, it is desirable in all degree level education to demonstrate that you have read and researched more widely than the required minimum. Using other references will give you a broader viewpoint and may provide a deeper understanding of the subject.

When you have completed each assignment, send it together with a TMA (tutor marked assignment) form, to your tutor. Make sure that each assignment reaches your tutor on or before the deadline given in the Presentation Schedule and Assignment File. If for any reason, you cannot complete your work on time, contact your tutor before the assignment is due to discuss the possibility of an extension. Extensions will not be granted after the due date unless there are exceptional circumstances.

## **FINAL EXAMINATION AND GRADING**

The final examination BHM 783 will be of three hours' duration and have a value of 50% of the total course grade. The examination will consist of questions, which reflect the types of self-testing, practice exercise and tutor-marked problems you have previously encountered. All areas of the course will be assessed. The work you submit to your tutor for assessment will count as the other 50% of your total course mark.

Spend the time between finishing the last unit and sitting for the examination to revise the entire course work. You might find it useful to review the self-tests, tutor-marked assignments and comments on them before the examination. The final examination covers information from all parts of the course.

## COURSE MARKING SCHEME

### Total Course Marking Scheme

ASSESSMENT	MARKS
Assignment 1-9	Nine assignments, best six marks of the nine count @ 5% each = 30% of course marks
Final Examination	70% of overall course marks
<b>Total</b>	100% of course marks

## COURSE OVERVIEW

This table brings together the units, the number of weeks you should take to complete them and the assignments that follow them.

Unit	Title of Work	Weeks Activity	Assessment (end of unit)
	Course Guide		
	<b>Module 1</b>		
1	Evolution of Comparative Public Administration	1	Assignment 1
2	Meaning of Comparative	1	

	Public Administration		
3	Importance of Comparative Public Administration	1	Assignment 2
4	Theoretical Perspectives	1	Assignment 3
5	Criticisms and Prospects of Comparative Public Administration	1	

<b>Module 2</b>			
1	Behavioural Approach to Comparative Public Administration	1	Assignment 4
2	Systems Approach	1	
3	Structural-functional Approach	1	
4	Development Administration Approach	1	Assignment 5
5	Bureaucratic Approach	1	Assignment 6
<b>Module 3</b>			
1	Bureaucracy and Development Administration	1	
2	Comparison of Administrative System between Developed and Developing Countries	1	Assignment 7
3	Compare the role of Bureaucracy in nation-building of Developing countries and Nigeria	1	Assignment 8
4	Compare the role of Bureaucracy in nation-building among the	1	Assignment 9

	developed countries		
5	Compare the role of bureaucracy in nation-building between Socialist and Western Democratic Countries	1	
	<b>Total</b>	16	9

## HOW TO GET THE MOST FROM THIS COURSE

In distance learning, the study units replace the university lecturer. This is one of the great advantages of distance learning. You can read and work through specially designed study materials at your own pace, and at a time and place that suits you best. Think of it as reading the lecture that a lecturer might set you some reading to do, the study unit will tell you when to read your other materials. Just as a lecturer might give you an in-class exercise, your study units provide exercises for you to do at appropriate points.

Each of the study units follows a common format. The first item is an introduction of the subject matter of the unit, and how a particular unit is integrated with the other units and the course as a whole.



Next is a set of learning objectives. These objectives let you know what you should be able to do by the time you have completed the unit. You should use these objectives to guide your study. When you have finished the unit, you must go back and check whether you have achieved the objectives. If you make a habit of doing this, you will significantly improve your chances of passing the course.

The main body of the unit guides you through the required reading from other sources. This will usually be either from a Reading Section of some other sources.

Self-tests are interspersed throughout the end of units. Working through these tests will help you to achieve the objectives of the unit and prepare you for the assignments and the examination. You should do each self-test as you come to it in the study unit. There will also be numerous examples given in the study units, work through these when you come to them too.

The following is a practical strategy for working through the course. If you run into any trouble, telephone your tutor. Remember that your tutor's job is to help you. When you need help, do not hesitate to call and ask your tutor to provide it.

- (1) Read this course guide thoroughly.
- (2) Organize a study schedule. Refer to the course overview for more details. Note the time you are expected to spend on each unit and how the assignments relate to the units. Important information e.g. details of your tutorials, and the date of the first day of the semester will be made available. You need to gather

all this information in one place, such as your diary or a wall calendar. Whatever method you choose to use, you should decide on and write in your own dates for working on each unit.

- (3) Once you have created your own study schedule, do everything you can to stick to it. The major reason that students fail is that they get behind with their coursework. If you get into difficulties with your schedule, please let your tutor know before it is too late for help.
- (4) Turn to unit I and read the introduction and the objectives for the unit.
- (5) Assemble the study materials. Information about what you need for a unit is given in the 'Overview' at the beginning of each unit. You will always need both the study unit you are working on and one of your references, on your desk at the same time.
- (6) Work through the unit. The content of the unit itself has been arranged to provide a sequence for you to follow. As you work through the units, you will be instructed to read sections from your other sources. Use the unit to guide your reading.
- (7) Well before the relevant due date, check your Assignment File and make sure you attend to the next required assignment. Keep in mind that you will learn a lot by doing the assignments carefully. They have been designed to help you meet the

objectives of the course and, therefore, will help you pass the exam. Submit all assignments not later than the due date.

- (8) Review of the objectives for each study unit confirms that you have achieved them. If you feel unsure about any of the objectives, review the study material or consult your tutor.
- (9) When you are confident that you have achieved a unit's objectives, you can then start on the next unit. Proceed unit by unit through the course and try to face your study so that you keep yourself on schedule.
- (10) When you have submitted an assignment to your tutor for marking, do not wait for its return before starting on the next unit. Keep to your schedule. When the assignment is returned, pay particular attention to your tutor's comments, both on the tutor-marked assignment form and also written on the assignment. Consult your tutor as soon as possible if you have any questions or problems.
- (10) After completing the last unit, review the course and prepare yourself for the final examination. Check that you have achieved the unit objectives (listed at the beginning of each unit) and the course objectives (listed in the Course Guide).

## **FACILITATORS/TUTORS AND TUTORIALS**

There are 17 hours of tutorials provided in support of this course. You will be notified of the dates, times and location of these tutorials, together with the names and phone numbers of your tutor, as soon as you are allocated a tutorial group.

Your tutor will mark and comment on your assignments, keep a close watch on your progress and on any difficulties you might encounter and provide assistance to you during the course- You must mail your tutor-marked assignments to your tutor well before the due date (at least two working days are required). They will be marked by your tutor and returned to you as soon as possible. Do not hesitate to contact your tutor by telephone, e-mail, or discussion board if you need help. The following might be circumstances in which you would find help necessary.

### **CONTACT YOUR TUTOR IF:**

- You do not understand any part of the study units or the assigned readings.
- You have difficulty with the self-test or exercise.
- You have a question or problem with an assignment with your tutor's comment on an assignment or with the grading of an assignment

You should try your best to attend the tutorials. This is the only chance to have face-to-face contact with your tutor and to ask questions which are answered instantly. You can raise any problem encountered in the course of your study. To gain the maximum benefit

from course tutorials, prepare a question list before attending them. You will learn a lot from participating in discussions actively.

As earlier stated above, this course BHM 783 Comparative Public Administration relates public Administration in public organizations. It makes in-depth analysis of the Comparative Public Administration in developing and developed countries for understanding of the practices and principles governing public Administration.

We hope you enjoy your acquaintances with the National Open University of Nigeria (NOUN). We wish you every success in the future.

**NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSIT OF NIGERIA**

**SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES**

**14/16, AHMADU BELLO WAY, VICTORIA ISLAND, LAGOS**

**COURSE CODE: BHM 783**

**COURSE TITLE: COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

**COURSE DEVELOPER/WRITER: DR AUGUSTINE NDUKA ENEANYA**

**NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA**

**COURSE EDITOR: PROFESSOR C.P MADUABUM**

**PROGRAMME LEADER: DR (MRS) AYODELE O. FAGBEMI**

**NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA**

**COURSE COORDINATOR: MR AGBEBAKU, HENRY USIOBAIFO**

**NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OIF NIGERIA**

## **MODULE 1**

### **EMERGENCE OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

**Unit 1 Evolution of Comparative Public Administration**

**Unit 2 Meaning of Comparative Public Administration**

**Unit 3 Importance of Comparative Public Administration**

**Unit 4 Theoretical Perspectives**

**Unit 5 Criticisms and Prospects of Comparative Public Administration**

## **MODULE 2**

### **APPROACHES TO COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

**Unit 1 Behavioural approach**

**Unit 2 Systems Approach**

**Unit 3 Structural-Functional Approach**

**Unit 4 Development Administration Approach**

**Unit 5 Bureaucratic Approach**

### **MODULE 3**

#### **CROSS-NATIONAL COMPARISON OF BUREAUCRACY AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION IN DEVELOPED AND DEVELOPING COUNTRIES.**

**Unit 1 Bureaucracy and Development Administration**

**Unit 2 Administrative systems between developed and developing  
countries**

**Unit 3 Comparison of the role of bureaucracy in Nation-building in  
between developing countries and Nigeria**

**Unit 4 The role of bureaucracy in Nation-building among the  
developed countries**

**Unit 5 The role of bureaucracy in Nation-building between Socialist  
and Western Democratic countries**



## **MODULE 1**

### **EMERGENCE OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

#### **UNIT 1 EVOLUTION OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

##### **CONTENTS**

##### **1.0 Introduction**

##### **2.0 Objectives**

##### **3.0 Main contents**

##### **3.1 Stimulants to Comparative Public Administration**

##### **3.2 Developing Comparative Public Administration as a discipline**

##### **4.0 Conclusion**

##### **5.0 Summary**

##### **6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments**

##### **7.0 References/Further Reading**

## **UNIT 1 EVOLUTION OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

There was not much of literature on comparative Public Administration before the second world war. In the early writings on the subject, scholars such as L.D White and F.W. Taylor or the human relations movement adopted a “management” approach and their main concern was building a science of administration through the articulation of certain “Universal” principles of administration. However, the turn of events during and after World War II changed the state of literature on comparative public administration. A number of studies by Dwight Waldo, Ferrel Heady and Stokes made significant contributions in making public administration a universal science.

### **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of the unit, students would be able to:

- Understand the motivating factors that led to the systematic study of comparative public administration;
- Understand the influence of World War II and the assistance programme initiated by the United States in the study of comparative public administration from general managerial approach to contextual and situational approach; and
- Understand the concern of public administration scholars searching for “Science of Administration” and the influence of

behavioural movement in Social Sciences in the development of theoretical constructs with cross-cultural and cross-national comparison.

### **3.0 MAIN CONTENTS**

#### **3.1 STIMULANTS TO COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

The major shift from this periodical thinking of public administration to comparative approach was stimulated by a number of factors starting with the World War II. During the World War II, there were post-war military occupations and accelerated technical assistance programmes sponsored by the United Nation, United States and some private foundations like the Ford Foundation. Numerous students from the USA at the time participated in the Aid programmes. This offered them the opportunity and exposure to government systems and cultures of other foreign countries (often non-western). The result of this exposure was the stimulation of a sense of “comparativeness” in general, while raising a number of questions about the appropriateness of principles and devices that had been adjudged as good or scientific principles of administration previously.

During and after the world war II, the traditional school of public administration consisting of Woodrow Wilson, William Willoughby, L. D. White and F. W. Taylor came to be criticized for its failure to undertake a comparative study of the administrative system. Robert Dahl considered

the claim of public administration to be a “science” as hollow as long as study was not comparative.

The World War II is often regarded as the dividing line between the old and new literature on the subject of public administration, as a new discipline under the name of new public administration came into being. In the field of comparative public administration, emphasis shifted from general managerial approach to contextual and situational approach.

Beside the World War II, there were a number of factors which attracted the attention of American scholars to the comparative study of public administrations:

3.1.1 New scientific, theoretical and technological developments influenced the structures of administration stimulating interest in the comparative study of administrative;

3.1.2 The emergence of free nations after the world war and efforts by these nations to achieve rapid socio-economic development, created new problems before public administration which led to scientific investigation and empirical studies in the field of public administration.

3.1.3 The assistance programmes initiated by the United States to help the newly independent countries in the task of their national development insisted on the establishment of modern personnel, budgeting and planning agencies by the recipient states. But when these countries failed to respond, it led the academic critics to

point out that the American patterns of improvements were “cultures bound” and could not be transported to the countries having different cultures soon it came to be recognized that “exogenous” technical change required a complete understanding of the culture context of the administrative institution and behaviour in foreign countries, “which developed ecological perspective among the students of public administration working developing countries.

3.1.4 New intellectual developments in comparative Sociology, Anthropology, politics and other areas stimulated the students of Public Administration to develop theoretical constructs with a cross-cultural, cross-national and cross-temporal relevance in their field.

3.1.5 The behaviour movement in Social Sciences led the students of Public Administration to move away from the traditional legal formal approach and to concentrate on the facts of actual behaviour of human beings in an administrative organization (Bhagwan and Bhushan, 2006:58); and

3.1.6 The concern of Public Administration scholars searching for “science of Public Administration”

### **3.2 DEVELOPING COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AS A DISCIPLINE**

There was increased awareness towards developing Comparative Public Administration as a discipline. There were several new developments in

this field and important new literature was created. However, Comparative Public Administration emerged in 1952 when a committee was set up in the United States by the American Political Scientists. This committee was named "SHARP" Committee headed by Professor Walter Sharp. The aim of this committee was to look into the study of Comparative Public Administration in a scientific way. In 1953, another committee was set-up by the society of American Public Administration, called "Comparative American Group" headed by Fred. W. Riggs and was affiliated to American Society for Public Administration. This committee was to look into the development of Comparative Public Administration and to develop criteria of relevance and objective. These two committees were set up in order to move the discipline forward.

Moreover, the Comparative Public Administration movement received a major boost, when it received the first professional recognition in 1953 through the appointment of an ad hoc committee on comparative administration by the American Political Science Association, which led to the establishment in 1960 of the Comparative Administration Group (CAG) and was affiliated to American society for public administration. Fred W. Riggs was appointed the chairman of CAG. The Comparative Administration Group in the United States has done commendable work in the field of Comparative Public Administration. It has prepared more than one hundred research papers on various aspects of comparative administration. The group received generous grants from Ford foundation

in 1962, through the American society for public administration and was publishing quarterly journals of Comparative Administration. It has sponsored experimental technique projects and promoted field research in comparative administration. Comparative public administration as a subject was included in the courses of study in several colleges and universities in the United States and other developed countries. Dwight Waldo started comparative public administration as a course of study in the University of California(Barkley) in 1948. Thereafter, it began to receive much greater attention which widened the scope of the study.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST**

What are the factors that led to the emergence of comparative public administration?

### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

Comparative Public Administration has widened the horizons of public administration by opening the doors of the discipline to all kinds of social science. The study of comparative Public Administration has not only improved intellectual and scholarly writings of researchers, it has helped to eliminate its parochialism or narrowness. Today, the principles of Public Administration are analyzed in a cross-cultural and cross-national contexts.

## **5.0 SUMMARY**

This unit has been able to explain the evolution of comparative public administration. It has been able to highlight the motivating forces leading to its emergence as a course of activity and a course of study in universities, especially during and after the World War II. As an activity, it has widened the horizons of public administration analysis in a cross-cultural and cross-national contexts. As a course of study, it has improved the intellectual and scholarly writings of researchers. Today, comparative public administration has received greater attention as a course of study in many colleges and universities in many developed and developing countries of the world.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENTS**

What role did the scholars in behavioural sciences play in the emergence of comparative public administration as a course of study in colleges and universities ?

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS**

- Basu, R. (2004). *Public Administration: Concepts and Theories*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Ltd.
- Eneanya, A.N. (2010). *Comparative Public Administration and Public Policy: Theories and Applications*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd.
- Heady, F. (1979). *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York: Marjell Dekker.
- Sharma, M.P, Sadana, B.L., and H. Kaur (2011). *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: Kishor Mahal publishers



## **UNIT 2 MEANING OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Introduction**
- 2.0 Objectives**
- 3.0 Main Contents**
  - 3.1 Conceptual Clarification**
- 4.0 Conclusion**
- 5.0 Summary**
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments**
- 7.0 References/Further Readings**

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The comparative study of administrative system has grown up with the comparative study of politics. Both share common characteristics such as : general outlook identified by behaviouralism, effort to be interdisciplinary in interests and techniques and efforts to arrive at concepts and theories that can be analyzed in cross-cultural and cross-national contexts. However, the study of comparative politics has placed emphasis upon voting behaviour, political attitudes, the activities of interest groups, and so on. It is only now when the concern has come to rest more on the performance of government and the processes of policy making, that the focus of inquiry has been shifting back to institutions. Bureaucracy, being the institution most clearly associated with performance has become the focus of study. In this unit, we shall examine the meaning of comparative public administration.

## **0.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of the study of this unit, students would be able to:

- Understand comparative public administrative as a systematic study of political systems with the aim of developing scientific theories; and
- Understand comparative public administration as a field of study that can be applied in different socio-political environments.

## **3.0 MAIN CONTENTS**

### **3.1 CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION**

Comparative Public Administration was described by the Comparative Administration Group of the American Society for Public Administration as “the systematic study of political systems with the aim of developing scientific theories, which could be applied to diverse cultures and national settings and the body of factual data, by which it can be examined and tested” (CAG, 1963). Riggs (1973) noted in his definition, that the term “comparative” should be used only for empirical, homothetic studies. He outlines three trends in the comparative study of Public Administration:

- i) From normative approach towards more empirical approaches;
- ii) Shifts from ideographic (individualistic) toward homothetic (universals);
- iii) Shift from a predominantly non-ecological to an ecological basis for the study of Public Administration.

From this definition, it is apparent that the focus of comparative public administration was a major developmental issues faced in American

public administration. According F.W. Riggs (1973), the first trend observed from the definition is fairly well established and the other two trends are perhaps only fast emerging.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST**

**Describe the concept of comparative public administration?**

#### **4. 0 CONCLUSION**

It is now apparent that comparative public administration was viewed as a developmental issue embedded in specific cultures and political settings, . As such, the study of the principles of public administration is inadequate. Therefore, for public administration to be regarded as scientific, it must have pure and applied aspects, as contained in the meaning of comparative public administration.

#### **5. 0 SUMMARY**

We can, therefore, identify certain components of emphasis of Comparative Public Administration, which include;

- Studies of different administrative systems in their ecological settings

- Emphasis of empirical study is based on rigorous methods, such as: field observations, field-experiment and organization- like groups;
- Inter-disciplinary orientations;
- Inter-action between administration, socio-economic, cultural and political phenomena.
- multi-organizational nature of Public Administration and importance of interactions among organizations at different levels of government; (local, state and national)
- widened horizons of public administration (Bhagwan and Bhushan, 2006:58).

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENTS**

Describe the major areas of emphasis of comparative public administration?

## **7.0 REFERENCES AND FURTHER STUDY**

- Eneanya, A.N. (2010). *Comparative Public Administration and Public Policy: Theories and Applications*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd.
- Heady, F. (1979). *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York: Mariel Dekker.
- Sharma, M.P, Sadana, B.L., and H. Kaur (2011). *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: Kiah Mahal publishers

## **UNIT 3 IMPORTANCE OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Introduction**
- 2.0 Objectives**
- 3.0 Main Contents**
  - 3.1 The academic study of Comparative Public Administration**
  - 3.2 Knowledge of individual characteristics of different cultures**
  - 3.3 Knowledge of different administrative systems**
  - 3.4 Relevance of ecology of Public Administration**
  - 3.5 Administrative practices of other countries**
- 4.0 Conclusion**
- 5.0 Summary**
- 6.0 Tutor-marked Assignments**
- 7.0 References/Further Readings**

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The study of comparative public administration is not merely an intellectual exercise of the scholars, nor is it limited to mere comparative studies. Its contributions have important bearing on the whole range of public administration. In this unit, we shall examine the important role comparative public administration has played in bringing politics and public administration closer to each other.

## **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of unit, students would be able to:

- Know the basic contributions in the study of public administration ;
- Know how comparative public administration methodology has broaden the field of social science research; and
- Know how comparative public administration has encouraged the process of social research analysis from normative to empirical approaches.

## **3.0 MAIN CONTENTS**

There are contributions of comparative public administration, which include:

### **3.1 THE ACADEMIC STUDY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION.**

It is believed that generalizations relating to administrative structures and behaviour, emerging out of comparative studies in different nations and cultures can help to formulate theoretical constructs, which can provide a scientific basis to the study of public administration.

### **2.1 KNOWLEDGE OF INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS OF DIFFERENT CULTURES**

Comparative Public Administration contributes to a greater understanding of the individual characteristics of administrative systems, functioning in different nations and cultures.

### **3.3 KNOWLEDGE OF DIFFERENCES OF ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS**

It helps to explain factors responsible for cross-national and cross-cultural similarities as well as difference in the administrative system.

### **3.4 RELEVANCE OF ECOLOGY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

It helps academicians, policy makers and Administration know the causes of success or failure of administrative structures and patterns in different environmental settings.

### **3.5 ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES OF OTHER COUNTRIES**

Lastly, through comparative studies, we learn about the administrative practices of other nations, which can be adapted to our own systems.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST**

What are the major contributions of comparative public administration as a discipline and activity?

### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

Comparative public administration has contributed immensely in eliminating the narrowness of the subject of public administration. It has made the subject broader, deeper and useful, especially in its cross-cultural and cross-national contexts. Lastly, it has encouraged the process of broadening the field of social analysis.

### **5.0 SUMMARY**

The importance of comparative public administration has been significant. It has not only eliminated its narrowness in terms of empirical analysis, but broaden the field of social science research. Comparative public administration has brought politics and public administration closer to each other.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENTS**

Highlight major contributions of comparative public administration in social science research?

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS**

Eneanya, A.N. (2010). *Comparative Public Administration and Public Policy: Theories and Applications*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd.

Sharma, M.P, Sadana, B.L., and H. Kaur (2011). *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: Kiah Mahal publishers



## **UNIT 4 THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES**

### **1.0 Introduction**

### **2.0 Objectives**

### **3.0 Main Contents**

#### **3.1 The Nature of Comparative Public Administration Research**

#### **3.2 General Theory**

#### **3.3 Middle-range theories**

#### **3.4 Organisational theories**

#### **3.5 Models (Paradigm)**

### **4.0 Conclusion**

### **5.0 Summary**

### **6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments**

### **7.0 References/Further Readings**

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Comparative public administration is a specialized branch of administration that scholars believe need inquiry. Besides the literature on comparative politics, what should influence its study among others, are the general literature on organisation theory and management theory. The development and management theory can assist in our understanding of comparative public administration, but we should not expect all the answers to come even from that fertile field.

There are a number of approaches, models and theories presently characterizing the subject area of Comparative Public Administration. Particularly after Second World War, a number of approaches have emerged in Comparative Public Administration analysis. Much of this effort is based on an adaptation of the developments in Comparative politics approach, organization theories and models. A model may take different names like: paradigm, ideal-constructs, intellectual framework,

conceptual framework, etc. Whatever name it bears, a model represents a framework for developing hypothesis and it can be used to test “cause and effect” relationship between variable.

The inter-disciplinary nature of the study of Comparative Public Administration makes it imperative to use models in analyzing data. The inter-disciplinary borrowing is extensive and comes from Sociology, Economics, Psychology and other Social Sciences. It has become difficult to develop a general administration theory that can be used as a framework that would give broad, cross-cultural explanations of cluster of concepts that would be helpful in classifying administrative systems around the world in terms of rich and poor bureaucracies or weak and strong states. Many reasons have been advanced in this regard. They are:

- 1) National Administrative systems are more difficult to study than other political institutions. For example, parties, mass publics, legislatures and courts, particularly when studied in terms of performance. Outputs of other political institutions are more readily available and in quantitative form. For example, electoral outcomes (votes or seats); legislative outcomes (seats); judicial outcomes (decisions). The outcome of administrative system is difficult to study because there are many kinds of agencies doing many kind of things.
- 2) The boundaries of administrative systems are difficult to establish. Since comparative Public Administration is a comparative study of policy implementation, all kinds of actors not belonging to regular public administrative machinery are involved in implementation, such as ; courts, mass publics, mass media, local governments and private organizations. Therefore, delimiting these sets of actors involved in each country becomes extremely difficult.

- 3) There is complexity in implementation networks as it may vary in function, such as: task, problem, natural, history, constituency, technology, centralization and dominance (Yates, 1982). It is difficult to use the term “bureaucracy” when implementation networks vary according to function.
- 4) The problem of change is also a factor. Administrative arrangements are constantly changing. It is difficult for international organization to keep up with changes in many countries at the same time, especially when international data on socio-economic indicators, for example: demography, health, housing, etc, are not available.
- 5) There is also the problem of research. There is the problem of research. Comparative Public Administration research has been behavioural. Behavioural research trying to penetrate bureaucracy with its legal-rationality is difficult. Moreover, many countries and agencies are not equipped to provide accurate data on performance.
- 6) There is the issue of divergent theories. There are expression of divergent theories by many states, including peripheral capitalist societies. This gives room to many expressions of concepts, definitions, methods and assumptions, making it impossible for acceptable comparative Public Administrative theory.

As a result of these reasons, models are often used in Comparative Public Administration because it has wide variety of cultural and political contexts.

## **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of the unit, students would be able to:

- Understand organisational theories that can be adapted to study comparative public administration;

- Understand management theories that are relevant to comparative public administration;
- Understand middle-range theories and models that are applied in comparative public administration

### **3.0 MAIN CONTENTS**

#### **3.1 THE NATURE OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION RESEARCH**

The development and state of Comparative Public Administration are strongly dependent on the definition of comparative public administration research. There were stringent and relaxed definitions of comparative public administration research, which emphasizes uniformity of research approach and structured design. In essence, such definitions call for research in several countries, with data being collected according to a certain regime, guided by a central research question. If not quantitative in nature, cases are chosen according to a most similar systems design or carefully replicated along the relationship between dependent and independent variables in order to control intermediate variables and produce robust evidence or counter-evidence. The goal of such comparative design is most ambitious in that it seeks to test hypotheses from certain theoretical perspectives and rule out rival explanations.

Another variant to this, was secondary analyses, for which monographs and journal articles have provided a mass of information, with the admitted flaw of possible reduced validity by not always offering to discern which statements are really based on empirical evidence and which are more loosely founded on works that are primarily theoretical and impressionistic in nature (Egeberg, 1999:160).

Another variant of comparative public administration research was the single case studies, which appeared in major public administration journals. The stringent definition made some reviewers of the journal articles to regard comparative public administration research as hypotheses testing (Heady, 1979:41).

### **3.2 GENERAL OR GRAND THEORY**

The problem of operational definition and measurement hamper the basic dependent variables of administrative systems, and their cross-national and cross-time comparison. There was failure to produce a general theory of administrative systems. Several observers advised comparative public administration to move its theoretical efforts from grand theory development of cosmic dimensions (Prestus, 1959:26; Jreisat, 1975:663; in Heady, 2001:33) to a more incremental production of middle-range theories.

### **3.3 MIDDLE-RANGE THEORIES**

The development of middle-range theory can be seen from two dimensions: problem-driven and discipline-driven (Peters and Pierre, 2007:272-275). In problem-driven dimension, theory development seeks to codify, classify and understand structural or behavioural phenomena of public administration or developments in its environments that are politically and socially perceived as problematic or in a state of flux. The problem of 1980s economic world crisis brought about the concern for efficiency and economy, which favoured an agenda for comparatively investigating public sector size and growth (Rose, 1985). Again, the problem of down-sizing bureaucracy towards privatization and deregulation policies brought comparative studies of public sector variance (Vickers and Wright, 1988). Furthermore, the problem of corruption pushed the

issue of administrative ethics on to the agenda. However, comparative research on causes of corruption gained momentum in USA and other parts of Europe. This brought concern on moral standards in public life (Della Porta and Meny, 1997; Williams, 2000a; 2000b; Williams and Robin, 2000; Rohr, 2001).

On the other hand, in the late 1950s and 1960s, comparative public administration became discipline-driven, especially focusing on bureaucratic model as conceptual framework of analysis (See Arora, 1972, quoted in Heady, 1979:14, 60). Then, bureaucratic model was conceived either as a checklist instrument or a broader model for comparing the major structural and functional characteristics of different administrative systems (Waldo, 1964). Middle-range theory development in the comparative public administration discipline was much informed by the applications and alterations to the bureaucratic model.

Several important development came from translating generic organization theory to bureaucratic organization and bureaucratic behaviours (Peters, 1989:7; Jorgensen, 1998:550).

### **3.4 ORGANISATIONAL THEORIES**

Organisational theory did much to articulate the role of environmental differences. Contingency theory, for instance, tried to match characteristics of the environment of organizations and their mode of production to the most appropriate structures. It was criticized for not acknowledging incidences of organisational closure due to environmental influences and for over-insulating structural variables from institutional transfer (Peters, 1989:7). Ecology theory offered a perspective on organization inertia, change and transformation (Kaufmann, 1976; Hogwood and Peters, 1983).

Other influences from organizational theory emphasized cross-national differences in organizational cultures (Crozier, 1963; Presthus, 1959; Lammers and Hickson, 1979, quoted in Peters and Pierre, 2007:274).

Another important source of modifying the bureaucratic model came from formal theorizing on the dysfunctions and ills of bureaucracy (Peter, 1996); the institutional public choice approach (Dunleavy, 1991); and Allison's (1971) method of triangulation of bureaucratic power and politics (Kettle, 1993:412).

### **3.5 MODELS ( SINGLE PARADIGM)**

From these analyses, it is obvious that comparative public administration lacks a single paradigm as conceptual framework. In other words, there is no "grand or general" theory for comparative public administration. Rather, middle-range theories and approaches abound in the discipline. Moreover, scholars choose questions on agreed concepts and find answers to them. In other words, they agree on what to study and organize data collection and theory development around core dependent variables. Such approach clearly departs from comparative public administration as a grand theory exercise, as administrative systems or transformations as a whole is no longer focused on the subject (Peters and Pierra, 2007: 276). However, the relevance of this approach is recognized by many scholars, but views differ as to which variables to include. Some scholars acknowledge that since grand theory of comparative public administration is to be substituted by middle-range theory, progress was best achieved by studying "the backgrounds, attitudes and behaviours of bureaucrats and those with whom they interact (Sigelman, 1976:624; in Heady, 2001:33). This view recognizes environment of those with whom bureaucrats interact but it remains quite narrow

in that its focus on individuals is behavioural only. Heady, (1979; 2001) takes a broader view. He specifies the environment of public administration by identifying the areas in which bureaucrats interact with others, that is, the broader political system and society in general. He also adds an organizational focus and emphasizes the importance of relying on several levels of analysis for understanding the complexity of public administration (Heady, 2001:34). Maor and Lane (1999) take “Actors, structures and behaviour” as building blocks for comparative public administration. These concepts operate as part of internal dynamics of the public sector. However, it is easier to operationalize “Actors” and “structures” as “public employees” and “public organizations”, respectively. Comparative analysis can be undertaken on variables of public employees – their socio-economic conditions of their employment, recruitment and career patterns in the civil service and reward systems. Moreover, the term, public organization can be operationalized as the civil service, which can provide a mass of material for secondary analysis. Both variables can present answers to central explanatory and normative questions in public administration. However, the operationalization, classification and explaining of behaviour is more problematic because of the absence of a theoretical paradigm on the nature of human behaviour in general. Peter’s (1988) choice of dependent variables: public employees, public organizations, bureaucratic behaviour and politico-administrative relations., changed the situation, even though, he adds “politico-administrative relations”. In any case, one established way of approaching comparative politico-administrative relations is from role theory (Aberbach et. al, 1981). In this tradition, attitudes, roles and behaviour are investigated by interviewing large samples of administrative and political elites in a number of countries and



compare. This approach has empirically helped to erode the classic politics and administration dichotomy.

Pierre's approach (1995) to comparative public administration is probably the most comprehensive in taking three sets of variables. He adds an explicit focus on the administration's relations with civil society, which in Peter's scheme are not absent but captured under bureaucratic behaviour. The three sets of variables in Pierre's comparative public administration project are: the intra-organisational dynamics of bureaucracy, which comprises such variables as: actors, structures and behaviour, politico-administrative relations; and the relations between administration and civil society. The relations between administration and civil society, according to him, serve to highlight the changes or challenges to contact points between public administration and civil society. Attention to the relations between public administration and civil society are not new and neither are certain tools to reduce the distance between them (Lasswell, 1960). Classification, such as: weak –strong states, for example, have been useful in comparing the bureaucratization of society or the encroachment of society on the autonomy of the state. Another established research tradition comes from studies that compare differences in trust and consent (Almond and Verba, 1965) and more recently of the value of social capital for government performance (Putnam et al., 1994).

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST**

Conceptual framework and models are used to compare public administration, instead of a general theory. Discuss.

#### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

As illustrated above in this unit, there is no grand or general theory of comparative public administration. The middle-range theories that are variants of organizational theory and other approaches formed general conceptual framework of analyses. The nature of comparative public administration research calls for borrowing of concepts from organization theories, management theories, and behavioural science approaches. This approach is justified because of the public nature of administration and need to understand the social, cultural and political settings of organisations.

#### **5.0 SUMMARY**

Comparative public administration is a specialized branch of administration because of the public nature of the discipline and socio-cultural and political settings. As a result, it is difficult to develop a general or grand theory that can be applied universally. Rather, concepts are borrowed from organizational theories, management theory, middle-range theories and behavioural science concepts to analyze and compare institutions based on contextual and situational settings.

#### **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENTS**

Scholars have observed that the study of comparative public administration cannot rely on a general theory. Do you agree?

#### **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS**

Aberbach, J.D., Putnam, R.D., and Rockman, B.A. (1981). *Bureaucrats and Politicians in Western Democracies*. Cambridge, M.A: Harvard University Press.

Allison, G. (1971). *Essence of Decision*. Boston, M.A: Little Brown.

- Almond, G. A, and S. Verba, (eds.), (1965). *The Civic culture* . Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Basu, R. (2004). *Public Administration: Concepts and Theories*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Ltd.
- Bhagwan, V. A. and Bhushan, V. (2006). *Public Administration*. New Delhi: Schand and Company Ltd.
- Crozier, M. (1964). *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Della, P.D. and Meny, Y. (1997). Democracy and Corruption: Towards a Comparative Analysis". *Democracy and Corruption in Europe*. London: Printer.
- Dunleavy, P. (1991). *Democracy, Bureaucracy and Public Choice*. Brighton: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Egeberg, M. (1999). "The Impact of Bureaucratic Structure on Policy-making". *Public Administration*, 77 (1).
- Eneanya, A.N. (2010). *Comparative Public Administration and Public Policy: Theories and Applications*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd.
- Heady, F. (1979). *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspectives*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York: Mariel Dekker.
- Hogwood, B.W. and Peters, B.G., (1983). *Policy Dynamics*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf.
- Jargensen, T.B, Antonsen, M., Hensen, H. and Melander, P., (1998). *Public Administration*, 76 (3).
- Jreisat, J.E. (1975). "Synthesis and Relevance in Comparative Public Administration". *Public Administration Review*, 35, (6).
- Kaufman, H. (1976). *Are government organizations immortal?* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

- Kettle, D.F. (1993). "Public Administration: The State of the Field". In A.W. Finifter, (ed.). *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*, APSA: Washington.
- Lammers, C.J. and Hickson, D.J. (eds.), (1979). "Organisations Alike and Unlike": *International and Inter-Institutional Studies in the Sociology of Organisations*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Lasswell, H.D. (1960). "The Technique of Decision Seminars". *Mid-west Journal of Political Science*, 4.
- Maor, M. and Lane, J.E. (1999). *Comparative Public Administration, Volume. 1*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Peter, B.G. (1996). *The future of Governing: Four emerging Models*. Lawrence, KS Kansas University Press.
- Peters, B.G. and Pierre, J. (2007). *The Handbook of Public Administration*. London: Sage Publications.
- Pierre, J. (ed.), (1995). *Bureaucracy in the Modern State: An introduction to Comparative Public Administration*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.
- Presthus, R.V. (1959). "Behaviour and Bureaucracy in many cultures". *Public Administration Review*, 19.
- Putam, R. (2000). *Boiling Alone*. New York: Simons & Schuster.
- Rohr, J.A. (2001). "Constitutionalism and Administration ethics: A Comparative Study of Canada, France, United Kingdom and United States". In T.L. Cooper (ed.). *A Handbook of Administrative Ethics*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Rose, R. (1985). *Understanding Big Government: The Programme Approach*. London: Sage.

- Riggs, F.W. (1973). "Administration in Developing Countries". *Updated version with some modifications: Prismatic Society Revisited*. Mornstown, N.J: General Learning Press.
- Vickers, J. and Wright, V. (1988). *The Politics of Privatisation in Western Europe*. London: Case.
- Waldo, D. (1964). *The Enterprise of Public Administration*. New York: Chandler and Sharp.
- Williams, R. (ed.), (2000a). *Explaining corruption*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- (2000b). *Corruption in the Developed world*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

## **UNIT 5 CRITICISMS AND PROSPECTS OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION MOVEMENT**

### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Introduction**
- 2.0 Objectives**
- 3.0 Main Contents**
  - 3.1 Identity crisis**
  - 3.2 Lack of Goal-based empirical Theory**
  - 3.3 In-built value judgement**
- 4.0 Conclusion**
- 5.0 Summary**
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments**
- 7.0 References/Further Readings**

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Comparative public administration has been criticized by many scholars . The inadequacies have been found in the angle of its development. Critics have observed that comparative public administration did not development a goal-based empirical theories. In this unit, we shall examine various criticisms levelled upon comparative public administration.

### **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of the unit, students would be able to:

- The inadequacies outlined by scholars in the study of comparative public administration as a social science;
- Understand the theoretical underpinnings of comparative public administration; and
- Appreciate the need to borrow concepts from organizational theories, management theories, behavioural science

approaches since there is no single paradigm or general theory that can be used for analysis universally.

### **3.0 MAIN CONTENTS**

Some scholars have observed certain inadequacies in the study of comparative public administration. They include:

#### **3.1 IDENTITY CRISIS**

The most frequent complaint is that Comparative Public Administration has failed to establish itself as a field of study with a generally accepted restricted range of topics to be addressed and despite the inclination to theories, that no consensus has been achieved. They assert that comparative public administration is inadequately developed as a social science and only fitfully applies its methodology for academic analysis.

#### **3.2 LACK OF GOAL-BASED EMPIRICAL THEORY**

Another criticism of Comparative Public Administration is that there is unseemly addiction to theorizing and a lack of ability to offer theories which can win acceptance and be tested empirically. According to critics, there is inadequate methodological base, lack of experience and tradition for goal-based empirical research.

#### **3.3 IN-BUILT VALUE JUDGMENT**

Scholars also criticized the traditional comparative government literatures on the grounds that they were “culture-bound and non-comparative in character” (Basu, 2004:392).

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST**

What the criticisms levelled against comparative public administration?

#### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

In spite of these scathing criticisms, the prospects of the study of comparative has been firmly located in examination of the backgrounds, attitudes and behaviours of bureaucrats and those with whom they interact. Much is happening in the field, which primarily focuses on Comparative Public Administration across political system. No matter the criticisms, Comparative Public Administration has come to stay and now a course of study in the Department of Political Science and Public Administration in colleges and Universities of many countries of the world.

#### **5.0 SUMMARY**

The criticisms levelled upon comparative public administration have centred on identity crisis, as it relies on other disciplines for its study, lack of goal-based empirical theory and in-built value judgment. However, the crisis suffered by comparative public administration during the last decade in terms of methodology and the applicability is not severe enough to make it disappear altogether. It might have lost its impetus in recent years, it has still that potentiality to remain alive because of its identity though faint in the conceptual range of modern social sciences.

#### **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENTS**

Scholars have criticized comparative public administration as having identity crisis, lack goal-based empirical theory and possess in-built value judgement. Discuss.

#### **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS**

Almond, G. A, and S. Verba, (eds.), (1965). *The Civic culture* . Princeton: Princeton University Press.



- Basu, R. (2004). *Public Administration: Concepts and Theories*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Ltd.
- Bhagwan, V. A. and Bhushan, V. (2006). *Public Administration*. New Delhi: Schand and Company Ltd.
- Eneanya, A.N. (2010). *Comparative Public Administration and Public Policy: Theories and Applications*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd.
- Riggs, F.W. (1973). "Administration in Developing Countries". *Updated version with some modifications: Prismatic Society Revisited*. Mornstown, N.J: General Learning Press.
- Sharma, M.P, Sadana, B.L., and H. Kaur (2011). *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: Kiah Mahal publishers
- Waldo, D. (1964). *The Enterprise of Public Administration*. New York: Chandler and Sharp.

## **MODULE 2**

### **APPROACHES OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

#### **UNIT 1 BEHAVIOURAL APPROACH**

##### **1.0 Introduction**

##### **2.0 Objectives**

##### **3.0 Main Contents**

###### **3.1 Behavioural Approach**

###### **3.2 Levels of Analysis**

###### **3.3 Contributions of Behavioural Approach**

###### **3.4 Criticisms**

##### **4.0 Conclusion**

##### **5.0 Summary**

##### **6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments**

##### **7.0 References/Further Readings**

#### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The public nature of administration and the need to understand the social, cultural and political settings of organisations make the enterprise of comparative public administration somewhat special. The borrowing of concepts from more general managerial, behavioural science approach and organisation theories must be done carefully and with a proper concern for contextual and situational factors. In this unit, let us examine the behavioural science approach.

#### **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, the students would be able to:

- Understand the internal dynamics within an organisation;
- Understand the use of scientific method of analysis in comparative public administration; and

- Know how to compare administrative behaviour in organizational settings.

### **3.0 MAIN CONTENTS**

#### **3.1 BEHAVIOURAL APPROACH**

The modern behavioural science movement was an outgrowth of the earlier human relations movement after the Second World War and evolved out of the Hawthorne Experiments. It was found during these studies that if supervisors developed effective human relations skills in counselling employees and established their authority on a basis of social skills and securing cooperation among employees, rather depending on technical and coercive authority, employee's productivity would increase.

Among the prominent behaviouralists are Abraham Maslow, Chris Argyris, Douglas McGregor, Rensis Likert, Hugo Munsterberg, Mary Parker Follett, Chester Barnard and others.

The behavioural scientists stressed the importance of emotional element such as feelings and sentiments to explain human behaviour and performance in organisations. The approach argues that beyond economic or material needs, man has some socio-psychological needs which must be satisfied for him to achieve optimal performance. As Nwizu (1998:26) rightly noted, human beings who work in organizations have aspirations and desires. Their behaviour is conditioned by their psychology, motives and social environment. The administrative sciences should study these "facts" of behaviour without getting involved in the question of "values". They used the knowledge of psychology, socio-psychology, anthropology and management.

The behavioural approach emphasizes "facts", rigorous scientific methods of data collection and analysis, quantification, experimentation test, verification and an inter-disciplinary orientation. It focuses on the

analysis of human behaviour in administrative settings. It is concerned with internal dynamics within administrative organisation; the behaviour of the individuals within an organization, the impact of the organisation on individual and the overall internal environment. It aims to develop knowledge that is verifiable, systematic and general.

The behavioural approach takes a more dynamic and organic view of organizations, their managements, work groups and individuals. It emphasizes psychological needs, intrinsic rewards and self-motivation much more than any of the other theories.

### **3.2 LEVELS OF ANALYSIS**

Three basic levels of analysis are involved in the behavioural approach. The first level is that of the individual, with his personality, motives, drives, attitudes, values, learning and adaptation abilities. The second level is the group level with its norms, values, sentiments, interaction patterns, problem solving and decision-making processes, adaptation and change mechanisms, conflicts, formal and informal behaviour. The third level is the total organization which is generally viewed as a complex human system.

### **3.3 CONTRIBUTIONS OF BEHAVIOURAL APPROACH**

This approach has made some useful contributions:

- Its emphasis on the use of participation and ways to handle conflict arising from strong differences of opinion within an organisation;
- It recognizes the important influence of the environment and constraints on behaviour
- The approach recognizes the importance of informal leadership for setting and enforcing group standards of performance;

- It made us to understand the importance of individual motivation, group behaviour, interpersonal relationships at work and the importance of work to human beings;
- It was this school which produced the concepts of job enrichment, management by objectives and rewarding good performance; and
- It was this approach which virtually laid the foundation of the discipline of Human Resources Management

### **3.4 CRITICISMS**

However, behavioural approach suffers from certain criticisms. Scholars observed that its assumption that all employees will seek self-actualization at work is not based on facts. People have diverse needs. It is wrong to assume that everyone is motivated by the same need in the same manner. Their assumption of great deal of compatibility between individual and organizational goals is not based on reality. The fact is that every individual has the desire to be autonomous and creative which is in conflict with the need of an organization to be efficient, orderly and predictable.

This theory does not attach any importance to non-human aspects of organization like technology. Finally, it has the same weakness as that of the classical approach and that is its assumption that the one best way of managing as humanizing organizations.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST**

Describe the behavioural approach to comparative public administration?

### **4.0 CONCLUSIONS**

The unit has examined behavioural approach in comparative public administration. The approach is concerned with internal dynamics

within administrative organizations; the behaviour of the individuals within an organization; the impact of the organization on the individual and the overall internal environment. The approach has engendered greater scientific research and systematic theory construction (SHARMA, et. Al, 2011).

## **5.0 SUMMARY**

The behavioural approach debunked the traditional approach to administration, as well as earlier theories of formal organization. It brought into the forefront the role of the individuals and small groups in achievement of organizational objectives. The approach argues that beyond economic or material needs, man has some socio-psychological needs which must be satisfied for him to achieve optimal performance.

The behavioural approach borrowed most of its methods and techniques from sociology and social anthropology. The approach aims at developing knowledge that is verifiable, systematic and general. It is, therefore, theory-oriented and concerned with pure rather than applied research.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

Explain the relevance of behavioural approach to comparative public administration?

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS**

Eneanya, A.N. (2010). *Comparative Public Administration and Public Policy: Theories and Applications*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd.

Nwizu, G. (1999). *Eminent Administrative Thinkers from Taylor to Present Day*. Enugu: John Jacob's Classic Publishers Ltd.

Sharma, M.P, Sadana, B.L., and H. Kaur (2011). *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: Kiah Mahal publishers.

## **UNIT 2   SYSTEMS APPROACH**

### **CONTENTS**

#### **1.0   Introduction**

## **2.0 Objectives**

## **3.0 Main Contents**

### **3.1 Meaning of a political system**

### **3.2 Conceptual Framework**

### **3.3 Political system and Comparative Public Administration**

## **4.0 Conclusion**

## **5.0 Summary**

## **6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments**

## **7.0 References/Further Readings**

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Public Administration as a field of human activity is the product of environmental factors, such as: social, cultural, economic and political of which it is a part. These environmental factors impinge on the public administration. Political system refers to the whole collection of related, interacting institutions and agencies. It is concerned with formulating and implementing the collective goals of a society or of groups within it. In this unit, we shall examine how the system approach can be used to analyze and compare the political systems of two or more countries.

## **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, students would be able to:

- Know what political system means;
- Understand the component parts or sub-systems of a political system;
- Know how these sub-systems interact with one another and the environment; and
- Understand how the political system can be used as a framework to analyze and compare government activities in two or more than two countries.

## **3.0 MAIN CONTENTS**



### **3.1 MEANING OF A POLITICAL SYSTEM**

The concept of administrative system originates from the theoretical work that is most frequently cited in Political Science – System Analysis by Easton (1965). According to Easton(1965), political system comprises of those identifiable and interrelated institutions and activities (government institutions and processes) in a society that make authoritative

allocations of values (decisions) that are binding on the society. A system is made up of a combination of elements: inputs, outputs, environment, conversion process and feedback. A system framework shows how these elements relate to and interact with one another. An entire set of these elements and their interactions in an environment is called a system.

A system, therefore, is not simply the administrative unit contained in the conversion process. An administrative system is the combination of the administrative processes that interact with the unit: that is, the environment within which the administrative unit operates, which influences and is influenced by the unit and the inputs to the outputs. From the unit, they are connected to each other by the conversion process and by feedback mechanisms.

Inputs and feedback suggest the kinds of stimuli likely to influence activities in the conversion process. Outputs are merely a label for that category of phenomena that reflect the products of Administrator's work.

### **3.2 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

A system, such as this is useful framework for treating administrative activities in all governments in certain settings. The system is a conceptual framework, whose purpose is to help the explain Public Administration activities. With the system as a guide, information about items that seem to function as conversion components, inputs, outputs, and feedback mechanisms are collected.

The interaction of these elements with one another may appear in a closed system in which decision-makers respond continuously to the impact that their previous decisions have had upon their environment.

However, in the real world, there are numerous features that can influence the decisions of the participants. Environments change in response to national and international politics, economic events and natural disasters. New inputs continuously come from the demands of citizens and citizen organizations. Officials have many options in reviewing the feedback from their previous decisions: officials differ in the weight they assign to precedent, to the demands that come from citizens or from other officials and to their own assessment about the success of current activities.

### **3.3 THE POLITICAL SYSTEM AND COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

To examine the systems that link administrative units with their environments, it is necessary to recognize the borders that surround the conversion process and that separate it from inputs and outputs. The conversion process includes units that provide services, collect taxes and impose regulations. Administrative units are variously termed: “departments, bureaus, agencies, Commissions, offices, services, etc.

The system views an administrative system as a sub-system of the society. It looks at various parts of an administrative system (formal organisation, informal organisation, roles, individuals) and examines the inter-linkages among various parts. Besides, the approach analyses the dynamic interactions between the administrative system and its external environment.

In conversion process, these administrative units are found within the Executive branch of national, state and local government in Unit. These administrative units constitute what Riggs (1964:31) suggests that

should be identified and compared with the kinds of function they do in another administrative system of another country. Rigg's suggestion is possible in developed countries where there is a correspondence between the form and procedures within government structures. Even in United Kingdom where the executive and legislative branches are merged, it will be possible to separate the "line" units of the administration and compare them and their environments with their counterparts in other governments.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST**

Describe what you understand as the political system approach in Comparative Public Administration?

### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

The political system is a set of institutions and agencies concerned with formulating and implementing the collective goals of a society or of groups within it. Governments are the policy making parts of political systems. A political system consists of inputs, conversion process, outputs, environment and feedback. These component parts are interdependent and interact with one another. They influence their environment and also are influenced by their environment. An important element in the system approach is the emphasis on input-output analysis.

However, the usefulness of political system approach in studying public policy or decisions is limited because it does not say much about the procedures and processes by which decisions are made and policy is developed. Nonetheless, it is helpful in organizing enquiry into policy formation and decisions of a particular government, which can be compared with another country.

### **5.0 SUMMARY**

A system is essentially an assemblage of things interconnected or independent so as to form a complex unity(Koontz et al, 1983:70).It refers to the whole collection of related, interacting institutions and agencies. Political system is a particular type of social system that is involved in the making of authoritative public decisions. Central elements of a political system are the institutions of government such as bureaucracy, parliaments, courts, political parties, interest groups, etc. These institutions are involved in formulating government policies and decisions. The study of administrative system help us to know which institution would best flourish in a particular environment in comparison with that in another country or countries.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

What is the relevance of a political system approach in the study of comparative public administration?

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

- Eneanya, A.N. (2010). *Comparative Public Administration and Public Policy: Theories and Applications*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd.
- Easton, D. (1965). *A System Analysis of political life*. New York: Wiley.
- Koontz, H., O'Donnell, C. And H. Weihrich (1983). *Management*. London: McGraw-Hill International Book Company.
- Riggs, F.W.(1964). *Administration in Developing Countries*. Boston: Mifflin.
- Sharma, M.P, Sadana, B.L., and H. Kaur (2011). *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: Kiah Mahal publishers

## **UNIT 3 STRUCTURAL-FUNCTIONAL APPROACH**

### **CONTENTS**

**1.0 Introduction**

**2.0 Objectives**

**3.0 Main Contents**

**3.1 Meaning of Structural –functionalism**

<b>3.2</b>	<b>Conceptual framework</b>
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Structural-functionalism and Comparative Public Administration</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Summary</b>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Tutor-Marked Assignments</b>
<b>7.0</b>	<b>References/Further Readings</b>

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Structural-functionalism was developed from the work of the anthropologists, like Malinowski and Redcliffe Brown in the early years of the present century. The important followers of this approach includes: Gabriel Almond, David Apter, Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton and Fred Riggs. Almond(1965) adopted input-output model of David Easton's system approach into the political system vis-a-vis demands and support. The main thrust of Almond's structural-functionalism centres on his assertion that all political systems must perform specific set of functions or they are to remain in existence as a system in equilibrium or working order. These functions may be performed by different kinds of structure within different types of political systems. In this unit, we shall examine the concept of structural -functionalism and its relevance in comparative public administration.

## **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, students would be able to:

- Understand the meaning of structural-functionalism;
- Understand the features of structural-functionalism; and
- Know how structural-functional theory can be used as framework for comparative public administration

## **3.0 MAIN CONTENTS**

### **3.1 MEANING OF STRUCTURAL-FUNCTIONALISM**

Almond and Powell (1965) defined structural-functionalism as “a form of system analysis which looks at political systems as a coherent whole, which influences and is in turn influenced by the environment”. To Almond and Powell (1965), the premise of structural-functionalism is to provide a consistent and integrated theory from which can be derived explanatory hypotheses relevant to all aspects of a political system.

### **3.2 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

The Structural-functional framework provides an important mechanism for the analysis of different social processes. In Structural-functionalism, social structure is viewed as any pattern of behaviour which has become a standard feature of a social system.

The two concepts basic to the approach are structure and function. While functions concern the consequences of patterns of action, structures refer to the patterns of actions and the resultant institutions of the systems themselves.

Almond and Powell (1966), the proponents of structural-functionalism pointed out that political system can be compared in terms of how functions are performed. Premising their analysis on modern Western political systems, they assert that political systems perform two sets of functions, namely: input and output functions.

The input-output model of Almond (1965) was taken from David Easton's distinction between two classes of inputs into

the political system, viz demands and supports. Demands are classified under four headings:

- 1) Demands for goods and services, such as wage and hour laws, educational opportunities, recreational facilities, roads and transportation;
- 2) Demands for participation in the political system for the right to vote, hold office, petition governmental bodies and officials, organize political associations and the like; and
- 3) Demands for the regulation of behaviour, such as provision of public safety, control over markets and labour relations, rules pertaining to marriage and the family
- 4) Symbolic inputs, such as demands for the display of the majesty and power of the political system in periods of threat or ceremonial occasions, or demands for the affirmation of norms or the communication of the policy intent from political elites (Almond, 1965:193).

Support inputs also may be classified under four headings:

- a) Material supports, such as the payment of taxes or other levies and the provision of services; such as labour contributions or military services;
- b) Obedience to laws and regulations
- c) Participation, such as voting, joining organizations, and communicating about politics; and
- d) Manifestation of deference to public authority, symbols and ceremonials (Almond, 1965:194).



The inputs consisting of demands and supports are converted by the political system into Policy outputs (extractive, regulative, distributive and symbolic outputs). In other words, the political system processes inputs and convert them into outputs. The demands entering the political system are articulated, aggregated or combined, converted into policies, rule-making, rule-application, rule adjudication, regulations, applied and enforced. The conversion functions of the political system, thus, may be divided into:

- 1) The articulation of interests or demands
- 2) The integration of interests or combination of interests into policy proposal;
- 3) The conversion of policy proposals into authoritative rules;
- 4) The application of general rules to particular cases
- 5) The adjudication of rules in individual cases and
- 6) The transmission of information about these events within the political system from structure to structure and between the political system and its social and international environments (Almond, 1965:194-5).

Thus, the authoritative output usually affect the environment as outcomes and in turn excite some form of feedback, that is, changes in the intensity and volume of demands and support from the environment. Almond added that political communication must be undertaken to inform all within the political system and outside of these diverse activities. Additionally, every system performs system maintenance and adaptation function through political socialization and recruitment of people.

According to Almond and Powell, (2008)), the functioning of any political system may also be viewed in terms of its capabilities defined as “the way it performs as a unit in its environment. The concept of regulative, extractive, distributive and responsive capability are employed as criteria to assess how a system is performing within its environment, how it is shaping its environment, and how it is being shaped by it.

According to Almond and Powell (1966), political systems can be compared in terms of the degree to which their political structures are specialized, political roles are differentiated and functions are specific. Actual comparison would depend on how outputs are performed by each political system. They further argued that political change occurs because of the challenge on the capabilities of the political system. The sources of such change are:

- 1) The Elites within the political system
- 2) The Social groups in the environment
- 3) Other political systems

They conclude that a political system is stable when inputs are converted to outputs without any problem. In other words, strains are not imposed on the system's capacity to respond to them. They suggested a series of functions that might serve as the framework of comparative analysis, namely: political socialization and recruitment, interest articulation, interest aggregation, political communication, rule-making, rule-application and rule adjudication. To some, this list depends too much on American pattern of competitive political theories, election campaigns and interest groups plus legislative, executive and judicial branches. To others, it is so general to be of little help in clarifying issues for comparison among the less-developed countries (Shankansky, 1978:42).

## **2.2 STRUCTURAL-FUNCTIONALISM AND COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

Structural-functional approach has shown that there is no clear and direct relationship between structures and functions. All similar structures do not necessarily perform similar functions. A social structure may perform multiple functions and similarly one function may be performed by more than one structure. In other words, this approach focuses on description of structures of governmental administration as a basis both for comparison and prescription. When applied to the study of public administration, it will be possible for example, to describe the formal structure of local government and the civil service in different African countries. When this is done, it becomes possible to do a cross-country comparison of structures.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST**

Explain what you know by the term structural-functionalism?

## **4.0 CONCLUSION**

Structural-functionalism as an analytical tool was borrowed from anthropologists and adopted into political system by Almond(1965). However, the input-output model of Almond was taken from David Easton's system model (1965). The main thrust of Almond's structural-functionalism centres on his assertion that all political systems must perform specific set of functions or they are to remain in existence as a system in equilibrium or working order. These functions may be performed by different kinds of structure within different types of political systems. At times, these functions may even be performed by structures that are not overtly recognized as political. The premise of structural-functionalism is to provide a consistent and integrated theory from which can be derived explanatory hypotheses relevant to all aspects of a political system. However, the formal structural-descriptive approach

has been criticized for not paying attention “to the process of administration notably the critical factor of human relations” (Ademolekun, 1983:20).

## **5.0 SUMMARY**

Structural-functional approach has shown that there is no clear and direct relationship between structures and functions. All similar structures may perform multiple functions and similarly one function may be performed by more than one structure. Thus, structural-functionalism has helped to clarify the general misconception that similar structures in diverse environments perform similar functions or that absence of certain structures implies that particular functions are not being performed in particular social systems.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

What are the contributions of structural-functionalists in comparative public administration?

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS**

- Almond, G.A. and Coleman, J.S. (eds.) (1965). “A Developmental approach to Political System”. In *World Politics*, Vol. Xvii, no. 2, January.
- Almond, G.A. and Powell, G.B. (1966). *Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Easton, D. (1957). “An Approach to the Analysis of Political Systems”. In *World Politics*, ix, April.
- Eneanya, A.N. (2010). *Comparative Public Administration and Public Policy: Theories and Applications*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd.

## **UNIT 4 DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION APPROACH**

### **1.0 Introduction**

### **2.0 Objectives**

### **3.0 Main Contents**

#### **3.1 Meaning of Development Administration**

- 3.2 Development Administration and Non-development Administration**
- 3.3 Characteristics of Development Administration**
  - 3.3.1 Change Orientation**
  - 3.3.2 Result Orientation**
  - 3.3.3 Commitment**
  - 3.3.4 Client Orientation**
  - 3.3.5 Temporal Dimension**
- 3.4 Development Administration and Comparative Public Administration**
- 4.0 Conclusion**
- 5.0 Summary**
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments**
- 7.0 References/Further Readings**

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The development Administration approaches of the 1950's and 60's focused on two major approaches. The first development administration felt that policy implementation in the developing countries could be improved through the transfer of administrative procedures and techniques from industrialized countries. These theorists followed the Weberian model. They emphasized the role of bureaucracy as instrument of development.

Another group of theorists argued that political processes and administrative structures had to be thoroughly transformed and modernized before the developing nations could achieve economic and social progress. The theorists looked at development as “social engineering ” and the national government as the “prime mover of change”. Development administration was thus, viewed as the

instrument for transforming traditional societies into modern ones. This approach focuses on certain characteristics of a dynamic administrative system. For example, goal orientation, change orientation, progressiveness, innovativeness, participation and responsiveness. The approach tends to look at the development administrative system in advanced countries (USA) as ideal while it is despicable in the third world countries. It exaggerates the irrelevance of Third World studies to the understanding of the advanced world (Streeten, 1984) and down-plays the potentialities for irrational bureaucratic performance in advanced world. The approach further views government bureaucracy for sustaining development programmes as ideal for Third World countries to import into their system.

However, the focus of development Administration has changed over the years. As it was once confined to deployment of foreign aid and technical assistance, development administration now focuses on planned change to meet the nation's broad political, economic, social and cultural objectives (Bjurand and Guiden 1978: 357-365). Many organizations, such as non-government, community, cultural are now involved in development projects. Now participative, decentralized and localized administrative approaches to development are encouraged. In this unit, we shall examine the meaning of contemporary development administration and its relevance to comparative public administration.

## **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, students would be able to:

- Define development administration;
- Know the characteristics of development administration
- Understand the difference between development administration and non-development administration; and
- Understand the use of development administration framework in comparative public administration

### **3.0 MAIN CONTENTS**

#### **3.1 MEANING OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION**

Weidner (1962) defined development administration as an “action-oriented, goal-oriented administrative system”. He further viewed development administration in government as “the process of guiding an organisation toward the achievement of progressive political, economic, and social objectives that are authoritatively determined in one manner or another”. Fainsod (1963) viewed development administration as “a carrier of innovating values.....It embraces the array of new functions assumed by developing countries embarking on the path of modernisation and industrialisation. Riggs (1979) viewed development administration both to administrative problems and governmental reform. Arora (1979) observed that development administration has been used in two inter-related senses. First, it refers to the administration of development programmes, to the methods used by large scale organisation, notably governments to implement policies and plans designed to meet their developmental objectives. The Second, it, by implication, rather than directly, involves the strengthening of administrative capabilities. These two aspects of development administration –the administration of development and the development of administration are intertwined in most definitions of development administration. Students of development administration have recognised that these two aspects are functionally inter-related to each other. Thus, development administration ordinarily involves the establishment of machinery for planning, economic growth and mobilizing and allocating resources to expand national income.



### **3.2 DEVELOPMENT AND NON-DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION**

Sometimes a distinction is made between development administration and non-development administration or “traditional” administration. It is said that both are similar so far as these are concerned with how rules, policies and norms are implemented by government organisations but they differ in their objectives, scope, complexity and degree of innovation in the developmental administration. It may, however, be said that the differing mixes of administrative departments will be seen as developmental for non-developmental processes start only when a country has achieved political freedom. The apparent developmental non-developmental dichotomy is due to the impression that development administration is concerned solely with the administration of developing countries. The difference between the two concepts may really be in the degree of emphasis or the ecological setting in which an administration functions.

### **3.3 CHARACTERISTICS OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION**

The following characteristics of development administration can be identified:

#### **2.2.1 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 regulatory or traditional administration which is basically concerned with maintenance of status quo

#### **3.3.2 RESULT ORIENTATION**

Development administration has to be result oriented since changes have to be brought rapidly and within a definite time schedule. Its performance is directly related to productivity, for example, increase in per capita income, etc.

### **3.3.3 COMMITMENT**

In development administration, the organisational role expectation is commitment to socio-economic change and concern for completing time bound programmes. Bureaucracy is expected to be “involved” and emotionally attached to the jobs they are called to perform.

### **3.3.4 CLIENT ORIENTATION**

Another characteristic of development administration is that it is client-oriented. It has to be positively oriented towards satisfying the needs of the people in specific target groups. The satisfaction of these needs is the criterion for evaluating performance of the development administration. The people are not the passive beneficiaries, they are the active participants in the development or public programmes. It is thus close relation between the “public”.

and “administration” that is an essential attribute of development administration.

### **3.3.5 TEMPORAL DIMENSION**

Since socio-economic changes have to be brought as quickly as possible, time assumes considerable importance in development administration. All development programmes are prepared for a certain time frame and must be completed within that.

## **3.4 DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION AND COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

It is a very common practice now a days to classify the modern states into two broad categories on the basis of their development – “developed” and “developing” . As earlier discussed, the nature of administration of a country is influenced by its environment. This implies that the “developed” and “developing” countries will have

administrative sub-systems peculiar to them This also explains the fact that there are differences within the administrative sub-system of both developed and developing countries that can be compared.

In contemporary world, development administration approach is viewed in economic terms, using Human Development Index (HDI) as framework of analysis. Both developed and developing countries can now assess their human development based on Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), such as:

- Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
- Achieve universal primary education
- Promote gender equality and empower women
- Reduce child mortality
- Improve maternal health
- Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
- Ensure environmental sustainability and
- Develop a global partnership for development

All these indicators are used by UNDP indices for assessing and comparing the performances of developed and developing countries on human development

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST**

What do you understand by the term development administration?

### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

In this unit, it is obvious that there is no single comprehensive theory of development . The contemporary theoretical approaches

to development are pluralistic, recognizing many pathway to development and less western in their cultural assumptions.

## **5. 0 SUMMARY**

Development approach has passed various stages. The first development administration felt that policy implementation in the developing countries could be improved through the transfer of administrative procedure and techniques from industrialized countries. Another view was that political processes and administrative structures had to be thoroughly transformed and modernized before the developing nations could achieve economic and social progress.

However, development administration has changed over the years. There is now a shift from the blue print approach to people-centred approach. The central theme of people-centred development are empowerment of people, development of administrative processes which responds to the needs of the people and human development. Many organisations, such as: non-government organisations, community, cultural organisations are now involved in development projects. Now, participative, decentralized and localized administrative approaches to development are encouraged

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

What is the relevance of development administration approach to comparative public administration.

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

Arora, R.K. (1979). *Comparative Public Administration: An Ecological Perspoective*. New Delhi: Associated Publishing House.

- Eneanya, A.N. (2010). *Comparative Public Administration and Public Policy: Theories and Applications*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd.
- Fainsod, M. (1963). "The Structure of Development Administration in "Developing Administration Concept and Problems", edited by Irving Swardlow. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.
- Riggs, F.W. (1979). "The idea of Development Administration". In *Development Administration in Asia*, edited by Edward W. Weidner. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Streeten, P. R. (1984). "Development Dichotomies". In *Pioneers in Development*, edited by Gerald M. Meier and Dudley Seers. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weidner, E.W. (1962). "Development Administration: A new focus of Research". In Ferrel Heady and Sybil and Stokes(editors). *Papers in Comparative Public Administration*. Michigan: University of Michigan.

## **UNIT 5 BUREAUCRACTIC APPROACH**

### **1.0 Introduction**

### **2.0 Objectives**

### **3.0 Main Contents**

#### **3.1 Meaning of Bureaucracy**

#### **3.2 Characteristics of Bureaucracy**

#### **3.3 Criticisms of Bureaucracy**

#### **3.4 Bureaucracy and Comparative Public Administration**

### **4.0 Conclusion**

### **5.0 Summary**

### **6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments**

### **7.0 References/Further Readings**

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The origin of the term “bureaucracy” is not entirely very clear, with some insisting that it originated from the French word “Burokrate”. However, as a subject for scholars, the term is primarily associated with the German social scientist Max Weber (1947). In this unit, we shall examine the meaning of bureaucracy, its characteristics and how the approach can be used to analyze and compare bureaucracies of two or more countries.

## **4.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of the unit, students would be able to:

- Know the meaning of bureaucracy
- The features of bureaucratic organisation; and the relevance of bureaucratic approach in comparative public administration

### **3.0 MAIN CONTENTS**

#### **3.1 MEANING**

The concept of bureaucracy has been used in so many different ways that it is difficult to provide acceptable meaning of the term. In the field of Sociology, bureaucracy has been understood as particular type of organization- as a system of administration rather than a system of government. In Social Sciences, bureaucracy is usually understood as a mode of organization. Modern political analysis, however, use the term bureaucracy to mean the administrative machinery of the state,; bureaucrats, being non-elected state officials or civil servants, who may or may not be subject to political control. Bureaucracy can also be used as a general invective to refer to any inefficient organization encumbered by red-tapism.

The most systematic study of bureaucratic phenomena is traced back to German Sociologist, Max Weber (1864-1920). To Weber, a person could be said to have “power” if within a social relationship his own will could be enforced despite resistance. If this power is exercised for the structuring of human groups, it becomes a special instance of power called “authority”. Thus, Weber distinguished between power and authority . Authority is instrumental in the emergence of organisation. The rules of an organisation are termed “administration”. The most important aspect of the administration is that it determines who was to

give commands to whom. Thus, every form of authority expresses itself and functions as administration.

According to Weber, all authority is “legitimate” because it is always founded on a popular belief structure. People may believe that obedience was justified because the person giving the order had some sacred or altogether outstanding characteristics. This authority of that person is “charismatic”. That authority would be “traditional” if the command is obeyed out of reverence for old established patterns of order. The third type of authority is legal authority to which Weber attaches “rational” character”. In this case, men might believe that a person giving an order was acting in accordance with his duties as stipulated in a code of legal rules and regulations. Weber thought that an ideal bureaucratic organisation can most effectively achieve a prescribed goal while eliminating arbitrariness and discord in interpersonal and inter-group relationships.

Max Weber, who used an “ideal type” approach to extrapolate from the real world the central core of features that would characterize the most fully developed bureaucratic form of organization. This ideal type is neither a description of reality nor a statement of normative preference. It is merely an identification of the major variables or features that characterize bureaucracy. The fact that such features might not be fully present in a given organization does not necessarily imply that the



organization is not bureaucratic. It may be an immature rather than a fully developed bureaucracy .

Bureaucracies are found in all large and complex organisations – political, religious, business, military, educational and others. However, public sector bureaucracies tend to operate in a somewhat different climate from those in the private sector. In short, bureaucracy is best conceptualized as a specific form of organization, and public bureaucracy should be considered a special variant of bureaucratic organization. Yet, in the popular imagination a bureaucracy is any organization in which people arranged in hierarchical ranks have to obey lots of rules. According to Weber, the ideal bureaucratic organisation, called the rational-legal bureaucracy could contain certain characteristics.

### **3.2 CHARACTERISTICS OF BUREAUCRACY**

Weber's ideal type of bureaucracy possesses the following characteristics:-

- 1. A Hierarchical Chain of Command:** The bureaucratic organization is structured as a pyramid with an absolute Boss on top, who divides up the overall task of the organization and gives responsibility for each sub-tasks to sub-bosses who divided responsibility yet more finely and so on through an unbroken chain of sub-bosses that stretches down to every employee. The Boss provides coordination between units that is, coordination from

above. In other words, all coordination must rise up and pass through the next higher boss.

**2. Specialization by Function:** Bureaucracy achieves efficiency through specialization of labour. In fact, the organizational structure of a bureaucracy is created by dividing the overall task into a series of well-defined specialties or functions. Each function is given responsibility for a defined set of tasks and given the tools needed to accomplish that task. The Boss gives orders and assigns tasks in such a way that all the parts add up to a coherent whole.

**3. Uniform Written Rules and Policies:** A bureaucracy is governed by uniform written rules and policies that in a corporation, profit or not for profits are set by the board and the management. These rules define the rights and duties of employees and manage. The most basic rules concern who can give order to whom. In bureaucracy, the Boss is responsible for the actions of all the people under him or her and has the right to give them orders that they must dutifully obey. The employee's primary responsibility is not to do what is right or what needs to be done but only to follow exactly the orders of his or her immediate Boss, the written policies of a bureaucracy also guarantees employee's regular wages as long as they are employee and in some cases, even a pension for long-term service.

**4. A Standard Procedures Defining Each Job:** In a bureaucracy, fixed procedures govern how employees are to perform their tasks, sometimes to an astonishing degree. Standardized procedures serve to make lessons learned in one part of the organization more broadly effective and to overcome irrational resistance to more effective ways of doing things.

**5. A career based on promotion for technical competence:**

Success in the bureaucratic organization is defined as a lifetime career of advancing to higher levels in the chain of command. Rising in the ranks provides both power and symbols of status. Promotion is achieved through technical competence in one's specialty and efficiency in carrying out orders. The professional career provides a "contract" between employee and organization. In its simplest form, a person devotes himself or herself to the organization in exchange for structured work and wages. The full-time professional management was married to the organization for life. In return, the organization promised a stable or rising salary, a pension, lifetime employment and a chance to rise in the hierarchy. The time of rising in the hierarchy and the security of a professional career was an important element in bureaucratic success, providing a strong motivation for long-term loyalty to the organization.

**6. Impersonal Relations:** In bureaucracy, relationships are from role rather than from person to person. The organizational structure and job description defined what is expected of an individual in each role and the holder of a particular role is expected to carry out its responsibilities in a rational and unemotional manner. Impersonal relations helped move bureaucracy beyond nepotism and favouritism by preventing family feeling or friendship from getting in the way of enforcing rules and making tough decisions. It kept managers sentiments from getting in the way of their duties.

### **3.3 CRITICISMS OF BUREAUCRACY**

To the critics, bureaucracy was efficient for certain kind of repetitive tasks that characterized the early industrial revolution. It no longer works so well because its rules and procedures are often dramatically opposed to the principle needed for workers to take the next step toward greater organizational intelligence (Gifford and Pinchot, 1994: 37). To them, the changing nature of work has made bureaucratic model unrealistic, such as:

1. Hierarchical chain of command cannot handle complexity of work of modern organization. Again, domination is not the best way to get organization tasks done. In modern organizational context, visions and values, teamwork (self-managing), lateral coordination, informal networks, choice

and free enterprise have replaced hierarchical chain of command.

2. Specialization by function – does not provide intensive cross - functional communication and continual peer-level coordination. In modern organization, multi-skilling, specialists and entrepreneuring organization in market-mediated networks, team work, lateral communication and collaboration have replaced specialization of organizations by functions.
3. Uniform Rules – though, organization still needs rules, but needs different rules that would guarantee the rights of employees and institution, of freedom and community, a say in social responsibility.
4. Standardized procedures–responds slowly to change. Bureaucracy does not deal well with complexity or foster interconnection. In modern organization, self-direction, self-management, force of the market and ethical community have come to replace standardized rules.
5. Professional Career – Fewer managers need and more educated workforce expects promotions, therefore, there is not enough room for advancement. In modern organization, there is group need for competence, group network to get more done and more pay for more capabilities.

6. Impersonal Relations: information – intensive jobs require in-depth relationship. There is need now for personal relationship to enable a choice between options and alternatives that will facilitate results. The nature of work in modern high-tech workplaces calls on people to marry positions in the organization to take responsibility for processes and services that intimately affect the customer and the wider community. Even in small service business and government agencies, the goods and services produced are knowledge and information intensive by virtues of the skills and intelligence of the people with their hands on the work processes. Hence, what worked before in bureaucratic era will not work in a society of knowledge workers.

### **3.4 BUREAUCRACY AND COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

Despite all these criticism, scholars are yet to find real substitute for bureaucratic approach. Bureaucracy in a political system offers the large-scale complex administrative capacities for performing government duties. Inherent in bureaucracy is the existence of certain organizational features and behavioural traits of the participants – known as bureaucrats. Administrative roles are highly specialized or differentiated and hierarchal relationship thoroughly understood; the service in the bureaucracy for professionals, who are salaried and have tenured status, whose service will only be terminated subject to laid-down procedures.

However, given the fact that bureaucracies interact with the political system (that is, the external control usually emanates from the legitimate political authority), it is expected that the political sub-types even amongst modernized polities will exert some variations on the bureaucracies. The Weberian bureaucratic model applies essentially to the countries of the Western Europe, most of which epitomizes developed or modern politics. Hence, as one moves away from the core western countries to Russia and most communist Europe, the model becomes less applicable, although it is still useful for purposes of comparison. Riggs (1964) also noted the inadequacies experienced in applying the Weberian model of ideal-type bureaucracy to developing countries of the world. This is because of “ecological” problems. According to him, it can be used to compare bureaucracies of developed countries (USA, Britain, France, Germany, etc) because of the relative similarities in the ecology and culture of their regions.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST**

Explain the major “thesis” of Weberian Bureaucratic theory?

## **4.0 CONCLUSION**

In this unit, we have been able to understand that the concept of bureaucracy has different meanings. However, Weber's definition has been found most useful for rational-legal organisation. Though, it has certain inadequacies when used as framework of comparison between developed countries and developing countries. It is most useful for comparing two or more developed countries because of their relative similarities in their ecology and culture.

## **6.0 SUMMARY**

The bureaucratic theory was one of the earliest theories of organisation. This theory was popularized by the German Sociologist, Max Weber. According to him, every organisation can be defined as a structure of activities (means) directed towards the achievement of certain objectives (ends). To understand an organisation, one needs to understand the procedures and activities of bureaucracy since bureaucracy gives meaning to organisation. Weber's bureaucratic model was intended to be an ideal construct. This ideal type of bureaucracy is the starting point not the end of organisational analysis and comparison. However, Weber's bureaucratic model is most useful to comparison between two or more developed countries because of their ecology and culture.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

Is Weberian bureaucratic model a useful framework of comparison for developing countries? Discuss.

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

Arora, R.K. (1979). *Comparative Public Administration: An Ecological Perspective*. New Delhi: Associated Publishing House.

Eneanya, A.N. (2010). *Comparative Public Administration and Public Policy: Theories and Applications*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd.



- (2010). *Public Administration in Nigeria: Principles, Techniques and Applications*. Lagos: Concept Publication Ltd.
- Riggs, F.W. (1979). "The idea of Development Administration". In *Development Administration in Asia*, edited by Edward W. Weidner. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Sharma, M.P, Sadana, B.L., AND Harpreet, K. (2011). *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: Kitab Mahal Publishers.

### **MODULE 3**

#### **UNIT 1 BUREAUCRACY AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION**

## **CONTENTS**

### **1.0 Introduction**

### **2.0 Objectives**

### **3.0 Main Contents**

#### **3.1 Conceptual Clarifications**

#### **3.2 Bureaucracy and Development Administration Nexus**

### **4.0 Conclusion**

### **5.0 Summary**

### **6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments**

### **7.0 References/Further Readings**

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

To transform the society from its relatively under-developed social, economic and political conditions to a well developed polity, the transformation must be planned one in which the government has to be the principal planner, energiser, promoter and director of accelerated development effort. The government organs have to provide incentives for social change and also remove serious bottlenecks and correct imbalances which effect the system. Administration's role as an agent of institutional, social and economic change has to be realized as the development process has to push ahead in a climate of uncertainty, and at times fluid political and social climate. In this unit, we shall examine the concepts of development administration and bureaucracy.

## **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, students would be able to:

- Know how the level of the development of a country influences the nature of administration and its sub-systems ;
- Know how the level of development of a country influences the nature of bureaucracy; and
- Understand the role bureaucracy as an instrument of social change.

### **3.0 MAIN CONTENTS**

#### **3.1 CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION**

It is very common practice to classify the modern states as “developed” and “developing”. This has some relations with the nature of their environment. Hence, the level of development has linkage with the nature of administration in that country. What is development? It is a very complicated concept. It refers to an aggregate of economic, social and political variables, each of which exists on a continuum ranging from less to more developed. A country may simultaneously exhibit some traits that appear to be developed and others that appear to be less developed. Similarly, some features of public administration may appear developed, while others in the same country may resemble the features of a less developed country. In other words, there are differences in public administration at each pole of the development continuum that do not reflect the stage of development as much as they reflect peculiar historical experiences or cultural traits. However, each of these nations demonstrates peculiarities in public administration that reflects its own evolution.

Riggs(1964) interprets development in terms of differentiation of structures. According to him, “the phenomenon of development involves a gradual separation of institutionally distinct spheres, the differentiation of separate structures for the wide variety of functions that must be performed in any society. On the other hand, bureaucracy refers to structures and departments which were created as instruments for nation-building and economic growth.

However, the impact of growing modernisation, internal democratization and the development of new social, political and economic goals caused these bureaucracies to extend the scope of their activities and recruit new personnel often referred to as “bureaucrats”. Thus, bureaucracy can also connote public service officials. Bureaucracy can also refer to red-tapism, division of work, hierarchical arrangement of offices, formalism, adherence of rights to offices etc. In this unit, bureaucracy refers, to structures and functions of officials in a rational-legal organisation.

#### **3.2 BUREAUCRACY AND DEVELOPMENT NEXUS**

In modern administration, bureaucracy is considered a misfit in the developing countries where speedy change is needed to bring about socio-economic

transformation. Its capacity for adaptation to change is considered low. This criticism of bureaucracy points out its weaknesses as an organisational form. Its role in the development administration has been questioned in this connection. "The Weberian model, according to the critics, is subject to the dysfunctional consequences of failing to take into account the individual or behavioural aspects of the people who work within the organisation system. It has been observed that the organisational design at best can function in a stable environmental situation. In an unstable environmental, as in the course of management of development the structure will be unsuitable to meet the demands of the situation. This view is supported by a number of scholars like Robert K. Merton, Alvin Gouldner, Robert V. Prethuis among others. Warren Bennis goes to the extent of saying that bureaucracy is likely to go out of use in the wake of new social system.

Most studies of public administration in developing countries have stressed the viewpoint that the band of officials who have been brought up and trained in the colonial administrative culture, wedded to the Weberian characteristics of hierarchy, status and rigidity in the adherence of rules and concerned mainly with the enforcement of law and order and collection of revenues, were quite unfit to perform the duties expected in the changed situation of an administration geared to the task of development.

Dwivedi and Jain (1985:200) drew attention to another dysfunctional aspect of development bureaucracy. Their observation was that development administration had inevitable consequence in the phenomenal expansion of bureaucracy in the Third World countries. This in turn had a fundamental effect upon their social structures. In many of these countries a new class, a bureaucratic bourgeoisie, rapidly acquired social and political importance. This new class was Western oriented and with the aid of the Western countries it was able to establish bureaucratic authoritarianism which substituted for popular mobilization and mass politics. That also meant maintenance of status quo and anti-development. Hence, they assert that the central issue of development administration is then no longer just one of manageability of the administrative structure. It is a more fundamental one: the incompatibility between bureaucracy, as a form of

institutionalized social control and development defined as quality of life for the population.

The point being emphasised here is that to meet the challenges of socio-economic development, bureaucracy has to adapt itself to new environment. The focus of bureaucracy has to change from the preservation of law and order to the achievement of targets, to accomplish most, and most rapidly with least waste and least failure.

A recent study suggests that there is no basic conflict between bureaucratic structure and development scale. But, it did find a sharply negative relationship between bureaucratic behaviour and development scale. The conclusion drawn in the study is that a more carefully and deliberately adopted bureaucracy would possibly be more flexible and capable of being positive towards the development requirements. The criticism against bureaucracy as given in earlier paragraphs, reveals some of its structural weaknesses as well as the behavioural consequences that flow from the structure. In any large scale administrative arrangement, bureaucracy cannot be thrown overboard. Its dysfunctionalities need to be identified and corrected. The changing role of bureaucracy in development administration is characterized in such phrases as 'development bureaucracy', and non-Weberian model of bureaucracy'. What is intended is to make the government organizations, structurally and behaviourally, geared to the task of development.

The following changes, among others may be helpful to fit bureaucracy into developmental tasks:

- (1) Structurally, there should be de-emphasis of hierarchy to get rid of the conventional organisational pyramid which leads to centralization and interpersonal conflicts.
- (2) There is need to redesign organizations to enable cooperative decision-making and promote collaborative problem-solving.

- (3) Authority should be decentralized to enable the field units to take decisions on the spot as far as possible, without waiting indefinitely for central clearance.
- (4) Communication or free flow of information unhindered by the status-levels in the organisation, should exist for speedy and effective decision-making.
- (5) Personnel structure of bureaucracy should be based on merit, and that should also be the criteria for work evaluation and promotion in the organisation.
- (6) Bureaucracy must secure the cooperation and participation of the people in development work.
- (7) Supremacy of the politician must be accepted and bureaucracy must work alongside him as a co-partner in the development enterprise.
- (8) Behavioural changes are needed to make the bureaucracy, change-oriented, result-oriented and people-oriented.
- (9) Professional mobility should be encouraged.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST**

Explain the nexus between the term development and bureaucracy?

### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

In this unit, we have been able to discuss the concepts of bureaucracy and development. In modern states, it is common practice to classify development into two categories: development and less-developed countries. Development refers to an aggregate of economic, social and political variables, each of which exists on a continuum ranging from less to more developed. A country may simultaneously exhibit some traits that appear to be developed and others that appear to be less developed. In developed countries, bureaucracies are large having numerous sub-units with specialized employees which reflect task specialization and wide range of governmental activities. In developing countries, on the other hand, bureaucratic functions are directed towards

nation-building and economic growth. It is the major instrument of social change. From this analysis, it is obvious that the level of development has linkage with the nature of administration of that country.

## **5.0 SUMMARY**

It is a very common practice now a days to classify the modern states into two broad categories on the basis of their development-“developed” and “developing”. The nature of the environment influences the nature of administration of a country. Both developed and developing countries have peculiar administrative structures and sub-systems peculiar to them. In developed countries, bureaucracies are large having numerous sub-units with specialized employees which reflect task specialization and wide range of government activities. In developing countries, public democracy is the dominant structure and directed towards nation-building and economic growth. It is an instrument of social change. However, among the developed countries, there are considerable differences in bureaucratic forms and procedures. These differences reflect their peculiar historical experiences. Above all, the level of development of a country has linkage to the nature of administration of that country. This implies that the “developed” and “developing” countries will have administrative sub-systems peculiar to them. This also explains the fact that there are differences within the administrative sub-system of the countries with the same category.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

How does the level of development of a country influence the nature of administration of that country?

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

Dwivedi, O.P and Jain, R.B. (1985). *India's Administrative State*. New Delhi: Gitanjali Publishing House.

Eneanya, A.N. (2010). *Comparative Public Administration and Public Policy: Theories and Applications*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd.

- (2010). *Public Administration in Nigeria: Principles, Techniques and Applications*. Lagos: Concept Publication Ltd.
- Riggs, F.W. (1979). "The idea of Development Administration". In *Development Administration in Asia*, edited by Edward W. Weidner. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Sharma, M.P, Sadana, B.L., AND Harpreet, K. (2011). *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: Kitab Mahal Publishers.



## **UNIT 2**

### **COMPARISON BETWEEN ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM OF DEVELOPED AND DEVELOPING COUNTRIES**

#### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Introduction**
- 2.0 Objectives**
- 3.0 Main Contents**
  - 3.1 Administration system in developed countries**
  - 3.2 Administration system in developing countries**
- 4.0 Conclusion**
- 5.0 Summary**
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments**
- 7.0 References/Further Readings**

#### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The nature of administration of a country is influenced by the environment, culture and historical experiences. This implies that both the developed and developing countries have administrative sub-systems peculiar to them because of their cultural and historical experiences. In this unit, we shall examine the administrative features both developed and developing countries in our comparison.

#### **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of the unit, students would be able to:

- Understand certain administrative features that make a developed country different from a developing country;
- Understand the influence of the political system on public administration; and

- Understand the effect of culture and historical experiences in the establishment of administrative sub-systems.

### **3.0 MAIN CONTENTS**

#### **3.1 ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM IN DEVELOPED COUNTRIES.**

Developed countries of the world demonstrate peculiar characteristics in public administration that reflect their historical experience. In the category of developed countries are included countries of Western Europe, North America, Scandinavia, Australia, New Zealand, Russia, Japan, Israel and now South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, too perhaps.

The main features of the administrative sub-systems are:

- (1) There is high degree of task specialization. There are a large number of specific administrative structures each specialized for particular purpose-agricultural, transport, regulatory, defence, budgetary, personnel, public relations, planning etc. Moreover, a set of political structure – parties, elections, parliaments, chief executives and cabinets are designed to formulate the rules and lay down the targets which the administrative structures then implement. In Rigg's view this is highly differentiated political system.
- (2) The roles are assigned according to the personal achievements of individuals rather than according to family status or social class. This system ranks high in terms of universalism and achievement orientation.
- (3) Developed political system consists of formal political structures in which control is exercised in conformity with a formula or a pattern which is laid down. The making of political decision becomes the duty of politicians, administrative decisions of administrators. Political decisions and legal judgements are made according to secular standards of rationality. Traditional elites (tribal or religious) have lost any real power to affect major governmental decisions.
- (4) Government activity extends over a wide range of public and personal affairs.

- (5) Popular interest and involvement in public affairs is widespread. A high degree of politicization has taken place, so the population is mobilized for intensive participation in decision making and executing processes.
- (6) The occupants of political or governmental leadership positions are widely viewed as legitimate holders of those positions, and change of leadership occurs according to prescribed and orderly procedures.

### **3.2 ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES**

Countries that belong to less-developed countries include: Portugal, Spain (Western Europe); Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, (Latin America); Nigeria, Ghana, Uganda, (Africa); and Malaysia, India, Pakistan, (Asia), etc. Most of these countries experienced a period of control by the colonial powers of western Europe. Some of the countries share historical experiences with one another or were settled by immigrants, who brought the governmental institutions of western Europe with them. Despite the peculiarities in structures and processes in individual countries, the following administrative features have been observed throughout less-developed countries (Heady, 1966:44):

- a) Among political elites, there is widely shared commitment to “development”, which sometimes take ideological trappings. The goals of development in these countries may take the form of agricultural or industrial development and improved welfare of citizens;
- b) There is high reliance on the public sector for leadership;
- c) The society suffers from constant political instability, instigated by disappointment of unfulfilled promises from political leaders and recourse to violence or change of government;
- d) The administrative experiences are overlapping, though there is a gap existing between the modernizing and traditional elites. The modernizing elites tend to be urban, western-oriented, educated

and committed to economic, social and political change. On the other hand, the traditional elites tend to be rural-oriented to local customs and to indigenous religion and opposed to change as a threat to these values;

- e) The administrative forms and procedures in less developed countries reflect the attributes of their environment, such as: lack of sufficient skills in the bureaucracy, conflict between the decision processes expected by some members of the indigenous elites and western-oriented elites;
- f) There is insufficient administrative resources and excessive aspirations;
- g) Finally, corruption exists in the bureaucracies of less-developed countries, in exchange for “expediting” a decision on behalf of an individual or to enable officials evade formal procedures. Nepotism or tribal favouritism is as carry-over from traditional values.

However, since it is misleading to compare administrative features among less-developed countries merely on the basis of their structures, it is necessary to make comparisons according to the “functions” that various organs perform in the political system. According to Riggs (1964), these functions would be better illustrated in the ecological setting of the political systems. This is because there are more differences in administrative sub-systems of these countries than among the developed ones. This is due to their large number, diverse cultures which reflect a global range of political cultures and their historical experiences. In the developed countries, there are differences in public administration at each pole of the development continuum that do not reflect the stage of development as much as they reflect peculiar historical experiences or cultural traits. For example, Great Britain,

France, Germany and the United States are currently at about the same stage of advanced development, yet each demonstrates peculiarities in public administration that reflect its own evolution. However, space would not permit us to look at structures and their functions and compare them in this unit. This can be obtained from reference materials.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST**

Compare and contrast the differences in administrative sub-systems between the developed and developing countries?

### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

In this unit, we have been able to compare administrative systems between developed and developing countries. We have discovered that both developed and developing countries have their differences of public administration within themselves because of historical experiences. However, some major features can be identified that reflect the public administration of both developed and developing countries.

### **5.0 SUMMARY**

The features of administrative sub-systems of developed and developing countries can be compared. Each of these countries demonstrates peculiarities in public administration that reflects its own evolution. However, there are more differences in administrative sub-systems of developing countries than among the developed ones. This due to their large number, diverse cultures which reflect a global range of political cultures and their historical experiences. Most of these countries have been for varying periods under the colonial rule of some foreign country. Despite the peculiarities in structures and processes in individual countries, the developing countries exhibit some common traits.

## 6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT

What are the factors that account for the differences within administrative sub-systems among developed and developing countries?

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Eneanya, A.N. (2010). *Comparative Public Administration and Public Policy: Theories and Applications*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd.

----- (2010). *Public Administration in Nigeria: Principles, Techniques and Applications*. Lagos: Concept Publication Ltd.

Heady, F. (1979). *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspectives*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York: Mariel Dekker.

Peter, B.G. (2007). *The Politics of Bureaucracy: An introduction to Comparative Public Administration*. London: Routledge.

Riggs, F.W. (1964). *Administration in Developing Countries*. Boston: Mifflin.

Seidman, H.B. (2000). *Politics, Power and Position: the Dynamics of Federal organization*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sharma, M.P, Sadana, B.L., AND Harpreet, K. (2011). *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: Kitab Mahal Publishers.

## **UNIT 3 COMPARISON OF THE ROLE OF BUREAUCRACY IN NATION BUILDING OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND NIGERIA**

### **CONTENTS**

#### **1.0 Introduction**

#### **2.0 Objectives**

#### **3.0 Main Contents**

##### **3.1 Bureaucracy and development Administration in developing countries**

##### **3.2 Fitting Bureaucracy into Development Task of Developing Countries**

##### **3.3 Role of Bureaucracy in Nation-building of developing countries**

##### **3.4 Role of Bureaucracy in Nation-building in Nigeria**

#### **4.0 Conclusion**

#### **5.0 Summary**

#### **6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments**

#### **7.0 References/Further Readings**

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

To transform the society from its relatively under-developed social, economic and political conditions to a well developed polity, the transformation must be engineered by public officials, sometimes called “bureaucrats”.. The bureaucrat’s role as agent of institutional, social and economic change has to be realized in the development process. In this unit, we shall examine the role of bureaucracy in both developed and developing countries of the world.

### **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, students would be able to:

- Know the growth of bureaucracies in both developed and developing countries; and
- The functions of bureaucracy in both developed and developing countries

### **3.0 MAIN CONTENTS**

#### **3.1 BUREAUCRACY AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES**

Developing countries are those countries that still battling with nation building and economic growth, such as: Nigeria, India, Uganda, Tanzania, Tunisia, Malaysia, Pakistan, Brazil, etc. Eisenstadt (1963:107) describes the growth of bureaucracies from these countries from structural functional angle in colonial and non-colonial developing countries. In the developing countries which had been under colonial rule, the administrative structures were inherited from the colonial period. They were highly centralised with small amount of internal differentiation. Their functions were limited to basic administrative services like revenue and law and order. They helped to establish the framework of modern legal and administrative practices. They were highly apolitical i.e. politically neutral. They served the colonial masters who were not politically responsible. There bureaucratic structures were inherited by the ex-colonial countries when the colonial rules left them.

There is also a second layer of the bureaucracies in these countries which consists of those departments and structures which were created after the attainment of independence. Here a new civil service was developed-new in personnel, goals, departments and activities. This drew new recruits, most of whom had participated in the national movements. They were the bearers of the new types of goals like economic development, social and educational advancement etc. Most of these new recruits usually had a much clearer, more articulate political orientation and a sense of political responsibility than did the former colonial civil service.

The bureaucracies in developing countries which have not been under colonial rule exhibit a somewhat different pattern. A traditional bureaucracy existed in them whether it was “royal” as in the Middle Eastern countries, or “oligarchical – republican” as in most Latin American countries. They dominated the political sense until the end of the Second World War. Some traditional elements were mixed with more modern ones which were borrowed from some European countries. They usually upheld the interest of the ruling oligarchies and



implemented rather limited economic and social objectives. The impact of growing modernization, internal democratization and the development of new social, political and economic goals caused these bureaucracies to extend the scope of their activities and recruit new personnel.

### **3.2 FITTING BUREAUCRACY INTO DEVELOPMENT TASK IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES**

The following changes, among others may be helpful to fit bureaucracy into developmental tasks:

- (1) Structurally there should be de-emphasis of hierarchy to get rid of the conventional organisational pyramid which leads to centralization and interpersonal conflicts.
- (2) There is need to redesign organizations to enable cooperative decision-making and promote collaborative problem-solving.
- (3) Authority should be decentralized to enable the field units to take decisions on the spot as far as possible, without waiting indefinitely for central clearance.
- (4) Communication or free flow of information unhindered by the status-levels in the organisation, should exist for speedy and effective decision-making.
- (5) Personnel structure of bureaucracy should be based on merit, and that should also be the criteria for work evaluation and promotion in the organisation.
- (6) Bureaucracy must secure the cooperation and participation of the people in development work.
- (7) Supremacy of the politician must be accepted and bureaucracy must work alongside him as a co-partner in the development enterprise.
- (8) Behavioural changes are needed to take the bureaucracy change-oriented, result-oriented and people-oriented.
- (9) Professional mobility should be encouraged.

### **3.3 ROLE OF BUREAUCRACY IN THE NATION BUILDING OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES**

In developing countries, public bureaucracy has become the dominant structure. Countries included among the developing countries include: Nigeria, India, Ghana, Uganda, Tanzania, South Africa, Brazil, Mexico, Pakistan, etc. In the absence of other strong institutions in these countries, the role of bureaucracy has been of crucial importance. Generally, the major functions of bureaucracy in these countries are as follows:

- (1) The most important functions are directed towards nation building and economic growth. The importance of public administration in the emerging countries of Africa and Asia goes beyond directing the organisational process in economic and social fields. It has the immense task of creating a national unity and national personality capable of surmounting the centrifugal force of tribal and regional rivalries and on the other hand, instilling the ferment of change in traditional societies. Differences of race, ethnicity, language, religion, region and tribe often threaten the unity, stability and progress of many developing countries. Therefore, it is the task of public bureaucracies to either eliminate or satisfactorily enmesh the sub-cultural differences. This task may prove to be more difficult than economic development.
- (2) Another area in which public bureaucracies in developing countries may play a critical role is the establishment of democracy. Most of these countries lack a genuine commitment to democratic values and process despite the lip service they pay to them. In some countries like India, Israel and Mexico, democracy ranks with economic development as a major goal. The issue is important because bureaucracy is inherently undemocratic and a strong bureaucracy may be a threat to democracy.
- (3) In developing countries, bureaucracies help to maintain the framework of a unified polity as well as the capacity to absorb varied demands and to regulate them effectively. Not only were they important instruments for unification and centralisation, but they enabled the rulers to implement continuous policy. In addition, they also served as important instruments for mobilization of resources –taxes, manpower and political support.

- (4) In many of these countries, bureaucracy performs the important function of political socialisation. In many cases, in addition to being administrative arm, it constitutes itself as an effective executive or part of it. It plays a part in setting up, determining and implementing political goals, and establishing major policy directives. In many developing countries, apart from the head of the executive, it is the only body capable of formulating clear political or administrative objectives.
- (5) Bureaucracy is one of the main channels of political struggle in which and through which different interests are regulated and aggregated.
- (6) Bureaucracy in most of these countries is also the Major instrument of social change. It maintains service orientation to both the rulers and the major strata of society.

### **3.4 ROLE OF BUREAUCRACY IN NATION BUILDING OF NIGERIA**

Essentially, development administration refers to structure, organization and organizational behaviour necessary for the implementation of schemes and programmes of socio-economic and political change undertaken by the governments.

Underlying this definition of development administration is an assumption that where the functions of a government change largely from the law and order, revenue collecting and regulatory type in pre- independence administration to those of socio-economic and political development post-independence administration. The role of administration will change from an “executive” to a “managerial” one. pre-independence.

The “executive” type of administration is largely designed to carry out the directions given from time to time by the government. These directions could be legislative fiats or executive orders. Even when the administrative hierarchies are some-how involved in the formulation of the policies, the

emphasis of the executive-oriented administration is principally to implement the policies and programmes. In the main, this type of administration confines itself to the maintenance of law and order, collection of revenues and regulating the national life in accordance with the statutory requirements.

In contrast the “managerially-oriented development” administration (post – independence) is essentially programmatically inclined. It focuses its attention not merely on “carrying out” the dictates and directions of the governmental system, but also on the crucial element of securing prescribed programmatic values. The emphasis here is attainment of goals and targets established in the planned programmes of government, which in fact may have built in forces disturbing social equilibrium.

The management of development has been the central focus of development administration. It connotes planned institutional capacity to accomplish the specific goals of development through the formulation of appropriate policies, programmes and projects and their successful implementation. Participative, responsive and accountable management constitutes the essence of development administration

As a result of this “managerial” orientation, primary focus is placed on the assessment of total capital resources not only in terms of fiscal means but also by way of the general institutional resources and of the critical societal plus administrative behavioural values available. This totality of programme inputs, both in financial and non-financial terms, renders possible a greater target degree of congruence between target and actual output.

Measurement of productivity in this context can be achieved “through performance budget work measurement cost accounting data” (Kendrick, 1963:59-66). Once this basic measurement can be achieved, attention will concentrate on the appropriator of programme goal and objective in relation to national resources, adjusted within the set priorities in order to attain the target. In the context development administration, the functions of law and order and revenue collection will support the developmental programmes.

These programmatic values are condemned in a new series of socio-economic and political programmes expressed in planning process of the state. The state, therefore, occupies the position of a changed agent.

Since the focus of development administration is on the achievement of programmatic values in terms of specific target and goals, there is the need for institutionalization of the mechanisms for administrative control and accountability in which the programme values have to be encased-- in terms of administrative values and institutional apparatus. This implies changes and modifications in the structure in line with the functional contents of developmental administration.

Prior to independence, the structure, values and work ways of the bureaucracy in Nigeria, for example, focused on laws and orders and revenue administration for which it was efficiently trained. However, development administration (national building) necessitated a different approach involving new value attitude-orientation and modified institutional set-up. This is the area, bureaucracy records its pronounced failure. For Development Administration to succeed involves production of planned results in close

association with clientele. It calls for serious restructuring of administration to facilitate people's involvement in all aspects of development. Inherent in development administration is the idea of decentralization. By and large, bureaucrats resist attempts to decentralize authority, delegate authority backed with responsibility and accountability within the hierarchy of organizational structure.

Apart from this cumbersome administrative routine, good in its times, practically immobilizes development administration of today. In development administration, there is emphasis on skill and compliance of personnel, who will manage the programmes and plans to be oriented towards rationality, efficiency, decisiveness, planning and productivity.(Diamant, 1970).

In other words, such bureaucrats will have "organizational ability, a better sense of punctuality; a greater concern for planning, efficiency, tendency to try new ideas, have faith in science and technology and belief on the good of the society, rather than the individual (Esman, 1971).

This implies that the institutional structure would be redesigned for increase in programme and field units, shifting lines of reporting and communications, developing control mechanism and improved method of information feed back to top echelons of the administrative hierarchical structure. Moreover, such arrangement inevitably implies coordinating and controlling functions will be established at the higher levels of management.

At the same time, attempts could be made to re-orient the bureaucracy to this new philosophy of administration. The task of nation-building requires a role of bureaucracy. Bureaucrats for this task of nation building, therefore, should be

people with progressive, motivation, wide administrative experience and have rich store of pooled knowledge needed for socio-economic transformation of the country Nigeria.

Moreover, there is the emergence of new technological changes in information and communication technology,(ICTs) that emphasizes networking, cooperation, cohesiveness and collaboration in job performance. The use of computers system for internet and intranet has necessitated institutional structure to be re-designed to flat type, which calls for decentralization and delegation of authority backed with responsibility and accountability.

These are challenges faced by Bureaucrats in Development Administration. Development Administration is an innovative administration requiring new skills and new ideas. It emphasizes on group performance and inter-group collaboration, rather than on individual performance. It involves employing of trained manpower and improving the existing staff, use of sophisticated aids to decision-making and adopting empirical approach to problem-solving as well as problem-finding. It also involves inter-disciplinary approach taking help from varied social and physical sciences, like economics, demography, Statistics, mathematics and computer science, etc. In terms of attitudes, development Administrators have to be flexible, adaptable and result-oriented.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST**

What is the role of bureaucrats in nation building in Nigeria?

## **4.0 CONCLUSION**

In this unit, we have discussed the role of bureaucracy and development administration in developing countries. The most important functions are directed towards nation building and economic growth. The importance of public administration in emerging countries of Africa and Asia goes beyond directing the organisational process in economic and social fields. It has the immense task of creating a national unity and national unity and national personality capable of surmounting the centrifugal force of tribal and regional rivalries and on the other hand, instilling the ferment of change in traditional societies.

## **4.0 SUMMARY**

The role of bureaucracy and development administration can be traced from the growth of bureaucracies from structural – functional angle in colonial and non-colonial developing countries. In developing countries which had been under colonial rule, the administrative structures were inherited from the colonial period. They were highly centralized with small amount of internal differentiation. Their functions were limited to basic administrative services like revenue and law and order. They helped to establish the framework of modern legal and administrative practices. They were highly apolitical, that is, politically neutral. They served the colonial masters who were not politically responsible. These bureaucratic structures were inherited by the ex-colonial countries when the colonial rulers left them. There is a second layer of the bureaucracies in these countries which consists of those departments and structures which were created after the attainment of independence. Here, a new civil service was developed –new in personnel, goals, departments and activities. This drew new recruits, most of whom had participated in the national movements. They were the bearers of the new types of goals like economic development, social and educational advancement, etc. Most of these new recruits usually had a much clearer, more articulate political orientation and a sense of political responsibility than did the former colonial civil service.



The bureaucracies in developing countries which have not been under colonial rule exhibit a somewhat different pattern. A traditional bureaucracy existed in them whether it was “royal” as in the Middle Eastern countries, or “oligarchical –republican” as in most Latin American countries. They dominated the political scene until the end of the second world war. Some traditional elements were mixed with more modern ones which were borrowed from some European countries. They usually upheld the interests of the ruling oligarchies and implemented rather limited economic and social objectives. The impact of growing modernization, internal democratization and the development of new social, political and economic goals caused these bureaucracies to extend the scope of their activities and recruit new skilled personnel to be able to bring about socio-economic transformation..

## **6.0 TUTOR-BASED ASSIGNMENT**

Describe the role of bureaucracies and development administration in developing countries?

## **6.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS**

Eneanya, A.N. (2010). *Comparative Public Administration and Public Policy: Theories and Applications*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd.

------(2010). *Public Administration in Nigeria: Principles, Techniques and Applications*. Lagos: Concept Publication Ltd.

Esman, M.J. (1971). “Gag and the study of public administration”. In Riggs, F.W. (eds.). *Frontiers of Development Administration*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Diamant, A. (1970). “The Temporal Dimensions in model of Administration and Organisation”. In Waldo, D. (ed.). *Temporal Dimensions of Development Administration*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Heady, F. (1979). *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspectives*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York: Mariel Dekker.

Peter, B.G.(2007). *The Politics of Bureaucracy: An introduction to Comparative Public Administration*. London: Routledge.

- Riggs, F.W. (1964). *Administration in Developing Countries*. Boston: Mifflin.
- Seidman, H.B. (2000). *Politics, Power and Position: the Dynamics of Federal organization*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sharma, M.P, Sadana, B.L., AND Harpreet, K. (2011). *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: Kitab Mahal Publishers.

## **UNIT 4 COMPARISON OF THE ROLE OF BUREAUCRACY IN NATION BUILDING AMONG THE DEVELOPED COUNTRIES**

### **CONTENTS**

#### **1.0 Introduction**

#### **2.0 Objectives**

#### **3.0 Main Contents**

##### **3.1 Major features of Administrative systems**

##### **3.2 Bureaucracy and Development Administration in Developed countries**

###### **3.2.1 Similarities of Administrative Systems**

###### **3.2.2 Differences in Administrative Systems**

##### **3.3. Case 1**

###### **3.3.1 Comparison between British and France Administrative structure**

###### **3.3.2 France Administrative structure**

###### **3.3.3 British Administrative structure**

##### **3.4 Case 2**

###### **3.4.1 Comparison between British and American Administrative structure**

#### **4.0 Conclusion**

#### **5.0 Summary**

#### **6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments**

#### **7.0 References/Further Readings**

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The changing role of bureaucracy in development administration is characterized in such phrases as development bureaucracy. What is intended is to make the governmental organizations, structurally and behaviourally, geared to the task of development. In this unit, we shall discuss the role of bureaucracy and development administration in developed countries.

## **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of the unit, students would be able to:

- Understand how bureaucrats, refereed as specialists play significant role in government activities, instead of use of generalists;
- Understand how a set of political structures-parties, parliaments, cabinets are designed to formulate policies, which the bureaucrats implement; and
- Understand how the bureaucrats can adjust to social or economic change and acquire new capabilities to meet new demands.

## **3.0 MAIN CONTENTS**

### **3.1 MAJOR FEATURES OF ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS**

Bureaucracies in more developed countries fulfil a great number and variety of functions in socio-economic transformation. The efficiency and effectiveness of bureaucracies impact on the society because they can adjust to social or economic change and quickly acquire new capabilities to meet new demands. In the category of more developed countries are included, broadly: countries of western Europe, North America, Scandinavia, Australia, New Zealand, Russia, Japan, Israel and now South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, etc.

Developed countries can be referred to countries with large number of specific administrative structures each specialized for particular purpose, such as: agriculture, transport, regulatory, defence, budgetary, planning, etc. There is high degree of task specialization and roles are assigned according to the personal achievements of individuals rather than according to family, status or social class(Sharkansky,1978:29-30). Moreover, government activities extend over a wide range of public and personal affairs. Popular interest and involvement in public affairs are widespread. Population is adequately mobilized for intensive participation in decision-making and executing processes. Furthermore, the political system is developed and consists of formal political structure in which control is exercised in conformity with the pattern laid down. The making of political decisions becomes the duty of the politicians; and administrative decisions that of bureaucrats or administrators. Traditional elites (tribal or religious) have lost any real power to affect major governmental decisions.

### **3.2 BUREAUCRACY AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION IN DEVELOPED COUNTRIES**

#### **3.2.1 SIMILARITIES OF ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS**

There are common forms and procedures of administration in more developed countries (for example, USA, UK, Germany and France). These include:

- a) Bureaucracies are large, having numerous sub-units with specialized employees which reflect task specialization and wide range of governmental activities;

- b) Bureaucracy accepts directions from other legitimate branches of government;
- c) Bureaucracy is considered to be professional – a sign of specialization among bureaucrats;
- d) The public service is large-scale, complex and instrumental, that is, its mission is understood to be that of carrying out the policies of the political decision-making;
- e) The bureaucracy exhibits a sense of professionalization –in the sense of identification with the public service as a profession, and in the sense of belonging to a narrow field of professional or technical specialization within the service;
- f) Bureaucracy is highly specialized and reflects in its ranks most of the professional and occupational categories found in the society. Their recruitment patterns are achievement oriented;
- g) The role of bureaucracy in the political process is fairly clear and the line of demarcation between the bureaucracy and other political institutions is generally definite and accepted. This is due to the fact that the political system as a whole is relatively stable and mature and the bureaucracy is more fully developed;
- h) The bureaucracy is subject to effective policy control by other functionally specific political institutions.
- i) The bureaucracy are more impersonal in their interactions with clients in the society .

### **3.2.2 DIFFERENCES OF ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS**

However, there are considerable differences in bureaucratic forms and procedures among the more developed countries. These differences reflect their peculiar ecological and historical experiences. For instance, in France and Germany, there are administrative courts that are distinct from the civil court system in USA and UK. Similarly, there are

considerable variations in the level of politicisation and the degree of political participation of public servants among the countries of this category. Public servants participate in politics in France and Germany, whereas, they do not participate in politics in USA and UK.

These examples are only illustrative, not exhaustive. However, most of the developed countries face the problem of incoherence in relations between numerous service and regulatory agencies. The problem is created by the enormous number of functional and territorial authorities which design and implement their own programmes at different levels as well as implement programmes designed and partly or wholly financed by national authorities. For example, in the United States of America, there are 78,000 local authorities within these authorities as well as government corporations and contractors that operate on the fringes of government

### **3..3 CASES:**

#### **3.3.1 CASE 1: COMPARISON BETWEEN BRITISH AND FRANCE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE**

#### **3.3.2 FRANCE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE**

France has had a long tradition of centralized and strong government going back at least to the reign of Louis XIV. Many of the administrative institutions developed by Napoleon 1 as Emperor to govern France are still being used and the principal direction for government activities in France continues to emanate from France.

French government has been dominated by bureaucracy, at least highly bureaucratic. This bureaucracy has been effective in many ways in

governing even in the face of the instability of governments during the Third and Fourth Republics, and in the face of large scale economic and social change. Bureaucracy has continued to play a very significant role in French government and politics.

Although, it is centralized, the French bureaucracy has a number of internal divisions. First, there are the vertical divisions between classes of administration (now A through G), which roughly represents educational qualifications needed for positions with F and G categories, being the top administrative positions requiring at least a university-level education. The lower categories may require secondary education with the lowest requiring no particular education. Within each of these classes, there are divisions based upon the nature of the position, specialty of the individual occupying the position and so on.

Perhaps, the most important of all the divisions is the separation of class A into the “grands corps”, as well as, some civil servants who do not belong to any of the corps. The “grands corps” constitute a vestige of Napoleonic administration. It represents organizations within the civil service and have some of the attributes of fraternal organizations, when an individual becomes a member for the duration of his or her career. There are two principal technical corps – *Mines and Ponts et Chaussées* – and five major administrative corps – *Inspection des Finances, Conseil d’etat, Cour des Comptes*, the diplomatic corps and the prefectural corps as well as several minor corps (Peter, 2010:133). The names attached to



these corps reflect their functional tasks for government. An individual remains a member of the corps even if he is working in the private sector; and indeed the contacts between public and private sectors are increased by the number of civil servants, who have “parachuted” into the private sector – a practice called *pantouflage* (Rouban, 2003, quoted in Peters,2010).

Furthermore, an individual becomes a member of one of the corps on the basis of performance at one of the two major schools channelling people into the civil service. One of the schools which provides personnel for the technical corps is the *Ecole Polytechnique*, established by Napoleon to provide the engineers he required to modernize France and to modernize its army. The other school, the *Ecole Nationale d' Administration* (ENA), supplies recruits for the administrative corps. ENA was established in 1946 as the training ground for future public servants. Its curriculum stresses law, administration and to a lesser extent finance, emphasizing the legalistic conception of administration in France.

Yet another division in French administration, one common to most administrations, but perhaps rather more intense in France is among the departments and agencies. French administration has a traditional bureaucratic structure, with departments divided into a number of sections and subsections. This structure and the competitive nature of policy formation in the system makes the units in the administrative system extremely protective of their budgets and their access to cabinet

and to presidency. There has been a limited increase in the number of autonomous organizations in French government, but not to the extent found in many other countries.

The civil service in France does not work under the same assumptions of impartiality as in Britain. Many senior civil servants are openly political and even participate in politics and hold public office. In-fact, a large proportion of government ministers are civil servants or former civil servants. Of-course, when a civil servant becomes involved politically, he or she may become “persona non grata” for subsequent governments. In that case, there are always opportunities outside government for members of the grand corps. A large percentage of French public employees are not civil servants but, rather, work for nationalized industries or parastatal organizations.

Furthermore, local government in France has only limited independence from the central government. The criteria for employment in local and regional governments are prescribed nationally. In addition, the major function of local government in most counties – education – is a national function and the employees of local schools are actually direct employees of the ministry of education in Paris. Likewise, many local public works are controlled centrally through the technical grands corps, so the latitude available to local governments to invest in capital projects as they wish is also limited.

The latitude of local governments has been limited even further by the prefectural system. France is divided into 95 departments, each named after a particular geographical feature. These divisions are also a Napoleonic device designed to eliminate the traditional provinces in France, such as Burgundy and Normandy, which were perceived to limit loyalty to the nation. The prefect was designed to ensure that each of the departments was governed in the manner desired by the central government in Paris. Each department had a prefect, who was responsible to the ministry of the Interior for the administration of government policy in his or her area.

In summary, French administration is a vast and somewhat contradictory institution. It has been a major weapon of a centralizing national government but is itself deeply divided and internally fractious. An administrative system that was formerly high centralizing is now becoming more decentralized than many administrations that have appeared more open to local influence. French administration is highly legalistic in its own definitions of its work and in its relationships with citizens, but at the same time it is deeply involved with politics. Individuals derive great status from their connections with the grands corps but may spend some or most of their career in the private sector. This system has been capable of governing France when there was little alternative governance available from politicians.

### **3.3.3 BRITISH ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE**

The British system of administration has adapted slowly to external pressures for change. To gain some understanding to this change, major organizations belong to British government. There are six major types of organization, each of which stands in different relationship to the political authority of parliament and cabinet.

The executive departments, such as the Department of Health and Social Security are most closely connected to that authority. The Treasury and Cabinet office are also at the heart of this collection of organizations help to determine overall government policy.

These are typically staffed by civil servants and headed by a politician sitting in cabinet. There is generally a permanent secretary at the top of the civil service pyramid, who serves as the link between a small number of political leaders and the permanent officials.

The British civil service made its first major movement toward modernization as a result of Northcote-Trevelyan Report of 1853, which stressed the value of a civil service recruited on the basis of merit. This report resulted in a civil service dominated by class composed almost entirely of honours graduates in the humanities (especially classics), who though intelligent, did not have the training in the economic and technological issues that were increasingly called, Executive class and clerical class.

There have been reforms in British civil service, especially, the “NEXT STEPS” reforms, which made executive positions of newly created agencies open to private sector as well as public sector applicants. This has made private managers, with limited public sector experience to make some in-roads. However, the major policy advice positions remained in the hands of career civil servants and public administration remains a major cog in the machinery of government.

The Treasury and Cabinet office are also at the heart of this collection of organizations, help to determine overall government policy. The third form of organization is local government. The United Kingdom is a unitary government, so the number and functions of local authorities are controlled by the central government, and much of the cost of local government is borne by the central government.

The fourth major group of public employees comprises the health service. These employees stand in a variety of relationships to government, depending upon how they are employed and what functions they perform. In general, the employees of the National Health service are definitely public employees, but they are not civil servants. Consequently, many of the benefits and restrictions- of civil service employment do not apply to them. Hospital physicians (consultants) and all other employees of the hospitals are salaried public employees, although they are employees of the National Health Service and not of government per se.

Fifthly, there are a number of non-departmental public bodies in the structure of British government. These bodies are, in turn, divisible into two groups. One group consists of the remnants of nationalized industries, such as: British Telecom, British Airways and British gas. Within the classification of nationalized industries, there are also some 150,000 industrial civil servants, with full civil service status, employed primarily in government-owned enterprises supplying the ministry of Defence.

In addition to the nationalized industries, there are a number of non-departmental bodies, commonly referred to as “quangos (quasi-non-governmental organizations), which represent a large number of different types of organizations standing in various relationships to government (Hogwood, 1983). Some are simply sections of cabinet departments that have been “hived off” and may still be staffed by civil servants.

Another group of non-department bodies are the universities, while clearly in the public sector, are kept at arm’s length from government for reasons of academic freedom.

Finally, there are the true “quangos” organizations that are private or partially private, but that spend public money and exercise the authority of government. There are also a number of advisory bodies for ministries included among the “quangos”. However, the types of public employees staffing these institutions are almost as varied as the institutions themselves.

### **3.4. CASE 2:**

#### **3.4.1 COMPARISON BETWEEN BRITISH AND AMERICAN ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES**

##### **1) POLITICAL SYSTEM**

British political system has civil culture – political culture, that is, participant and pluralistic, “based on communication and persuasion”- a culture, that permits change but moderates it. Since the political culture and structure are congruent, the political system has been able to maintain stability and its legitimacy has been well established. USA shares with Britain in “participant” and “pluralistic” civil culture and a stable democratic political system. Specifically, Britain operates parliamentary system of government, while USA operates Presidential system of government. Because of this, the role of bureaucracy varies. Moreover, there are differences of history in the two countries. British society is evolutionary – developed gradually, while America society is revolutionary. Finally, American society is achievement-oriented, while British is ascription-oriented (favouring individual class- appointment is distributed on class-line). Patronage is the key the word.

##### **2) HIERARCHY**

Structurally, the executive departments are the major units of administration, but included in the Executive branch are host of regulatory commissions, government corporations and other agencies. Decisions of executive re-organization are left to the congress. Congress exercises the power to create or abolish executive departments but delegates limited power to the President to make his choice with congressional approval. The department's secretary at the head is a political appointee of the President (subject to senate confirmation) and serves at his pleasure.

Usually, a department has under-secretary and several Assistant Secretaries.

The task of a central personnel agency for the federal government is now divided between new office of personnel management and a new merit systems protection Board. Similar to Administrative class is a system of grades reflecting levels of responsibility.

Usually, the top three “super-grades” comprise experts in a professional capacity. A senior executive service (SES) was created in 1979 similar to British Administrative class.

In British administrative system, the standard pattern is for each ministry to be headed by a minister, who is responsible before the parliament for all ministry affairs and who heads the ministerial hierarchy. Directly under the Minister is the office of the permanent secretary held by a senior civil servant with the obligation to serve any minister and any government with the same degree of neutrality. One or more deputy secretaries assist the permanent secretary, each in charge of several sections. Under secretaries and Assistant Secretaries head lower echelon divisions, with principals and assistant principals in turn heading up smaller units within these divisions. Responsibility for personnel management has been shifted from the treasury to a civil service department directly under the control of the prime minister.

### **(1) ABSTRACT RULES**

In British administrative system, the civil service is an establishment of the Crown and its affairs are almost exclusively controlled by order-in-council or other executive action. The British operates under a convention that imposes upon the official and the minister clearly understood mutual obligations based on the principles of impartiality and anonymity. The civil servant is



expected to offer his advice to the minister, who has political responsibility, but he is obligated to carry out loyally all government decisions. In USA, there is no constitutional protection for national civil service. The Executive and legislature share in regulating the bureaucracy, which gives it only a partial statutory base.

#### **(4) ROLE SPECIFICITY**

In USA, bureaucrats are expected to work under political direction, though he may be actively involved in policy formulation. Moreover, high-ranking bureaucrats play major roles in public policy-making, but the rules of the game vary. Instead of behind –the-scene activity protected by a carefully preserved veil of anonymity and secrecy as in the British tradition, the Americans expect that bureaucratic participation in policy-making will be much more open with the inevitable reactions that follow to the bureaucrat concerned, who has to publicly face it. In British Administrative system, bureaucracy is viewed as neutral agent of the political decision-makers. High ranking career officials initiate and choose among policy proposals, subject to ministerial discretion.

#### **(5) SPECIALIZATION**

In USA, public servants are better educated and come from business and professional backgrounds. Interchange between governmental and non-governmental careers is fairly common. While, in British system, professionalism is de-emphasized in bureaucracy either as a criterion for recruitment of Administrators or as a goal that serving administrators should attain. There is polarization between generalists and specialists in British civil service. Again, bureaucracy in Britain is mainly from autocratic class and, therefore, less representative.

**(6) RECRUITMENT BASED ON MERIT**

Appointment in British system is career-based at an early age through a system of competitive examinations to a unified service which draws a clear distinction between intellectual and routine work, with subsequent promotion also to be based on merit, rather than nepotism. Generally, in British system, there is preference for career-staffing and candidates with general mental ability for fresh recruit. Recruitment for higher civil service is the form of competitive examinations on a variety of subjects, paralleling the courses of study offered in the universities and open only to fresh and young university graduates. In American Administrative system, a person can be recruited into the service at the age of 50 or above. Recruitment is through specialized and practical examinations on an open competitive basis to those meeting prescribed minimum qualification.

**(6) IMPARTIALITY**

In USA, high-ranking official play roles in public policy-making, but the rules of the game vary. Instead of behind-the-scene activity protected by a carefully preserved veil of anonymity and secrecy as in the British tradition, the Americans expect that bureaucrats to participate openly in policy-making with inevitable reactions from target population which he has to face. There is no demarcation between politics and bureaucratic officialdom.

**(7) CAREER DEVELOPMENT**

In USA, the channels for career advancement for higher level Administrators are less planned and more haphazard than in the British system. In Britain, appointment is on career basis at an early age through a system of competitive examinations to a unified service which draw a clear distinction between intellectual and

routine work, with subsequent promotion also to be based on merit rather than nepotism.

### **SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST**

Compare and contrast the role of bureaucracy and development administration in UK and France?

### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

In this unit, we have been able to discuss the role bureaucracy and development administration in developed countries. Among other functions, they have large bureaucracies, and have numerous sub-units with specialized employees. In addition, there is high degree of task specialisation and they are subject to effective policy control by other functionally specific political institutions. However, there are considerable differences in bureaucratic forms and procedures among the more developed countries. These differences reflect their peculiar ecological and historical experiences. For instance, in France and Germany, there are administrative courts that are distinct from the civil court system in USA and UK. Similarly, there are considerable variations in the level of politicisation and the degree of political participation of public servants among the countries of this category. Public servants participate in politics in France and Germany, whereas, they do not participate in politics in USA and UK.

### **5.0 SUMMARY**

Bureaucracy and development administration in developed countries can be interpreted in terms of differentiation of structures(Riggs, 1979). According to him, “the phenomenon of development involves a gradual separation of institutionally distinct sphere, the differentiation of separate structures for the wide variety of functions that must be

performed in any society". In the category of developed countries, include: USA, Britain, France, Germany, etc.).

The administrative structures of both Britain and France show some elements of centralization and decentralization. When examining central local relations. According to him, both systems are highly centralized territorially, though, British decision structures are more austere. British dogmatism, stems from the hallowed role given to the party and parliamentary supremacy, which provides room for bargaining and adjustment. On the other hand, French pragmatism resulted from discretionary adjustments made by bureaucracy in Paris, the prefects and the dual local-national roles played by a number of French politicians who simultaneously hold local and national office. Thus, the French system resulted in numerous adjustments and bargains which produced a more accepted and effective policy implementation than the British. There is administrative courts in France, which is different from ordinary courts in USA and UK. Again, while bureaucrats in France participate in politics, they are neutral in UK and USA.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

Compare and contrast the role of bureaucracy and development administration in USA and Britain?

## 7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING

- Eneanya, A.N. (2010). *Comparative Public Administration and Public Policy: Theories and Applications*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd.
- (2010). *Public Administration in Nigeria: Principles, Techniques and Applications*. Lagos: Concept Publication Ltd.
- Esman, M.J. (1971). "Gag and the study of public administration". In Riggs, F.W. (eds.). *Frontiers of Development Administration*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Diamant, A. (1970). "The Temporal Dimensions in model of Administration and Organisation". In Waldo, D. (ed.). *Temporal Dimensions of Development Administration*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Heady, F. (1979). *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspectives*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York: Mariel Dekker.
- Hogwood, B.W. and Peters, B.G. (1983). *Policy Dynamics*. Brighton: Wheastsheal
- Peter, B.G. (2010). *The Politics of Bureaucracy: An introduction to Comparative Public Administration*. London: Routledge.
- Riggs, F.W. (1964). *Administration in Developing Countries*. Boston: Mifflin.
- Seidman, H.B. (2000). *Politics, Power and Position: the Dynamics of Federal organization*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sharkansky, I. (1978). *Public Administration: Policy-making in Government Agencies*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing.
- Sharma, M.P, Sadana, B.L., and Harpreet, K. (2011). *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: Kitab Mahal Publishers.

## **UNIT 5 COMPARISON OF THE ROLE OF BUREAUCRACY IN NATION BUILDING BETWEEN SOCIALIST (USSR, CHINA) AND WESTERN (UK, USA) COUNTRIES**

### **CONTENTS**

- 1.0 Introduction**
- 2.0 Objectives**
- 3.0 Main Contents**
  - 3.1 Conceptualisation of Bureaucratic Organisation**
  - 3.2 Common Functions performed by Public bureaucracies in Socialist and Western Democratic Countries**
  - 3.3 Bureaucracy and Nation-building in USSR#**
  - 3.4 Bureaucracy and Nation-building in China**
  - 3.5 Bureaucracy and Nation-building in Western Democratic Countries**
- 4.0 Conclusion**
- 5.0 Summary**
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignments**
- 7.0 References/Further Readings**

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Evidently, one of the attributes of bureaucracy is the implementation of policies through administrative staff. Yet both models have different views about bureaucratic organizations. In this unit, we shall discuss the role of bureaucracy and development administration in socialist and western democratic countries, respectively.

### **2. 0 OBJECTIVES**

At the end of this unit, students would be able to:

- Understand socialist model of bureaucracy and development administration;
- Understand how western model of bureaucracy differs from the socialist model; and
- Understand certain bureaucratic roles that are similar to both socialist and western bureaucratic models

## **5.0 MAIN CONTENTS**

### **5.1 CONCEPTUALIZATION OF BUREAUCRATIC ORGANISATION**

Weberian model conceives bureaucratic organisation as having structural pre-requisites. No discussion on the conception of a bureaucratic organisation can proceed without reference to the Weberian model of bureaucracy. Its basic structural pre-requisites are:

- i. Defined rights and duties prescribed in written regulations;
- ii. Systematically ordered authority relationships;
- iii. Promotions regulated by merit and seniority;
- iv. Technical competence as a formal condition of employment;
- v. Fixed monetary salaries;
- vi. Strict separation of the office and the incumbent in the sense that the employee does not own the means of administration and cannot appropriate the position;
- vii. Administration work as a full time career; and
- viii. Operations governed by a system of abstract rules and their consistent application to particular cases.

The socialist conception of bureaucratic organisation has been influenced by Marxist theory of state and adapted by socialist theorists on organisation. There are basic elements in the Marxist perception of the state. First, the state is an organ of class domination. Secondly, it exists to create an order which legalises and perpetuates the oppression of the

one class by moderating class conflicts. Thirdly, to state is a temporary phenomenon; it will wither away with the abolition of classes. In advocating the abolition of the state, however, the Marxist theory does not rule out the imperative of having an administrative machinery in a society. It contends that unlike the capitalist society, in a communist society agencies of administration will be organized on the principle of representation and their functioning will be conditioned by social division of labour. In this context, the function of administration primarily relates to the management of the level and the varied modes of production in the light of the social priorities at a given point of time. In other words, it ceases to remain merely an instrument of coercion and becomes responsible to society.

Evidently, the Weberian and socialist conceptions of bureaucracy differ regarding its specific functions and role. Weber views bureaucratic organisation in a value neutral context; it stands for rationality and machine-like efficiency. In Marxist-Leninist conception, it is an organ of political coercion in a class society. Weber underlines the continuity and permanence of bureaucracy and considers it an indispensable machinery for managing a complex industrial society. In the socialist viewpoint, the old bureaucratic model needs to be replaced by a new one based on the elective principle and accountability to the public. These differences apart, the socialist theory emphasises the continuance of administration (though on a social basis) even after the so-called withering away of the state. Theoretically, it denotes the management of multiple public tasks on specific functional basis without the impingement of the coercive political role of the state.

### **3.2 COMMON FUNCTIONS OF PUBLIC BUREAUCRACIES IN SOCIALIST AND WESTERN MODELS**

However, theory apart, bureaucratic organisations, whether in the west or in socialist countries perform some important common functions.



Some of the common structural features of public bureaucracies are: hierarchical structure, use of rules and regulations, impersonality of operations, division of labour, complexity of administrative tasks, and employment of trained personnel either on a career or on a programme basis.

### **3.3 BUREAUCRACIES AND NATION BUILDING BETWEEN SOCIALIST (USSR, CHINA) AND WESTERN COUNTRIES**

Administration in socialist countries have to face all the problems of developing societies engaged in rapid economic development with inadequate resources. The insistence emphasis on responsiveness of the official state administrative machinery to the party apparatus creates all sorts of problems. It leads to continuous conflicts between party units and the official government agencies held accountable for the administration of particular programmes. It also poses dilemmas of individual choice to the person who is both a public official and a disciplined party member, reducing his initiative and willingness to experiment because of fears about being caught between competing duties.

#### **3.3.1 BUREAUCRACY AND NATION BUILDING IN USSR**

In USSR, Leninist model of the theory of bureaucratic organisation is a combination of democracy and centralism. Democracy is seen here as the power of the working people, election of governing bodies at all levels, and above all, their accountability to various institutional units of the political system as well as to the main source of power, the people. On the other side, centralism is conceived as collective leadership exercised on the principles of subordination of the majority to the majority undivided authority, and above all, obedience and discipline. Democracy and centralism should be interlinked, indeed integrated in the political system. It means, in brief, expressing different views, ascertaining

majority opinion, incorporating in it a decision and conscientiously implementing that decision. In the Leninist model, the organisational structure as well as the process of decision-making, at the level of either the state organ or the party apparatus, are guided by principles of democratic centralism, dual subordination, and the production territorial criterion. The term democratic centralism denotes the permissibility of dissent or debate to the extent that it does not jeopardise organisational unity or unity of action already agreed upon. The principle of dual subordination makes each administrative unit responsible to the popular assembly which apparently created it, and vertically, to the corresponding organ at the next level in the hierarchical chain. The production-territorial principle assumes that within a particular geographical area, all enterprises engaged in a given line of production would be coordinated within one administrative hierarchy.

Generally, operative methods of the Leninist administrative apparatus are based on the concepts of “one-man-management” and “collegiate management”. Theoretically, these two concepts stand for two different forms of organisation: board governed or individually managed agencies. If the principle of collegiate management seeks to ensure collective leadership in making decisions regarding vital problems, “one man management principle” has been so conceived as to inhibit shirking of individual responsibility by entrusting a precise task to anyone in charge of an agency or a bureau.

### **3.3.2 BUREAUCRACY AND NATION BUILDING IN CHINA**

Ever since the revolution in 1949, Communist China has gone through several stages in its political development, reflecting shifts in political objectives and power relationships. In the early years from 1949 to 1957, the emphasis was on social reconstruction following the long war years, and the launching of projects for rapid economic development with special stress on heavy industry. The Soviet model was consciously

taken as a guide and the state bureaucracy was mainly relied on for implementation. During 1957 a complicated intra-party debate led to the movement known as the “Great Leap Forward” with what proved to be over-ambitious objectives for rapid progress on all fronts. The CCP took a more commanding role using the slogan “politics takes command”, and the state apparatus was downgraded as over-bureaucratized. Central economic planning was dropped in favour of a decentralized effort to stimulate agricultural production through rural communes without sacrificing industrial development.

Under the principles of “democratic centralism” on which the Chinese political system operates, the final decision-making authority is highly centralised in both the Communist Party and the government. In the party the Central Committee elected by the Party Congress is theoretically the ultimate repository of power between Congress sessions. In practice, the Politburo and its Standing Committee together with the party secretariat run the party organisation and the party in turn directs all the other organisations in the country, including the bureaucracy.

The staff in the administrative agencies generally carries out government policies and programmes. Chinese refer to bureaucrats as “cadres” or “kanpu” which denotes leadership, skill and capability in an organisational set up. Thus, we may refer to the state council members as the party and central government’s leading cadres. The intermediary level of bureaucrats is the middle-level cadres; and those at the bottom level, who must deal directly with the masses are the basic-level cadres. Every cadre is a party member but every party member is not a cadre. In short, cadres are the functionaries of the various party and government bureaucracies and have authority to conduct party or government business.

The post-Maoist leaders, especially Deng Xiaoping, have viewed the reform of the bureaucracy as necessary for realisation of the “four

modernisations” and have taken steps toward greater bureaucratic rationalisation and professionalization. Specific measures have included opening up access to advanced education at home and abroad; greater stress on technical qualification for initial recruitment; replacement of bureaucrats by de-emphasising seniority in favour of expertise; structural streamlining which has sharply reduced the number of ministries and agencies in the state council and the size of their staffs; and renewed emphasis on direct public opinion controls over lower level officials through the ballot, public opinion polls, and other devices. Bureaucratic personnel “are now expected to be revolutionary, well-educated and professionally competent”. However, the evidence available so far does not prove that fundamental, institutional and ideological changes haven taken place in China. But combining Maoist and more technocratic principles the new leadership hopes to achieve stability, marked by efficiency and production. The overriding consideration has however remained the same, that is, to make sure that the bureaucracy remains politicized.

### **3.4 BUREAUCRACY AND NATION BUILDING IN WESTERN COUNTRIES(USA,UK)**

The Weberian bureaucratic model is the major feature of the administrative system in its basic structural pre-requisites are defined rights and duties prescribed in written regulations. Calculability of organisation results is through rules and established procedures. In the western model, administration work as a full time career and operations is governed by a system of abstract rules and their consistent application to particular cases. In addition, government agencies are not only responsible to legislative bodies, but are also mutually counterpoised. The bureaucracy is an indispensable machinery for managing complex society. Finally, western bureaucracy emphasizes specialization and professionalism.

## **SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST**

Compare and contrast the role of bureaucracy and development administration in UK and France?

### **4.0 CONCLUSION**

In this unit, we have been able to discuss the roles of bureaucracies and development administration in both western and socialist countries. Though, socialist bureaucratic model has similarities with western models, in terms of hierarchy of organisation, authority, reward, and operate with rules and procedures, they differ in certain aspects. In social bureaucratic model, there is no independent and impartial recruiting agency like the civil service commissions . Members of the communist party receive preference and not recruited in accordance with well established principles of recruitment. There is supposed to be harmony between policy makers and administrators, both follow the same ideological and social base. Civil services are totally controlled by the Communist party. Civil servants do not form any trade unions. The socialist model does not emphasize “specialisation and professionalism. It is felt that if too much importance is given to a limited number of technical experts, it might discourage the spirit and initiative of the ordinary lower ranking members of the

Administrative network, that is, the “masses” upon whose efforts the socialist model leans heavily for organisational success.

### **5.0 SUMMARY**

The above analysis points to the specific features of the socialist model of bureaucracy and how it differs in significant aspects (normatively and operationally) from the Western bureaucracies in concept and practice. However, both models share certain features in common. The socialist model is organised as a hierarchy of

specialised offices in pursuit of specific goals. Its primary task is the implementation of state goals in the social and economic spheres. Authority percolates from the upper to the lower ranks of the bureaucracy, and those at the top generally have more seniority or experience and receive more wages than their subordinates. Recruitment and promotion are based on universalistic achievement standards; rules and written communications are widely used in socialist organisations and offices are separate from office holders who can be replaced.

Underlying the differences between the two models is a general disagreement over the ways organisations are viewed. In the rational bureaucratic type, the chief concern is with achieving internal efficiency through the maximum use of technical knowledge. In socialist conception, the predominant emphasis is on finding ways to maximize the involvement and commitment of organisational participants, particularly the masses at the bottom of the organisation.

## **6.0 TUTOR-MARKED ASSIGNMENT**

Compare and contrast the western bureaucratic model and socialist model?

## **7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READING**

Basu, R. (2004). *Public Administration: Concepts and Theories (4<sup>th</sup> edition)*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Ltd

Eneanya, A.N. (2010). *Comparative Public Administration and Public Policy: Theories and Applications*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd.

----- (2010). *Public Administration in Nigeria: Principles, Techniques and Applications*. Lagos: Concept Publication Ltd.

- Esman, M.J. (1971). "Gag and the study of public administration". In Riggs, F.W. (eds.). *Frontiers of Development Administration*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Diamant, A. (1970). "The Temporal Dimensions in model of Administration and Organisation". In Waldo, D. (ed.). *Temporal Dimensions of Development Administration*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Heady, F. (1979). *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspectives*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. New York: Mariel Dekker.
- Peter, B.G.(2010). *The Politics of Bureaucracy: An introduction to Comparative Public Administration*. London: Routledge.
- Riggs, F.W. (1964). *Administration in Developing Countries*. Boston: Mifflin.
- Sharma, M.P, Sadana, B.L., and Harpreet, K. (2011). *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*. New Delhi: Kitab Mahal Publishers.