

## PREFACE

In a bid to standardize higher education in the country, the University Grants Commission (UGC) has introduced Choice Based Credit System (CBCS) based on five types of courses *viz. core, discipline specific, generic elective, ability and skill enhancement* for graduate students of all programmes at Honours level. This brings in the semester pattern, which finds efficacy in sync with credit system, credit transfer, comprehensive continuous assessments and a graded pattern of evaluation. The objective is to offer learners ample flexibility to choose from a wide gamut of courses, as also to provide them lateral mobility between various educational institutions in the country where they can carry their acquired credits. I am happy to note that the University has been recently accredited by National Assessment and Accreditation Council of India (NAAC) with grade ‘‘A’’.

UGC (Open and Distance Learning Programmes and Online Programmes) Regulations, 2020 have mandated compliance with CBCS for UG programmes for all the HEIs in this mode. Welcoming this paradigm shift in higher education, Netaji Subhas Open University (NSOU) has resolved to adopt CBCS from the academic session 2021-22 at the Under Graduate Degree Programme level. The present syllabus, framed in the spirit of syllabi recommended by UGC, lays due stress on all aspects envisaged in the curricular framework of the apex body on higher education. It will be imparted to learners over the six semesters of the Programme.

Self Learning Materials (SLMs) are the mainstay of Student Support Services (SSS) of an Open University. From a logistic point of view, NSOU has embarked upon CBCS presently with SLMs in English / Bengali. Eventually, the English version SLMs will be translated into Bengali too, for the benefit of learners. As always, all of our teaching faculties contributed in this process. In addition to this we have also requisitioned the services of best academics in each domain in preparation of the new SLMs. I am sure they will be of commendable academic support. We look forward to proactive feedback from all stakeholders who will participate in the teaching-learning based on these study materials. It has been a very challenging task well executed, and I congratulate all concerned in the preparation of these SLMs.

I wish the venture a grand success.

**Professor (Dr.) Ranjan Chakrabarti**  
Vice-Chancellor

Netaji Subhas Open University  
Under Graduate Degree Programme  
Choice Based Credit System (CBCS)  
Subject : Honours in Public Administration (HPA)  
Comparative Public Administration  
Course Code : CC-PA-05

First Print—January, 2023

**Netaji Subhas Open University**  
**Under Graduate Degree Programme**  
**Choice Based Credit System (CBCS)**  
**Subject: Honours in Public Administration (HPA)**  
**Comparative Public Administration**  
**Course Code: CC-PA-05**

**: Board of Studies :**  
**: Members :**

**Chandan Basu**

*Professor of History*  
*Director, School of Social Sciences, NSOU*

**Soma Ghosh**

*Professor of Political Science*  
*Principal, HMM College for Women*

**Barnana Guha Thakurta (Banerjee)**

*Associate Professor of Political Science*  
*NSOU*

**Manoj Kumar Haldar**

*Assistant Professor of Political Science*  
*NSOU*

**: Writers :**

**Block I Units 1-5**

**Kaushik Ghosh**

*Assistant Professor of Political Science,*  
*Bankura University*

**Block II Units 1-5**

**Titu Bardhan**

*Faculty of Political Science,*  
*Vidyasagar Metropolitan College*

**Block III Units 1-5**

**Nikita Rai**

*Scholar of Political Science,*  
*University of North Bengal*

**Block IV Units 1-5**

**Isha Tirkey**

*Assistant Professor of Political Science,*  
*University of North Bengal*

**Dipankar Sinha**

*Professor of Political Science*  
*University of Calcutta*

**Pujan Kumar Sen**

*Professor of Public Administration*  
*NSOU*

**Sital Prasad Nag**

*Associate Professor of Political Science*  
*NSOU*

**Debajit Goswami**

*Assistant Professor of Public Administration*  
*NSOU*

**: Editor :**

**Debajit Goswami**

*Assistant Professor of Public Administration*  
*NSOU*

**: Format Editing :**

**Basabi Chakraborty**

*Assistant Professor of Public Administration,*  
*NSOU*

**Notification**

All rights reserved. No part of this Self-Learning Material (SLM) may be reproduced  
in any form without permission in writing from Netaji Subhas Open University.

**A.B.Aich**  
Registrar

**Netaji Subhas Open University**  
**Under Graduate Degree Programme**  
**Choice Based Credit System (CBCS)**  
**Subject: Honours in Public Administration (HPA)**  
**Comparative Public Administration**  
**Course Code: CC-PA-05**

CONTENTS

Block I <b>Introduction</b> .....	1- 10
Block II <b>Theories and Models of Comparative Public Administration</b> .....	11 - 48
Block III <b>Public Choice Theory</b> .....	49 - 111
Block IV <b>Recent Trends</b> .....	112 - 168

**CC-V**  
**BLOCK-1**  
**UNIT-1**

**AN INTRODUCTION TO COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

**STRUCTURE**

**1.1 Learning Objectives**

**1.2 Introduction**

**1.3 Nature and Scope**

**1.4 Evolution**

**1.5 Major Approaches**

**1.6 Problems**

**1.7 Conclusion**

**1.8 Summing Up**

**1.9 Glossary Keywords**

**1.10 Model Questions (3 Questions each of 6, 12 & 18 Marks)**

**1.11 Further Readings and References**

**1.1 Objectives**

This unit helps our students in learning:

- How does Comparative Public Administration emphasise on the development of the third world countries
- How do successes and failures of one country's public administration help the administration of other countries

- Evolution of this subject
- Various approaches and models of Comparative Public Administration

## 1.2 Introduction

*“... The new paradigm for public administration must be comparative i.e., global, since the solution of the problem to which it addresses itself will require increasing communication between scholars and practitioners in all countries”.*

*--- Fred W. Riggs*

*... the comparative aspects of public administration have largely been ignored; and as long as the study of public administration is not comparative, claims for “a science of public administration” sound rather hollow. Conceivably there might be a science of American public administration and a science of British public administration and a science of French public administration; but can there be a “science of public administration” in the sense of a body of generalized principles independent of their peculiar national setting?*

*--- Robert A. Dahl*

After World War II, newly independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America (most of them were ruled by the United Kingdom, France, Germany, The Netherlands, Portugal) required socio-economic-political development in their own way. All these colonial countries had only one single common legacy and that is ‘ultimate exploitation by the colonial rulers more than century years old’. That’s why they needed special care which the then dominated traditional public administration failed to provide. Because traditional public administration was born and developed in first world countries. So, traditional public administration had solutions of the problems of those countries. So, comparative public administration (CPA) is an answer for the probable development methods for the newly independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Without introducing something new, it was not possible to rebuild the third world countries. Although scholars like Woodrow Wilson wanted to compare public administration from the very initial stage of this subject, but most of his contemporary scholars were not in favour to compare various administrations in that initial stage. They wanted to give a good shape to the subject (public administration) at first and only then they were in favour of compare one country’s administration with another. We may also say in this way that satisfaction over the traditional public administration in spite of the fact that traditional public

administration is non-comparative by nature, was one of the major causes that CPA took so many years to emerge. Why CPA is necessary? Actually, until or unless, we compare one thing with other thing/ things we cannot say that this one is good or bad. So, comparison is very much necessary to know whether I am doing well or I need to change, and if I need to change, towards which direction I need to change? In this connection, one thing we should remember that literature of comparison of administration is very old. It is even found in the writings of Aristotle too. Aristotle, in his time, compared 158 city-states' political systems to learn what makes a government good and what makes a government bad. In comparative public administration it is very important to know that what we should compare and what we should not--- and obviously the whole matter will be done in a systematic way. In this particular point, modern comparative public administration differentiate itself from older classification and analysis. So, CPA is closely associated with nation building process since World War II.

One of the major important objectives of the comparative public administration is to make the public administration universal. If we minutely follow the first quotation of this writing taken from Fred W. Riggs, we will see that Riggs did not want that public administration should show much concern over a single country. Behind flourish or spread or popularize this CPA subject, it should be noted that after World War II, each newly independent country adopted various types of political, economic, social as well as administrative systems considering their own suitability. This actually helped CPA to flourish as a specialized field. At the same time, we should not forget to mention another important objective or purpose of the CPA i.e., after comparing properly, apply best administrative solutions assembling from anywhere of the world to solve a particular socio-economic-political problem anywhere and achieve better goals.

### **1.3 Nature and Scope**

Like other social science subjects, CPA also have ambiguity and debates over what is its nature and what are its scope. By nature, one can say that CPA is cross cultural as well as cross national. It is cross national because it studies administration of various countries. It is cross cultural because different countries possess different administrative culture of its own. If anybody wants to compare the administrative system of capitalist countries with the administrative system of socialist countries, then, he has to compare countries like USA, UK, France (capitalist countries) with the administration of Cuba, Vietnam (socialist countries). If any scholar wants to study the administration of developed countries and developing countries, he has to compare USA's administration (developed) with that of India's administration (developing). That's why CPA is branded as a cross cultural discussion platform.

By nature, comparative public administration is empirical too. traditional public administration was very much book oriented. But comparative public administration on contrary is very much empirical and survey based at the grassroots level. From the above point, another nature of CPA comes forward and i.e. while traditional public administration emphasized on theories (e.g. what to do or what not to do). On contrary, comparative public administration emphasized on how to do.

CPA also transformed from ideographic to nomothetic nature. According to Fred W. Riggs, ideographic approach means those approaches which emphasize on a particular case, a particular historical event or on a single nation-state. On contrary, nomothetic approach wants to generalize various theories. So, ideographic approach was obviously descriptive one only. But nomothetic approach is full of writing on comparing various political, social, administrative systems.

No one can deny the fact that, CPA helps public administration to move from non-ecological to ecological. And most of its credit goes to Fred W. Riggs. Although few experts of CPA introduced or discussed about ecology in CPA, but theoretical form of this in CPA was first given by Fred W. Riggs. Now, one may ask that what is ecological factor in comparative public administration? The term 'ecology' comes from the subject biology. There it purely denotes 'environment'. But, in the field of comparative public administration, it denotes the relationship between one country's administration with economic, political and social factors of that particular country.

Institutions are playing very important role in comparative public administration. Here institutions mean legislature, executive and judiciary. Because state or administrative authority cannot do anything without various institutions mentioned above of the state. For example, in any country legislature passes the bill into law, executive organ executes those laws and judiciary interprets the law and if anything found wrong in execution, judiciary correct the same. CPA after careful studying or analysis tries to implement the best institutional process in a country.

Another important nature of traditional public administration was that it emphasized on individual rather organization. For example, while traditional public administration emphasized on any particular organisation of a state like, NASA, Soviet ROSCOSMOS (erstwhile Soviet Space Programme), CPA here emphasize on individual.

Traditional public administration surveys any particular country's administration and then apply this to other administrative systems. But comparative public administration under Fred W. Riggs had multiple focus. He and his followers knew better that the demands and needs of the third world countries are something different and much more than first world countries. That's why they have given special multiple focus on CPA to become a best solution to old exploited colonial countries.



Comparative public administration not only emphasizes on inter-government analysis, but it also emphasizes on intra-governmental activities too. It means comparative public administration try to compare administrative systems between or among the countries as well as between or among the various ministries/ departments within a same government too. It is one of the most important nature of CPA.

CPA emphasised on studying voting behaviour of the various countries. Why do people cast vote? Why do a section of people cast vote in favour of a particular political party for a long time? Why do a section of people always shift their political loyalty from a particular political party to another--- all these queries are traced and discussed by CPA. For example, we know that India, Pakistan and Bangladesh are neighbours. But since 1947, Pakistan and Bangladesh (even when it was erstwhile East Pakistan) were ruled by the military junta. But, in India, democracy successfully runs since independence (except two years of emergency period). What are the major causes behind this? How did various forms of political system (democracy, autocracy) affect administration? CPA tries to serach out the answer of all these questions.

Another important subject matter of CPA is growth and functions of pressure groups or interest groups in different parts of the world. How did interest groups emerge, how did they function, particularly how did they operate in different political structures and cultures--- all are the prominent subject matter of this discipline.

On the other hand, few want to discuss CPA mainly at three broad levels i.e. i) Macro; ii) Middle-range; and iii) Micro.

i) Macro Level: In macro level, for example, India's administrative system will be compared with France's administrative system. Two states' administrative system will be discussed here, in details.

ii) Middle-range Level: In this approach, local level governments of the various states are compared and analysed.

iii) Micro Level: Under this approach, comparison took place in grassroots level with similar type of organisations. For example, Railway administrative system, Banking system of various states can be compared and discussed under micro level analysis.

Another important scope of CPA is management of human resources including financial management. These areas are mostly needed while discussing or analysing third world countries administration.

Social welfare including education are two other important areas of discussion in CPA. As the subject intend to develop the socio-political-economic conditions of third world countries, so, without developing social welfare indicators and education no third world countries can develop itself.

## 1.4 Evolution

When a new subject or a branch of new subject emerged, thought comes in the mind that what are the necessity of this new discipline? In case of comparative public administration, this question also arose and the simple answer is the independence of colonial countries after World War II. As we have already discussed that in spite of Aristotle's attempt in ancient Greek, we consider that comparative politics emerged as a separate discipline only after World War II. To serve the people of the third world countries, it is necessary to make the administration suitable for them. And to do this no administration of the first world country can help them. Because demands and priorities of the first world countries are different from the demands and priorities of the poor countries. Malnutrition is the problem found among the people of third world countries. Famine was very much normal for the people of newly independent countries. On contrary, these words are uncommon to the people of first world countries. Overnutrition is the problem of the first world countries. Fred W. Riggs has been given the most of the credit behind flourishing of this subject. Dwight Waldo, Ferrel Heady, L D White, R A Dahl are the eminent scholars in the field of CPA, but the contribution of Fred W. Riggs is the most remarkable one. To him, earlier studies should not be considered as 'comparative governments' and those studies one merely called as 'governments of foreign countries'. Because not only they had lack of comparativeness in nature but also these were not written in orderly manner. Fred W. Riggs wrote an article 'Notes on Literature Available for the Study of Comparative Public Administration'. It was published in 'The American Political Science Review' in 1954. In this article Riggs discussed about the available literature found on the comparative public administration in various countries. It was such a nice and needed article of that time. It was that time when under the leadership of Fred W. Riggs and under the financial patronage (one-half million dollars) of Ford foundation, a group of people started to discuss on comparative administration for two decades. Riggs was the Chairman of the comparative administration group (CAG) (which was a special division of the American Society for Public Administration) from 1960 to 1973. Scholars gradually believed that Weberian model was not sufficient to understand public administration of third world countries. Dwight Waldo talked about the structural functionalism of the comparative public administration but in practice it is the credit of Riggs who actually introduced structural functionalism in the study of comparative public administration.

Marshall Plan (1948) also played an important role behind emergence of comparative public administration. Under this plan USA provided foreign aid to Western Europe. USA all total transferred 13.3 billion dollars to Western Europe to recover their economy.

At present this comparative public administration discipline is receiving importance throughout the world, beyond boundary.

## 1.5 Major Approaches:

Major approaches under this discipline may be called:

- i) Bureaucratic approach
- ii) Behavioural approach
- iii) Structural-functional approach
- iv) Ecological approach

i) Bureaucratic approach: Max Weber introduced this approach. To Max Weber, each organization can be defined or understood as a structure of activities and in future it will be in the direction to achieve desired goal. For the sake of maximum interest gain, each organisation develops a specialized system and few systematic rules and regulations.

ii) Behavioural approach: This approach is related with the scientific study of human behaviour in different social environments. This approach demands that comparative public administration should include individual in the study. As this approach stresses on 'fact', thus, collection of data and analyse the same, quantification and verification of that data are given the primary priority.

iii) Structural-functional approach: This approach is derived from the research work of Malinowski and Radcliff Brown--- two anthropologists. Although this approach was not applied in the field of public administration, as same as applied in the anthropology. In this approach, two major key words are 'structure' and 'functions'. Here social structure refers to "any pattern of behaviour, which has become the standard feature of a social system". This approach, in the arena of comparative public administration accepts that, a structure exists in each administrative system. And with the help of this structure and components or organs, several functions are performed. In comparative public administration, structures are of two types, 'concrete' (various government departments) and 'analytic' (structures of authority, power etc.). The word function here denotes any consequences of structure. It may be possible that those are the consequences of one structure to another structure or are the consequences of the whole system. Structures may be monofunctional or multifunctional. If structure like Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) is noticed, we'll find out that it is monofunctional but if we look at the Office of the US President, we'll find out that this structure is multifunctional.

iv) Ecological approach: As we have already discussed that Fred W. Riggs is the father of this approach and according to him, this ecological approach is based on the

communication between administrative system and its external environment. But this environment is something different from the idea of Botany. Here, environment denotes political, cultural, economic and social systems. So, influence of administrative system over environment and vis-à-vis are the main discussing matter of this approach. In his famous book 'Ecology of Public Administration' (1962), Fred W. Riggs nicely discussed the relationship between administration and with its environment or surroundings. To Riggs, administration, social, economic, political--- all are subsystems of a society.

## **1.6 Problems**

Study of CPA depends very much on the political culture of that country. Sometime, country or specifically express, ruler of that country does not want that news or information from his country should go outside. For example, one can very much consider the case of North Korea now. North Korean President Kim Jung-un does not allow foreign media to travel here and there and collect information about his country. Even, he sometimes arrested foreign media personnel, tortured them on the grounds of spying in North Korea. So, if one scholar wants to compare capitalist country's administration with socialist country's administration and he chose USA as sample from capitalist country and North Korea as sample from socialist block, that researcher might face big problem to collect information from his sample North Korea. Or, we may say in this way that on the very first day when he chose North Korea as his sample, his research work came to an end.

Technology is another challenge in case of studying or comparing various countries. Normally first world countries are technologically advanced countries, so, the tools and methods one is able to use in first world countries, is not easy to use the same in third world countries. For example, if one researcher is collecting data and analyse the same with 5G technology sitting in a developed country and that researcher use 3G technology while surveying and analysing in a third world country, findings might not give the same outcome.

## **1.7 Conclusion**

In conclusion, we may remind that CPA is not only a subject. CPA has become a tool for development of the developing and underdeveloped countries. One question sometime arose that whether was it too late to introduce the discipline CPA as a tool for development? It means should we introduce or implement CPA before World War II? The simple answer is no. Reality is something different. Actually, if we deeply notice, we'll find out that, till the end of World War II, concept of developing countries almost absent. These areas (e.g. India, Sri Lanka) were captured by the

colonial superpowers and they gave independence to these countries after World War II. So, in reality, the main subject matter (i.e. developing countries) of CPA did not exist at all before World War II. Till that time, their identity was just they were 'colonies'. So, as the main subject matter was absent, how did CPA emerged as a separate discipline?

### **1.8 Summing Up**

- I. Comparative Public Administration can be branded as a movement to save and develop the third world countries
- II. This discipline received most contributions from Fred W. Riggs
- III. Subject matter of Comparative Public Administration is very tough as different nations have different political culture (democratic, autocratic etc.)
- IV. Without studying Comparative Public Administration, no administrative development is possible in current world

### **1.9 Glossary Keywords**

Major Approaches to Comparative Public Administration, Developing Countries, Third World Countries, Comparison of Administration, Comparison of Socio-Political-Economic Condition, Fred W. Riggs,

### **1.10 Model Questions (3 Questions each of 6, 12 & 18 Marks)**

#### **6 Marks Model Questions**

- a) Examine the nature of comparative public administration.
- b) Write a short note on the shifting of ideographic nature to nomothetic nature.
- c) Why comparison is needed in administration?

#### **12 Marks Model Questions**

- a) What are the scope of comparative public administration?

- b) Write a note on the contribution of Fred W. Riggs in the emergence of comparative public administration.
- c) Write a note on the ecology approach to comparative public administration.

### **18 Marks Model Questions**

- a) Write a note on the various approaches of the comparative public administration.
- b) What are the major problems in comparative public administration?
- c) Explain the evolution of comparative public administration.

### **1.11 Further Readings and References**

1. *'The Ecology of Public Administration'* by Fred W. Riggs
2. *'The Study of Public Administration'* by D. Waldo
3. *'Political Culture and Political Development'* by Lucian W. Pye and Sidney Verba
4. *'Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective'* by Ferrel Heady
5. *'The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems'* by Robert A Dahl
6. *'Modern Comparative Politics: Approaches, Methods and Issues'* by S N Ray
7. *'Introduction to Comparative Political Analysis'* by Rakhahari Chatterji

## **BLOCK 2**

### **THEORIES AND MODELS OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

#### **UNIT 1 RATIONALE BEHIND THEORY AND MODEL BUILDING**

##### **STRUCTURE**

- 1.1 Learning objectives**
- 1.2 Introduction**
- 1.3 Theory building**
  - 1.3.1 Administrative management**
  - 1.3.2 Scientific management approach**
  - 1.3.3 Bureaucratic approach**
  - 1.3.4 Human relations approach**
  - 1.3.5 Behavioural approach**
  - 1.3.6 Public policy making**
  - 1.3.7 New public administration**
- 1.4 Model building**
  - 1.4.1 Systems model**
  - 1.4.2 Institutional model**
  - 1.4.3 Rational policy-making model**
  - 1.4.4 Incremental model**
- 1.5 Conclusion**
- 1.6 Summary**
- 1.7 Keywords**
- 1.8 Model questions**
- 1.9 References**

##### **1.1. LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

After reading this Unit, one should be able to:

- Explain why there was a need to devise and theorise newer theories and models in public administration
- Discuss various advantages and disadvantages of theory and model making,
- Highlight traditional theorising with modern administrative theories,
- Explain new public management theory
- Explain the rationale behind scientific management theory
- Gather knowledge about the bureaucratic theory,
- Understand and appreciate the human relations approach that has taken the world of administration by storm
- Understand the Eastonian model for policy analysis;
- Discuss the Rationality model for policy-making;

- Highlight the Institutional approach, which addresses the role that state and social institutions have in defining and shaping public policies;
- Describe Lindblom's Incremental approach to policy-making; and
- Examine the Political Public Policy approach

## **1.2. INTRODUCTION**

Modern day states are highly bureaucratic in nature. Since the 19<sup>th</sup> century throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> and in the 21<sup>st</sup> centuries administration has played a pivotal role in safeguarding the interests of the modern state. Without it no state can function and serve the people that make its populace. Even in times of war a bureaucratic model is not necessarily disturbed for there is always a scope of improvement in the institution. Public Administration in a modern state is a government in action. The activities of government are almost look to the state. Today government has ceased to be merely the keeper of the peace, the arbiter of disputes and the providing of common and mundane services. Public Administration is an integral part of the development process and has a significant role to play in national development and social change. It is responsible for ending social inequalities and providing social justice to the weaker sections of society. It is a great instrument in the spread of education, ending untouchability, providing social status to each and everyone. Public Administration plays a significant role in policy making in various fields. It helps the executive in identifying major policy areas, preparing major policy proposals, analysing various alternatives and solutions, dividing the major policies into sub-policies.

In fact, bureaucracy is the only conceivable instrument capable of formulating and implementing the policies of modern government is called upon to undertake. From the above discussion, Public Administration is really government in action. It is true that public administration is mainly concerned with the executing and implementing part of governmental activity. Thus, Public Administration consists of getting the work of government done by coordinating the efforts of the people so that they can work together to accomplish their set tasks. Public administration is concerned with the activities of the government, people and it differ from the private administration. Administration is essentially a matter of human relationships. It may be emphasized that the administrator is neither a philosopher nor a politician.

## **1.3. THEORY BUILDING**

Theory building in public administration is not an easy task to do, because there are various kinds of public organisations, administrative structures and processes has been developed in the study of public administration. The aim of public administrative theory is to achieve politically legitimated goals by constituency moulded means.

For the success of public administration, public administrators have borrowed various methods, role, and theories from the other disciplines like economic, sociology, psychology etc. Theory building in public administration is not only related to develop a theory of administration but also to formulate a set of theories. Administrative theory is basically deals in the various ideas and views of various scholars.

Administrative theory is that theory, which. helps to develop the other theories in the field of public administration. They are administrative management theory, the scientific management approach, the bureaucracy approach, the human relations approach, the behavioural approach,



the systems approach, public-policy approach, decision making theory, public choice theory, and in the end, it creates new public administration. Administrative theory helps to growth various theories in the field of public administration, which is briefly discussed in the following:

### **1.3.1 Administrative Management:**

Theory Administrative management theory is that a science of administration can be developed based on some principles and experience of administrators. It deals primarily with formal organisation structure. The basic aims of this theory are efficiency and economy. It explains briefly in the words of Henry Fayol, Luther Gullick and Lyndall Urwick. Henry Fayol is considered the father of administrative management theory.

He mainly focusses on the development of broad administrative principles which are applicable to general and higher management levels. He defined management in terms of five functions, Planning, Organizing, Commanding, Coordinating and Controlling. Gullick explains major management techniques by the word POSDCORB, which stands for a different technique such as, Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting and Budgeting.

The administrative management theory is marked by the four basic features, impersonal, specialization, efficiency, and hierarchy. Although, the exponents of this theory, they often invoked the name of science, but they did not even come close to using established scientific methods. Their principles were derived from experience and collections of information.

### **1.3.2 The Scientific Management Approach:**

The scientific management approach was based on the design and the operation of production processes on the shop level of the organisation. Scientific management refers to the time motion studies. It signing in the United States in twentieth century by contribution of the scientific management school. The key representatives of this school are Lillian Gilberth. F.W. Taylor is the father of scientific management.

Scientific management theory concern was to improve organisational efficiency and economy for the sake of the creational production. Taylor's belief that economic incentives are strong enough to motivate the worker for the increased production in the organisation.

The major principles of scientific management are:

- It based on standardization of work methods.
- It deals with scientific selection and training of workers.
- It was an open advocacy of an equal division of work and responsibility between management and workers.
- There should be active cooperation and cordial relations between management and workers.

### **1.3.3. Bureaucratic Approach:**

The bureaucratic approach was systematically developed by German sociologist Max Weber in the twentieth century. He was first to describe its characteristics systematically. According to the Weber, bureaucracy is superior to any other form decision, precision, stability, discipline, and reliability.

For Max Weber, the national-legal bureaucracy was a prime example of rationalization and its impact on Western socio-economic and political institutions. Weber's explain the characteristics of the bureaucratic forms of organisation is based on Division of Labour, Hierarchy, Rules, Rationality, Inter personality, Rule orientation and Neutrality.

#### **1.3.4 The Human Relations Approach:**

The basic of the human relations theory lies in its primary in human beings, psychological motivations, and informal group behaviour in the organisation. This theory focuses on management as a web of interpersonal relationships and it is also based on the behaviour of role occupants in an organisation than on the formal structure of the organisation.

This theory came from the Hawthorne experiment which were carried out in the USA by Elton Mayo and his colleagues of the Harvard Business School in the late 20th century. In the first experiment workers operating under a piece-rate system. Overall, the significance of Hawthorne investigation was in discovering the informal organisation which it is now realized exists in all organisations.

#### **1.3.5 Behavioural Approach:**

Herbert Simon, Douglas McGregor, Abraham Maslow, Kurt Lewin, Chester Barnard, Mary Parker Follet, Rensis Likert and Wanen Bennis are some of the foremost behavioural scientists who contributed in the development of the Behavioural approach to organisation. Behavioural scientists explain that an industrial organisation should be considered a social system which has both economic and social dimension. Every member of the organisation is unique to some degree.

#### **1.3.6 Public Policy making:**

The model of public policy making are more concerned with the objective of forming better policies for the state. The public policy maker as a person who does not have the brain, time, and money to fashion truly different policies. Public policy-making organs in India are, Constitution, Parliament, Cabinet, Planning Commission, National Development Council, Judiciary, Civil Services, Press, Political Posters, Pressure and Interest Groups, Professional Associations, and Voluntary Organisations.

In our nation, policy is formulated by the cabinet or minister but it is implemented by the civil servants. Policy-making is done at the Union and State level in India.

#### **1.3.7New Public Administration:**

New Public Administration was used to describe new philosophical outlook for public administration, which is specially based on efficiency and economy. It began to be said that efficiency is not the soul of public administration.

Man is the focal point of all administration activities who cannot be subjected to the mechanical test of efficiency. New public administration is movement inspired by younger scholars. Overall, the new public administration has stressed on four important goals relevance, values, equity, and change.

Therefore, it is no doubt that, the study of public administration is a systematic body of knowledge which is mainly study of administrative system of the organisation. It goals to improve production and create efficiency of workers. In the public administration, the organisation is based on scientific management which is need for modern welfare state.

Thus, administrative theory really is very useful for the modern state because it is based on the scientific management. It brings change in structure and process of the system of the government organisation. At last, it brings a new kind of public administration in the modern state, of which basic aim is managerial orientation.

## **1.4. MODEL BUILDING**

In general terms, a model is a representation of a person or thing. When one is considering political systems or elitism in terms of public policy, one is abstracting from the real situation to simplify and identify significant aspects of public policy. In other words, in the field of public policy, models help to classify our ideas about public policy environment. They not only identify issues but also suggest explanations for public policy and its effects.

### **1.4.1 Systems model**

The Policy-making process has been regarded by David Easton as a 'black box', which converts the demands of the society into policies. While analysing political systems David Easton (1965) argues that the political system is that part of the society, which is engaged in the authoritative allocation of values. Inputs are seen as the physical, social, economic and political products of the environment. They are received into the political system in the form of both demands and supports. Demands are the claims made on the political system by individuals and groups to alter some aspect(s) of public policy.

At the heart of the political system are the institutions and actors for policymaking. These include the chief executive, legislators, judges, and bureaucrats. In the system's version they translate inputs into outputs. Outputs, then, are the authoritative value allocations of the political system, and these allocations constitute what is called public policy or policies. The system theory portrays public policy as an output of the political system.

### **1.4.2 Institutional model**

Institutional model focuses on the government as an institution for policy analysis. It covers the realms of key government institutions – Parliament, Executive (including government departments) and Judiciary. In other words, a policy does not take the shape unless it is adopted and implemented by governmental institutions. The government institutions endow public policy with three distinct characteristics. Firstly, the government invests legal authority to policies. Secondly, application of a public policy is universal. Only public policies extend to all citizens in the state. Thirdly, public policy involves coercion. It is applied to the acts of government in backing up its decisions. A policy conveys the possibility for imposing penalties, through coercion, if necessary. Only the government can legally impose negative sanctions on violators of its policies. As such, there is a close tie-up between public policy and governmental institutions. The institutional approach to public policy, which depends on the interactions of those institutions created by the constitution, legislature, or government, has gained significance.

The value of the institutional approach to policy analysis lies in asking what relationships exist between institutional arrangements and the content of public policy, and also in investigating these relationships in a comparative fashion. However, it would not be right to assume that a particular change in institutional structure would automatically bring about changes in public policy. Without investigating the underlying relationship between structure and policy, it is difficult to assess the impact of institutional arrangements on public policies. In this context, Thomas Dye says, “both structure and policy are largely determined by environmental forces, and that tinkering with institutional arrangement will have little independent impact on public policy if underlying environmental forces – social, economic, and political – remain constant”

### **1.4.3. Rational policy making model**

The idea of ‘rationality’ has an important place in the study of policy and decision-making in the post-World War II era. Two sources are mainly responsible for this rational approach:

- (i) the idea of economic ‘rationality’ as it grew in economic theory, and
- (ii) the idea of ‘bureaucratic,’ rationality, as advocated in sociological theories of organisation.

The concept of rationality, as it has been applied in public policy, has its roots in the construction of ‘economic man’, a ‘calculating self-interested individual’. The Weberian model (formulated by Max Weber, a German Sociologist) of the rational imperative, or the choice of the most appropriate means to achieve the desired ends, has transformed the analytical approach to decision making studies. This approach emphasises that policy decisions involve a choice among policy alternatives on rational grounds. Rational policy-making is “to choose the one best option.” Thomas Dye equates rationality with efficiency. “A policy is rational when the difference between the values it achieves and the values it sacrifices is positive and higher than any other policy alternative.” He further observes that the idea of efficiency involves the calculation of all social, political, and economic values sacrificed or achieved by a public policy, not just those that can be measured in monetary terms.

Thomas Dye prescribes a few requirements to policy-makers in selecting a rational policy. They must:

- know all the society’s value preferences and their relative weights,
- know all the policy alternatives available,
- know all the consequences at each policy alternative,
- calculate the ratio of benefits to costs for each policy alternative, and
- select the most efficient policy alternative

### **1.4.4 Incremental model**

Charles Lindblom (1917- 2018) is a critic of the traditional rationality model. In criticising the rational model as advocated by Simon and others, Lindblom rejected the idea that decision-making was essentially something which was about defining goals, selecting alternatives, and comparing alternatives. Lindblom wanted to show that rational decision-making was simply “not workable for complex policy questions.” To Lindblom, constraints of time, intelligence, cost, and politics prevent policy-makers to identify societal goals and their consequences. He

drew the distinction between Herbert Simon's concept of comprehensive (or root) rationality and his own idea of 'successive limited comparisons' (or branch decision-making).

There are 3 prime analyses of incremental model

- i) Simple Incremental Analysis: It is a form of analysis in which only those alternative policies which are marginally different to the existing policy are analysed.
- ii) Strategic Analysis: Lindblom suggests reliance on "informed thoughtful" use of methods to "simplify problems" so as to make better choices. These methods include: "trial and error learning; systems analysis; operations research; management by objectives; programme evaluation and review technique."
- iii) Disjointed Incrementalism: It is an analytical strategy which involves "simplifying and focussing" on problems by six methods: (i) the limitation of analysis for a few familiar alternatives; (ii) intertwining values and policy goals with empirical analysis of problems; (iii) focussing on ills to be remedied rather than on goals to be sought; (iv) trial-and-error learning; (v) analysing a limited number of options and their consequences; (vi) fragmenting of analytical work to many partisan participations in policy-making.

## **1.5. CONCLUSION**

The Unit dealt with the various approaches and models of public policy. It emphasises public policy as an important area of politics and public management. As a separate approach it is useful in studying the interaction between government that produces policies, and its people for whom the policies are intended. There are now two public policy approaches, each with its own methods and emphases. The first is labelled as 'Policy Analysis;' the second, 'Political Public Policy.'

From a policy analysis perspective, Putt and Springer (1989) argue that the function of policy research is to facilitate the analysis of public policy process by providing accurate and useful decision-related information. The skills required to produce information, which is technically sound and useful, lie at the heart of the policy research process, regardless of the specific methodology employed. Attempting to bring modern science and technology to bear on societal problems, policy analysis searches for appropriate methods and techniques that help the policy-makers to choose the most advantageous action.

## **1.6. SUMMARY**

- Public administration is one of the most important parts of modern-day state system where proper legalised functionaries work coordinated in a manner for the good of the population. In order to initiate such changes administrators, undertake certain policies for the execution of plans that will in future lead to the good of the state.
- Models and theories are the two important factors in policy analysis and formulation as well. Theories act as background to proper models which implemented in real zones can lead to successes of policies undertaken by various institutions.
- Models act as structures based on which proper policies could be implemented. Various theorists have provided models to understand public policy formulation.
- Comparative public administration deals with the various models and theories that make up the corpus of public administration and public policy. Based on various theories and models theorists and administrators as well devise plans to be initiated to make the system better and efficient to deal with the problems of the people.

## 1.7. KEYWORDS

**1, Universal-** relating to or done by all people or things in the world or in a particular group; applicable to all cases.

**2, policymaking-** the activity of deciding on new policies, especially by a government or political party.

**3, institutional-**This means that an organization has a distinctive sense of self and identity and its way and its beliefs become important for the society as well.

**4, systematic-**a systematic approach to learning that involves carefully following the program's steps. Systemic describes what relates to or affects an entire system.

**5, incentives-**In general, incentives are anything that persuade a person to alter their behaviour. It is emphasised that incentives matter by the basic law of economists and the laws of behaviour,

## 1.8. MODEL QUESTIONS

### Short questions

What is new public administration?

What are the various facets that administrative theory deals with?

Name a few policy making organisations in India?

### Medium questions

What is black box model?

Write a short note on the incremental model?

What are the major principles of scientific management?

### Long questions

Critically examine the policy-making models and suggest best suitable model/ models for a democratic country?

Theories and models are the soul of administration while institutions are the body- justify this statement?

Explain rational decision-making model in detail?

## 1.9. REFERENCES

- Buchanan, J.M. (1988). Market Failure and Political Failure. *Cato Journal*. 8(1).
- Dane, K. (2022). *Discuss the theory building in public administrative*. Owlgen.in. Retrieved March 12, 2023, from <https://www.owlgen.in/discuss-the-theory-building-in-public-administrative/>
- Dror, Y. (1964). Muddling through-science or inertia? *Public Administration Review*.24.
- Dror, Y. (1989). *Public Policy-Making Re-examined*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Dye, T.R. & Gray, V. (Eds.). (1980). *The Determinants of Public Policy*. Toronto.
- Dye, T.R. (2004). *Understanding Public Policy*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Easton, D. (1957). An approach to the analysis of political systems. *World Politics*. 9(1).
- Easton, D. (1965). *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*. New York: Wiley.

- Friedrich, C.J. (1941). Constitutional Government and Democracy. Boston: Little, Brown & Company.
- Hogwood, B.W. & Gunn, L.A. (1987). Policy Analysis for the Real World. London: Oxford University Press.
- Lane, J-E. (2000). The Public Sector. London: Sage Publications.
- Lindblom, C. (1968). The Policy-Making Process. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Lindblom, C. (1959). The Science of Muddling Through. Public Administration Review.19

## **UNIT 2**

### **FRED RIGGS**

#### **STRUCTURE**

##### **2.1 Learning objectives**

##### **2.2 Introduction**

##### **2.3 Ecological approach**

##### **2.4 Agrariaindustria models**

###### **2.4.1. Agraria**

###### **2.4.2. Industria**

##### **2.5 Fused Prismatic Diffracted**

##### **2.6 Prismatic Sala theory**

##### **2.7 Conclusion**

##### **2.8 Summary**

##### **2.9 Key words**

##### **2.10 Model Questions**

##### **2.11 References**

#### **2.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

**After studying this unit, you will be able to:**

1. Discuss the essential features, merits, and limitations of the Ecological Approach to the study of Comparative Public Administration;
2. Appreciate the way Fred W. Riggs has used the Ecological Approach in the creation of his models;
3. Understand the key elements of the Riggsian models of Agraria and Industria and their limitations;

4. Examine the attributes of Fused, Prismatic, and Diffracted societies, more particularly the Prismatic system and its administrative subsystem, the Sala;
5. Develop insights into the utility and limitations of the Prismatic-Sala model in the context of 'developing societies'; and
6. Have a brief view of the concepts of Development Administration and Administrative Development.

## 2.2 INTRODUCTION

In recent years modern Governments have experienced a great change in their functions and responsibilities. In the changed context role of Public Administrative has become all the more crucial in fulfilling the goals of the government. Consequently, administrative theories and models have become all the more important to the understanding of it. The ecological approach to the study of administration has been suggested when Western organisation theories have been found inadequate for the study of the problems of administration in Third World Countries, After the Second World War many countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America were liberated from colonial rule. They were faced with the task of nation-building and socio-economic transformation to fulfil their people's aspirations. The western scholars who acted as consultants to many of these countries found that western organizational models failed to explain the reality in Third World Societies. This realisation resulted in the development of new concepts and approaches including the ecological one. In this unit, we shall discuss the views of Fred W. Riggs on the ecological approach to the study of Public Administration.

Fred Riggs was a renowned professor of Emeritus of the political science department of the university of Hawaii. He was a political scientist and pioneer in administrative model building and theory formulation. He is known for his work in public administration, especially the Riggsian model. Here are some of his other works; *Frontiers of Development Administration*, *Idea of Development Administration*, and *Administration in Developing Countries*. The Riggsian theory or sala was based on the different types of societies we have in the world. Fred w. Riggs made a great effort in searching for an effective and efficient model for analysing public administration in developing countries. With Fred Riggs background in sociology, he identified the fused or traditional society, diffracted or developed society and the prismatic or developing society.

According to Fred Riggs, the fused or traditional society has no specialization, it is undeveloped because in it there is a low level of structural differentiation with a corresponding level of integration. There is no separation among the various institutions. From the very beginning, Riggs made a great effort in searching for an objective and effective model for analysing public administration in developing regions. With his background in sociological theory, Riggs created the —fused-prismatic-diffracted model. This model covers a wide range of research. For instance, economic life, social structures, political symbols, and the allocation of power are all part of the analysis of structural function. From the perspectives of heterogeneity, overlapping, formalism, and social transformation, the model observes peculiar features in a prismatic society. Even though the theory behind it needs refinement, it has exerted tremendous influence on the understanding of public administration and organizational behaviour.



A polarized model is inadequate in depicting the features that contribute to a developing country's administrative system. As a result, Riggs abandoned models that differentiated flanked by agrarianism and industrialism. Rather, Riggs opted to make a more diverse, yet simplified model, namely, the —fused prismatic-diffracted model or called a —prismatic model. The formulation of the prismatic model was primarily based on the extent to which a social administrative system undergoes functional differentiation. The model is appropriate for learning three societal kinds: highly developed Western industrial societies and traditional agrarian societies, as well as developing societies. Each society has its own social, economic, politically symbolic, and communicative attributes, as well as its political system and concepts of individual rights. Yet, these attributes eventually develop into dissimilar administrative systems. Riggs whispered that the degree to which each component of society differs from another in function is measurable and that measures of functional differentiation can be used to locate the three societal kinds beside a continuum. Simultaneously, Riggs whispered that his theoretical model can be used to compare the fundamental structure of several societies. Through his model, one is so able to comprehend each country's administrative attributes and differences. Riggs' analysis of public administrations primarily relies upon a functional structural analytical approach. He refers to the structure as a society's pattern of activity, while the function is measured to be the outcome of a pattern of activity. Given this analytical approach, one discovers that traditional agrarian societies, highly developed industrial societies, and developing societies are functionally and structurally separate. Such functional and structural attributes can be further examined by using a biological approach, that is, via a spectrum. Taking a traditional agrarian society as an instance, say a traditional Thai society, one notices that several social functions and social structures are highly functionally diffuse, that is, there is no organized division of labour. This analogy serves to demonstrate the consequences of an unorganized functional and structural system in a traditional agrarian society. But, should a white ray of light be beamed through a prism, it would disperse into a wide range of colours. Riggs uses the word —diffractl to refer to this phenomenon (dissimilar to its meaning in physics) as a metaphor for the functional and structural system that is highly functionally specific, as found within an industrialized society. Though, Riggs believes that there is a third scenario in addition to the two opposed extremes. That is, one necessity also contemplates the condition of the white light throughout the procedure in which it is being beamed through the prism itself. Specifically, the white ray is just starting to be diffracted, but the diffraction procedure has yet to be completed. Social differentiation, hence, cannot be successfully achieved overnight. Likewise, social transformation does not progress at a constant speed. The question, therefore, remains, how does a traditional society become modernized? Moreover, how does a fused society become a more diffracted society? Flanked by the two extremes of a —lack of division of labourl society versus a diffracted society, one may ask, what other possibilities are there? Through his model, Riggs suitably and thoroughly addresses these questions. Riggs first tackles these issues by describing how a ray of light passes through a prism: when a fused white light is beamed through a prism, the white light is subsequently diffracted into a rainbow of colours. Riggs further conceptualizes the diffraction procedure itself as creating a continuum.

### **2.3 ECOLOGICAL APPROACH**

The administration does not function in isolation from its environment. It influences it and is influenced by it. An understanding of the dynamics of this process of interaction between the

two is necessary for the understanding of the administration. The approach adopted is known as the ecological approach. Ecology is a term borrowed from Biology. It is concerned with science dealing with the interrelationship of organisms and their environment. It is a study of the interplay of living organisms and their physical and social environment. It is concerned with the question of how a balance involving organisms and the environment is achieved for survival. In Biology, it is established that a particular plant requires for its growth particular climate Soil humidity, temperature, etc. A plant that can grow well in a particular climate cannot do so under a different climate. Likewise, the growth or development of each society is conditioned by its history, economic structure, values, political system, etc. The characteristics of its social system and its physical, environment shape the ideas and institution just as a plant cannot grow in a different environment; so also, all institutions cannot thrive in a different social setting. Thus to understand the ecology of Public Administration. i.e. the interaction of administration and its environment, it is necessary to have an understanding of the society and the various factors affecting its functioning.

The ecological approach to the study of public Administration was initiated by J.M. Gaus, Robert A. Dahl and Robert A. Merton long before Fred W. Riggs. But it was Riggs who made a significant contribution to this approach: Fred W. Riggs, a distinguished American scholar and consultant to many developing countries, developed the ecological concept based on his studies in Thailand, the Philippines and 28 India. In his study of the administrative systems of developing societies, Riggs analysed the relationship between the administrations and the economic, social, technological, political and communication factors from a wide perspective. He has explained with illustration how environmental conditions influence administrative systems based on his Studies in Thailand and the Philippines. Riggs raised basic questions about the relevance of Western organisation theories to developing countries. He pointed out that each society has certain unique characteristics which influence the working of its sub-systems. He found that most Western theories look "inside" the system. The "outside" refers to the general socio-economic environment. The socioeconomic environment in Western developed countries is not the same as that in the Third World Countries. That is why, as observed by Riggs, the theories or models developed for the former seem inapplicable to the latter. The findings of Riggs, therefore are considered a significant contribution to the understanding of administrative systems in Third World Countries, based on them he has broadened the analytical frame for the examination of the administrative systems in Third World Countries.

## **2.4 AGRARIA INDUSTRIA MODELS**

Inspired by Dwight Waldo, Fred W. Riggs utilized innovatively the essential feature of the general system approach, the structural-functional, and the ecological approach, while developing a typology of models in his path-breaking article entitled, 'Agraria and Industria-Toward a Typology of Comparative Administration' published in an anthology, Towards a Comparative study of Public Administration edited by William J Siffin in 1957. In the agrarian-industria models, Riggs used the ideal-type methodology, which has logically interrelated various important and relevant concepts and their relationships and, which are based on imagination and extrapolation of societies that represent the total development of the characteristics of a particular model. Like Max Weber's models, Riggs's models are ideal-typical or 'pure' in the formulation and are not found in real life. It may, however, be pointed

out that Riggs abstracted his Agrarian model from the features of Imperial China of ancient times and likewise, for Industria, he abstracted the features of the modern United States of America. Normally, we can say that two were inductive models derived from the study of distinct historical societies. However, we should remember that ideal-type models are not necessarily inductive or deductive. Deductive models by some scholars are constructed based on the analysis of features of several societies or systems. It is assumed by some scholars that Weber's model of bureaucracy was apparently 'deductive' in nature. Nevertheless, the caution is clear: Ideal-type models need not be inductive or deductive. They have a methodology of their own.

#### **2.4.1 Agraria**

The main features of an agrarian society were as follows:

1. Man's status is based on his birth (parentage, lineage)
2. Traditions are followed, as the basis of the functioning of an administrative system. These traditions favour privileged groups over the rest.
3. Some structures perform many functions; they are multi-functional in nature.
4. Social groups at the local level are stable and there is very little movement from one social group to another. Thus, the status system is rigid and almost closed.
5. Occupations in this society have very little specialization.
6. Various groups in the agrarian society have specific tasks defined by traditions. This leads to rigidity in their classification of social hierarchy that is based on conventional stratification.

#### **2.4.2 Industria**

An industria society has the following features:

1. There is universalism and equity in the application of rules in society. No special privileges are granted to any section of society.
2. Structures are specialized in their nature. They perform tasks particularly related to their special sphere.
3. Progress of a person in society and the administrative system is decided on merit and achievement (as against birth in the agraria)
4. Certain social groups have the opportunity and freedom to move on to other social groups depending on their will and skill. The road to progress, vertical or horizontal, is not blocked for anyone.
5. The occupational system is well-developed with its norms and rules. There is no interference from any outside structure in the conduct of occupational roles.
6. The class system in society is not rigid or based on any conventional social hierarchy. Instead, it is based on a generalized pattern of occupational achievement.
7. Associations in society are not based on rigidity or birth. Instead, they are functionally specialized and based on achievement.

### **2.5 FUSED PRISMATIC DIFFRACTED**

Prismatic society is characterised by various economic, social, political, and administrative sub-systems. Riggs called the administrative sub-system the 'Sala Model'. In a diffracted society its counterpart is called 'Bureau' or 'Office' and in a fused society 'Chamber'. Each of them has distinctive features of its own. The Spanish word, 'Sala', has a variety of meanings like a government office, a religious conference, a room, a pavilion, etc. The word, 'Sala', is also generally used in East Asian countries more or less with the same meaning. Sala has certain features of both the diffracted 'bureau' and the fused 'chamber'. However, the 'bureau' features of Sala do not well represent its basic character. The heterogeneous value system and the traditional and modern methods of the prismatic society are reflected in its administrative rationality and efficiency found in the Bureau is absent in Sala.

Riggs believes that when analysing prismatic societies, mainly social scientists fail to understand how they essentially function. More significantly, they are unable to fully understand the circumstances under which society experiences diffraction. Such social scientists only grasp the concept of a dedicated structure and are not able to conceptualize the whole social structural system. Taking a family household as an instance, in a fused society the family is the model through which politics, the administrative system, religion, and ethics are judged. In contrast, in a diffracted society, the family household's influence on other social structures is negligible. Yet, in a prismatic society, the degree of influence lies within these two extremes. In other words, a family household's influence on several other social structures is less than in a fused society, but more than in a diffracted one. The revision of economic behaviour can be applied in the same manner. In a prismatic society, should one ignore the interrelationship flanked by political, administrative, social, and economic factors, and limit one's analysis to economic behaviour alone, one not only fails to fully grasp the larger picture but more importantly, misunderstands the role of economic behaviour as well.

## **2.6 PRISMATIC SALA THEORY**

**Prismatic-Sala Model** The ecological approach to development administration is the central point of Riggs's analysis. It is on account of environmental influences that an administrative system in a prismatic society develops the characteristics of heterogeneity, formalism and overlapping. These three, according to Riggs, are the important features of development administration in a developing nation.

### **Heterogeneity**

It is the presence of a mix of traditional and modern forms and institutions in the administrative system. For example, office attendants coexist with telephones as aids to the administration. Modern ideas are superimposed upon traditional ones. Behind the façade of new structures introduced, the old and traditional ways of doing things persist. In brief, in prismatic society modernity and tradition coexist in an uneasy companionship.

### **Formalism**

The existence of discrepancy between the formally prescribed norms and their practice is known as formalism. As a result of formalism, there is a wide gap between government proposals and their implementation. Most of the laws are either bypassed or not implemented at all. Although government officials insist on following some of the laws, rules and regulations, their official behaviour does not correspond to the legal status. Very often they work for the

realisation of goals other than the achievement of programme objectives. Formalism gives rise to administrative evils like red tape, passing the buck, inefficiency and corruption.

### **Overlapping**

It means non-administrative criteria determining what is described as administrative behaviour.

The administrative structures are intermixed with the social, economic, political, and cultural aspects of society. As a result of overlapping, the administrative institutions give the impression of performing specific administrative functions, but actually, they perform a variety of non-administrative, traditional functions. The social role of the officer often overlaps with his/her official role and causes a lot of confusion and maladjustment.

## **2.7 CONCLUSION**

In adopting a deductive procedure, the —fused-prismatic-diffracted model likewise ignores the ultimate goal of public administration in its attempt to build a value-free science. W. Wilson argues that the primary function of any public administration is to work efficiently. So, it should be obvious that a public administration cannot and should not abandon sure values. Moreover, while the —fused-prismatic-diffracted model tends to supplement its theory with empirical proof, it is sometimes hard to find appropriately related proof. The uniqueness of Riggs' theory is undeniably influential. Yet, his theory is to some extent predicated on logical speculation or assumptions. For instance, Riggs believes that formalism is the primary and sole factor in rising administrative hierarchical power within prismatic societies. This argument, though, is too simple and unequivocal to accept. To illustrate his argument, Riggs uses American society as his model of a diffracted society. The shortcoming here is, although American society is a developed and industrialized country, one cannot infer that it is free of formalism and no longer a prismatic society. So, the theoretical hypothesis that American society is a model which one should use in constructing a diffracted society is both inappropriate and unsatisfactory.

Riggs openly admits that the prismatic model is appropriate only for examining phenomena that occur throughout the social transformation procedure. In an actual society, though, —independent variables and —dependent variables are complex and therefore hard to predict. Consequently, causal inference is hard to avoid. From a purely functional or linguistic point of view, the —fused prismatic-diffracted model uses too much terminology and dedicated jargon. To understand it, one necessarily patiently wades through the definitions provided by Riggs himself. Therefore, in designing a new model, and in the effort to distinguish it from others, Riggs recognized a unique vocabulary that has no application whatsoever to other models. In addition, from a structural perspective, the —fused-prismatic-diffracted model is awkwardly divided into three sections. This kind of organization reflects the model's formalist limitations. Factors that cause or instigate social transformations are latent, unstable, and indefinite at best. In describing the development of Middle Eastern society, D. Lerner's —The Passing of Traditional Society proves this point decisively. Certainly, there are societies whose transformations have occurred as a result of powerful external forces. Under these circumstances, if one insists on using the —fused-prismatic diffracted model for analytical purposes, the result would be irrelevant to the facts

## **2.8 SUMMARY**

- Classical organizational theories mainly emphasise organizational structures and principles and behavioural theories concentrate on human behaviour in the organisation. But ecological theories emphasise the interaction of administration with its environment.
- Both in content and in analysis, Riggs's ecological approach extends the horizons; and assumes an integrated approach to the administrative system. His approach and models help us in examining the administrative process in developing countries. Although in practice his administrative models are difficult to find, they help us in appreciating the realities.
- The Sala model provides an opportunity to analyse and understand the administrative system in developing countries. It also facilitates further such studies that are based on empirical and ecologic approaches.

## 2.9 KEYWORDS

- **Ascriptive values:** Values derived by birth
- **Attainment values:** Values derived from one's efforts.
- **Barter exchange:** It is a characteristic feature of the traditional economy. In such an economy there is an exchange of goods and services without the use of money.
- **Bureau:** Bureau or office refers to an administrative sub-system in a diffracted society.
- **Chamber:** Refers to administrative sub-system in a fused society.
- **Differentiation:** Existence of a situation in which every function has a corresponding specialised structure for its performance.
- **Formal:** The official norm, the theory, what ought to be done, as expressed in constitutions, laws, rules and regulations.
- **Integration:** A process to tie together, to coordinate the various kinds of specialised roles in a society

## 2.10 MODEL QUESTIONS

### Short questions

Who are the theorists who initiated the ecological approach?

What is the origin of the 'sala'?

Who inspired Riggs to write 'Agraria and Industria- Toward a Typology of Comparative Administration'?

### MEDIUM QUESTIONS

What is the major criticism of the ecological approach?

Public administration without comparison will not develop- justify the statement?

What objections did F. Riggs have to the traditional society theory?

### Long questions

What is the Riggsian model of public administration?

Explain prismatic sala theory?

Write a short note on the need for governments to compare to serve the public better through public administration?

## **2.11 REFERENCES**

- Arora, Ramesh K. 2021. *Comparative Public Administration: An Ecological Perspective*. New Delhi: New Age International.
- Heady, Ferrel. 1995. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*. New York. Marcel Dekker.
- Heady, Ferrel. 1979. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Riggs, Fred. 1964. *Administration in Developing Countries: Theory of Prismatic Society*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Riggs, Fred.
- Riggs, Fred W. 1961. *The Ecology of Public Administration*. New Delhi: Asia Publishing House.
- Riggs, Fred W. 2006. "The Prismatic Model: Conceptualizing Transitional Societies," in Otenyo, E. and Lind, Nancy (eds.) *Comparative Public Administration: The Essential Readings*, New York: Elsevier Ltd., 52-56.
- Shen, Chu-Ta. 1987. "A Study on Riggs' Ecological Public Administration Model," *Journal of Su Chou University*, 9-10.

## **UNIT 3**

### **A CRITIQUE OF RIGGS**

#### **STRUCTURE**

- 3.1 Learning objectives**
- 3.2 Introduction**
- 3.3 Riggs, CAG and ecological approach**
- 3.4 Criticism of Fred Riggs**
- 3.5 Conclusion**
- 3.6 Summary**
- 3.7 Key words**
- 3.8 Model questions**
- 3.9 References**

### **3.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

After studying this unit, one will be able to

- Understand the beginning of the era of comparative public administration in the USA and its ramifications globally.
- Understand the ecological approach to public administration by Fred Riggs holistically.
- Analyse the fallacies and redundancies linked with the Riggsian approach.
- Critically evaluate the pros and cons related to the various theories of Fred Riggs.
- Explain the relevance of the Riggsian approach to public administration in both historical terms as well as contemporary terms.

### **3.2 INTRODUCTION**

One cannot criticise something that one does not know about. Such criticism is hollow and lacks objectivity and rationality. If pursued such an analysis will only yield faulty, error-laden results. Therefore, the priority while constructing a critique of Riggs is to explain what Riggs stood for and what is the Riggsian approach.

With the end of the Second World War and the emergence of third-world nations Public Administration was developed as Comparative Public Administration by developing its comparative viewpoint. It was developed with a more scientific outlook of public administration by establishing and strengthening theory in Public Administration. In simple words comparative public administration refers to the comparative study of government administrative systems functioning in different countries with different cultural and geographical settings at different periods. Originally the thinkers of the USA were trying to develop the subject matter of Comparative Public Administration by undertaking the analysis of various constitutional administrative systems in the world. In this regard, Robert Dahl addressed three major obstacles. They are

- (1) the inherent normative implication of Public Administration
- (2) what a science of Public Administration must be based upon a study of human behaviour and
- (3) that “as long as the study of Public Administration is not comparative, claims for a science of Public Administration sound rather than hollow.”

When Public administration is defined as a sub-field of political science Comparative Public Administration is a specialization in the field of Public Administration. Like other specializations such as administrative theory, public-personnel administration, and government budgeting. Comparative public administration focuses on Public Administration as a field of study and research rather simple execution of tasks. Haroon A. Khan defined Comparative Public administration as a quest for searching patterns and regularities in administrative behaviour and action and to characterize them in present-day nation-states.

### **3.3 RIGGS, CAG AND THE ECOLOGICAL APPROACH**

The first organization formally formed to formulate a universal comparative theory of public administration was the Comparative Administration Group (CAG) in 1960 that was a division of the ASPA, funded by the Ford Foundation to study methods for improving public administration in developing countries under the chairmanship of Fred W. Riggs. More than providing administrative techniques this group became a forum for intellectuals to understand



why the developing countries differ so much in the practice of administration and are not able to sustain the classical theory principles of administration in their systems even though Classical theorists of administration like Fayol and Weber, etc preached that their principles and models of administration were universal in their element and can be applied anywhere with the greatest success. CAG gave the idea of scientific studies and emphasized empirical and ecological (social, cultural and historical factors) study of various administrative systems. Even the CAG had to shut shop in the early 70s since various administrators and academicians realised that the highly complex setting which the group had provided for comparative Public Administration studies was resulting in failures in providing empirical assessment of administration factors in a society. They stated that it provided a very good direction but the techniques were not specified to execute the idea. And so the studies were transferred back to the Department of Comparative Studies. In 1968, the first Minnowbrook Conference was held under the chairmanship of Dwight Waldo that also talked about the need for Comparative Public Administration study and analysis.

The prominent idea under the banner of CAG was the ecological approach. Administration and its environment influence each other and an understanding of the dynamics of this process is necessary to understand administration. This approach is known as the ecological approach. The word 'ecology' is borrowed from biology where it suggested the interdependence between an animal species and its natural environment. The Ecological approach to the study of public administration was initiated (in the order) by J.M. Gans (1947), Robert. A. Dahl (1969), Roscoe Martin (1952) and F.W. Riggs (1961). In 1961, F.W. Riggs in his book, "The Ecology of Public Administration" explored from a comparative perspective the interaction between public administration and the environment in which it develops. In analysing the administrative system from the ecological point of view, Riggs mainly used the structural-functional approach. Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton, Marion Levy, Gabriel Almond and David Apter are the other thinkers who adopted this approach in their works. The ecological approach views public bureaucracy as a social institution which is continuously interacting with the economic, political and socio-cultural sub-systems of a society. Bureaucracy is not only affected by these environmental systems but also affects them in turn. Thus, this approach emphasizes the necessary interdependence of public bureaucracy and its environment. In the opinion of Riggs, administrative institutions are shaped and affected by their social, economic, cultural and political environment. Therefore, he emphasizes that to understand better the real nature, operations and behaviour of a particular administrative system, one should identify and understand deeply various environmental factors influencing it. The ecological approach determines how an administrative system operates in practice. Thus, it is useful to understand administrative realities.

Fred Riggs, who is known as the Father of Comparative Public Administration is the propounder of the ecological approach. He wrote the book "The Ecology of Public Administration" in 1962 in which he threw light on the relationship & interaction of an administration with its external surroundings. He analysed that many factors like political, social, economic, administrative etc. are influenced by its environment & in turn influence the environment in which it works. During his period as a Researcher at the Foreign Policy Association in the USA, Fred Riggs came across an interesting phenomenon regarding American Public Administration. He found them to be extremely self-absorbed in their approach which believed that the American way of administration was unique without any complements

elsewhere in the world and that it could answer all the administrative problems emerging in the newly developing countries. However, to explore the consequences of 28 intermingling contrasting systems in developing countries, he looked at the structural-functional approach of the social sciences. This approach provides a mechanism to understand social processes. The function is the consequence of patterns of action while the structure is the resultant institution and the pattern of the action itself. It reads complicated but the theory is not that difficult to understand. Social structures can be concrete such as Government departments and Bureaus or even specific societies held together by shared beliefs, customs and morals and also analytic like the structure of power or authority. These structures perform certain functions and in terms of the structural functional approach, these functions have an interdependent pattern between structures. So the first step would be to view bureaucracy as a structure which has an administrative system with characteristics like hierarchy, specialization etc. The behavioural characteristics can be rationality, neutrality, professionalism, and rule orientation. Then, one can proceed to examine the functions of bureaucracy.

According to Riggs, there are five functional requisites of a society: Economic, Socio-communicational, Symbolic, and Political. While talking about Riggs's explanation of the concept and contribution to this approach, we cannot proceed further without mentioning his Prismatic Model. This model uses a common phenomenon as an analogy, when white light passes through a prism it breaks into seven colours of different wavelengths. As per Riggs, the white light is the fused structure of traditional society. The rainbow represents the diffracted (or refracted) structures of an industrialized society. Inside the prism, society was in transition. Riggs challenged the traditional approaches of public administration implying that basic principles of administration have universal application. It also contributed to the comparative study of public administration by providing a more relevant perspective; that not all systems work the same in all places, so one can take what one likes and leave the rest.

### **3.4 CRITICISM OF FRED RIGGS**

Fred W. Riggs, one of the leading scholars on public administration in contemporary America, is considered an authority with exceptional creativity and great theory in the field of the comparative study of public administration. From the very beginning, Riggs made a great effort in searching for an objective and effective model for analysing public administration in developing regions. He is an energetic pioneer in research methodology, as evidenced by the "Pan-disciplinary approach" he came up with in the book " Public Administration in Developing Countries " published in 1964. Among others, Riggs' most significant contribution was to create the administration model - the fused prismatic-diffracted model. The model covers a wide range of research, for instance, economic life, social structures, political symbols, and the allocation of power are all part of the analysis of structural function. Moreover, the model can be applied in modern, traditional, developing and semi-developed economies. Riggs has consistently put a particular emphasis on the linkage between public administration and its environment and therefore advocated the concept that the administrative behaviour in a given society must be understood in the context of the social background instead of the administration itself.

A polarized model is inadequate in depicting the characteristics that contribute to a developing country's administrative system. As a result, Riggs abandoned models that differentiated between agrarianism and industrialism. Rather, Riggs opted to create a more diverse, yet

simplified model, namely, the "fused-prismatic diffracted" model or what I have chosen to call a "prismatic" model. The formulation of the prismatic model was primarily based on the extent to which a social administrative system undergoes functional differentiation. The model is appropriate for studying three societal types: highly developed Western industrial societies and traditional agrarian societies, as well as developing societies. Each society has its own social, economic, politically symbolic, and communicative attributes, as well as its political system and concepts of individual rights. Yet, these attributes eventually develop into different administrative systems. Riggs believed that the degree to which each component of society differs from another in function is measurable and that measures of functional differentiation can be used to locate the three societal types along a continuum. Simultaneously, Riggs believed that his theoretical model can be used to compare the fundamental structure of various societies. Through his model, one is therefore able to comprehend each country's administrative attributes and differences. Riggs' analysis of public administrations primarily relies upon a functional-structural analytical approach. He refers to the structure as a society's pattern of activity, while the function is considered to be the outcome of a pattern of activity. Given this analytical approach, one discovers that traditional agrarian societies, highly developed industrial societies, and developing societies are functionally and structurally distinct. Such functional and structural attributes can be further examined by using a biological approach, that is, via a spectrum. Taking a traditional agrarian society as an example, say a traditional Thai society, one notices that various social functions and social structures are highly functionally diffuse, that is, there is no organized division of labour. This analogy serves to demonstrate the consequences of an unorganized functional and structural system in a traditional agrarian society. But, should a white ray of light be beamed through a prism, it would disperse into a wide range of colours. Riggs uses the word "diffract" to refer to this phenomenon (different than its meaning in physics) as a metaphor for the functional and structural system that is highly functionally specific, as found within an industrialized society. However, Riggs believes that there is a third scenario in addition to the two opposed extremes. That is, one must also contemplate the condition of the white light during the process in which it is being beamed through the prism itself. Specifically, the white ray is just starting to be diffracted, but the diffraction process has yet to be completed..

Social differentiation, hence, cannot be successfully achieved overnight. Likewise, social transformation does not progress at a consistent speed. The question thus remains, how does a traditional society become modernized? Moreover, how does a fused society become a more diffracted society? Between the two extremes of a "lack of division of labour" society versus a diffracted society, one may ask, what other possibilities are there? Through his model, Riggs suitably and thoroughly addresses these questions. Riggs first tackles these issues by describing how a ray of light passes through a prism: when a fused white light is beamed through a prism, the white light is subsequently diffracted into a rainbow of colours. Riggs further conceptualizes the diffraction process. itself as creating a continuum.

Riggs believes that when analysing prismatic societies, most social scientists fail to understand how they essentially function. More significantly, they are unable to fully understand the conditions under which society experiences diffraction. Such social scientists only grasp the concept of a specialized structure and are not able to conceptualize the entire social structural system.

Fred W. Riggs' article "Agraria and Industrial Toward a Typology of Comparative Administration," published in 1955, won him wide acclaim among scholars. Since the publications of *The Ecology of Public Administration* (1961) and *Administration in Developing Countries* (1964), Riggs' position and reputation in the field of comparative public administration have been peerless. T. Parsons once said that "sociologists all critique Max Weber, but no one can do social research independently and scientifically without referring to Weber's theories." In the same manner, those who study comparative public administration will criticize Fred W. Riggs' "fused-prismatic-diffracted model," but in conducting research, no one is free of Riggs' influence. The limits of Riggs' theory can be summarized along the following lines. First, one school of thought that supports the "fused-prismatic-diffracted model" believes that this model can replace empirical studies in general. In other words, empirical studies are regarded as having little to no value. The primary reason for this stems from the perspective that empirical studies are time-consuming and expensive. As Milne astutely points out, however, it is dangerous for novice scholars to rely entirely upon model theories. Shortcomings arise when scholars erroneously believe that once one is familiar with one model of administrative theory, one can draw broad conclusions about the administrative features of all regions without conducting empirical research. A second critique of Riggs' theory identifies the scope of the "fused-prismatic-diffracted model" as being too broad and abstract. Riggs' structural function studies, which include several cultural factors-including economic, social, and political-are difficult to follow. Therefore, some scholars may be tempted to denounce this kind of large-scale theory as middle-range theory, and hence, consider empirical investigations as supplemental. The objective is thus to shorten the distance between theory and practice. Concrete examples include the study of the influence of foreign capital enterprises on political transformations and minutely detailed categorizations of the hierarchical power system. Another critique of the "fused-prismatic-diffracted" model argues that while it is predicated on the notion of deduction, there is little empirical evidence to support it. Most sciences require empirical evidence so that results can be verified, not only repeatedly but also at any time and place. Moreover, objective comparisons would then likewise be possible. Riggs, however, endeavours to prescribe "formalism" as a given standard, and most scholars consider this concept unsatisfactory. Moreover, when scholars attempt to use Riggs' model to study the administrative systems of foreign countries, they often encounter numerous difficulties. Scholars have also found that in some cases the "fused-prismatic-diffracted model" ignores certain variables, but in others it exaggerates them. For instance, as Riggs himself pointed out, aside from cultural factors others should also be considered. These include historical background, the political structure of postcolonial countries, territorial size, the status of hierarchical power, and the role of the military, as well as social ideologies. Most importantly, the unique circumstances of each country will have a profound influence on administrative behaviour. Yet, these are factors Riggs seldom discusses.

In adopting a deductive process, the "fused prismatic-diffracted" model likewise ignores the ultimate goal of public administration in its attempt to build a value-free science. W. Wilson argues that the primary function of any public administration is to work efficiently. Therefore, it should be obvious that a public administration cannot and should not abandon certain values. Moreover, while the "fused-prismatic-diffracted model" tends to supplement its theory with empirical evidence, it is sometimes difficult to find appropriately related evidence. The uniqueness of Riggs' theory is undeniably influential. Yet, his theory is to some extent

predicated on logical speculation or assumptions. For instance, Riggs believes that formalism is the primary and sole factor in increasing administrative hierarchical power within prismatic societies. This argument, however, is too simple and unequivocal to accept. To illustrate his argument, Riggs uses American society as his model of a diffracted society. The shortcoming here is, although American society is a developed and industrialized country, one cannot infer that it is free of formalism and no longer a prismatic society. Therefore, the theoretical hypothesis that American society is a model which one should use in constructing a diffracted society is both inappropriate and unsatisfactory.

### 3.5 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it can be said that though Riggs provided a new approach to studying public administration. With the ecological approach, Riggs changed the discourse of public administration towards comparative analysis. The model propounded by him brought a breath of fresh air to the traditional domain. But problems remained with this model as with every other model. It was criticised as having a western bias against the newly independent third-world countries. It also avoided the goal of creating a value-free model and thus reduced the basic tenets of Weberian bureaucratic efficiency.

### 3.6 SUMMARY

- Fred Riggs along with other theorists of the comparative public administrative group brought a welcome change to the discipline of public administration.
- The ecological approach propounded by Fred Riggs explained public administration is not a mechanistic institution of state service but rather is an engagement between the environment and its constitutive forces of which its environment is the primary one.
- The Riggsian approach divided the entirety of the environment between agraria, industria and prismatic society.
- There are major drawbacks to the model put forward by Fred Riggs. The western bias against the third world nations, the shifting of the goal of public administration. The inclusion of a differentiated model rather than holism is some of the many problems in the theory of Riggs.

### 3.7 KEYWORDS

1. **Diffracted**- to break up light or sound waves by making them go through a narrow space or across an edge. In the context of Public Administration where the division of typologies takes place.
2. **Prismatic**- the colours formed by the refraction of light through a prism. prismatic effects. In Public Administration shows various formulations in the same society.
3. **Pan-disciplinary**-an approach that brings together knowledge from various disciplines such as literary, anthropological, political etc. to make the research more coherent.
4. **Post-colonial**-The consensus in the field is that "post-colonial" (with a hyphen) signifies a period that comes chronologically "after" colonialism. "Postcolonial," on the other hand, signals the persisting impact of colonization across time periods and geographical regions.
5. **Ecological Approach**-The ecological approach focuses on the perception and control of behaviours that occur naturally, that is, outside the laboratory. In particular, the ecological approach focuses on aspects of the animal and the environment that determine the success or failure of behaviours.

### 3.8 MODEL QUESTIONS

#### SHORT QUESTIONS

Name the people associate with the Comparative public administration group?

Name the book written by Fred Riggs and its core contents?

Which conference in 1968 changed the orientation of public administration towards comparative analysis?

#### MEDIUM QUESTIONS

Explain with suitable examples how the ecological approach began to change the domain of public administration?

Explain prismatic society?

Explain the terms Agraria and Industria?

#### LONG QUESTIONS

Write a brief note on what are the limitations of the Riggsian model of comparative public administration?

Explain with examples the fused diffracted prismatic model?

Public administration has come a long way since the second world war Justify this statement in light of the contribution of Fred Riggs.

### 3.9 REFERENCES

Dahl Robert A. (1947) "The Science of Public Administration" USA: Blackwell Publishing.

Easton David (1957) "An Approach to the Analysis of Political system" New York: Ardent Media Inc

Heady, F. (1979). Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Peng, W. (2008). A Critique of Fred W. Riggs' Ecology of Public Administration. *International Public Management Review*, 9(1), 213–226. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/41288330.pdf>

Pfiffner, J.M. (1946) "Public Administration" New York: The Ronald Company.

Riggs, F.W. (1961) "The Ecology of Public Administration" New York: Asia Publishing House.

Riggs, F. W. (1962). "Trends in the Comparative Study of Public Administration," *International Review of Administrative Science* Vol. 27(1),

Riggs, F. W. (1964). Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Riggs, F. W. (1964). The Ecology of Development. CAG Occasional Paper

Waldo, D. (1967) "The study of Public Administration" New York: Random House.

Willoughby, W.F. (1927) "Principles of Public Administration" Washington: Publications of Institute for Government Research.

## **UNIT 4**

### **FERREL HEADY**

#### **STRUCTURE**

##### **4.1 Learning objectives**

##### **4.2 Introduction**

##### **4.3 FerrelHeady's comparative perspective**

##### **4.4 Advantages of comparative public administration**

##### **4.5 Conclusion**

##### **4.6 Summary**

##### **4.7 Key words**

##### **4.8 Model questions**

##### **4.9 References**

#### **4.1. LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

After studying this Unit, one should be able to:

- Understand the importance of Ferrel Heady in the discipline of comparative public administration.
- Gain knowledge regarding the comparative public administration group that initialised the comparative public administration as a prominent subset of public administration

- Analyse the various ways in which comparative public administration has expanded over the years and helped enrich the discipline of public administration as a whole
- Understand the various ways in which facets of who comparative public administration has transformed from the days of Ferrel Heady to the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

#### **4.2. INTRODUCTION**

The goal of the comparative public administration movement, not unlike that of public administration generally, is the development of a science of administration comprised of general propositions of universal applicability. Where the movement parts company with other approaches to the study of public administration is its choice of subject matter and methodology. It assumes that the science of public administration can only be based upon generalizations drawn from administrative behaviour and practices analysed in widely differing societies and cultures. Moreover, to approach the study of public administration from a broad perspective, the comparative administration movement has found it necessary to develop new methods and techniques of analysis

In 1963, the Comparative Public Administration Group (CAG) was set up, as a committee of the American Society for Public Administration. It was funded from 1963 to 1970 by the Ford Foundation. Fred W. Riggs was the chairman of the group from its inception till the end of 1970. The CAG conducted a series of seminars on comparative administrative systems, focusing on theoretical as well as applied perspectives. It published more than one hundred monographs and brought out several edited anthologies on various themes. The group also sponsored many research studies in countries of Asia, Europe, Latin America, and Africa. Besides, it was instrumental in publishing a quarterly, 'Journal of Comparative Administration' through SAGE publishers; the journal was later re-named Administration and Society, which continues to be published. Among the scholars, who were pioneers in the Comparative Public Administration Movement were Ralph Braibanti, Milton Esman, Ferrel Heady, John Montgomery, Fred Riggs, William Siffin, and Dwight Waldo.

Though Ferrel was most widely recognized for his contributions to comparative public administration, he maintained a clear and coherent focus on public administration as a general area of theory, research, and scholarship, albeit one illumined by his comparative perspective. He also remained an engaged and reflective man who could not separate his intellectual interests from his personal life. This included insightful commentary on his experiences as president of the University of New Mexico during the tumultuous era of Vietnam War protests and the Watergate scandal. Ferrel Heady died on August 16, 2006, at his home in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Together with Fred Riggs, he is widely known and respected as one of the founders of comparative public administration.

#### **4.3. FERREL HEADY'S COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE**

Despite his evident aptitude and ability as an academic administrator and colleague in professional associations, Ferrel Heady was first and foremost a scholar whose work habits and research were performed carefully and meticulously. Rereading the first chapter of his seminal contribution to the field, Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, one is impressed by the breadth and depth of his knowledge of the works of his predecessors and contemporaries. This chapter is a tour de force on the development and status of the field and a must-read for all students of public administration, regardless of whether they are



comparative scholars. Ferrel firmly believed that all students in public administration should be knowledgeable about governments and governance in systems other than that of the United States. Without such comprehension, Ferrel believed, the ability to understand one's nation is limited. Thus, during his lifetime, he advocated "mainstreaming" the comparative perspective into all public administration curricula, and he wrote his classic work to enable such integration.

Ferrel Heady was a broadly educated, well-trained, and skilful scholar whose home discipline was political science. To understand his contributions to the field, one must view his work as focused primarily on comparative public administration but firmly grounded within the discipline of political science. In this regard, Ferrel had much in common with his contemporaries, a group that included Fred Riggs, Dwight Waldo, Alfred Diamant, William Siffin, Lynton Caldwell, Gabriel Almond, Walter Sharp, and many other early contributors to our knowledge of comparative administration.

The record of this "golden era" in comparative public administration is a continuation and expansion of what had already begun during the post-war period. The sheer bulk and great diversity of the output generalizes hazardous. Nevertheless, it is possible to identify some characteristic features, which not only show what was accomplished but also foreshadow some of the predicaments faced later by the comparative administration movement. One obvious enduring influence can be traced to the large-scale post-war effort to export administrative know-how through unilateral and multilateral technical assistance programs. The CAG inherited the then favourable reputation and shared many of the attitudes associated with the public administration technical assistance efforts of the 1950s. Experts in public administration, not only from the United States but from numerous European countries as well, were scattered around the world, engaged in similar projects to export administrative technology, largely drawn from American experience to a multitude of developing countries. Looking back, one of these experts describes the scene as follows: The 1950s was a wonderful period. The "American Dream" was the "World Dream" – and the best and quickest way to bring that dream into reality was through the mechanism of public administration. The net result of all this enthusiastic action was that in the 1950s public administration was a magic term and public administration experts were magicians, of a sort. They were eagerly recruited by the United States aid-giving agencies and readily accepted most of the new nations, along with a lot of other experts as well. Another well-informed participant observer takes 1955 as the baseline year and describes it as "a vintage year in a time of faith – faith in the developmental power of administrative tools devised in the West. It was a sanguine year in a time of hope – hope that public administration could lead countries toward modernization. It was a busy year in a brief age of charity – the not-unmixed charity of foreign assistance. Members of the CAG, many of whom had been or still were active participants in such programs, shared as a group most of the assumptions of the public administration experts, at least initially. Siffin has provided an accurate and perceptive analysis of the orientations, which marked this era, noting several major features.

The first was a tool or technology orientation. The best developed and most widely exported of these processes were in the fields of personnel administration and budgeting and financial administration, but the list included administrative planning, records management, work simplification, tax and revenue administration, and at least the beginnings of computer

technology. Part of the tool orientation was a belief that the use of the tools could be essentially divorced from the substance of the governmental policies, which they would be serving. Second, there was a structural orientation that placed great emphasis on the importance of appropriate organizational arrangements and assumed that organizational decisions could and should be based on rational considerations. For the most part, organizational forms then popular in the West were thought of as the most fitting, and organizations recommended for the developing countries usually emulated some model familiar to the expert at home.

Underlying these administrative manifestations were certain value and contextual orientations that helped explain the specifics of technical assistance recommendations. The instrumental nature of administration was the core value, with related supportive concepts of efficiency, rationality, responsibility, effectiveness, and professionalism. Education and training projects, including the sending of thousands of individuals to developed countries and the establishment of about seventy institutes in developing countries, were designed to inculcate these values as well as transmit technical know-how in specific subjects. Probably most important of all, these normative elements, particularly the commitment to responsibility as a basic value, were in Siffin's words "predicated upon a certain kind of socio-political context – the kind of context which is distinguished in its absence from nearly every developing country in the world." This context included economic, social, political, and intellectual aspects drawn mainly from U.S. experience and to some extent from other Western democratic systems. Politically, for example, these systems operated "within reasonably stable political frameworks, with limited competition for resources and mandates. In this milieu, administrative technologies provided order more than integration.

The political context of administration was generally predictable, supportive, and incrementally expansive." In this and other respects, Siffin concluded that "the radical differences between the U.S. administrative context and various overseas situations were substantially ignored.

#### **4.4. ADVANTAGES OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

The positive influence and contribution of comparative public administration are summarized as follows:

##### **Scientific**

Study of Public Administration Robert Dahl in his well-known article entitled 'The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems' published in *Public Administration Review*, (1947) had observed that there cannot be a science of public administration without a comparative analysis. Even James Coleman, an eminent scholar of comparative politics, had observed "You cannot be scientific if you are not comparative." Through comparative analysis of administrative systems, new insights into the administrative reality in cross-national contexts are generated, which can be treated, as hypotheses to be tested empirically in order to draw generalizations that may apply to many or select groups of nations.

##### **Inter-disciplinary Orientation**

Comparative public administrative studies have several concepts and methodologies from Political Science, Sociology, Economics, Anthropology, Psychology, and other disciplines. This has broadened and enriched the study of public administration to a greater extent. A good number of scholars from different disciplines have contributed to the development of comparative public administration.

### 3. Strengthening Ecological Orientation

Traditional public administration was confined to the description of administrative structures prevailing in certain western countries like the U.S, Great Britain, and France. The environment of public administration was treated, as 'given'. There was no focus on this issue. Contemporary comparative public administration has boldly advocated for the adoption of an ecological approach to the study of administrative systems. This approach has made administrative analysis more realistic and dynamic.

### 4. Universalism

Comparative studies in public administration have challenged parochialism in western studies. The non-western world has experienced and nurtured its own administrative reality that has been elaborated by a host of comparative scholars of whom many of them are western. The conceptual transformation of even the western administrative analysis can be attributed to the insights provided by comparative public administration.

### 5. More Rational

Use of Foreign Assistance Comparative public administration studies have proved to be catalysts to the capacity building of nations receiving aid from international agencies and big powers. The utilization of such assistance has become more prudent, as a result of insights gained from the experiences of different nations.

### 6. Holistic Approach

'Grand' theories of comparative public administration, borrowed from Political Science, Sociology, and Anthropology may not have strengthened scientific analysis of administrative reality, yet they have expanded the vision of public administration by making its scholars and practitioners more aware of the need to look at administrative systems from a 'holistic' angle. This 'systemic' perspective has augmented the understanding of a variety of administrative systems and their subsystems.

### 7. Administrative Development

Comparative studies of public administration have stressed improvements in the structures, processes, and behavioural patterns of public administrative systems in diverse settings. This approach has highlighted that the processes of socio-economic and even political development get speeded up through effective administrative practices. 8. Development Administration A related benefit of the study of comparative public administration has been in the emergence of the concept of 'development administration,' which has become a key strategy for holistic transformation of various societies. It is accepted widely that development administration is a goal-oriented and a change-oriented administration and is the

main engine of all round progress of a country.

#### 4.5. CONCLUSION

The prospects for the comparative public administration movement were not as bright as they had once seemed to be. The period of massive technical assistance in public administration, which had helped launch the movement, was over. The CAG, which had been the organizing force during the years of greatest activity, had lost its separate identity, and the programs it initiated had been ended or cut back. As a source of action-oriented plans for dealing with problems of development administration, the movement had generally been judged disappointing. At any rate, whatever the impact, it had lessened. As a pioneer of the ecological approach F. Riggs through his prismatic model explained the differences between various civilisations and their ways of public management was also an important part of the public administration discipline looking through the lens of comparative politics. His name is thus taken along with Heady as a theorist who not only popularised comparative administration but developed it further for future generations. Moreover, earlier optimistic expectations about the possibilities of transferring or inducing a change in developing societies had come into question, as many of these nations were suffering from increasing rather than decreasing problems of economic growth and political stability.

As an academic or intellectual enterprise, comparative administration had moved from a position of innovation and vitality to a more defensive posture, reacting to charges that the promises of its youth had not been fulfilled and to advice from various quarters as to remedial measures. During the decades of the 1980s and 1990s, however, there has been a reassuring revival of activity in comparative public administration. The exuberance of the movement's youth has not been regained, but the field may have attained maturity – a stage of development bringing fewer drastic changes but presenting a new set of challenges and problems.

Today's public administration functions in a different time and faces different challenges, requiring new concepts and methods. Realizing the massive influence of unfolding globalism, comparative public administration opens the door for effective adjustment and transition from traditional, ethnocentric perspectives to a wider scope that integrates knowledge from various places and cultures. There is no one way to get to the place where public administration ought to be. The students of public administration still study comparative public administration whenever any necessity arises. The meteoric rise of comparative public administration was due to the formation of Comparative Administration Group and financial help given by the Ford Foundation. Today, students of public administration do not display excessive interest in the subject. But sometimes they say that the administrative systems of different countries should be studied in a comparative way in order to have a full understanding of all aspects of the subject. Comparative administration remains a potent weapon in the hands of administrators, theorists, technocrats, bureaucrats and policy makers to improvise their domains both intellectually and materialistically. The state remains the focal point of international power and without a proper administrative system running the state is like running a car blindfolded, doomed to destruction. There is an ample scope for governments to learn from each other's successes as well as failures and comparative political analysis creates that opportunity for study.

#### 4.6. SUMMARY

- Ferrel Heady has been one of the most prominent comparative public administration theorists of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The corpus of his work as enlightened not only the discipline of public administration but public management as well.
- Through the CAG Heady and other theorists led a new approach to public administration and opened the sector for more nuanced, holistic and approach to studying newer dimensions of public administration.
- Heady has highlighted the co-existence of normative studies, empirical studies, ideographic studies, nomothetic studies, non-ecological studies, and ecological studies in the discipline of comparative public administration and this co-existence represents the nature of the discipline.
- With major contributions from Riggs, Heady, Dahl and others today CPA is contributing to the science of public administration, re-enforcing the Inter-disciplinary and ecological orientation, calling for development administration.
- With the advent of modern administrative development has positive influencing of the intellectual development of the discipline of public administration and has broadened its structure, processes, roles, and behaviour, as such.

#### 4.7. KEYWORDS

1. **Incremental-** of, relating to, being, or occurring in especially small amounts of change
2. **Instrumental-** serving as a crucial means, agent
3. **Tool orientation-** changing the direction or approach of solving a problem with the medium of equipment or policy
4. **Ecological Approach-** an approach that focuses on the primacy of the environment in public administration.
5. **Comparative analysis-** when two or more things are compared qualitatively or quantitatively to choose the best option towards problem resolution is called comparative analysis.

#### 4.8 MODEL QUESTIONS

##### SHORT QUESTIONS

Mention the prominent members of the comparative public administration group (CAG)?

What were the two incidents that affected the thoughts of Ferrel Heady at the University of New Mexico?

Why thousands of individuals were sent to developed countries and the establishment of about seventy institutes in developing countries, undertaken by the US government?

##### MEDIUM QUESTION

Write a short note on comparative public administration in the 21<sup>st</sup> century?

Mention any 2 prominent criticisms of a comparative approach to public administration?

What are the supportive concepts of administration? Explain

## **LONG QUESTIONS**

Write a short note on the contributions of Ferrel Heady to the discipline of comparative public administration?

Explain in detail about Comparative Public Administration Group?

A comparative approach to public administration has expanded the domain of knowledge of public administration to newer areas- justify this statement?

## **4.9 REFERENCES**

- Arora, Ramesh K. 2021. *Comparative Public Administration: An Ecological Perspective*. New Delhi: New Age International.
- Dahl, Robert, 1947. "The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems," *Public Administration Review* 7, No.1.
- Heady, Ferrel. 1995. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Heady, Ferrel, and Sybil S. Stokes, eds. 1960. *Comparative Public Administration: A Selective Annotated Bibliography*. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, Institute of Public Administration
- Henry, Nicholas. 2004. *Public Administration and Public Affairs*. Upper Sadle River, N.J.: Pearson.
- Jreisat, J. E. (2005). Comparative Public Administration Is Back In, Prudently. *Public Administration Review*, 65(2), 231–242. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2005.00447.x>
- Riggs, Fred W 1961. *Ecology of Public Administration*. London: Asia Publishing House
- Rosenbloom, David H. 1998. *Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics, and Law in the Public Sector*. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Siffin, William J., ed. 1957. *Toward the Comparative Study of Public Administration*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

## **UNIT 5**

### **A CRITIQUE OF FERREL HEADY**

#### **STRUCTURE**

- 5.1 Learning objectives**
- 5.2 Introduction**
- 5.3 Riggs and Heady**
- 5.4 FerrelHeady's comparative perspective**
- 5.5 Conclusion**
- 5.6 Summary**
- 5.7 Key words**
- 5.8 Model questions**

## 5.9 References

### 5.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After studying this unit, one would be able to-

- Understand the life and contributions of Ferrel Heady to the area of comparative public administration.
- Explain the various approaches Ferrel Heady and Fred Riggs proposed to diversify the field of comparative politics
- Critically analyse the various structures that are important to study comparative public administration

### 5.2 INTRODUCTION

Heady's work focused on the study of comparative public administration, which involves examining how public administration operates in different countries and contexts. He is known for developing a conceptual framework that identified three different types of administrative systems: the Anglo-Saxon model, the Germanic model, and the Napoleonic model.

Heady also wrote extensively on topics such as bureaucracy, organizational theory, and public policy, and his work has had a significant impact on the field of public administration. He was a professor of political science at the University of Kansas for many years, and his contributions to the field continue to be studied and discussed by scholars today.

Ferrel Heady served his country and his profession for over 65 years in the armed forces, as the political science faculty at several noted universities, as a university president, and as leader of several professional associations supporting public administration and public service (*Public Administration Review* 1994). After earning his PhD in political science from Washington University (St. Louis) in 1940, Ferrel Heady served in the US Navy during World War II. After the War, he taught political science at the University of Michigan (1946-1966), where he also served as director of the Institute of Public Administration (1960-1966). He moved to the University of New Mexico in 1967, where he served as president from 1968 to 1975. From 1975-1981 he returned to the political science faculty, where he served as Professor Emeritus until he died in 2006.

Despite his evident aptitude and ability as an academic administrator and colleague in professional associations, Ferrel Heady was first and foremost a scholar, whose work habits and work were performed carefully and meticulously. Rereading the first chapter of his seminal contribution to the field, *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective* one is impressed by the breadth and depth of his knowledge of the works of his predecessors and contemporaries. This chapter is a tour de force on the development and status of the field and is a “must read” for all students of public administration, whether they are comparative scholars. Ferrel believed firmly that all students in public administration should be

knowledgeable about government and governance in systems other than the U.S. Without such comprehension Ferrel believed that the ability to understand one's own nation was limited. Thus, during his lifetime he continued to advocate "mainstreaming" the comparative perspective into all public administration curricula, and he wrote the classic work to promote such integration.

Ferrel Heady's contributions to public administration literature began in the 1940s with law review articles on administrative rule making (Public Administration Review 1994). Over the next 15 years, he continued with a steady stream of articles and monographs on state-level administrative reform, primarily published through the Institute of Public Administration and its predecessor organizations at the University of Michigan and the National Municipal League.

Beginning in the late 1950s, his interests expanded into comparative public administration, inaugurating what most consider the primary focus of his career. For these efforts, he selected "bureaucracy" as an overarching variable common to public administration throughout the world and, hence, an appropriate focus for the study of public administration from a comparative perspective. His work in this period included articles in scholarly journals, contributed book chapters, an edited book and occasional papers published through the Comparative Administration Group (CAG) of the American Society for Public Administration. It culminated with the publication of the treatise *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, eventually rendered in six editions over 35 years. His comparative publications in this period also included several journal articles.

While Ferrel Heady was most widely recognized for his contributions to comparative public administration, he maintained a clear and coherent focus on public administration as a general area of theory, research and scholarship, albeit one illuminated by his comparative perspective. He also remained an engaged and reflective man who could not separate his intellectual interests from his personal life. This included his insightful commentary on his experiences as president of the University of New Mexico during the tumultuous era of Vietnam War protests and Watergate scandal.

### **5.3 RIGGS AND HEADY**

Ferrel Heady and Fred W. Riggs are two prominent American political scientists who made significant contributions to the field of public administration. Both scholars were pioneers in the comparative study of public administration and emphasized the importance of context in understanding administrative systems. While their work had similarities, they had different perspectives and approaches to the study of public administration. Fred W. Riggs was a political scientist who made significant contributions to the field of comparative public administration. Riggs believed that administrative systems could not be fully understood without considering the broader social, cultural, economic, and political context in which they operate. He believed that administrative systems are shaped by cultural factors, which influence the behaviour of bureaucrats and the way in which they interact with citizens. Riggs was particularly interested in the relationship between administrative systems and development. He believed that administrative systems were critical to the development of countries and that understanding administrative systems was key to understanding why some countries developed while others did not. Riggs also argued that administrative systems in



developing countries were often characterized by "dualism," where traditional and modern systems coexist and compete.

Riggs' most significant contribution to the field of public administration was his concept of "prismatic societies," which he developed in his book "Administration in Developing Countries." Riggs described prismatic societies as societies in which multiple social forces coexist and compete, resulting in a complex and dynamic environment. This concept has been widely used in the study of public administration in developing countries and has helped scholars understand the complex and diverse administrative systems in these countries.

Ferrel Heady, on the other hand, was a political scientist who focused on the comparative study of administrative systems. Heady believed that a comparative study of administrative practices across countries could provide insights into how administrative systems functioned and what factors influenced their development. He identified three different types of administrative systems: the Anglo-Saxon model, the Germanic model, and the Napoleonic model.

Heady's classification system helped scholars understand how different administrative traditions evolved in different countries. He highlighted the importance of cultural, social, economic, and political factors in shaping administrative systems. Heady's work also emphasized the importance of context in shaping administrative systems. He believed that administrative systems could not be fully understood without considering the broader social, cultural, economic, and political context in which they operate.

One of Heady's most important contributions to the field of public administration was his conceptualization of the three models of administrative systems. He explained the Anglo-Saxon model to be characterized by individualism, with a focus on individual rights and freedoms, decentralized decision-making, and limited government. In contrast, the Germanic model is characterized by the rule of law, with a highly centralized administrative system focused on efficiency and effectiveness. The Napoleonic model, on the other hand, emphasized centralization with a highly hierarchical administrative system controlled by the central government.

While Riggs and Heady had different perspectives on the study of public administration, their work had some similarities. Both scholars emphasized the importance of context in shaping administrative systems. They both believed that administrative systems could not be fully understood without considering the broader social, cultural, economic, and political context in which they operate.

Riggs and Heady also shared an interest in the study of bureaucracy. Riggs was particularly interested in the behaviour of bureaucrats, and he believed that cultural factors played a significant role in shaping their behaviour. Heady, on the other hand, was interested in the structure and organization of bureaucracies and how they differed across countries.

In conclusion, Fred W. Riggs and Ferrel Heady were two influential political scientists who made significant contributions to the field of public administration. Their work emphasized the importance of context in understanding administrative systems and helped scholars understand the complex and diverse administrative

## **5.4 FERREL HEADY'S COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE**

Ferrel Heady was one of the most influential scholars in the field of public administration during the mid-twentieth century. He is perhaps best known for his comparative perspective on public administration, which he developed during a time when there was increasing interest in studying the differences and similarities among administrative systems in different countries. Heady believed that studying public administration comparatively could help us understand how different administrative systems functioned and what factors influenced their development. He argued that the study of public administration should not be limited to the examination of administrative practices within a single country, but rather should be extended to a comparative study of administrative practices across countries. Heady's comparative perspective was based on the belief that administrative systems were shaped by a complex interplay of cultural, social, economic, and political factors. He argued that different countries had different administrative traditions, which were influenced by their histories, cultures, and political systems.

One of Heady's most significant contributions to the study of comparative public administration was his identification of three different types of administrative systems: the Anglo-Saxon model, the Germanic model, and the Napoleonic model. The Anglo-Saxon model, according to Heady, was characterized by a strong tradition of individualism, which placed a high value on individual rights and freedoms. Administrative systems in countries such as the United States and the United Kingdom were said to reflect this tradition, with a focus on limited government, decentralized decision-making, and a strong emphasis on individual rights. The Germanic model, on the other hand, was characterized by a strong emphasis on the rule of law, with a highly centralized administrative system that placed a premium on efficiency and effectiveness. Countries such as Germany and the Netherlands were said to reflect this tradition, with a strong focus on hierarchical structures, bureaucratic procedures, and a commitment to achieving specific goals.

Finally, the Napoleonic model was characterized by a strong emphasis on centralization, with a highly hierarchical administrative system that was tightly controlled by the central government. Countries such as France and Italy were said to reflect this tradition, with a strong focus on centralized decision-making, bureaucratic formalism, and a commitment to implementing government policies. Heady's comparative perspective on public administration also emphasized the importance of context in shaping administrative systems. He argued that administrative systems could not be fully understood without taking into account the broader social, cultural, economic, and political context in which they operated. For example, he argued that the differences in administrative systems between the United States and the United Kingdom could be explained by the fact that the United States had a stronger tradition of individualism, while the United Kingdom had a stronger tradition of collectivism. Similarly, he argued that the differences in administrative systems between Germany and France could be explained by the fact that Germany had a stronger tradition of bureaucratic efficiency, while France had a stronger tradition of centralized decision-making.

## **5.5 CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, Ferrel Heady's comparative perspective on public administration was a significant contribution to the field, as it helped to broaden the scope of the study of public

administration beyond the borders of individual countries. Heady's identification of three different types of administrative systems, along with his emphasis on the importance of context, helped to provide a framework for the comparative study of public administration that continues to be relevant today.

## 5.6 SUMMARY

- Ferrel Heady was a pioneering scholar in the field of comparative public administration, and his work helped to establish the comparative approach as a key method for studying public administration and governance.
- Heady's approach to comparative public administration emphasized the importance of cultural and historical context in shaping administrative systems, and he sought to develop a more nuanced and contextualized understanding of public administration across different countries and regions.
- Heady's seminal book "Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective" introduced a set of comparative analytical categories that helped researchers to identify and compare different dimensions of administrative systems, including the structure, function, culture, and performance of government organizations.
- Heady's comparative method has been influential in shaping the development of public administration as a field of study, and has also had broader implications for the study of comparative politics, international relations, and development studies.
- Despite some criticisms of his approach, Heady's work remains highly regarded and continues to inspire new research on the comparative study of public administration and governance.

## 5.7 KEYWORDS

1. **Comparative Public Administration** - The study of public administration systems and practices across different countries and regions, with a focus on identifying similarities and differences, and analysing the causes and consequences of these variations.
2. **Administrative Culture** - The values, beliefs, norms, and attitudes that shape the behaviour of individuals and organizations within public administration systems, and that influence the design and implementation of public policies and programs.
3. **Contextualization** - The process of understanding and interpreting social phenomena in their specific historical, cultural, and institutional contexts, rather than treating them as universal or abstract concepts.
4. **Analytical Categories** - Conceptual frameworks or sets of criteria used to identify and analyse different aspects of public administration systems, such as the structure, function, culture, and performance of government organizations.
5. **Development Administration** - A subfield of public administration that focuses on the challenges and opportunities of promoting economic, social, and political development in less developed countries, and that emphasizes the importance of context-specific approaches and participatory governance.

## 5.8 MODEL QUESTIONS

### SHORT QUESTIONS

How did Heady define and approach the study of administrative culture?

In which areas did Riggs and Heady differ?

What is the Germanic model proposed by Heady?

## **MEDIUM QUESTIONS**

In what ways did FerrelHeady's approach to comparative public administration reflect broader intellectual trends and debates in the social sciences during the mid-20th century?

What was FerrelHeady's main contribution to the field of comparative public administration?

In what ways did Heady's work challenge traditional assumptions about public administration?

## **LONG QUESTIONS**

What were Ferrel Heady's key ideas and contributions to the field of comparative public administration, and how have these ideas influenced the study of public administration today?

How did Ferrel Heady's work challenge traditional assumptions about the study and practice of public administration, and what were some of the key debates and controversies sparked by his ideas?

How did Ferrel Heady approach the study of administrative culture, and what were some of the key insights and findings he developed through his research in this area?

## **5.9 REFERENCES**

- Heady, F. (1956). Public Administration and the Comparative Method. *Public Administration Review*, 16(2), 81-89.
- Heady, F. (1966). The Comparative Approach to Public Administration. In R. C. Macridis (Ed.), *Modern Comparative Politics* (pp. 582-603). Prentice-Hall.
- Jones, L. R. (2007). The Consummate Comparative Public Administrationist: A Tribute to Ferrel Heady (1916-2006). *Public Administration Quarterly*, 31(1), 132-136.
- Meier, K. J., & O'Toole Jr., L. J. (2005). Ferrel Heady and the Comparative Study of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 65(5), 554-563.
- Stillman II, R. J. (Ed.). (2015). *Ferrel Heady: A Pioneer in Comparative Public Administration*. Lexington Books.
- Stillman II, R. J. (2016). A Tribute to Ferrel Heady: A Pioneer in Comparative Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 76(6), 856-858.

## **BLOCK: III PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY**

### **UNIT I**

#### **BACKGROUND**

##### **Structure**

1.1 Learning Objectives

1.2 INTRODUCTION

1.3 WHAT IS PUBLIC CHOICE

1.4 BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT

1.5 BASIC PREMISES OF PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY

1.6 APPLYING ECONOMICS TO POLITICS AND GOVERNANCE

1.7 BASIC METHODOLOGY OF PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY

1.8 PUBLIC CHOICE CHALLENGE TO ORTODOX THINKING

1.9 PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY A PARADIGM SHIFT IN OUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

1.10 CONCLUSION

1.11 SUMMARY

1.12 GLOSSARY

1.13 MODEL QUESTIONS

1.14 REFERENCES

## **1.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

After reading this unit, students will be able to

- Discuss the basic concept of public choice theory
- Explain the origin and development of public choice theory

## **1.2 INTRODUCTION**

'Public choice'/'public choice theory' is a relatively new science located at the interface between economics and politics was founded in 1948 by Duncan Black, who died in 1991 without ever achieving full recognition as the Founding Father of the discipline. It received widespread public attention in 1986, when James Buchanan, a leading architect was awarded the Nobel Prize in 'Economic Science' for his developmental of the contractual and constitutional base for the theory of economic and political decision making. It is James Buchanan only who is known as the father of the Public Choice Theory. Public Choice Theory is the use the methods and tools of economics to explore how politics and government works. It is the subset of positive political theory that studies self-interested agents like Voters, politicians and bureaucrats and their interactions to the politics and governance. Public choice has roots in positive analysis but is often used for normative purposes in order to identify a problem or suggests improvement in different aspects of governance and politics.

The major proponents of public choice theory are James Buchanan, Gordon Tullock, Niskanen, Anthony Downs and Vincent Ostrom.

This particular course designed to have detailed study of public choice theory and seek to explain the background, basic tenets, its contribution and limitations. Whereas, this particular unit mainly attempt to explain the origin and development of the modern public choice theory, visit the early writings, discuss the premise of the theory and an attempt to focus on advent of public choice theory in the broad discipline of public administration.

### **1.3 What is Public Choice?**

Public Choice is the application of economics to the analysis of non-market decision-making involving public goods, externalities and income distribution. Public choice takes the principles that economists use to analyse people's actions in the marketplace and applies them to people's actions in politics and an administration. Public choice as defined by Dennis Mueller is “the economic study of non-market decision making or simply application of economics to political science. The subject matter of Public Choice is same as that of political science: the theory of the state, voting rules, voter behaviour, party politics, the bureaucracy and so on. The methodology of Public Choice is economics an inherently interdisciplinary field. As public choice is often referred to as a school of economics however” (1979). The interesting fact of the theory is that it does not try to explain how the economy works. Rather, Public choice uses the methods and tools of economics to explore and understand how politics and government works.

## **1.4 BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT**

### **1.4.1 HISTORY OF PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY**

An early precursor of modern public choice theory was the work of the two French mathematician J.C Borda(1781) and M.de Condorcet (1785). Condorcet considered the first person to discover the problem of cycling by using the simple majority rule where one can decide or choose among the alternatives in the decision making. The Codorcet work has raised some important questions which modern public choice is also concerned. Following the Borda and Condorcet, there comes Lewis Carroll wrote a series of pamphlets analysing the properties of voting procedures roughly a century after the work of Borda and Condorcet. Wicksell and John C. Calhoun also seen as forerunner of the public choice theory. Wicksell wrote the classic essay on Just Taxation and his normative inquiry regarding the economic justification of the

state.v John c. Calhoun writing on political economy anticipate the “public choice revolution” in modern economics and an administration.

#### **1.4. 2 MODERN PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY**

The Scottish economist Duncan Black rediscovered Borda’s and Condorcet’s ideas again, and made them widely available to the English speaking world. Black’s 1948 articles on the electoral problems that Borda and Condorcet posed make him arguably the “founder of modern Public Choice”. Black’s most important contribution to Public Choice theory is his famous “*Median Voter Theorem*” and rediscovered earlier work on voting theory. In 1951, the American economist (and later Nobel laureate) Kenneth Arrow made another major contribution with his Impossibility Theorem. His book *Social Choice and Individual Values* (1951) influenced formulation of the theory of public choice and election theory. One of Arrow’s students, Anthony Downs, also worked on the median-voter issue, but he is best known for his 1957 application of rational choice theory across the workings of the political marketplace. Tremendous growth in the study of the Public Choice trace back to year 1962 and 1963 when James Buchanan introduced normative rules like *Politics as Exchange, Economic Constitutionalism* which were constitutive of the public choice. The Gordon Tullock co-authored book *Calculus of consent* with J.M Buchanan which made them leading scholar in the field. Not only that, Tullock’s rent-seeking article has proved to be a hidden classic which made the public choice theory more empirical. Application of economics to the study of politics has taken to understand the social function of democracy by Joseph Schumpeter in book *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. Following Tullock and Buchanan it is 1971, William Niskanen’s study on Bureaucracy from the economic methodology became new area of study in the field of public choice. With Niskanen marked the end of first generation of Public Choice theorists. First generation theorists has mainly led the foundational stones to public choice theory and latter second generation and third generation theorist like McKelvey (1976) and Schofield (1978) William Riker’s (1982) implemented the economic



methods in different direction. The scholar like Riker studied “Populist Democracy” through the lenses of the public choice. Taylor and Herman (1971) has measured the length of a government’s life and related this length to various characteristics of the government. Person and Tabellini (2000, 2003) have developed and tested hypotheses about the effects of electoral rules on political outcomes such as the size and composition of state budgets, rent seeking and corruption. Their work uncovers significant differences between two- and multi-party systems, and between presidential and parliamentary systems.

The field of public choice is now some sixty years old and it has become important theory in almost all three subject, political sciences, public administration and economics. it has brought the tremendous shift in the methodology of political and an administrative science. Important theoretical breakthroughs are fewer and farther between than during the field’s first 25 years. If we see the much current research, it consists of extending existing theories in different directions, and of filling in the remaining empty interstices in the body of theory. Robert Tollison states that the “Public Choice can now be said to be both an interdisciplinary and an international field of research.”

### **1.5 THE BASIC PREMISE OF PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY:**

- Its major concern is public investment and public expenditure decisions.
- Public choice assumes that people gets motivated by the ‘self-interest’. Public choice theorist believes that the primary motive in people's action in the marketplace whether they are employers, employees, or consumers is mainly the concern for themselves.
- In short, the basic premise of the public choice is that every individual is driven by the self-interest and as a rational person, it focuses to increase its self-interest. When this premise applied to the role of the government and bureaucracy, Public choice theory makes an important interference.
- JamesM Buchanan has pointed out that in this context that political theorists while examining the public policies made by the mere politicians, executives, bureaucrats they ignore the “open” system of behavioural analysis mainly the role of self-interest,

imperfect information and the role of incentives in shaping politicians' choices. He further argues, if people takes incentive in market then it is possible people respond to the government incentive.

- In a welfare state also it is perfectly possible for a self-interested majority to exploit the minority by voting themselves public benefits. So, the major concern of the public choice theory lies to explore major aspect of politics and an administration by using the economic method.
- Market may fail to provide adequately in such areas does not necessarily mean that government can do things better, there is 'government failure' too.
- Political decision-making is not a dispassionate pursuit of the 'public interest', but can involve a struggle between different personal and group interests. There is no single 'public interest' anyway. We live in a world of value-pluralism: different people have different values and different interests. Competition between competing interests is inevitable. This makes it vital to study how such competing interests and demands are resolved by the political process.

## **1.6 APPLYING ECONOMICS TO POLITICS AND GOVERNANCE**

Public Choice is about applying these simple economic concepts to the study of how collective choices are made- applying them to such things as the design and workings of constitutions, election mechanisms, political parties, interest groups, lobbying, bureaucracy, parliaments, committees and other parts of the governmental system.

- public choice emphasis upon Political decision, the main concern of the theory to understand how individual makes political decisions. As per the public choice theorists, in collective political decisions, such as to raise the commercial taxes or build a new bridge or a road are just as economic as they too involve a choice between costs and benefits and it is not just financial costs and benefits, but, more broadly, between whatever has to be sacrificed and whatever is gained as a result
- Another important assumption of public choice theory is that, when someone makes an economic choice, they personally experience both the costs and benefits. However, in Public Choices, by contrast, the people who benefit are not always the who bear the cost. Butler has pointed out that, in market both the customer and seller have to give

consent before transaction, if either the buyer or seller doesn't agree to deal, they can simply walk away. However, in politics the minority cannot walk away, they are forced to accept the decision of the majority, and bear the sacrifices that collective choice demands. Now, that makes self-interested majority to exploit the minority, by voting themselves public benefits that impose financial or other burdens on other people.

- what makes crucial to study how such government decisions are made is for the fact that government can use coercion to force minorities to go along with the majority decisions.

So, the public theorist uses the economic method to understand how government decisions are made, and public choice theory help us to understand this process, to identify problems such as the self-interest of particular group and the potential exploitation of coerced minorities and to propose the ways to deal with these shortcomings.

## **1.7 BASIC METHODOLOGY OF PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY**

### **1. METHODOLOGICAL INDIVIDUALISM:**

The idea of the Methodological Individualism has been out forwarded by the Joseph Schumpeter. as it has been said "work in Public choice begins with the methodological Individualism". In the theory of the public choice, the individual stand for the basic unit of analysis and the public goods, service and the decision structure is the analytical variable. Individuals are assumed to be self-interested. The word "self-interest" is not equivalent to preferences which affect the decisions they make, and that those preferences may differ from individual to individual. Groups, organizations, or even societies, are also is the composition of these individuals, it is not different institutions. As other social science stream, talks of group decision making being different from individual decision- making, the public choice approach denies the legitimacy of decision making at the group level.

### **2. RATIONAL CHOICE**

The second important element of public choice which is closely related to the first is the rational choice. According to the S. Sen, Rational Choice is merely the modern application of the attribute of '*measuring the pleasure plain calculus*' that according to

the classical philosophers follow. It considers but one aspect of the human behaviour, namely decision making in specific environment. Individuals are assumed to be rational. Rationality is defined as the ability to rank all known alternatives available to the individual in a transitive manner. Individuals are assumed to adopt maximizing strategies. Maximization as a strategy implies the consistent choice of those alternatives which an individual think will provide the highest net benefit. Public choice theorist claim that even politics should not analysed from a 'public interest' perspective but, rather from an 'individual gain- maximizing' concept. Even the politicians, bureaucrats, and voters also act to maximize the personal gains. Rational Choice theory attempts looks to individual decision making as the source of collective political outcomes and suggests that the individual function according to the logic of rational self-interest. Through the assumptions of rational self-interest, positive political theory postulates a specific motivational foundation for behaviour.

### **3. POLITICS AS EXCHANGE**

Public choice scholars argue that politics is as system of exchange. It considers the realisation of certain ends arises as a result of bargaining and exchange among individuals. However, the exchange takes place in the political sphere or public sphere rather than the market place. Exchange takes place in political realm between various players to gain mutual benefits.

#### **1.8 THE PUBLIC CHOICE CHALLENGE TO ORTHODOX THINKING**

Post-war 'welfare' scholars seek hard to measure the costs and benefits of policy proposals such as new roads or airports, and to identify how 'social welfare' might be increased and maximised by the right choices. They believed such work would inform and improve public decision making and those policy decisions would be made logically and rationally, by enlightened and impartial officials, pursuing the public interest. That in turn would make them far superior to market choices, driven as they were by self-interest and private profit.

Public choice theorists showed the dissatisfaction to the assumption and they pointed out that the people who make public decisions are, in fact, just as self-interested as anyone else. They are, after all, the same people; individuals do not suddenly become angels when they get a job in government. Public Choice does not necessarily argue that all actions to influence government policy are self-interested. They further pointed out that we should not assume that people behave differently in the marketplace for goods and services from how they behave when influencing government decisions. It is prudent to assume that self-interest might motivate people.

It was a great challenge for the orthodox thinkers when Buchanan, with his co-author Gordon Tullock, applied this 'economic' view of human beings systematically through the institutions of government – suggesting that legislators, officials and voters all use the political process to advance their private interests, just as they do in the marketplace. Even more fascinating was their conclusion that political decisions, far from being made efficiently and dispassionately in pursuit of the 'public interest', could well be less efficient, less rational and more vulnerable to manipulation by vested interests than the supposedly flawed market process.

### **1.9 PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY A PARADIGM SHIFT IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

The primary contribution of public choice theory in the field of public administration has been the fact that it has questioned the very basis of bureaucracy run governance. If we look back to the history of inception of public choice in public administration, it is the Vincent Ostrom who is the key promoter of theories in the public administration. The conceptual framework pivoting on bureaucratization theory they adopted at its inception as an academic discipline, led to a theoretical crisis and a practical dead-end. Vincent Ostrom offered an alternative: Public Choice. He proposed that Public Choice should be in fact the foundational theoretical framework for Public Administration. He further pointed out that "the proper foundation of Public Administration is in Public Choice theory. The proper operational basis of Public Choice is Public Administration"(p116)

policy and an institutional change that executes in modern is happen mainly through the Public Administration apparatus. Public Choice has profoundly and programmatically engaged the territory of an already established domain, the field and practice of Public Administration. It has been said that, irrespective of the field and discipline when it comes to address the policy issues means dealing with the mechanisms and the processes of the modern administrative state. A large part of the reforms and policy implications emerging from the insights of the Public Choice research program are precisely about the institutional structure of the administrative state and its functioning at all of its different levels: from the lowest, the operational one, to the highest, constitutional choice.

Public Administration is first and foremost about the building, maintaining and operating in real life structures and processes that function as preconditions the infrastructure and determinants of real-life public policies and their management. From the operation of the electoral system to the implementation of macroeconomic policies, from the monitoring and enforcement of constitutional rules to the regulatory framework of the market, the apparatus of Public Administration is vital. Ostrom pointed that Public Administration and Public Choice are connected intrinsically, they seem to be different facets of the same coin. In brief, Public Choice, whether one is aware of it or not, whether one likes it or not, is, when it comes to the applications, more about Public Administration than about anything else.

During the initial decades of Public Choice, the Bloomington scholars were the main promoters of the Public Choice revolution in the field of Public Administration. In the '60s and '70s their work was in many respects defined by a systematic attempt not only to introduce Public Choice insights into the discipline dealing with the study of the administrative side of public affairs but, even more, to revolutionize this field, to incite a "paradigm shift" towards the Public Choice foundational principles.

### **1.10 CONCLUSION**

Public Choice theory made a powerful impact in the study of politics and an administration. It has led to some major rethinking of the very nature of elections, legislatures and

bureaucracies; and on whether the political process can claim to be in any way superior to the market process. Public choice theory in the study of political process, institutions, and public policies has brought a new insight in study of social science. Its basic assumption about the human nature and political decision making and study of it through the economic lenses has brought a challenge to all conservative and normative theories. Public choice did not emerge from some profoundly new insight, some new discovery, some social science miracle. The essential wisdom of the 18th century, of Adam Smith and classical political economy was lost through two centuries of intellectual folly. Public choice does little more than incorporate a rediscovery of this wisdom and its implications into economic analyses of modern politics.

In this unit, the attempt has been made to explain the basic concept of the public choice. Its history of origin and evolution from a small assumption to one of the most influential theory in political science and public administration. Its challenge to orthodox theories by applying this 'economic' view of human beings systematically through the institutions of government. the relationship of the public choice with the public administration and how the advent of the public choice approach has brought the theoretical shift in public administration.

### **1.11 SUMMARY**

- Public Choice applies the methods of economics to the theory and practice of politics and government. This approach has given us important insights into the nature of democratic decision-making.
- Collective decision-making is necessary in some areas. However, the fact that the market may fail to provide adequately in such areas does not necessarily mean that government can do things better
- Public Choice is about applying these simple economic concepts to the study of how collective choices are made- applying them to such things as the design and workings of constitutions, election mechanisms, political parties, interest groups, lobbying, bureaucracy, parliaments, committees and other parts of the governmental system.
- Public Choice has profoundly and programmatically engaged the territory of an already established domain, the field and practice of Public Administration.

### **1.12 GLOSSARY**

- Externalities: A consequence of an industrial or commercial activity which affects other parties without this being reflected in market prices.
- Value- pluralism: the idea that there are several values which may be equally correct and fundamental and yet in conflict with each other.
- Paradigm: A set of theories that explain the way a particular subject is understood at a particular time.
- Macroeconomics: the branch of economics concerned with large-scale or general economic factors, such as interest rates and national productivity.

### **1.13 MODEL QUESTIONS**

1. What is public choice? discuss in detail the application of economic in politics and an administration.
2. Discuss in detail the origin and development of public choice theory.
3. what are the major premise of public choice theory? explain basic methodology of the theory in brief.
4. Explain 'public choice theory a paradigm shifts in public administration'.

### **Write Short notes on**

1. Methodological Individualism
2. Politics as Exchange
3. Rational Choice
4. public choice as challenge to orthodox thinking

### **1.14 REFERENCES**

Aligica, Paul Dragos. (2015) *Public Administration, Public Choice and the Ostroms: the achievements, the failure, the promise*. NewYork. SpringerScience Business Media. DOI 10.1007/s11127-014-0225-8.



Muller D (2008). Public Choice: An Introduction. In Lawrence A and Ingram Helen M. (Ed). *Politics, Policy & Public Choice: A critique & A Proposal*: The University of Chicago Press. Jstor.

Sen. S (2010). *Consent, Constitutions and Contrast; Public Choice Perspective on the state*. In Dhameja, A Contemporary Debate in Public Administration. New Delhi, India: PHI Learning Pvt Ltd.

Ostrom, Vincent and Ostrom, Elinor. (1971). *A Different Approach to The Study of Public Administration*. Wiley. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/974676>

Rowley, CharlesK. (2008). Public Choice and Constitutional Political Economy. In Lawrence A and Ingram Helen M. (Ed). *Politics, Policy & Public Choice: A critique & A Proposal*: The University of Chicago Press. Jstor.(Schneider, 2008)

Basu, Rumki (Revised Edn.) (2004) *Public Administration: Concepts and Theories*. New Delhi, India: Sterling Publishers

Bhattacharya Mohit. (2010) Public Choice Theory: Government in the New Right Perspective. In Dhameja, A (Ed). *Contemporary Debates in Public Administration*. New Delhi, India: PHI Learning Pvt Ltd.

Schneider, C. K. (2008). *Readings in Public Choice and Constitutional Economy* . Springer.

## **UNIT 2**

### **BASIC TENETS OF PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY**

#### **Structure**

2.1 Learning Objectives

2.2 INTRODUCTION

2.3 BASIC TENETS OF PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY

2.4 COLLECTIVE DECISION MAKING

2.5 GOVERNMENTAL FAILURE

2.6 VARIOUS SCHOOL OF THOUGHT

2.7 CONCLUSION

2.8 SUMMARY

2.9 GLOSSARY

2.10 MODEL QUESTIONS

2.11 REFERENCES

### **2.1 Learning Objectives**

After reading this unit, the student will be able to

- explain about the basic tenets of Public choice theory
- clarify about the institution and mechanism of public choice theory
- elucidate the different school of public choice approach

### **2.2 INTRODUCTION**

In order to understand the theory, it is very important to have clear conception of the principle, methodological base and mechanism of particular theory. So, like other theories, public choice theory has its own analytical unit as the individual, public goods and public choice. The public choice theorist has made the various assumptions regarding the individual behaviour and they came up with methods which has become the foundational base of the theory. This unit consists of basic tenets of public choice theory where effort has been made to describe some principles and the methodology. Explain the institutions and the mechanisms of Public Choice theory and further attempt to discuss about the various school of approach within Public Choice tradition.

### **2.3 BASIC TENETS OF PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY**

Beginning with simple assumption that human behaviour in market is it same to that of in the government institution and process, the public choice developed. In order to

understand the theory, it is very important to have clear conception of the principle, methodological base and mechanism of particular theory. Public choice takes the same principles that economists use to analyse people's actions in the marketplace and applies them to people's actions in collective decision making which are as follows,

- The individual is the basic unit of analysis. Further, Use of the individual as the common decision unit. They believe that there is no decision made by an aggregate whole. Rather, decisions are made by the combined choices of the individual.
- The second the conceptualization of public goods as the type of event associated with the output of public agencies. public choice theory is concerned with the effect that different decision rules or decision-making arrangements will have upon the production of those events conceptualized as public goods and services. Thus, the type of event characterized as public goods and services, and decision structures comprise the analytical variables in public choice theory.
- The individual confront certain opportunities and possibilities in the world of events and will pursue his relative advantage within the strategic opportunities afforded by different types of decision rules or decision-making arrangements. The consequences are evaluated by whether or not the outcome is consistent with the efficiency criterion which mark another unit of analysis.

#### **2.4 COLLECTIVE DECISION MAKING**

Collective decision making rule helps in forming the government, deciding the goods to be provided in public sector and what taxes to be imposed. The public choice theorist has mainly written on the nature of collective choice. Mancur Olson was the first to provide an insight into why collective group action is not likely to be very successful, specially if the group size is large. As he pointed out tha in the case of public interest, if the group is larger then there is tendency of having small individual benefit and therefore the less people participates or volunteer in the group activity where it is needed to fulfil particular objective. Voting represents the collective decision activity and public choice theorist argues that in most of the democratic countries, special interest dominates the public interest and this is one of the major subject where public theorist has made detail study about majority voting, vote etc. which has explained below.

### **2.4.1 ELECTIONS**

“ It has been said that if you like laws or sausages, you should never watch either being made. The quip sums up a Public Choice scholar’s view of elections” (Butler,2012). The public choice theorist pointed out that the purpose of voting is to try somehow to translate the opinions of many individuals into one collective decision. But the decision that eventually emerges depends greatly on what particular electoral system is chosen. Moreover, every system has its own quirks – not just in terms of the mechanics of how it operates, but in terms of how it affects the way that voters and candidates behave. The political process is plainly not very pretty; and the final decision that emerges from it may be a much distorted reflection of what anyone actually want.

### **2.4.2 RATIONAL IGNORANCE**

The important underpinning of the Public Choice theory is the lack of incentives for voters to monitor government effectively. Anthony Downs in his book *An Economic Theory of Democracy (1957)* identify that “the voter is ignorant of the political issues and that ignorance is rational.” Even the result of an election is crucial. However, individual’s vote rarely decides an election. The public choice theorist has mentioned that this kind of rational ignorance is not found in the market. Someone who buys a mobile phone typically wants to be well informed about the mobile he or she selects. That is because the mobile phone buyer’s choice is final as She or he pays only for the one chosen. If the choice is wise, the buyer will benefit; if it is unwise, the buyer will suffer. However, voting lacks that kind of direct result. Therefore, most voters are largely ignorant about the positions of the people for whom they vote.

According to the Downs, there is a lack of an adequate rational choice model of large elections with costly voting presents and giving the central place of voting within political economy has become an obvious problem.

### **2.4.3 THE VOTER THEOREM**

“Another point made originally by Duncan Black is that vote seeking parties will tend to bid for the middle ground – his median voter theorem (Butler,2010).” He takes some simple issue such as how much we should spend on defence. Public Choice scholars call these one-dimensional issues, since people choices lie somewhere on a single scale, ranging between nothing and a great deal. For example, a few people will say we should spend nothing at all on defence, and a few will say we should spend much more than we do at present. But, like the shape of a bell, most people are likely to bunch around some point in the middle and that single scale preferences of people are termed as *single picked*. Not only are there more voters in the middle but if a party pitches its policy closer to where the voters bunch it is still likely to pick up those voters at one of the extremes. When question arise how to win election? as per the voter theorem, the rational vote-gathering strategy for an extreme party is therefore to move towards the centre, hoping that its more extreme followers will stay with it while simultaneously gathering up some of the large mass of moderate voters. Indeed, the nearer to the centre that any party moves, the more advantage it has over any that are farther out. The result, said Black, is that political parties converge on the centre of opinion, trying to position themselves close to the ‘median voter’. This view has a great deal of truth in it: electors in countries such as the UK and the USA often complain that there is ‘no difference’ between the parties. But, nevertheless, this simple idea has been challenged, and indeed largely abandoned, in recent times for a variety of reasons.

## **2.5 GOVERNMENT FAILURE**

Market may fail to provide adequately in such areas does not necessarily mean that government can do things better, there is ‘government failure’ too. Buchanan (1962) argues that while democracy is best for promoting individual and market freedom, it may not necessarily be a very efficient system. The basic idea of democracy is that people vote for electing their representatives by secret ballot with the political party that wins the majority forming a government. Arrow’s *Impossibility theorem* specify that there is no way to devise a collective decision making processes which satisfies every desires of collective decision makers. Every interest groups try to use the political process for their interest. So, every government hugely face the political pressure

specially the legislator, bureaucrats and executives because as per public choice theorist. The economic cost of favouring a particular interest group are usually higher than the benefit of the particular interest group making it socially undesirable.

### 2.5.1 LEGISLATURES

Public choice theorists also examine *the actions of legislators*. The primary responsibility of the legislator is to pursue the "Public Interest" but the legislator is mostly paying attention to use the public resources for their interests. The incentives for good management in the public interest are weak. In other words, Jane S Shaw has pointed out that "legislators have the power to tax and to extract resources in other coercive ways, and because voters monitor their behaviour poorly, legislators behave in ways that are costly to citizens" (Shaw,2002). One technique analysed by public choice is log rolling, or vote trading.

**LOGROLLING:** Politics is a continual process, with a variety of different issues coming up over time – a state of affairs that gives wide scope for individuals and groups to gain from exchanging support between each other. Such kind of vote trading is known as logrolling, the concept was first started in USA. It says that the expression probably derives from the old practice of neighbours assisting each other to move felled timber, which is difficult to do alone.

An agreement to exchange votes on separate legislative measures, for example in cases like – the need for better roads in its own locality, say. It makes a simple bargain with other such groups: you vote to improve our roads today, and we will vote to improve yours sometime soon is called *explicit logrolling*. It is common in democratic bodies, such as committees and legislatures, where votes are easily traded and – since both partners need to know that the other is delivering the bargain – easily observed. It does not work so well in secret ballots, or between large groups that cannot easily discipline their members.

Another mechanism, implicit logrolling, is where the different groups bundle their various proposals into a package before they are voted on. So voters or legislators who feel very

strongly about one measure also end up voting for other people's measures too. This kind of vote trading is common when party election manifestos or legislative proposals are being put together. Implicit logrolling has many benefits for legislator.

### **2.5.2 RENT SEEKING**

Rents are here defined as returns in excess of opportunity cost engineered in a market economy through the regulatory intervention of government (Tollison, 1982, 1997, Rowley, Tollison and Tullock, 1988, as cited in Tollison, 2008). The original insight came from Gordon Tullock in 1967. However, the phrase was coined by Anne Krueger some years later. In politics, rent seeking is the attempt by particular groups to persuade government to grant them sort of valuable monopolies or legal privileges. If their rent seeking is successful, such benefits could add up to a substantial transfer of wealth to these privileged groups from the general public. He pointed out that, the Consumers and taxpayers lose financially as a result of the monopoly prices, and also lose in terms of reduced choice and lower quality that they have to endure. Tullock noted, all expensive lobbying activity is unproductive, and a pure loss to the economy. Rent seeking activity produces nothing of value to the community. All it does is determine which monopoly privileges will be granted to which interest groups. According to Tullock "rent seeking groups would spend or in terms of the community as a whole, waste. Huge resources on trying to tilt law making in their own favour came as a real blow to the 'welfare economics'. He made it clear that, far from the public policy process being superior to the market, rent seeking massively distorts public decisions.

### **2.5.3 BUREAUCRACY**

Another major subfield of public choice theory is the study of Bureaucracy Apart from the voters and politicians, public choice analyses the *role of bureaucrats* in government. Further disturbing feature of government is that public officials also have their own interests. The American economist William A. Niskanen tried to identify the interests and objectives of bureaucrats in a 1971 book, *Bureaucracy and Representative*

*Government.* He suggested that people in public agencies seek to maximise their budgets – which brings with it power, status, comfort, security and other benefits. They have the advantage over legislators in budget negotiations, he thought, because they know more about their agencies' functions than legislators do, as the latter are inevitably generalists. And once the politicians have committed to a policy, bureaucrats can crank up the implementation budget, knowing that the politicians will not want the public humiliation of abandoning the project. The result is a larger and less efficient bureaucracy than electors actually want. A 1971 article, by George Stigler, marked the arrival of the Chicago School and criticised bureaucracy from another point of view. In "capture theory" introduced by the late George Stigler concluded that Bureaucrats easily gets captured and starts working for social interest because they don't have definite profit goal to channelized their behaviour. They are usually there in government because they have some mission and goals and mostly rely upon the legislators for their budgets. Usually, the interest groups or leaders who have some benefits from their mission influence the legislature and increases their funds. So such interest group, lobbyists and industrialists becomes important to them and this lead to bureaucrats captured by the interest groups.

#### **2.5.4 OTHER INSTITUTIONS**

Some of the public choice scholars has also brought the institution of democratic governance in a study. Scholars like Mark Crain, William Shughart and Robert Tollison has made study on the President or chief executive officer and the independent judiciary. They pointed out, that the occupants of these positions as self-interested people, who by exercising the power of veto bills, on the one hand and by ruling on the constitutionality of laws, on the other, add stability to democratic decision making processes and increase the durability of the favours granted to special interest groups and, hence the amounts the groups are willing to pay for them.

Public Choice emphasised much about the Democratic theory also. They observed that social function of democracy has been fulfilled accidentally by the continuous struggle



for power between parties. just as the social function of markets is fulfilled incidentally by the competitive struggle for profits among firms.

The scholars like Gordon Tullock and James Buchanan has also interpreted the advanced societies with liberal democratic constitution, and they draw much attention towards the dark site of the modern life in the welfare state. They claimed that the public sector has been suffering from inherent systemic failure in terms of policy-making and implementation.

## **2.6 VARIOUS SCHOOL OF THOUGHTS**

### **2.6.1. Rochester School**

Rochester School was first led by the William H Riker, pioneer of the new method of positive political theory. Positive political theory, or rational choice theory, aim to build formal models of collective decision making processes frequently relying on the assumption of self-interested rational action. Rochester School mainly consists of political scientists and not economists. As the many practitioners belongs to this school are based in Rochester, it is mainly called the Rochester School of Public Choice. The objective of the Rochester School theorist is firstly, to make the positive statements about political phenomena or descriptive generalizations that can be subjected to empirical verification. The method of Positive political theory is basically to explain the political process scientifically that involves the use of the mathematical models, statistical analysis, game theory decision theory and the historical narratives and experiments.

Secondly, Rational Choice theory attempts looks to individual decision making as the source of collective political outcomes and suggests that the individual function according to the logic of rational self-interest. Through the assumptions of rational self-interest, positive political theory postulates a specific motivational foundation for behaviour. Rochester School is the most technical work in public choice. The school basic ideas in relation to politics is that political studies are much effective from rational choice perspective then the public interest perspective.

### 2.6.2 CHICAGO SCHOOL

The Chicago School, a very distinct school of the political economy has long been recognized by economists of all persuasions. According to the George J Stigler stated that “ the notion of the Chicago perspective on economics includes a self-conscious orientation towards politics and its study.”. The Chicago Public Choice economists are different from other Chicago economists in their topic of study. According to S. Sen, “among the three prominent public choice schools in America, the Chicago stands out for its work in the field of regulation.” The prominent Chicago Public School theorists are David Friedman, Robert Friedan and Robert Lucas. The most notable assumption in the Chicago view of politics has mainly expressed by the Stigler and Becker. They believe that political activity is motivated by the same forces as market behaviour and the condition under which political choices are made clearly encourages behaviour that is shaped by forces like ideas, values, norms or ideology. Another important standpoint of Chicago School which makes it different from other school of public choice is Stigler theory of ‘regulatory capture’ where he emphasised that those who are regulated by the state, themselves capture the regulatory process and earn benefits at the cost of consumers.

### 2.6.3 VIRGINIA SCHOOL

The Virginia School, is the third important school of public choice. It is actually the school of economic thought originated in Universities of Virginia in the 1950s and 1960s basically focusing on public choice theory, constitutional economics, and law. It is normatively oriented in comparison to other schools. Virginia school uses the method of comparative analysis of alternative processes of decision making between the market and non-market institutional settings. The school in its methodology added the concept of politics- as- exchange to methodological individualism and rational choice in the analysis of political processes. The school analytically points out that the rational choice element of utility maximization is applicable in individual level but unsuited to broad social sense because the society is not an entity that maximizes. So, it brought new unit of analysis known as the *politics as an exchange processes* in limelight. Their primary claim is the exchanges takes place in the political or public sphere rather than the market and in

political scenario, exchange mainly occurs between various political actors to gain the mutual benefit. For example, Vote casting by people of particular place to particular candidate to win the election are an exchange for the service that party would offer to the people of that place when they come to power. Another claim of the proponent of the Virginia School is that in politics as exchange model, the focus should be more in process, rather than the outcome.

### **2.6.3.1 DIFFERENCE OF INDIVIDUAL CHOICE IN MARKET AND POLITICAL REALM**

The public choice theorist of the Virginia School (one of the school of Public Choice Tradition) has mainly advocates the use of economic methods to the study of politics. They have argued that economic and political process are not the same.

Buchanan has pointed out five such differences which are as follows:

*First*, in the market, individual is all responsible for his choice whether the outcome be relevant for him or not. Whereas, in the political voting process, on the other hand, the individual choice does determine by the choice of all. Due to this reason, there comes the far greater degree of uncertainty in the political process, because individual lacks control over the final outcome.

*Second*, In the market, each individuals feels that prices, total sales, the total amount on offer by sellers are all beyond his control. Market processes seem to this individual quite impersonal and not influenced by him. On the other hand, voters know that his voice will have a role in determining the final social outcome. There is a greater sense of social participation.

*Third*, difference is that since decision- making through voting, unlike decision making in the market, is dependent on the choices of all, each individuals feels an absence of a sense of responsibility. Each individual may feel that even if he does not vote the social outcome will in any case be decided.

*Fourth*, distinction is in the difference in the nature of the alternatives offered in the two environments. A consumer in the market can allocate, his budget among the range of alternatives. In the market, a combination of goods and services may be purchased. A

voter in politics, on the other hand, has to choose one candidate (alternative) to the exclusion of others.

*Fifth*, difference between choice in the market and political arena is that each unit of money spent goes towards the purchase of good, nothing goes waste. But in the political sphere, a person may vote for a candidate who loses.

## **2.7 CONCLUSION**

The Public choice theory is very distinct in itself among all other theories of public administration. It has covered almost every aspect of the politics and an administration. the important contribution of the theory in the field of public administration is

In this unit, attempt has been made to exposed the principle of public choice theory. suppositions of public choice approach such as methodological individualism, rational choice and the politics of exchange has introduced. The unit also explained the institutions of Elections, bureaucracies and legislature with the mechanistic concepts like logrolling, capture theory and rational ignorance. The unit also went through the different schools of thought on public choice.

## **2.8 SUMMARY**

- The Methodological Individualism, Rational Choice and politics as exchange is the suppositions of public choice theory.
- The important underpinning of the Public Choice theory is the lack of incentives for voters to monitor government effectively.
- Most voters are largely ignorant about the positions of the people for whom they vote.
- rent seeking is the attempt by particular groups to persuade government to grant them sort of valuable monopolies or legal privileges
- Some of the public choice scholars has also brought the institution of democratic governance in a study.
- There are three school of thought under public choice tradition.
- Virginia School advocates difference of choices in market and political realm

## **2.9 GLOSSARY**

Welfare Economics: refers to the allocation of goods and resources for promoting social welfare

Equilibrium: State of physical balance or balance due to the equal action of opposing forces

Methodology: System of methods that used in a particular area of study or activity or a philosophical framework within which the research is conducted.

## **2.10 MODEL QUESTIONS**

1. Write down the Principle of public choice theory.
2. Briefly explain the Institutions and mechanism of the public choice theory.
3. What are the key contribution of different school of thought?
4. Explain in brief the Virginian school of thought.

### **Write short notes on**

1. Methodological Individualism
2. Bureaucracy
3. log rolling
4. Chicago School

## **2.11REFERENCES**

Rowley, Charles K. (2008) Public Choice and Constitutional Political Economy Scaff. In Lawrence A and Ingram Helen M. (Ed). *Politics, Policy & Public Choice: A critique & A Proposal*: The University of Chicago Press. Jstor.

Sen. S (2010). *Consent, Constitutions and Contrast; Public Choice Perspective* on the state. In Dhameja, A *Contemporary Debate in Public Administration*. New Delhi, India: PHI Learning Pvt Ltd.

Bhattacharya Mohit. (2010) *Public Choice Theory: Government in the New Right Perspective*. In Dhameja, A (Ed). *Contemporary Debates in Public Administration*. New Delhi, India: PHI Learning Pvt Ltd.

Shaw S. Jane. *Public Choice Theory*. library of Economics and Liberty. <https://www.eolib.org/library/Enc/PublicChoiceTheory>

Buchanan, James M. *The Calculus of Consent* 1962

Basu, Rumki. (Revised Edn.) (2004) *Public Administration: Concepts and Theories*. New Delhi, India: Sterling Publishers.

Muller D (2008). *Public Choice: An Introduction*. In Lawrence A and Ingram Helen M. (Ed). *Politics, Policy & Public Choice: A critique & A Proposal*: The University of Chicago Press. Jstor.

### **UNIT 3**

#### **CONTRIBUTIONS**

##### **Structure**

3.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

3.2 INTRODUCTION

3.3 MAJOR CONTRIBUTION OF PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY

3.4 KUNT WICKSELL

3.5 GORDON TULLOCK

3.6 JAMES M BUCHANAN

3.7 ANTHONY DOWNS

3.8 WILLIAM NISKANEN

3.9 VINCENT OSTROM

### 3.10 CONCLUSION

### 3.11 SUMMARY

### 3.12 GLOSSARY

### 3.13 MODEL QUESTIONS

### 3.14 REFERENCES

## **3.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

After reading this unit, students will be able to

- Discuss the contribution of public choice theory.
- understand the contributions of different public choice theorists
- Explain the concept of rent seeking concept of Gordon Tullock.
- Elucidate the normative of James Buchanan.
- Examine the work of the Anthony Downs.
- Describe the vies of Niskanen in Bureaucracy

## **3.2 INTRODUCTION**

The field of public choice is now some sixty years old and it has become important theory in almost all three subject, political sciences, public administration and economics. Public choice theory has tremendous contribution in the field of politics and administration. Its distinct approach, methodology and the mechanisms has brought new dimension in the study of political processs, institutions and public finance. Apart from that there are some scholars who have contributed to grow public choice theory as influential theory which as now to be said as the lineage of *New Public Management* and the *Game Theory*.

### **3.3 CONTRIBUTIONS OF PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY**

Sugato Sen in his work '*Consent, Contribution and Contrasts: The Public Choice Perspective on the State*'(2010)has pointed put the major contribution of the Public choice theory which are as follows:

- Public choice theory's major contribution pertinent to the area of public administration has been the fact that it has questioned the very basis of bureaucracy run governance.
- The principal contribution of public choice theorists overall has been, first, that they have largely managed to convince economists that it is futile to talk of economic policy, and public finance, without discussing politics. Economic policy is, after all, made by politicians.
- S. Sen pointed out that public choice theorists have mounted a spirited attack on several strands of economic theory and social philosophy; such as neoclassical economics, Pigovian welfare economics, Pigou Marshall type of public finance theory, and Benthamite utilitarianism.
- When discussing politics and the institutions that supply public goods, they have made a powerful case for 'politics-as-exchange', and the Constitutional-contractarian paradigm. They have contributed to voting theory, namely single-peaked preference, median voter hypothesis, vote-trading (logrolling), strategic and insincere voting, and so on. They have provided incisive analysis of supply of public goods that are not pure public goods, specifically 'club goods'. They have also broadened our understanding of collective action.
- He mentioned that public choice theorist has made a persuasive case for the possibility of government failure and shown that it is more widespread than was thought, and have given powerful insights into the theory of regulation and rent-seeking.
- The whole New Public Management approach and viewpoint is, moreover, heavily influenced by public choice theory and can indeed be said to trace its lineage to it.
- Finally, public choice theorists have provided insightful analysis of political business cycles—the relation between economic prosperity and depression and political events such as elections. Other social scientists such as Michal Kalecki had earlier provided related accounts.



## SOME OF THE MAJOR PROPONENTS OF PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY AND THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS:

### **3.4 KNUT WICKSELL**

Knut Wicksell was the Swedish economist well known in the study of social science for his contribution to the theory of public finance which give impetus to the development of the welfare economics and public choice. Richard Musgrave and the James Buchanan who has done tremendous work in the socio-economic-political field call Knut Wicksell their intellectual father and not only that, they consider their work stands in the Wicksellian tradition. Wicksell has successfully written much in the public finance which said to be the foundation stone where later study of state, welfare, justice, decision making through the economic method in the realm of the politics and an administration carried forward.

Some contributions of Wicksell are:

- Wicksellian approach rendered that the state is a participant within the economic process. Wicksell construes the state itself is a process or a framework of rules and procedures that governs the human relationships and all the fiscal phenomena of the state do not result from the optimizing choices of some intellectual political being, but rather emerge through interactions among participants within various fiscal and political processes and that those interactions are also shaped and constrained by a variety of conventions, institutions and organizational rules.
- In a Wicksellian approach the magnitude of the governmental activity is explained with the references to the same principle that are used to explain other features of economic activities within society.
- He was concerned for the injustice that emerged from the unregulated parliamentary assemblies, this majority rule was imposing cost on large segment of tax payers or citizens. He pointed out that, the network of the institutional relationships would make it possible for people their capacities as taxpayers, better to say their tax monies were directed as they wished and the Wicksell made an effort to describe such relationships because he believed, that the ability for people to direct their taxes would locate the government on the same boat as other economic participants.

- He also assumed that if the parliament gets bound by the rule of unanimity, then its decision would conform closely to unanimity within the underlying population.

### **3.5 GORDON TULLOCK**

Gordon Tullock was born in Rockford, Illinois on February 16, 1922. He is one of the founders of the field of public choice. Tullock with James Buchanan formed the core of the Public Choice centre over its quarter century of existence. Gordon Tullock was both chief editor and chief referee of public choice over its first quarter century of its existence. James Buchanan has described Gordon Tullock as a natural economist, where natural is defined as having “intrinsic talents that emerge independently of professional training, education, and experience”. A natural economist, therefore, “is someone who more or less consciously thinks like an economist”. Here we focus on few of his seminal pieces that contributed greatly to the development of the public choice field.

1. *"Problems of Majority Voting"* (Tullock 1959) a book written by the Tullock when he was post-doctoral fellow at the Thomas Jefferson Centre for Political Economy of the University of Virginia. Tullock argued that an individual will aim at equalizing marginal cost and utility of every consumed unit. Then he added that, this should be the same for voter's behaviour. He explains that in a democracy, the problem is “majority is binding on the minority” and it can result in a misallocation of the resources and to the creation of external costs, costs applied to people who don't receive any benefits from a voted decision.

Tullock has also developed the idea of a necessary unanimity rule when he explained he felt very necessary for the member of the minority to get aware of the fact that they are paying taxes for something they don't benefit from and in order to pass bills, unanimity might be necessary.

2. Another important contribution made by Gordon Tullock is the '*rent seeking*' concept. The idea of rent seeking was first led by the Gordon Tullock in 1967. However, the phrase was coined by Anne Krueger some years later. In politics, rent seeking is the attempt by particular groups to persuade government to grant them sort of valuable monopolies or legal privileges According to Tullock “rent seeking groups would spend or in terms of

the community as a whole, waste. Huge resources on trying to tilt law making in their own favour came as a real blow to the 'welfare economics'." He made it clear that, far from the public policy process being superior to the market, rent seeking massively distorts public decisions.

### **3.6 JAMES M BUCHANAN**

James M. Buchanan was an American economist and architect of the public choice theory.

Buchanan had extensive interests, and as an academic, he found ways to contribute to several disciplines. As we know, that James Buchanan with Gordon Tullock formed the public choice society. He was a highly prolific writer, being the author of some 20 books and many articles. The most important book which has become the methodological base of the theory of public choice is *The Calculus of Consent; Logical Foundation of Constitutional Democracy* (1962) which has written by Buchanan with Gordon Tullock. Buchanan's insights into human nature and political outcome provide an understanding of the perks that motivate political actors and allow more accurate predictions of political decisions. In 1986, Buchanan was awarded the Noble Prize in economics for "his development of the contractual and constitutional bases for the theory of economic and political decision making. He was highly influenced by the Wicksell, for him, Wicksell is the "primary precursor of the of modern public choice theory"

Some of the ideas and work of James Buchanan which has contributed in the public choice theory are as follows:

- Buchanan argues that basically economists while examining the market used "closed" system in which they see the individual are motivated by self-interest, respond to incentives and struggle with imperfect information. While examining the public policies made by the mere politicians, executives, bureaucrats they ignore the "open" system of behavioural analysis mainly the role of self-interest, imperfect information and the role of incentives in shaping politicians' choices. According to Buchanan "open system, greatly restrict the usefulness that economic theory might have in policy discussion". He then came up with the queries that i) what kind of method of analysis should it be, if we applied the assumption we made about commercial action to political action? ii) his major concern was if the people respond to incentive in markets then why not assume

they respond to incentive in government. Iii) Another observation was people are self-interested when they are buying and selling. Why not assume they are self-interested when they are voting and making policy? He tried to understand and solve queries with this approach where he took the method of economics in the study of politics and which came to be known as Public choice theory or James Buchanan calls it "*politics without romance*" and suggests that "public choice theory has become the avenue through which a romantic and illusory set of notions about the workings of governments" has been replaced with more realistic notions."

So, the Buchanan argues the individual in politics irrespective of their role for e.g. voter, politicians, bureaucrats, lobbyist, everyone makes decision which can address some of their interest. His insistence on analysing politics in terms of self-interest, limited information, and transactions reject socio political elites' pretensions. His whole work mainly analyses how ordinary and imperfect people act politically.

### **BUCHANAN'S NORMATIVE RULES**

According to S. Sen, following the Wicklesian decision principle, Buchanan has derived two normative rules which are in his view, constitutive of the public choice approach: (a) politics as exchange and (b) economic constitutionalism or contractarianism as the basis of public policy making."

- **POLITICS AS EXCHANGE:** Politics as Exchange Politics, public choice scholars argue, is a system of exchange. Buchanan contrasted this to the idea of politics as a "common search for the good, the true, and the beautiful"(1987), where those ideals have an objective definition or truth value distinct from any participating individuals' values. In this, he followed Knut Wicksell, adopting his idea that what separates markets and politics is not what people choose, but the structure of the institutions that shape the pursuit of their preferences; in politics as in markets, people pursue their interests, which are privately defined, even if the individual chooses to define them as public interests. To achieve these goals, individuals engage in exchange. Politicians trade policies for votes. For example, legislators trade votes among each other for support for their bills, and "individuals exchange agreed-on shares in contributions toward the costs of that which is commonly desired, from the services of the local fire station to that of the judge." As in the market, these exchanges should

create mutual gains as "two or more individuals find it mutually advantageous to join forces to accomplish certain common purposes." In Buchanan's view, people even trade consent to coercion in exchange for the benefits they perceive from a political order.

- **ECONOMIC CONSTITUTIONALISM:** The second normative principle is a mechanism for an expression of political criticism. As Buchanan states that " Existing constitutions or structures or rules, are the subject of critical scrutiny." Which actually means the provisions given in the constitution are subject to critical review. James Buchanan argued that "the political economist who seeks to offer normative advice, must of, necessity, concentrate on the process of structure within which political decisions are observed to be made."

### **3.7 ANTHONY DOWNS**

Anthony Downs' *an Economic Theory of Democracy* (1957) is one of the founding books of the Public Choice movement, and one of the most influential social science books of the twentieth century. Downs' book introduced seminal ideas, such as a cost-benefit calculation of political participation, a spatial model of party competition, knowledge about public affairs as a by-product of other more directly instrumental activities, and concepts such as rational ignorance and cue-taking behaviour. He has written extensively in areas of public policy such as housing policy, transportation policy, and urban development, and on the politics of bureaucracy.

In *an economic theory of democracy* (1957), an early work in rational choice theory, Anthony Downs claimed that significant elements of political life could be explained in terms of voter self-interest. Downs argued that in democracies the most voters possess moderate opinion. Seminal works of Downs are as follows:

- Down's concept of '*Paradox of not voting*' has been highly appreciated by the rational choice theorists. Where he argues that in election of large democracy, the individual vote value and its effect in the election outcome has become comparatively small. He

pointed out that the voter is largely ignorant of political issues and that this *ignorance is rational*. Even the result of an election is crucial. However, individual's vote rarely decides an election. Downs states "it requires time and effort to collect the information necessary to make a reasoned choice among available alternatives, an opportunity-cost perspective on voting suggests that few voters should bother" (PG 92). Thus, the direct impact of the well informed vote is almost nil, voter doesn't have any chance to determine outcome of the election.

- According to the Downs, there is a lack of an adequate rational choice model of large elections with costly voting presents and giving the central place of voting within political economy has become an obvious problem.
- Another important contribution of an Economic Theory of Democracy is on the role of information. Downs regarded as a founding figure in "Information Economics." Downs' approach to political information emphasizes the need to take into account whether new information can be expected to make a difference in the choice we make about which candidate/party to support or about whether to vote to counteract this expectation of rational ignorance, Downs points out that information useful to political choice may be gained at a relatively low cost as a "by-product" of other activities.
- Downs most important contribution in PCA is related to the bureaucratic behaviour. Downs in his book '*Inside Bureaucracy*' has specify that decision making in the bureaucracy mainly get influenced by the self-interest. Though, the interest differs from person to person. Its not same for every bureaucrat of every level, different officials motivate by different things such as power, money, prestige, income, loyalty and security.

### **3.8 WILLIAM NISKANEN**

Niskanens' work was the first systematic effort to study the bureaucracy within the public choice framework. Niskanen in his book *Bureaucracy and Representative Government (1971)* argues that those who work in the bureaucracy seeks to maximize their budget and the size of the bureau. He contends that only by increasing the budget that they can maximize their self-interest. The basic ideas of Niskanen which has contributed in the study of Public Choice theory are as follows:

- In terms, of what bureaucrats actually do pursue, Niskanen suggested, that budget maximisation provided a fair measure. It is an approximation to the objective of profit in the market context. And it provides a simple proxy for all the other things that go with a large and growing budget – such as job security, promotion prospects, salary increases and so on.
- According to Niskanen, business people are exposed to the scrutiny of well-informed customers and analysts, but bureaucrats are not. The fact that bureaucrats are far more knowledgeable about their own particular area than the average politician means that politicians cannot effectively control the bureaucracy. And this monopoly of inside knowledge about their own function enables them to use the ‘bundling’ strategy to protect their empires: by being opaque about which parts of their function could be scaled back or prised off, they present politicians with a single package which the politicians have to take or leave.
- To counteract the evils of bureaucratic monopoly and the bureaucratic tendency to increase salary, power and prestige, Niskanen's prescription is the following: (a) Stricter control on bureaucrats through the executive or the legislature.  
(b) More competition in the delivery of public services.  
(c) Privatization or contracting out to reduce wastage.  
(d) Dissemination of more information for public benefit about the availability of alternatives to public services offered on a competitive basis, and at competitive costs.

### **3.9 VINCENT OSTROM**

Vincent Ostrom’s role as a pivotal figure both as a participant in the initial Public Choice conferences, when Public Choice hadn’t settled yet on an official name, and as its key promoter of the theory’s use in Public Administration, has also been recognized and reemphasized in a recent article published in *Public Administration Review*, the flagship journal of the field, by Theo Toonen, a leading Public Administration scholar of the current generation. The role Ostroms played at the interface between Public Administration and Public Choice theory is very well captured in *Public Choice Theory in Public Administration: An annotated Bibliography* by Nicholas Lovrich and Max Neiman,

published in 1984, with a foreword by Robert Golembiewski. Some the concepts of Vincent Ostrom which has contributed in the study of public choice theory are

- Vincent Ostrom is the second generation thinker of public choice tradition. He mainly advocates for the replacement of the traditional doctrine of 'bureaucratic administration' by the concept of 'democratic administration'. He argues that people should have the power to decide and their demands should be the priority. He further, states that " bureaucratic structures are necessary, but not sufficient structures for a productive and responsive public service economy". In addition, he argues that the best structures for satisfying individual preferences are not centralised bureaucratic agencies but rather more fragmented multi organisational arrangements.
- Ostrom sought a way out of the prevailing public choice pessimism by looking at how collective decision making might be improved by splitting up the process between different centres. He argues that '*polycentric*' decision making improves the quality and stability of collective choices, and is better tuned to the inherent diversity of the population. He further observes the decentralisation creates diversity and offers more opportunity for citizen's choice. He further proposes d bureaucratisation of all administrative units and states that decentralisation and democracy enhance participation at the work place and grass root level empowerment of the people.

### **3.10 CONCLUSION**

All this public choice theorist has contributed their writings in the study of political process, bureaucracy, voluntary exchange, decentralization, voting and governance. The second generation and also the third generation theorist has implemented the methodology of the public choice in the study of other different aspects of politics. Third-generation scholars have taken Public Choice into interesting new avenues. Robert D. Tollison, for example, has shown how the rise of parliament in the late medieval age led to the decline in monopolies because it now required a majority in the legislature, not just the consent of the monarch, to create them. The pioneers of modern public choice theory were all either British or American and was mainly focused on the workings of two party majority system. But Public Choice has grown international, and now looks much more to the multi-party systems and diverse voting rules that prevails in many other places.



This unit has mainly attempt to cover the major contribution of public choice theory. Apart from that shed some lights on the work and contribution of different theorist. It has addressed the important concept like 'Politics as exchange' of Buchanan, Gordon Tullock's 'rent seeking', 'paradox of not voting' of Anthony Downs and others.

### **3.11 SUMMARY**

- Buchanan considers Wicksell as primary precursor of the of modern public choice theory.
- In politics, rent seeking is the attempt by particular groups to persuade government to grant them sort of valuable monopolies or legal privileges.
- James Buchanan with Gordon Tullock formed the public choice society
- Niskanens' work was the first systematic effort to study the bureaucracy within the public choice framework.
- Vincent advocates for the replacement of the traditional doctrine of 'bureaucratic administration' by the concept of 'democratic administration'.

### **3.12 GLOSSARY**

- Polycentric: Having more than one centre is polycentric.
- Monopoly: an organization or group that has complete control of something, especially an area of business, so that other have no share.
- Contractarianism: Any of various theories that justify moral principles or political arrangement by appealing to a social contract that is voluntarily committed to under ideal conditions for such commitment. Also called contractarianism.

- Benthamite Utilitarianism : Utilitarianism is a family of normative ethical theories that prescribe actions that maximize happiness and well-being for all affected individuals. Benthamite is relate to philosophical system of utilitarianism proposed by Jeremy Bentham.

### **3.13 MODEL QUESTIONS**

1. Write down the contribution Gordon Tullock and James Buchanan.
2. Discuss the major contribution of public choice theory
3. What are the major contribution of Anthony Downs?
4. Write the note on the views of second generation theorist William Niskanen and Vincent Ostrom.

#### **Write short notes on:**

1. Contribution of Wicksell
2. 'Rent Seeking'
3. Buchanan's normative rule
4. Anthony Downs view on Bureaucracy
5. paradox of not voting
6. Vincent Ostrom

### **3.14 REFERENCES**

- Sen. S (2010). *Consent, Constitutions and Contrast; Public Choice Perspective* on the state. In Dhameja, A Contemporary Debate in Public Administration. New Delhi, India: PHI Learning Pvt Ltd.
- Butler. E (2012). *Public Choice- A Primer*. Westminster, London: The Institute of Economic Affairs.

Rowley and Friedrich (2008) *Readings in Public Choice and Constitutional Political Economy*: Springer Science Business Media, LLC.

Muller, D. (1979). *Public Choice*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Mitchell, William.C.(1989). *Chicago Political Economy: A Public Choice Perspective*. Springer. Retrieved from. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30025197>

Atkinson, Anthony. (1987) B. *James M. Buchanan Contributions to Economics*. Wiley. Retrieved from. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3440481>

Mueller Dennis.C.(2012) *Gordon Tullock and Public Choice*. Springer. Retrieved from. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41483751>

## **Unit 4**

### **LIMITATIONS CONTENTS**

#### **Structure**

4.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

4.2 INTRODUCTION

4.3 A QUESTION OF SELF INTEREST

4.4 OTHER CRITICAL VIEWS

4.5 CRITICS AND PUBLIC CHOICE RESPONSE

4.6 CURRENT AND FUTURE HORIZON

4.7 GAME THEORY

4.8 CONCLUSION

4.9 SUMMARY

4.10 GLOSSARY

## 4.11 MODEL QUESTIONS

### 4.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this unit, students will be able to

- Describe the limitations of public choice theory
- Explain the Wright views against public choice theory
- Analyse opinion of different critics
- Relate the relevance of public choice theory

### 4.2 INTRODUCTION

There were growing popularity of the public choice theory in the last decades or two. relatively 1970s marked the increased public concern for greater economic productivity, the increasingly technical bias of economic research. Public choice theory has a tremendous contribution in the field of politics, governance and administration. According to S. Sen, “when discussing politics and the institutions that supply goods, they have made a powerful case for ‘politics-as – exchange’, and the constitutional-contractarian paradigm. They have contributed to voting theory, namely single-peaked preference, median voter hypothesis, vote trading (log rolling). They have incisive analysis of supply of public goods, specifically

‘club goods’(Sen,2010). They have also broadened our understanding of collective action. ‘The public choice school has been successful in pointing out that there are alternatives available for the delivery of services to the citizens. Even though the weight of the contribution is much heavier but like other theories, public choice theory has been subjected to severe criticism.

### 4.3 A QUESTION OF SELF INTEREST

The public choice theorist assumes, that in the private marketplace people are motivated mainly by self-interest. They make the assumption that people acting in the political marketplace, most notably the view of all legislators, bureaucrats and voters as purely self-interested, and a strong preference for

and belief in the market rather than social planning. However, the critic Michael D Wright, in his article 'A Critique of the Public Choice Theory Case for Privatization: Rhetoric and Reality, 1993 has pointed out that public choice theory as a justification for privatization is problematic and as per Wright, it is problematic in three distinct ways which are as follows: First, He argues that, the use of the self-interest preference model of market behaviour in the political realm is integral to public choice theory, but it has no necessary prevalence over any other model. The model has not been proven as empirically correct. In fact, there is much evidence to suggest that it is incorrect. Second, Wright claims that, the assumption that voters will also vote according to individual, rather than collective interests, remains a point of contention and has also not been empirically proven. Third, the assertion that the private firm is more efficient than the public enterprise is not at all clear. The three critical view of Wright has explained below:

#### **4.3.1. A PUBLIC SECTOR MODEL BASED ON SELF INTEREST**

- According to the Wright, "the assumption that the self-interest model of behaviour employed in the market is also appropriate in analysing individual preferences in the public sector can be challenged. Whereas, most of those who defend the public interest model agree that it is as much a goal as it is an analysis, public choice theory is not willing to acknowledge similar limitations. He argues that the view of human nature on which public choice theory is based is that the individual is an "egoistic, rational, utility maximize" in both the economic and political. Even though it is acknowledged by some theorists, such as James Buchanan, that the use of the homo economicus (the wealth-maximizing egoist) construction is not appropriate for the empirical exercise of predicting the likely outcomes of political interactions, the model is still the apparently scientific basis for public choice theory. It is also admitted by Buchanan that though self-interest is not the sole motive of politicians and bureaucrats, and may not be as relevant in politics as in the market, it is still believed to be "a significant motive."
- The second and modified view of Buchanan, that self-interest is a significant, but not the only component of human nature, suffers from an inability to explain the theorizing that follows this admission. Put simply, if self-interest is not the only aspect of human nature that is important to understanding the public sector, then it seems curious to base a theory of politics solely on the economic model.
- The most important feature to the public choice model is that legislators are self-interested because they are fixated with re-election. wright contradicts the argument that elections are

less competitive and that incumbents are ready to re-elected. He pointed out that “the difficulty that public choice theory has in responding to these different trends is that it attempts to predict legislative behaviour, rather than understand the thinking processes of legislators, bureaucrats, and voters. The theory is committed to focussing on predictions of individual legislator behaviour, rather than interpretations.”

- The public choice fails to shed any light on motivations other than self-interest, and as such deprives attempts to develop more democratic and responsive institutions in response to these other motivations. Rather than confronting the problems within bureaucracy at an institutional level, public choice theorists advocate the privatization of government-owned enterprises based on their analysis of individuals. In short, they specify that only the market can properly respond to the self-interested individual. When this view of individuals is made less clear, then it cannot be assumed that the individuals involved in managing state enterprises must be engaged in behaviours that are contrary to the public interest.

#### **4.3.2 THE VOTER MODEL**

Election is the primary institution of study for public choice theorists and has also been the subject of severe criticism. The narrow voter self-interest model suggested by public choice theorists has also been questioned by recent research. There are two basic points here. First, though the connection between the overall economic conditions of society and electoral results remains apparent, the effect of voters' individual economic circumstances on voting behaviour (the concern of public choice) does not appear to correspond in a similar manner. Second, since Public Choice theorists apparently refute the rational, self-interest model as applied to voters, the response has been that voters can afford to vote according to their ideology because it costs them almost nothing to do so, public theorists argue, since one's vote will almost certainly make no difference to the outcome of an election, whereas in the market setting it is more costly to base decisions on noneconomic factors such as personal ideology because real economic interests are at stake.

The above public choice statement has been condemned by the alternative argument. The difficulty with the public choice explanation is that it still does not explain why - if one's vote is essentially meaningless would any economically rational person vote. As it has pointed out that, voting can cost money in time away from work and it can be inconvenient, yet the propensity to vote increases the

more education a voter has, and voters with more education are more likely to aware of the argument that voting is not rational. The economic response to this is that voters must have a taste for voting for which they are willing to pay in order to satisfy." This kind of behaviour is still considered to be rational by the public choice theorists because in the extremely remote case that one's favoured candidate lost by one vote and one did not vote, one would feel such deep regret that the cost of voting is a reasonable price to pay to avoid this scenario. But this kind of argument undermines the core of the public choice position on voting elaborated by Lee, which is that voters can afford to take positions that are not economically rational because to do so costs them almost nothing.

### **4.3.3. EFFICIENCY IN PRIVATE AND PUBLIC ENTERPRISE**

In area of the goods and services which is the another primary unit of the public choice theory. the Public choice theory claims that at the state should be exempt from efficiency concerns in areas of provision and delivery of goods and services where there are particular social concerns. The Public choice suggests that though the public sector may be important in ascertaining the appropriate level of demand, the private sector is more efficient in providing goods and services to meet this demand. There are two themes which guide the discussion in this section. First, there may be important social reasons why private market provision is not appropriate in certain areas because of certain values or social goals we wish the state to represent. Second, the empirical evidence relating to whether efficiency is greater in public or private firms is much more complex than public choice theorists acknowledge. The Both of these points has been evaluated, as well as the fact that public choice theory concentrates much more on the public-private distinction than on questions of competition, a concentration which seems to be problematic for the public choice analysis.

### **4.4 OTHER CRITICAL VIEWS**

- First, according to the S. Sen, "The Public Choice school has been successful in pointing out that there are alternatives available for the delivery of services to the citizens. The role of 'market' as a competing paradigm has challenged the hegemonic position of the state. Also, the power of bureaucracy has been similarly challenged, opening up possibilities of non-bureaucratic citizen-friendly organizational options. It is not however a state versus market debate, as it is often made out to be. The real issue is now to make the state more

democratic and citizen-friendly, and not to relegate it to the background altogether and install the new God of 'market' in its place (Sen, 2010).

- [Steven Pressman \(economist\)](#) offers a critique of the public choice approach, arguing that public choice actually fails to explain political behaviour in a number of central areas including politicians' behaviour as well as [voting behaviour](#). He pointed out that in the case of politicians' behaviour, the public choice assumption that a politician's utility function is driven by greater political and economic power cannot account for various political phenomena. (Pressman,2004).
- Second, again, it pointed out, in different countries, there are different situations and their method to check governmental overgrowth may not be of universal relevance. For instance, public choice method is not compliant in the state-led 'development' activities in the Third World.
- The 'public' which the Public choice seeks to cater to are not always the elite or the middle class and needs of the low income group with poor purchasing power can never be met by the market. Lacking a philosophical or ethical foundation, the public choice theory is neither socially inclusive nor offers an integrating view of the economy and policy.
- As for critiques concerning voter behaviour, it is argued that public choice is unable to explain why people vote due to limitations in [rational choice theory](#). For example, from the viewpoint of [rational choice theory](#), the expected gains of voting depend on (1) the benefit to the individual if their candidate wins, and (2) the probability that the individual's vote will determine the election's outcome. However, even in a tight election the probability that an individual's vote makes the difference is estimated to be effectively zero. Aldrich, suggest that even if an individual expects gains from their candidate's success, the expected gains from voting would also logically be near zero. When this is considered in combination with the multiple recognized costs of voting such as the [opportunity cost](#) of foregone wages, transportation costs, and more, the self-interested individual is, therefore, unlikely to vote at all (at least theoretically)( Adrich,1993).
- Fourth, the public choice writer mainly rejects public interest and the welfare state however, it has observed that the development of human institution in history has been toward these concepts. The concept of people's welfare still exists in the societies.
- According to the Herbert Simon, 'the major motivational premise of public choice, individual self-interest is false' 'Human beings not only makes decisions in terms of individual self-



interest, but in terms of the perceived interests of the groups, families, organizations, ethnic groups and national states with which they identify and to whom they are loyal'.

#### **4.5 CRITICS AND PUBLIC CHOICE RESPONSE**

- According to some interpretations of public choice theory (usually critical), the proponents of public choice theory depict government officials as well as politicians as being utility maximizers who seek to maximize their 'budgets' or some other objective, which is not conducive to promoting the 'public interest'. These critics actually charged public choice theorists having narrow view of human motivation and action. The critics also pointed out, that public choice theorists call for a minimal state. According to S. Sen, "This type of criticism of public choice theorists is misplaced. Suppose that we go along with these critics and say that it is deplorable that bureaucrats and politicians are concerned with maximizing their own utility rather than the public interest. But then we discover that public choice theorists recommend a minimal state. So, the role and influence of venal and corrupt politicians and bureaucrats is sought to be minimized. It follows that these critics cannot fault public choice theorists both for suggesting that politicians and bureaucrats are self-serving and venal, and if these critics accept this view of public officials in general, also for recommending a minimal state. Unless, of course, the critics feel either that selfishness is not descriptively and empirically correct or that it is not prescriptive and moreover, since politicians and bureaucrats should not be selfish, there ought to be a greater role of the state." (Sen,2010).
- In another critical question. It has been asked that, if a person looks for his own gain and self-interest in market place, why the same individual suddenly respond to the public interest where he is a bureaucrat or politician? public choice theorists make an appeal for assuming consistent behaviour in all aspects of life in response. The theorists pointed out two different things about political institutions. First, whichever is the institution, the representative's individual pursues the interest of that institution. In other words, the decision-maker responsible for that institution. Thus, just as the entrepreneur can be thought as responsible for the business firm, the politician can be the representative for the

party, the bureaucrat for the bureaucracy, the individual voter for the collective populace. Secondly, sometimes the individual goes beyond the interest of group or institute and pursue his own gain and self-interest.

- Critic of public choice theory has pointed out, that public choice theory seems more as the proponent of New Right ideology, and it is seen as advocating untrammelled markets, minimal governments and drastically cut bureaucracies. This may be true, but public choice theorists' contribution has been largely methodological. Public choice theory has provided a new way of approaching the study of politics.

We can say that, there was many noteworthy attacks to the public a choice theory regarding the cooperation among humans, bureaucracy and the public interest. however, all findings of the public choice are relevant on one or another area of politics and public administration.

#### **4.6 CURRENT AND FUTURE HORIZON OF PUBLIC CHOICE**

The emergence and growth of diverse new democracies has given Public Choice a new importance as new nations look to its findings for lessons on how their own constitutional, legislative and electoral systems should be constructed. In the process, Public Choice has had to expand out of the traditional US and UK two-party majority-voting models that were familiar to its founders and deal with a much wider range of different systems. Established democracies too have been taking lessons from Public Choice. There is more recognition of the private interests of legislators and bureaucrats, and of the need to restrain them. Such policies are becoming more common: sunset legislation to limit the lifetime of public agencies and programmes, privatisation and deregulation, tax simplification, competition between and within government agencies, market testing for public provision, constitutional caps on government borrowing and other measures. As attention moves beyond the traditional US and UK systems, Public Choice scholars have gone more deeply into the workings of mechanisms such as proportional representation, multi-member seats and party list systems.

#### **4.7 GAME THEORY**

The most trending and particularly fruitful recent aspect of modern Public Choice is game theory, and in particular what is known as evolutionary game theory. Game theory explores what people do when their choices are critically dependent on the actions of others. The classic example is the prisoner's

dilemma, in which two prisoners both confess because they fear harsher punishment if they remain silent and the other implicates them. This sort of reasoning is very relevant in voting situations, particularly those in which people might try to anticipate how others will vote and then vote strategically, in order to improve the chances of their own favoured candidates or outcomes, or to prevent others from succeeding. Moving on from the pure theory of electoral gaming, economists have found it fruitful to conduct practical experiments on how real people do actually behave when faced with choices such as those they face in elections and politics.

#### **4.8 CONCLUSION**

Though public Choice theory is also not free from the criticism and has its limitations. yet, it can point out that public choice is an analysis of government organs, based on the tenets of methodological individualism, democratic administration and decentralization. It has extensively expounded political and bureaucratic behaviour, making a case for market efficiency and not only that it has influenced the approach and view point of the Public Management Theory and can said that public choice as its lineage.

This unit made some reflection on the critical views expressed by various scholars on Public Choice theory. It also discussed the response of public choice against the critics and lastly the unit has concluded with giving short description regarding the Game Theory which is the modern aspect of public choice and importance of the theory in the present and future study of public administration and political science.

#### **4.9 SUMMARY**

- Wright mainly challenged the assumption that voters will also vote according to individual, rather than collective interests, remains a point of contention and has also not been empirically proven.
- The Public choice suggests that though the public sector may be important in ascertaining the appropriate level of demand, the private sector is more efficient in providing goods and services to meet this demand has been highly criticized.
- As per critics the real issue is now to make the state more democratic and citizen friendly, and not to relegate it to the background altogether and install the new God of 'market' in its place.

- public choice theorists make an appeal for assuming consistent behaviour in all aspects of life to critics.
- There were many noteworthy attacks to the public a choice theory regarding the cooperation among humans, bureaucracy and the public interest. however, all findings of the public choice are relevant on one or another area of politics and public administration.

#### **4.10 GLOSSARY**

- Secret Ballot: The Secret ballot, also known as the Australian Ballot, is a voting method in which a voter identifies in an election or a referendum is anonymous.
- Individualism: social theory favouring freedom of action for individuals over collective or stare control.
- Proportional representation: type of electoral system under which subgroups of an electorate are reflected proportionately in the elected body.

#### **4.11 MODEL QUESTION**

1. Describe the limitations of Public Choice Theory
2. Discuss the three criticism made by Wright on Public Choice Theory
3. Outline the other critical views and Public Choice response .

#### **Short Note on:**

1. Voter model
2. Current and future horizon of public choice
3. Game Theory

#### **4.12 REFERENCES**

Aldrich (1993). *Rational Choice and Turnout*. American Journal of Social Science

Pressman, Steven (2004). *What is wrong with public choice*. Journal of Post Keynesian Economics.

Orchard, Lionel and Stretton, Hugh. (1997). *Public Choice*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23599913>

Sen. S (2010). *Consent, Constitutions and Contrast; Public Choice Perspective* on the state. In Dhameja, A *Contemporary Debate in Public Administration*. New Delhi, India: PHI Learning Pvt Ltd.

Butler. E (2012). *Public Choice- A Primer*. Westminster, London: The Institute of Economic Affairs.

Bhattacharya Mohit. (2010) *Public Choice Theory: Government in the New Right Perspective*. In Dhameja, A (Ed). *Contemporary Debates in Public Administration*. New Delhi, India: PHI Learning Pvt Ltd.

## **UNIT: 5**

### **NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT**

Structure

5.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

5.2 INTRODUCTION

5.3 NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT: GENESIS

5.4 SALIENT FEATURES OF NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

5.5 PRINCIPLES OF NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

5.6 IMPACT OF NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

5.7 NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT REFORMS: APPRAISAL

5.8 CONCLUSION

5.9 SUMMARY

5.10 GLOSSARY

5.11 MODEL QUESTIONS

5.12 REFERENCES

#### **5.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

After reading this unit, students will be able to

- Explain the emergence of New Public Management.
- Describe the salient features of NPM
- Examining the impact of NPM
- Evaluate the New Public Management

## **5.2 INTRODUCTION**

New Public Management(NPM)is the new thrust of administrative reforms sweeping through the world. The term has been used in the recent times to describe a management culture that emphasizes the centrality of the citizen or customer as well accountability for results. The New Public Management(NPM) is the latest paradigm in the evolution of public administration. It came into existence in the 1990s. The book entitled Reinventing Government by David Osborn and Red Gaebler, published in 1992heralded the birth of the new public management. NPM represents the second reinvention in public administration the first being the New Public Administration of the late 1960s. NPM is a modern management practice with the logic of economics retaining core public values which are not a static phenomenon but evolving one.

Unit has mainly made an attempt to explain the emergence of New Public Management. Discusses the basic characteristics and principles. The effort has been made to simplify the impacts of the New Public Management in management and an administrative function of different countries. Overall the unit has tried to cover the basic part of New Public Management.

## **5.3 NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT: GENESIS**

With the outset of globalization, everything is evolving to adjust to the pace of the world with which it is changing. Each and every individual, sector, and institution have a different take on globalization, on how it has impacted their lives. Different professionals have alternate opinions on how the influence of globalization can be studied and used for their own benefit. Globalization is one of those concepts that hold a multitude of meanings to

people from different backgrounds, some may find interest in the interdependence of the countries which have economic, political, and even social implications on the state whereas some may look at it as a financial boon of interconnectedness and some even judging it for freedom of access to every corner of the world. communication activities of public sector organizations can be seen both as transformative in the introduction of NPM and as an outcome of this process. The impact of globalization on public administration has been significant, emphasizing change, and reinventing public administration with a management orientation. Since the early 1980s, serious challenges have been posed to the administration to reduce reliance on bureaucracy, curtail the growth of expenditure and seek new ways of delivering public services. New Public Management Perspective prescribes a set of reform measures for organizing and offering services, with market mechanisms, to the citizens. At the beginning 1980s, there has been a widespread attack on the public sector and bureaucracy as governments all over began to consume scarce resources. The expansion of government has been into too many areas, which could as well be in the domain of the private sector. Bureaucracy was considered to be too unwieldy, unresponsive, inefficient, ineffective, and unable to withstand the competition. *A culmination of several factors has given rise to the NPM perspective.* These include:

### **5.3.1 Increase in Government Expenditure**

During the 1970s and 1980s, the rise in government expenditure along with poor economic performance led to the questioning of the need for large bureaucracies. Hence, attempts were initiated to slow down and reverse government growth in terms of increasing public spending as well as staffing. This paved the way for a shift towards privatization, quasi-privatization of certain activities, and moving away from core government institutions.

### **5.3.2 Influence of neo-liberalism**

There has been a powerful influence of neo-liberal political ideology during the 1980s and 1990s. Neo-liberalism favoured the dominant presence of market forces over the state. Concepts such as efficiency, markets, competition, consumer choice, etc. had gained predominance. Free markets unrestrained by the government, removal of barriers to facilitate the free flow of goods and money, and privatization were considered

significant measures for economic growth. The then prevailing scenario favoured rollback by the state and the space created by it to be filled with the private sector.

### **5.3.3 Impact of New Right Philosophy**

The New Right Philosophy propagated in the 1970s in the UK as well as the USA, favoured markets as more efficient for allocation of resources. Excessive reliance on the state was not considered appropriate and it propagated a lesser role for it and opted for self-reliance. This perspective had a global impact in generating a consensus about the efficiency of market forces. Markets were considered to play a key role in the creation of economic wealth and employment.

### **5.3.4 Public Choice Approach**

The public choice approach had a major impact on the evolution of the new public management perspective. The human being is considered to be a utility maximize, who intends to increase net benefits from any action or decision. The voters, politicians, and bureaucrats are considered to be motivated by self-interest. Bureaucracy, being the core of public administration, is held responsible for the declining quality of public services. This thinking led to the new paradigm of government sensitive to market forces, which meant remodelling of government according to concepts of competition and efficiency. has become attractive as a consequence of this approach.

### **5.3.5 Washington Consensus**

The 1980s and 1990s have been characterized by questioning the role of the state in economic development. It was increasingly felt that poverty and economic stagnation, especially in developing countries, were the result of the state undermining the operation of market forces. The need for adjusting the economy on various fronts such as financial and banking sectors and a reduced role for the state in economic development has been considered indispensable. This led to the emergence of the Washington consensus. It basically comprises the reform measures promoted by Bretton woods institutions (International Monetary Fund and World Bank), the US Congress and Treasury, and several think tanks, which aimed to address the economic crisis, especially in Latin American



countries during the 1980s. This is also termed a structural adjustment cum stabilization program which emphasized the need for sound microeconomic and financial policies, trade and financial liberalization, privatization, and deregulation of domestic markets. This has also been responsible for giving a push to market forces.

The emergence of the NPM perspective has been one of the recent striking trends in the discipline of public administration. Its focus basically is on the following:

Restructuring government operations along market lines; Distinguishing strategic policy formulation from implementation;

Emphasizing performance evaluation and quality improvement; and

Stressing upon effective service provision and value for money for the customer.

#### **5.4 SALIENT FEATURES OF NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT**

New Public Management (NPM) is the most dominant paradigm in the discipline of public administration (Arora 2003). It conjures up an image enmeshed with a minimal government, debureaucratization, decentralization, market orientation of public service, contracting out, privatization, performance management, etc. These features signify a marked contrast with the traditional model of administration, which embodies a dominant role of the government in the provision of services, hierarchical structure of organization, centralization and so forth. Grounded in rational choice and public choice containing elements of total quality management (TQM) the New Public Management (NPM) seeks to offer more efficient mechanism for delivering goods and services and for raising governmental performance levels (Kelly 1998). Falconer (1997) provides a central characteristic of NPM which are as follows:

##### **5.4.1 Hands-on professional management of public organization:**

People, responsible for public service delivery, should be proactive managers rather than reactive administrators. The modern public manager should have discretion in decision

making within his or her particular area of responsibility. Unlike the traditional public administrator, who operated in accordance with established rules and regulations, and who implemented the policies of government with little or no discretion and with no direct responsibility, the public manager is a much more active individual, with decision making authority over, and responsibility for, the public service he or she delivers. This is called 'Hands-On Professional Management'.

#### **5.4.2. Explicit standards and measures of performance**

Under the new public management, management lies at the core of public sector activity, and professional managers are viewed as the key to improved public sector performance. It has been pointed out that, public management embodies the important belief that public sector organizations should increasingly be subjected to rigorous 'measures of performance'. This means that these organizations must pay closer attention to the objectives. Subjecting public managers to performance evaluation introduces disciplinary mechanisms which compel public sector bodies to focus on their specific responsibilities and carry out those tasks efficiently and effectively.

#### **5.4.3 Greater emphasis on output controls**

The proponents of New Public Management claims that for too long, public sector organizations failed to concern themselves with their outputs (i.e. the quality of services). The focus was on inputs, given that political debates on public sector matters usually revolved around the question of resources. Under the new public management, the focus is shifted to that of results. The important question for the proactive public manager is what he or she actually achieves with the resources available. As such, the most important concern of the public manager is with results. The new public management calls for decentralization in public sector organization.

#### **5.4.4 Shift to disaggregation of units in the public sector**

Given that public management embodies a strong criticism of the bureaucratic form of organization, it is not surprising that it advocates a disaggregation of bureaucratic units in order to form a more efficient, accountable public service. This is called 'disaggregation of

public sector units'. It is more efficient because smaller units of activity are better able to establish objectives and work toward achieving them more quickly and more directly. It is more accountable, because the new public management replaces the 'faceless bureaucrat' with visible, responsible managers who are directly accountable to the public

#### **5.4.5 Shift to greater competition in the public sector**

The central arguments within the public management approach are- the market, not government, is the best allocator of resources and individuals are the best judges of their own welfare. As such, market disciplines are advocated for the public sector, in line with the belief that the threat of competition and rivalry between providers' fosters efficiency in service provision and choice for the customer. It brings 'greater competition in public service provision'.

#### **5.4.6 Stress on private-sector styles of management practice**

The recommendation of 'private sector styles of management' is that the efficiency of public service provision is enhanced where a public sector agency conducts its affairs in accordance with business principles. An important theme within public management is that the public sector should seek, as far as possible, to behave in a more business-like manner (i.e. more like the private sector). Therefore, public service agencies should adopt reward structures for their employees, much like those in the private sector, encompassing such mechanisms as performance-related pay and more flexible working practices.

#### **5.4.7 Stress on greater discipline and economy in public sector resource use**

the important requirement that public service agencies must pay much greater attention to the way in which they use the financial and human resources at their disposal. The emphasis in the new public management is very much on cutting the cost of public service provision, while, at the same time, increasing its quality (i.e. doing more with less).

## **5.5 PRICIPLES OF NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT**

Osborne and Gaebler (1993) identified ten principles that represent an operational definition of NPM which are as follows:

- First, government has a responsibility to steer the delivery of public services in the addressing of public issues. As such, it reflects a notion that government does not necessarily have to be doing something in order to be responsible for the delivery of that public service.
- Second, government ought to be "community-owned" and that the role of government is to empower citizens and communities to exercise self-governance. This notion stands in contrast to the notion that citizens are merely recipients of public services and do not have to be actively engaged in the process of deciding what those services would look like. Indeed, the citizen simply needs to know they were receiving the same service as that delivered to other citizens or recipients such that no preferential treatment is being shown (Miller and Dunn, 2006).
- Third, competition is seen as inherently good such that, through competition, the best ideas and most efficient delivery of services can emerge. Competition can drive the newly empowered citizens and recipients to create new and better ways of providing public goods to themselves and their fellow citizens. New Public Management: Emergence and Principles 13 Sometimes competition means that various public and private firms were competing to procure the rights to deliver a public service. It also means that departments within a government have to compete for limited public resources, that communities have to compete with each other to offer fresh and original ideas, and employees have to compete with each other in the delivery of the services for which they are responsible.
- Fourth, far too often, the results of governmental operations were the enforcement of rules that may or may not have been relevant to the particular cases. It should be the purposes for which agencies are created that drive the activities of that agency, not the rules that have been constructed around that agency.
- Fifth, Public agencies should be judged on the results that they generate. Organizational processes like the budget cycle should be directed assessing the cost and benefits of the outputs of the units and not on the allocation of inputs (staff, space, resources) between those units.

- Sixth, the notion of customer is predicated on the value of choice. Customers ought to have a right to choose between competing and differentiated approaches that could be taken to deliver any particular public good.
- Seventh, bureaucracies earn their allocation of resources by demonstrating the value in terms of the public good that will be generated by the investment that elected officials would make in a particular agency. This perspective has the units in an agency competing with each other by selling to the elected officials a greater public good than that offered by the other agencies.
- The eighth principle relates to the desirability of orienting public agencies toward preventing rather than curing public problems. Although this particular principle has been seen as a critique of bureaucracy is general, it is not our intention to argue that anticipatory organizations are inherently related to NPM.
- The ninth principle is about maximizing the participation of the broadest possible number of people and institutions in the decision-making process. In this sense, it is anti-hierarchy and anti-bureaucratic. It is also anti-uniformity in that the way a particular public service is delivered is a function of the local community of participants who decide how that service will be delivered.
- The tenth principle relates to leveraging market forces and utilizing market based strategies in the delivery of public goods. It presumes that there is no one way to deliver a public good and a wide variety of delivery mechanisms are possible.

## **5.6 IMPACT OF NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT**

The new public management with its explicit market orientation and over-reliance on the private sector has varied responses from Third-world countries. The New Public Management Perspective had a significant impact on the administrative systems of western democracies by the mid-1980s. The economic recession arising out of the oil crisis of the 1970s, public sector cutbacks, limiting public expenditure and striving towards productivity, efficiency, and economy provided the impetus to the reforms. A host of initiatives were ushered in the form of the creation of new agencies, restructuring, privatization, contracting out, etc. These attempted to address certain key concerns that include productivity, marketization, service orientation, decentralization, and accountability for performance. The basic tenet of NPM is decentralization with

multiple agencies performing the activities instead of a single agency. These comprise civil servants and chief executives responding to the concerned Ministry. Each agency has to set out objectives and responsibilities in the form of an agreement. The key financial, service, and quality targets are to be indicated in a business plan.

In the United Kingdom, the public administrative systems underwent a significant transformation in 1979 wherein the Thatcher government initiated key reforms. The measures favoured rolling back the state, free markets, and limited government. With a view to bringing in the economy in the public sector, a series of reviews into various aspects of the work of departments, to examine specific policies, activities, and functions to bring about savings, were carried out. Financial devolution has been a major initiative in Britain at the central government level, introduced in 1982. Under Financial Management Initiative (FMI), measures were directed towards improved financial delegation, and financial control focusing on clear-cut objectives, measuring performance against them, and assessing the costs involved in achieving them. To monitor the activities of private entities, set service standards, prices of privatized utilities and regulatory organizations have also been set up. Public private partnerships in the financing of new public facilities, including transport projects, roads, hospitals, museums, etc. were initiated.

In the USA, the concept of entrepreneurial government enunciated by David Osborne and Ted Gaebler (1992) made an elaborate case for transforming the bureaucratic government into an enterprising government that is responsive to citizens' needs in a market-oriented manner. In the U.S.A., in 1993 under the influence of Osborne and Gaebler's view of entrepreneurial government, then Vice-president Al Gore, had initiated National Performance Review (NPR). This report was entitled 'From Red Tape Results:

Creating a Government that Works Better and Costs Less'. The basic objective of this has been to transform the culture of federal organizations by making them performance-based and customer-oriented and to prescribe a new type of government that functions cheaply and efficiently. It identified adherence to certain steps which include among others: putting customers first, making service organizations compete, empowering employees to

get results, and decentralizing decision-making power. The NPR promoted certain measures in achieving the above-mentioned objectives.

In the Australian government, the adoption of NPM measures aimed at slimming the state and the use of market mechanisms in the provision of services. Certain activities were outsourced. Partial user-pay charges for health and education services were introduced. Privatization of government business enterprises was also undertaken. Service charters were introduced in all government departments and business enterprises. Public service reforms were also ushered in to make the system more efficient, flexible, responsive, performance-oriented, and accountable through a performance-based pay system, decentralization, etc.

In New Zealand, corporatization of government commercial enterprises, and contractual relationships between government and civil servants to ensure accountability, performance orientation, and customer service were initiated. A Senior Executive Service (SES) was created comprising the Chief Executives of government departments and a new group of senior officials. They were appointed on Five-year renewable contracts. To examine the social consequences of corporatization, a Specialist Social Impact Unit (SIU) was set up. The reforms in New Zealand aimed at reducing the size of the core public service, setting up new forms of state-owned enterprises, segregating policy and service delivery activities, measurement of performance of public service organizations.

Developing countries such as India also introduced managerial reforms as part of the aid conditionalities imposed by donor agencies such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. They included reduced budgetary support to public sector enterprises, disinvestment, corporatization, and outsourcing of certain activities. Attempts have also been made to introduce citizens' charters, strengthen redressal grievance mechanisms, e-governance initiatives, and so on. We have already discussed these in detail in Unit 16 in Course 011 of this Programme.

## **5.7 NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT REFORMS: AN APPRAISAL**

The New Public Management (NPM) perspective has brought in reforms, which attempted to create a new entrepreneurial, user-oriented culture in the public organizations with a focus on performance measurement and autonomy to the organizations and individuals in contrast to the traditional model. Market philosophy cannot be an adequate substitute for the 'public interest, which is the core of governmental operations. The entry of economic and managerial principles into the public sector affects not only the organization concerned but also the nature of the state as a whole. This has raised certain critical issues within the state, between state and market as well as between state and society

The paradigm shift from public administration to new public management involves a move in the basic design coordinates of public sector organizations that become less distinctive from the private sector and the degree of discretionary power enjoyed by public managers is increased, as the procedural rules emanating from the centre are relaxed. New Public Management (NPM) is totally different in many ways from traditional public administration.

The New Public Management (NPM), perspective does not propagate just the implementation of new techniques but also makes a case for the propagation of a new set of values derived from the private sector. Public service as distinct from the private sector is characterized by certain basic norms such as impartiality, equality, justice, and accountability. These seem to be overridden by market values such as competitiveness, profitability, efficiency, and productivity. Some apprehend that this could lead to the weakening of public interest, challenging the legitimacy of public service.

The 'new paradigm' called the New Public Management, which has steadily emerged, emphasizes the role of public managers in providing high-quality services that citizens value and advocates increasing managerial autonomy, particularly by reducing central agency controls. It demands quick corrective measures and rewards both organizational and individual performance. It recognizes the importance of providing the human and technological resources that managers need to meet their performance targets and is receptive to competition and is open-ended about which public purposes should be performed by public servants as opposed to the private sector.



NPM fails to establish a clear-cut relationship between citizens and politicians. In any democracy, people have a key role in having direct relationships with their elected representatives. Politicians also are expected to be responsive to their needs and demands in varied ways. This way, the state is able to control society on the basis of a democratic mandate from the people. But for the NPM model, market mechanisms<sup>14</sup> play a dominant role and fail to indicate the ways through which people in a market system can contribute towards creating a suitable democratic system.

The NPM 'stipulates that public servants should have to accept more personal accountability for the actions of their agencies in return for this enhanced autonomy and flexibility. This is clearly a significant departure from the concept of anonymous' bureaucracy in traditional public administration. The promotion of collective interests affecting the majority is a distinct feature of democracy, but New Public Management is considered to be an individualistic philosophy that fails to take cognizance of the collective demands of the society. The market-oriented restructuring, especially, in a developing country is bound to affect certain categories of society particularly the poor, peasants, and labourers due to its repercussions such as withdrawal of subsidies, reduction in the workforce, and cutbacks in welfare programs.

The NPM has to be viewed not so much as an altogether new 'paradigm' as a refreshing reconstruction of the evolving discipline of public administration. It needs to be recalled that there has been a long tradition of 'implementation' research by several academics like Pressman and Wildavsky. Implementation studies' moved the issue from a focus on organizations, especially on their structures and processes, to public programs and the result they produced. It was "performance" that took the centre stage in public administration. As it has been rightly suggested, the NPM did not emerge all of sudden as a new paradigm. These two trends: a focus on performance more than organizational structure and process and efforts to explore the problem from many different disciplinary bases, gave birth to the NPM which, therefore, had its roots in the earlier implementation research in traditional public administration. New Public Management reforms are not generalized prescriptions solutions that can hold good and yield positive results for all countries. It cannot be a single dominant administrative reform strategy for developing countries. Any reform initiative has to be in conformity with the local conditions. Public

administration has to be set and looked at from its own environmental context. NPM reforms basically originated in the west and hence its impact is bound to vary. As Caiden (1991) remarks, "unless reconciled with local ecology, universal formulas of administrative reform based on western concepts were unlikely to work". There has been a lack of research studies to examine the impact of NPM reforms on developing countries. Also, there have been no proper indicators of measurement of NPM reforms. There are methodological problems in assessing the costs and benefits of the reforms. For instance, it is not feasible to assess the effect of performance-related pay, and short-term contracts on the morale and motivation of staff and the productivity of the public sector.

### **5.8 CONCLUSION**

As we have discussed above, the emergence of NPM can be largely traced to the failing administration of the previous machinery, NPM emerged as a tool for developmental goals in the 1990s to enhance the management of the administration. At the Commonwealth Association for Public Administration and Management (CAPM) Conference held in Charles town, Canada, in August 1 994, For the first time in the history of the Commonwealth such a high-level conference addressed itself exclusively to the issues of public management aka 'government in transition. 'Empowering' the citizens also assumes crucial significance.

Any reforms under the influence of NPM need to be introduced in any country keeping in view its political and socio-economic setup. The advocates of NPM focused on the benefits of managerial autonomy and exposed the overprotected bureaucracy to managerial models, which if carefully adopted, can bring about improvement in traditional public administration. This calls for different kinds of collaborative partnerships, and networking, thereby striving toward combining economic management with social values. A balance needs to be maintained between managerial reforms and governance challenges.

### **5.9 SUMMARY**

- The failure of the traditional Public Administration in the managerial sector led to the emergence of New Public Management.
- Globalization played a vital role in boosting the rise of NPM
- The two defining pillars of New Public Management are the Public Choice Theory and New Taylorism.
- New Public Management prescribes a set of reform measures for organizing and offering services, with market mechanisms, to the citizens.
- NPM has brought various kinds of reforms to different countries.

### **5.10 GLOSSARY**

- Globalization: It refers to the spread of the flow of financial products, goods, technology, information, and jobs across national borders and cultures.
- Managerialism: It involves belief in the value of professional managers and the concepts and methods they use.
- Desegregation: The elimination of segregation by race in schools and public places.
- Quasi-markets: Organizationally designed and supervised markets intended to create more efficiency and choice than a bureaucratic delivery system.
- New Taylorism: Based on maximizing efficiency by standardizing and routinizing the tools and techniques for completing each task involved with a given job.
- Decentralization: the breaking up of central authority, and the distribution of it over a broader field, such as local authorities.

➤

### **5.11 MODEL QUESTION**

1. Analyze the impact of the emergence of New Public Management on different countries.
2. Discuss in detail the factors which impacted the inception of NPM.
3. What are the Characteristic features of New Public Management
4. Write in detail the reforms of the New Public Management which came along with it.

### **Write Short notes on**

1. Principles of NPM.
2. Washington Consensus.
3. Write down the limitations of NPM.
4. Give an overview of the New Public Management.

### **5.12 REFERENCES**

Bhattacharya, Mohit, (2001,) *New Horizons of Public Administration*, Jawahar Publishers,

New Delhi. Stark, Andrew, 2001, What is the New Public Management? Oxford University Press, JStor.

## BLOCK IV RECENT TRENDS

### UNIT I: MINNOWBROOK-I

#### Structure

- 1.1 Learning Objectives
- 1.2 Introduction
- 1.3 Minnowbrook Conference 1968: A Background Study
- 1.4 Emergence of New Public Administration
- 1.5 Key Features of New Public Administration
- 1.6 Conclusion
- 1.7 Summary
- 1.8 Glossary
- 1.9 Questions
- 1.10 References

#### 1.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- To understand the reasons that led to the emergence of New Public Administration
- Identify the features of New Public Administration.
- Understand the concerns and contributions of Minnowbrook-I to the study of Public Administration.

#### 1.2 INTRODUCTION

According to B. Guy Peters and Jon Pierre, there is a tendency among the public, and even among

scholars, to equate politics and government with events such as elections, or the various conflicts in the society that shape major policy developments. “Those activities are indeed important for governing, but there is a massive amount of activity involved in translating laws and decrees made by politicians into action, and in delivering public programs to citizens. That work is often less visible, but is crucial for making things happen in government. Legislatures and political executives may pass all the laws they wish, but unless those laws are administered effectively by the public bureaucracy, little or nothing will actually happen.” (2003:1) Mohit Bhattacharya defines, Public administration as a specialised academic field that “deals essentially with the machinery and procedures of government as these are used in the effective performance of government activities. Administration has been defined as a cooperative human effort toward achieving some common goals.” (2020:4)

However, as Dwight Waldo cautioned us regarding the dangers of ‘defining’ public administration, “the immediate effect of all one sentence or one paragraph definitions of public administration is mental paralysis rather than enlightenment and stimulation.” (2020:4) This simply means that given the field of public administration, which is the action and executive field of government, it is difficult to contain it or have a settled boundary. In fact, as an academic subject that is engaged in building a varied body of knowledge on public administration, one has to be prepared with the shifting boundaries of government in any given society. Robert Dahl too argued that the “study of public administration inevitable must become a much more broadly based discipline, resting not on a narrowly defined knowledge of techniques and processes, but rather extending to the varying historical, sociological, economic and other conditioning factors...” (2020:4) As a result of the progression and evolution of public administration, what we see is that the boundaries of this discipline is not clearly marked as it used to be in the initial years specially when the study was confined to the politics- administration dichotomy. As Bhattacharya argues that it has become more of an interest than a discipline, more a focus than a separate science... it is necessarily cross-disciplinary.” (2020:4)

In this growing discipline, the impact of the Minnowbrook conferences have played a crucial role. These conference held in 1968, 1988, and 2008 in the Adirondack Mountains in Upstate New York are those events of public administration that appear in a gap of every twenty years and have a tremendous impact. According to Kim, O’Leary, et.al., these gatherings represent an extraordinary assembly of intellectuals who intended to “take stock of where the field is, where the field is going, and where the field needs to go.” “Minnowbrook is an enduring

legend in public administration, a narrative with an attendant mystique and mythology.”  
(2010:1)

### 1.3 MINNOWBROOK CONFERENCE 1968: A BACKGROUND STUDY

*...What Minnowbrook helped to inaugurate was a greatly needed and highly significant discussion. Here was fresh and original thinking on the role of Public Administration in the “time of revolutions” in which we find ourselves. - Dwight Waldo, 1970*

The year 1968 was the most turbulent one in the most turbulent decade in the United States since World War II. Starting with the Tet Offensive in Vietnam, which made it quite clear to the American citizens that the USA was not winning the war and the government was not telling the truth to them. The country was tearing itself apart over the Vietnam War. There was also the social upheaval as lesser privileged (Black Americans) were not been able to avail benefits of the prosperity generated during the 1950’s and early 1960’s. This was coupled with political violence and decline in the commitment of Americans to their institutions: the family, the church, the media, the profession, the government etc.

Dwight Waldo in his article “Public Administration in a time of Turbulence”, observed that in spite of these issues, public administration showed no sign of being aware of them, much less being serious to solve them”. It was in this backdrop that Dwight Waldo, then holder of the Albert Schweitzer Chair of Public Administration at the Maxwell School of Syracuse University, organized the Minnowbrook I Conference. Waldo felt that public administration had to respond to the events and turmoil of the day. He especially felt that the new generation must have a voice. He asked three junior colleagues, all assistant professors—H. George Frederickson, Frank Marini, and William (Harry) Lambright—to organize a conference. He wanted the “best and brightest” of the New Public Administration generation. He contacted the leading scholars of the day and several practitioners and asked who they would recommend as their rising stars.

Thirty-four young public administration scholars came to Syracuse University in 1968 right after the annual conference of the American Political Science Association in Chicago. The participants travelled to the Syracuse University Minnowbrook Conference Centre on Blue Mountain Lake, in New York’s Adirondack Mountains. The conference centre, named after the brook that runs through the property, is a quiet and remote place consisting of a lodge and several cabins.

Virtually all the academic participants at Minnowbrook were political scientists who tended to frame their perspectives on public administration along political science fault lines, particularly the so-called behavioral (logical positivism, rationality, science) versus anti-behavioral (philosophical, historical, normative) debate. Most conference participants were familiar with the debate between Waldo and Herbert Simon over the role of science in political science and public administration. That debate tended to frame the Minnowbrook “conversation,” dominated by the anti-behavioural perspective associated with Waldo, where he a more political, theoretical, and philosophical approach to thinking about the tensions between democracy and bureaucracy, and Simon who insisted on a more empirical investigation—some might argue technocratic—of organizational and behavioural approaches to understanding decision making.

#### 1.4 EMERGENCE OF NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Under the patronage of Dwight Waldo, these scholars gathered at Minnowbrook and posed a challenge to “the ‘givens’ of orthodox public administration” and demanded restoration of values and public purpose in government. This group of young generation of American scholars initiated a new movement in the American public administration which came to known as the ‘new public administration. These scholars were aware and took note of the failings of democracy in the United Nations of America. The new proposition demanded the primacy of politics in administration.

The Minnowbrook I Conference was followed by several symposia, work- shops, and other gatherings. The conference papers were published in a book, *Towards a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective*, edited by Frank Marini (1971). This book is considered a classic, often taught in most courses on the history of public administration. The book is important to the intellectual development of the field, not only because it provides a historical perspective on the scholarly debates that took place at the time but also because it sets the stage for the themes to be explored after the conference. These themes were seen, in retrospect, as important markers for where the field was moving and what topics required more research.

In this book, Marini selected nine papers that cover the more important themes analyzed during the conference. These papers are the following:

a) “*The Recovery of Relevance in the Study of Public Administration*” (Todd R. La Porte)

In this essay, La Porte argues that the discipline, profession, values, literature, in short the very components of the public presence of the field of Public Administration, are out of touch with the problems that we face. La Porte then tries to show us the way to 'recover relevance' and bridge the gap with the real world.

b) "*Social Change and Administrative Adaptation*" (Orion F. White, Jr.)<sup>[1][2]</sup><sub>SEP</sub>

White analyses and illustrates some of the important ways that our society is changing, indicates how these changes are affecting the political and administrative reality, and urges the development of newer ways of dealing the problem.

c) "*Some Implications of Adaptation Capacity for Organizational and Political Development*" (Robert P. Biller)<sup>[1][2]</sup><sub>SEP</sub>

Biller supports and supplements the La Porte and White view of the state of affairs of the field of Public Administration. He suggests theoretical and practical improvement centre on the concept of development, but along the way he stops to explore several dilemmas of the study and practice of Public Administration, including a redefinition of 'public' which incorporates turbulence as an essential element.

d) "*Toward a Theory of Public Administration*" (Larry Kirkhart)<sup>[1][2]</sup><sub>SEP</sub>

This is the first paper in *Toward a New Public Administration* that focuses on the relationship of Public Administration to social-scientific theory. He traces out some of the newer trends in social science, with special reference to philosophy, sociology, and psychology, and attempts to discern their implications for the theory of Public Administration.

e) "*Normative Theory and Public Administration: Some Suggestions for a Redefinition of Administrative Responsibility*" (Michael M. Harmon)

He studied Public Administration through the problem of administrative responsibility. He explored that our ideas of administrative responsibility quite inadequate in terms of our present social and political state.

f) "*The Scientific and Moral Authority of Empirical Theory of Public Administration*" (Philip S. Kronenberg)

He presents a critical assessment of empirical theory in Public Administration. Here, he selects



two bodies of theoretical literature for special focus: comparative national Public Administration and organizational behaviour.

g) “*A New Comparative Public Administration*” (Keith M. Henderson)<sup>[1]</sup>In this paper, Henderson grapples with the past, present, and alternative futures of comparative Public Administration as a field of study from the standpoint of ‘non-comparative’ Public Administration

h) “*Constraints on Innovation in Policy Making: Economic Development and Political Routines*” (Ira Sharkansky)<sup>[1]</sup>This paper is the first that deals with practical problems of administration. He reflected on some themes that represent an active and growing research debate and tradition in the field of political science that he believes has been of “profound importance for the policy makers”.

i) “*Analysis, Rationality, and Administrative Decision Making*”<sup>[1]</sup>(S. Kenneth Howard)<sup>[1]</sup>

Howard takes a very critical look at PPB and asks what kind of rationality it is that those who would “rationalize public- expenditure decisions” have in mind.

## 1.5 KEY FEATURES OF NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

New public administration emphasised on four major themes: **Relevance, Values, Equity** and **Change**.

### **Relevance:**

The argument made by the advocates of these changes was that academic public administration was no longer “relevant” to the real problems of the day, most of those problems being concerned with policy—and particularly policy analysis—rather than administration.

There was a growing desire to deal explicitly with the political and administrative implications of administrative action. Furthermore, the aspect of ‘relevance’ was also in relation to the character of knowledge. Questions such as “public administration knowledge for what? Is it the purpose of public administration to facilitate use of administrative knowledge for the perpetuation of political knowledge? At the Minnowbrook conference, certain questions were raised?To what extent are we aware of the social and moral implications of knowledge in Public Administration?Does Public Administration presently yield knowledge useful to certain institutions in society (usually the dominant ones) and not to others?

These hard-hitting questions were challenging the status-quo in public administration. The new movement aimed at bringing about radical change in the curriculum to facilitate meaningful studies oriented towards the realities of public life.

### **Values:**

The new public administration rejected the value-neutral position taken by the behavioural political science and also the management-oriented public administration. They argued that such a position is difficult to maintain, rather they should explicitly espouse the cause of the disadvantaged sections of the society. This can be done by being transparent about the values that are being served through administrative action. The core of this can be understood through this statement “The new public administrator “is less ‘generic’ and more ‘public’ than his forbear, less ‘descriptive’ and more ‘prescriptive’, less ‘institution-oriented’ and more ‘client-impact oriented’, less ‘neutral’ and ‘more normative’ and it is hoped, no less scientific.”

### **Social Equity**

According to new public administration, distributive functions and impact of governmental institutions should be public administration’s basic concern. Frederickson adopted a bold social-equity attitude: “a public administration which fails to work for changes which tries to redress the deprivation of minorities will likely be eventually used to repress those minorities.” Such an action-oriented stance is intended to work for the removal of the wrongs of society and working for the betterment of the socially deprived sections. Thus, its aim was to make public administration more proactive towards major social issues.

### **Change:**

It goes without saying that any efforts to serve the cause of social equity is to actively work towards social change. The conference attempted to make the discipline more relevant and social equity oriented through change and innovation.

This change could be brought about by making certain changes in the status quo and also taking a stand against the powerful interests that is embedded in institutions. The participants at Minnowbrook aimed at exploring the many ways to bring about institutionalising change and remedying the bureaucratic tendencies seen in big organisations.

Dwight Waldo characterised NPA in the following manner, “Its adherents were centrally involved change in the American Society for Public Administration designed to give it a much forward stance... it is unlikely to transform radically public administration in the short run, but in the long run there is a possibility; and in any case it now is and will continue to be a yeasty addition to the entire complex of theories, techniques, and aspirations”

## 1.6 CONCLUSION

Frederickson argued, “to affix the label ‘new’ to anything is risky business. The risk is doubled when newness is attributed to idea, thought, concepts, paradigms, theories... the newness is in the way the fabric is woven, not necessarily in the threads that are used and the newness is in arguments as to the proper use of the fabric-however threadbare”.

The first Minnowbrook gathering involved new scholars wrestling with conflicting views of the field—past, present, and future. The movement that begun at Minnowbrook came under serious criticism of being anti-theoretic, anti-positivist and anti-management. Indeed, the participants at this gathering identified the role they were to continue to play in the field’s development primarily as one questioning the status quo. That development was not straightforward, easily reconciled, or aligned with common goals. The spirit of Minnowbrook I, however, was strong and enthusiastic. Public administration academics had to “recover relevance.” They had to go back to basics and deal with real problems. The other was caring. “Public administration in practice had to be more caring, more in touch with those served.” Bureaucrats (like academics) were said [to be] more interested in themselves than their clients. The conference suggested that administrators had to think beyond accountability. There was lots of talk about equity, and socio-emotional needs as subjects of Public Administration.

The success of the movement can be understood in terms of how it was able to bring public administration closer to political science. It was also able to integrate public administration with the basic concerns of political theory. Further by adopting features such as “client oriented, normative and socially conscious public administration”, the need for de-bureaucratized and basic, qualitative transformation of public administration, especially in third world countries have been advocated. After all, there is in this movement” a streak of idealism, a concern for quality of life and a desire to ameliorate the lot of the more deprived members of society.”

We need urgently to inject a good deal of the New Public Administration thinking into the policy-making process and we need to do this not only as a reminder of the new kinds of questions society is increasingly asking of governments but also as a corrective to those other relatively new and currently dominant influences which see in quantitative analysis and mechanistic techniques the solution to most of man's ills.”

## 1.7 SUMMARY

- The study of new public administration can be traced back to the history of Minnowbrook Conference that was held in 1968.
- The aim of the conference was to streamline the study of public administration by bringing in intellectuals in the field to review and debate on the state and the future outcome of the discipline.
- It was propelled by the period of political crisis that emerged in the United States of America.
- The key features of new public administration are relevance, values, social equity, and change.
- Ethics honesty, and responsibility in government have returned again to the lexicon of Public Administration.
- Effective Public Administration has come to be defined in the context of an active and participatory citizenry.

## 1.8 GLOSSARY

Minnowbrook Conference: outcome of the social disturbances in the late 1960s and early 1970s to bring a change in the orientation of public administration.

Ethics: accountability between the public and the administration, integrity guidelines to the administration in their operations which would ensure that the public receives what they need in a fair manner.

New Public Administration: administration that is normative, client-oriented and socially conscious. This new movement is helpful for the developing countries, as well as those places where there is a need of de-bureaucratization and basic qualitative transformation.

Relevance: a change in the discipline of public administration to make it more socially relevant, where the focus is on policy issues.

Values: arguing for normative concerns in administrative analysis and rejection of value neutrality.

Equity: distributive justice such that there is reduction of economic and social discrimination and promotion of life opportunities for all groups.

## 1.9 MODEL QUESTIONS

### Long Questions

- What is New Public Administration? What events led to its emergence?
- What is the Minnowbrook Conference? Explain its key features.
- Discuss the relevance of New Public Administration.
- Critically analyse the major literature that were published in the course of Minnowbrook I.

### Short Questions

- What four important themes emerged from New Public Administration?
- Why has the period from late 1960s to early 1970s been described as a period of social upheaval?
- What was the Waldo vs Simon debate?
- What was the immediate reason behind the Minnowbrook Conference-I?
- What has been the main contribution of the Minnowbrook Conference-I?
- In which ways New Public Administration is different from Public Administration?

## 1.10 REFERENCES

- Bhattacharya, Mohit. 2001. *New Horizons of Public Administration*, New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers,
- Bhattacharya, Mohit. *Development Administration*. New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers and Distributors, 1997.
- Dahl, Robert. 1947. The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems. *Public Administration Review* 7:1–11
- Frederickson, G. 1989. Minnowbrook II: Conclusions”, *Public Administration Review*. 49(2), pp. 95-100
- Frederickson, George F., and Ralph Clark Chandler. 1997. Democracy and Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective. *International Journal of Public Administration* 20, nos. 4–5 (Special Issue): 817–1155.
- Frederickson, George F., and Richard Mayer. 1998. Minnowbrook II. *Public Administration Review* 49 (Special Issue).
- Frederickson, George H. 1997. Introduction, *International Journal of Public Administration*, 20:4-5, 817-835

- Gil-Garcia, J. Ramon. 2003. "Towards a Public Administration: Minnowbrook III. A Reflection and Proposal", in <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/104/10410111.pdf>
- Guy, M. E. 1989. "Minnowbrook II: Conclusions", *Public Administration Review*. 49(2), pp. 219-220.
- Heady, Ferrel. 1966. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, Prentice-Hall.
- Henry, Nicholas. 1975. *Public Administration and Public Affairs*, New York: Prentice Hall.
- Hildreth, W. Bartley, et.al. 2021. *Handbook of Public Administration*, New York and London: Routledge
- Marini, Frank. ed. 1971. *Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective*. Scranton, PA: Chandler.
- Mathur, Kuldeep. 1985. "Development Administration in India: Old Lessons and New Concerns," *Journal of Social and Economic Studies*, 2:4.
- Nabatchi, Tina and Julia L. Carboni. 2019. "Assessing the Past and Future of Public Administration: Reflections from the Minnowbrook at 50 Conference" *IBM Centre for The Business of Government* in [https://www.businessofgovernment.org/sites/default/files/Assessing%20the%20Past%20and%20Future%20of%20Public%20Administration%20-%20Reflections%20from%20the%20Minnowbrook%20at%2050%20Conference\\_0.pdf](https://www.businessofgovernment.org/sites/default/files/Assessing%20the%20Past%20and%20Future%20of%20Public%20Administration%20-%20Reflections%20from%20the%20Minnowbrook%20at%2050%20Conference_0.pdf)
- O'Leary, Rosemary. Et.al. 2008. *The Future of Public Administration Around the World: The Minnowbrook Perspective*, Washington D.C: Georgetown University Press.
- Otenyo, Eric E. and Nancy S. Lind (ed.). 2006. *Comparative Public Administration: The Essential Readings*, Elsevier.
- Peters, B. Guy and Jon Pierre (ed). 2003. *Handbook of Public Administration*, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Simon, Herbert. 1947. A Comment on "The Science of Public Administration." *Public Administration Review* 7:200–203.
- Waldo, D. 1980. *The Enterprise of Public Administration*. Chandler and Sharp Publishers, Novato C.A.
- Waldo, Dwight. 1952 a. "The Development of Theory of Democratic Administration". *American Political Science Review* 46:81–103

## UNIT II

### MINNOWBROOK-II

#### Structure

- 2.1 Learning Objectives
- 2.2 Introduction
- 2.3 Minnowbrook Conference 1988: A Background Study
- 2.4 Themes of Minnowbrook II

2.5	Differences between the two Minnowbrooks: A comparative study
2.6	Conclusion
2.7	Summary
2.8	Glossary
2.9	Questions
2.10	References

## 2.1 Learning Objectives

- To analyse the relevance and contributions of Minnowbrook II Conference
- To find out the key differences between the first and second Minnowbrook Conferences.
- To understand the context in which the Minnowbrook II Conference took place
- To appreciate the additions made by the second Conference to the discipline of Public Administration

## 2.2 Introduction

“In public administration as governance, it is essential that we do not diminish our institutions to such an extent that we lose our capacity to support the development of sound public policy, as well as our ability to effectively implement that policy.” (H. George Frederickson, 1997)

The period 1978-88 marked several significant stages in the American policy studies and public administration. It marked the two-hundred years since the ratification of the Constitution with a separately established executive branch, upholding the principle of separation of powers, it had been a hundred years since the publication of Woodrow Wilson’s essay that stated the need for an effective running of the same constitution and it had been twenty years since the first Minnowbrook Conference which was held in 1968 in the Adirondack Mountains in Upstate New York. The latter event marked a new beginning in the discipline of public administration. Held at a gap of twenty years, these gatherings turn out to be an extraordinary assembly of intellectuals who intend to “take stock of where the field is, where the field is going, and where the field needs to go.” (O’Leary, et.al, 2010:1) It has been argued that “Minnowbrook is an enduring legend in public administration, a narrative with an attendant mystique and mythology” (O’Leary, et.al, 2010:2)

## 2.3 Minnowbrook Conference 1988: A Background Study

There had been significant changes since the last conference, the context in which American

public administration was practised had also transformed. While Minnowbrook I reflected the stormy times, it left a different mark on the field, the mood of the discipline of public administration was such that it sought to identify values and ethics as the critical issue of the 1970s. However, “it made a difference, but- like the times- was guilty of overreaching.”

In contrast, by 1988 the social environment of the Minnowbrook –II was markedly different. There was an increasing cynicism toward government that started with Watergate scandal. Frederickson stated that “since the public was unable to be effective at changing government, some simply concluded that it is better to have less of it.” (Fredrickson, 2007:825) Indeed, throughout the 1970s and early 1980s, the political and social context was steadily changing. The dominant political mood was increasingly anti-governmental and anti-bureaucratic. The politics of bureaucrat bashing were increasingly effective as political leaders, the press, and civil society viewed government employees as detached from their work, unmotivated by results, and indolent in their work efforts. The public administration period that began with the Progressive Era reform movement and flourished as part of the “positive state” was coming to an end as new constraints were being implemented to limit bureaucratic discretion in program development, implementation, and evaluation.

The era of positive government, “which stimulated rapid sub urbanisation, the stringing together of American cities with a national network of freeways, and the growth of schools and hospitals for the baby boom” has given way to regulatory state. The “New Right” support for market solutions often included alarming examples of bureaucratic retreat, such as in the area of deregulation and new efforts aimed at devolution. The context of public administrative reality in post-Reaganite United States of America “changed in favour of less directly performing government and governance, more privatisation and contracting out, more voluntarism and social capacity- building and more third party government.” Frederickson argued that the “values of public purpose had receded to pave way to the value of private interest.” While the policy of affirmative action had seen some successes, but the period also saw the prevalence of homelessness and poverty, and it became a crucial issue for the USA once again.

The economy too had changed, for instance employment in primary industries had declined, which was replaced by employment in service and information fields, however it was done with very low salary. The technological development caused certain geographical areas to flourish, while there was a decline in primary industry such as agriculture, timber, minerals that caused such areas to struggle under pressure.



In academics too, the arena of public administration had undergone drastic changes. It was much larger than it was in the 1960s, with schools and programmes at every major to minor universities. The field too became much more interdisciplinary than the 1960s when it was still primarily a part of political science. In the 80s, it had become much more sophisticated analytically as well as theoretically.

It is in these contexts, that the Minnowbrook II occurred in 1988, organized by George Frederickson, distinguished professor and holder of the Stene Endowed Chair in Public Administration at the University of Kansas.

#### 2.4 THEMES OF MINNOWBROOK II

In the course of the Conference, Dwight Waldo narrated a meeting in which a cynic had pronounced the death of public administration. To this, Waldo strongly disagreed, he said “public administration is going to be around for a long time so be of good cheer, and get on with it!” (Frederickson, 830). The purpose of the second conference was not to “facilitate a general examination of the future of public administration, it was also to determine whether important differences exist between people who entered public administration in the 1960s and those who entered in the 1980s”.

Though the debate between the normative and the behaviourist perspectives continued at Minnowbrook II, social equity and diversity were accepted as basic values among the participants. The conference was practical and more civil in comparison to the previous one which was radical and confrontational one. It was anti-behavioural in its approach in 1968, but in 1988 it was more receptive of the contributions of behavioural science to public administration. Yet, both conferences were theoretical. Like the first one, Minnowbrook II produced a considerable literature (Frederickson and Mayer 1989; Bailey and Mayer 1992; Frederickson and Chandler 1997).

The scholars who had assembled were sensitive to the failings of American democracy. Themes such as ethics, social equity, human relations, reconciling public administration and democracy, continued to be of intellectual interest. What was unique was themes such as leadership, constitutional and legal perspective, economic perspectives and technology policy. Frederickson summarized the premises from Minnowbrook II: “First, more technicist; second, more individualist; third, a social equity perspective that now included gender and age; fourth, an emerging importance on productivity and performance measurement; and fifth, a greater connection to mainstream social science and the positivist or Simon perspective.” The tone of

Minnowbrook II marked a change especially in its attitudes towards the people. Mary Ellen Guy argued, "Government is no longer seen as a train on which people want to ride." There was a general understanding that public servants were seen more as conservators rather than agents of change; on the other hand, privatisation was accepted in many of those fields, which were earlier considered to be the only domain of the government or public administration".

## 2.5 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE TWO MINNOWBROOKS: A COMPARISON

While Minnowbrook I had a significant effect on the study and practice of public administration, Minnowbrook II provided "a unique opportunity to compare the theoretical and research perspectives of that generation with those of the present generation, and to discuss and speculate on how those contrasting perspectives have influenced and will continue to influence the conduct of governmental affairs." (Fredrickson 819) In hindsight Minnowbrook I appeared to be a well-intentioned but overambitious optimism, while in comparison Minnowbrook II which exuded pragmatism and confirmed the inevitability of government as a tool for strengthening society. With these ideals public administration was called upon to renew its capacity such that it was able to deal with the problems of the emerging future.

Minnowbrook II was designed to compare and contrast the changing epochs of public administration. While Minnowbrook I was attended by scholars most of whom belonged from the field of Political Science, the second conference included individuals who were trained in policy analysis and policy studies, economics, planning, urban studies and law. The presence of younger people from different backgrounds posed two main questions as Fredrickson explains "how is that affecting the theory and practice of public administration? What will be the long range effects of the new generation on the field?"

While both the conferences were at the Minnowbrook Conference Centre, but 1988 conference was organizationally somewhat different from Minnowbrook I. More people attended Minnowbrook II; the number of female participants were 14 in II whereas all the participants at Minnowbrook I had been male except one female. Diversity in society as well as in work place was accepted as a basic value among the participants at Minnowbrook II. It was observed that "the gender diversity issues were clearly a 1980s interpretation". (Mary Ellen Guy) By this time, the feminist theory had started to influence the literature and attitude of bureaucracy and managerial decision making and thus it found a reflection in the Conference too. Thus, the Minnowbrook II in real sense "reflected the beginning traces of a more heterogeneous work force, at least from the gender dimension." About half the Minnowbrook

II participants were younger public administrators, with the other half were the ones who had participated in the previous conference.

A comparison between the two Minnowbrooks bring out the continuities as well as the discontinuities with an eagerness for ground-breaking research.

The following five major themes of Minnowbrook II were related to Minnowbrook I:

1. Concern for social equity that predominated at the first conference and was acknowledged as important in 1988 too.
2. Democratic values such as special focus on ethics, accountability and administrative leadership was reaffirmed.
3. The debate between the normative and behavioural perspectives that dominated the previous conference, continued with special emphasis on epistemological questions regarding how people learn about the field.
4. The need to respond to social diversity, for instance the emerging gender dimension and the need for free interchange between 'generalists' and 'specialist'.
5. The changing outlook on the government in Minnowbrook II as government was no longer seen as the train on which people wanted to ride.

The distinct identity that Minnowbrook II sought to establish was by focussing on the current as well as the future vision of the field of public administration.

1. It set its vision onto the future without appearing to be radical. There was an agreement that the environment of public administration is exceedingly complex, thus any meaningful long-term vision is not only unreasonable but also not feasible.
2. The scholars acknowledged the indebtedness to other disciplines, while at the same exhibited a strong sense of intellectual parochialism, for the general mood was not to lose the disciplinary identity.
3. While on the one hand there was tacit acceptance of 'privatisation', on the other, there was a strong adversarial attitude towards business. The background of the conference reflected a tension between capitalism and democracy that resulted in "an unusual form of truncated capitalist economy operating within a truncated democracy". Here public administration had to balance the best that business offered and the best that non-profit sector offers.

4. Public personnel practices were scrutinised, wherein there a need for innovative personnel practices were emphasised such that it reinforces high productivity.
5. There was a general reluctance to idolise technology as a necessary tool for improving public policy.

Unlike the first conference, Minnowbrook II conferees made a conscious effort to conclude, to summarise, to integrate, and to compare. The full papers and responses from the Conference were published in two issues of the International Journal of Public Administration. The first issue looks into the broad range of topics of democratic government, equality, ethics and leadership as they relate to public administration. The second issue dealt with matters of policy, policy analysis, technology, and management relating to public administration.

## 2.6 CONCLUSION

“Overall, Minnowbrook II was less controversial and probably less influential than Minnowbrook I.”(O’ Leary,2010:7)

In some ways, the themes that emerged from Minnowbrook II reflected changes in public administration as an academic field. Changes in the field, the maturation of the profession, and entry into the discipline by scholars and practitioners who were trained in a range of fields and with diverse specialties gave rise to a robust and fragmented professional landscape. Minnowbrook II grappled with issues that permeated the disjointed and growing study of public administration. These included contemporary challenges to the legitimacy and efficacy of government bureaucracies. The credibility of studying policies with “scientific” tools had to be compared with the more subjective analysis of practicing and influencing the art of administration. (O’ Leary,2010:7)

In spite of all, the conference could offer little attention to the realities of public administration. It failed to visualize the vision how public service can function at its best with in what promises to be a future declining market share, as the United States faces the reality of a global economy and a changing industrial base”. However, Holzer states: “Given the pragmatism evident as Minnow Brook II, one might also conclude (however reluctantly) that a new realism might more effectively serve the public and public sector for the next two decades”.

However, it mostly missed the coming importance of the reinventing government movement and the emergence of the New Public Management. The scholars were less successful in setting forth an agenda whereby the field might strategically manage the challenges that it would

soon confront, because of the more techno-bureaucratic systems and processes that were being championed, developed, and implemented.

Mary Timmey Bailey observed that “In contrast to Minnow brook I, which challenged Public Administration to become proactive with regard to social issue, “Minnow II retreated from an action perspective to cerebral examination of democracy, ethics, responsibility, philosophy and even economics. Finally, Mary Ellen Guy states that “the discipline of Public Administration is on a stable footing”. The discipline “seems to be at peace with its core values and its sense of relevance and purpose”. It has also accepted democratic values and has accorded pre-eminent attention to the issue of social equity.

The optimism that was associated with the new public management which was capable to solve important societal problems has dissipated. Minnowbrook II was caught in a mood of ‘constrained hopefulness’. While the 1968 conference offered challenge for public administration to become proactive with regard to burning issues, the 1988 conference that was held in the midst of governmental cutback and ‘privatisation’ policy ‘retreated from an action perspective to an examination of democracy, ethics, responsibility, philosophy and even economics. The outcomes were therefore more pragmatic and less radical.

## 2.7 Summary

- Minnowbrook I was organised by Dwight Waldo in 1968 that attempted to re-establish the relevance of public administration in a time of social, political, and cultural upheaval.
- Twenty years later, since the first Minnowbrook Conference, the world had transformed significantly. Governments were being questioned, there was a growing anti-governmental and anti-bureaucratic sentiments.
- Minnowbrook II, organised by H George Frederickson in the year 1988, was yet another endeavour to examine the evolution of public administration and the consequences for scholarship and practice. The purpose “to compare and contrast the changing epochs of public administration.”
- The second conference was different from its predecessor in many ways. To begin with the participants were diverse, half of whom were women, the group included a mix of junior scholars and even the “original Minnows”.
- It was less “radical” more pragmatic that focussed on the role and relevance of public administration.

- Social equity and diversity were largely accepted as basic values of public administration. Overall, the attention was given more towards the questions of policy implementation and not much on big questions about bureaucracy and democracy.

## 2.8 Glossary

**Minnowbrook II:** The Second Minnowbrook Conference was held at the original Minnowbrook Conference Centre in 1988, twenty years after the first Minnowbrook.

**Watergate Scandal:** a political scandal in the USA involving the administration of President Richard Nixon that ultimately led to his resignation.

**Positive state:** the emergence of welfare state had increased the activities and responsibilities of public administration. Such a welfare state was referred to as positive state.

**Anti-bureaucratic:** opposition or dislike for complex methods and processes associated with bureaucracies.

**Anti- government:** opposition or hostile attitude towards governments.

**Original Minnows:** the scholars who participated the first Minnowbrook Conference in 1968.

**Privatisation:**The transfer of ownership, property or business from the government to the private sector is termed privatization

## 2.9 Long Questions

- Elaborate the events that formed the background to the Second Minnowbrook Conference.
- Discuss the themes that emerged from the Minnowbrook II
- In which ways was Minnowbrook II different and radical than Minnowbrook I
- Analyse the continuities and discontinuities between Minnowbrook I and Minnowbrook II

Short Questions:

- What was the political environment of the United States of America in the 70s and 80s?
- In which ways was Minnowbrook II similar to Minnowbrook I?
- In which ways was Minnowbrook II different from Minnowbrook I?
- Discuss the uniqueness of Minnowbrook II in terms of its participants?

- What themes in public administration was discussed in the Second Minnowbrook Conference?
- Briefly discuss the impact of Minnowbrook II.

## 2.10 Reference:

- Bhattacharya, Mohit. 2001. *New Horizons of Public Administration*, New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers,
- Bhattacharya, Mohit. *Development Administration*. New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers and Distributors, 1997.
- Dahl, Robert. 1947. The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems. *Public Administration Review* 7:1–11
- Frederickson, G. 1989. Minnowbrook II: Conclusions”, *Public Administration Review*. 49(2), pp. 95-100
- Frederickson, George F., and Ralph Clark Chandler. 1997. Democracy and Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective. *International Journal of Public Administration* 20, nos. 4–5 (Special Issue): 817–1155.
- Frederickson, George F., and Richard Mayer. 1998. Minnowbrook II. *Public Administration Review* 49 (Special Issue).
- Frederickson, George H. 1997. Introduction, *International Journal of Public Administration*, 20:4-5, 817-835
- Gil-Garcia, J. Ramon. 2003. “Towards a Public Administration: Minnowbrook III. A Reflection and Proposal”, in <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/104/10410111.pdf>
- Guy, M. E. 1989. “Minnowbrook II: Conclusions”, *Public Administration Review*. 49(2), pp. 219-220.
- Heady, Ferrel. 1966. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, Prentice-Hall.
- Henry, Nicholas. 1975. *Public Administration and Public Affairs*, New York: Prentice Hall.
- Hildreth, W. Bartley, et.al. 2021. *Handbook of Public Administration*, New York and London: Routledge
- Marini, Frank. ed. 1971. *Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective*. Scranton, PA: Chandler.
- Mathur, Kuldeep. 1985. "Development Administration in India: Old Lessons and New Concerns," *Journal of Social and Economic Studies*, 2:4.
- Nabatchi, Tina and Julia L. Carboni. 2019. “Assessing the Past and Future of Public Administration: Reflections from the Minnowbrook at 50 Conference” *IBM Centre for The Business of Government* in [https://www.businessofgovernment.org/sites/default/files/Assessing%20the%20Past%20and%20Future%20of%20Public%20Administration%20-%20Reflections%20from%20the%20Minnowbrook%20at%2050%20Conference\\_0.pdf](https://www.businessofgovernment.org/sites/default/files/Assessing%20the%20Past%20and%20Future%20of%20Public%20Administration%20-%20Reflections%20from%20the%20Minnowbrook%20at%2050%20Conference_0.pdf)
- O’Leary, Rosemary. Et.al. 2008. *The Future of Public Administration Around the World: The Minnowbrook Perspective*, Washington D.C: Georgetown University Press.
- Otenyo, Eric E. and Nancy S. Lind (ed.). 2006. *Comparative Public Administration: The Essential Readings*, Elsevier.
- Peters, B. Guy and Jon Pierre (ed). 2003. *Handbook of Public Administration*, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Simon, Herbert. 1947. A Comment on “The Science of Public Administration.” *Public*

*Administration Review* 7:200–203.

- Waldo, D. 1980. *The Enterprise of Public Administration*. Chandler and Sharp Publishers, Novato C.A.
- Waldo, Dwight. 1952a. “The Development of Theory of Democratic Administration”. *American Political Science Review* 46:81–103

## UNIT III

### MINNOWBROOK-III

#### Structure

- 3.1 Learning Objectives
- 3.2 Introduction
- 3.3 Minnowbrook Conference 2008: A Background Study
- 3.4 Key Themes of Minnowbrook III
- 3.5 Impact of Minnowbrook III
- 3.6 Conclusion
- 3.7 Summary
- 3.8 Glossary
- 3.9 Questions
- 3.10 References

#### 3.1 Learning Objectives

- To analyse the relevance and contributions of Minnowbrook III Conference
- To understand the context in which the Minnowbrook III Conference took place
- To appreciate the additions made by the third Conference to the discipline of Public Administration

MINNOWBROOK III—2008: THE FUTURE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION,

PUBLIC MANAGEMENT, AND PUBLIC SERVICE AROUND THE WORLD

#### 3.2 Introduction



Public administration as an academic field continued to grow through the 1990s and early 2000s.

By 2008 more choices emerged in the field of professional associations, journals, public administration programmes, and conferences. Degree programmes were accredited thus giving a kind of standardisation to curricula for master of public administration programme. Various aspects of the field such as public management and/or administration, public finance and budgeting, non-profit management, local government, and public policy analysis were developed. The need to achieve academic promotion had become much more rigorous than what it was in 1968. By 1988 there was not only a growth in the quantity of publications. The field had become relatively diverse and “multitheoretical”, “it is a safe observation that mainstream public administration was embedded as a form of applied social science and that the field was growing increasingly scientific, rational, and positivist.” (O’Leary p.9)

### **3.3 Minnowbrook Conference 2008: A Background Study**

In a matter of twenty years, public administration and governance witnessed many challenges and changes. The setting of Minnowbrook III was similar to the first Minnowbrook than the second. A range of problems starting with the controversial presidency of George W. Bush, the issue of global terrorism, especially the 9/11 attacks, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, etc. had already shaken the American society. Furthermore, the impact of natural calamity like the Hurricane Katrina and the devastation that it left behind, along with a severe economic recession were forms of turbulence that reminded one of the 1960s.

During the government of President Bill Clinton, an act called the Government Performance and Result Act began to define operational changes which made the states to think more seriously about performance. Here, the role of private contractors in bringing public service delivery increased at every level of government. Perhaps, the most dramatic of it all was that for the first time the Democratic Party was about to have its African American nominee for president. This was viewed as a promising significant departure in the roles and responsibilities of the government and also the marketplace, if Barack Obama was elected.

The social and political response to current events in 2008, however, was measured and more civil compared with 1968, though social issues dominated debates about the scope and influence of government. There appeared to be more citizen confidence in democratic and bureaucratic institutions on one hand, however, there was still a lack of trust for some institutional leaders. What is interesting is that in the governance networks of 2008, non-profit and private-sector actors complemented the work of governments at a time when there was an increasingly fragmented intergovernmental and interjurisdictional environment at both

national and global levels.

Given these issues and contexts, scholars started to rethink the role of government in view of the realities of 2008. The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, pressured the US government to put homeland security as their topmost national agenda, although it had already been at the top of numerous other countries' agendas. Globalisation opened up new avenues and opportunities for the United States and also put it in a state of vulnerability. "The economies, financial systems, health concerns, energy systems, cybersecurity needs, and the climates of the world were, and still are, increasingly becoming integrated and interdependent with one another."

In such a volatile political landscape the need to bring about bureaucratic changes was inevitable. These changes were to be viewed as increasingly technocratic, performance oriented, and directed toward managing by results. In the field of public administration, there were three main changes: first, the New Public Management to governance emerged; second, The publication of *Reinventing Government* by Osborne and Gaebler (1992) – redefined the functions of the Government and favoured an "Entrepreneurial Government" for bringing radical changes with the focus on de-bureaucratization, democratization, and decentralization of the administrative processes in the interest of the citizens; and third, the process of liberalisation, privatisation and globalisation made Public Administration 'enabler' or 'facilitator'.

### **3.4 Key Themes of the Minnowbrook III**

All three Minnowbrook conferences were celebrated in part as a legacy of Waldo. It is worth mentioning that after Minnowbrook I, Waldo edited a book titled *Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence* (1971). In the preface he indicated that the Minnows had gone too far in their critique of government. In tearing down government, there had to be a replacement model. One of the key discussions at Minnowbrook III was that we have yet to develop that replacement model—certainly not one apt for this new century.

During his career Waldo searched for a way to relate democracy and bureaucracy. As he articulated his case, "democracy at its best provides legitimacy and demonstrates the government's responsiveness to the people". Bureaucratic administration involves the power to govern effectively. Finding the right balance of responsiveness and effectiveness was the challenge Waldo sought to address, and it is a challenge that emerged at Minnowbrook III. For the new generation of Minnows, the Minnowbrook III gathering represented an effort to

discuss the components of this balance.

There were extraordinary changes in the world in the last 20 years or so and it is argued that public administration is reasserting its role and leading the way in addressing cotemporary problems. Therefore, the mission of Minnowbrook III was to “critique the current state of public administration public management and public service today and examine the future of the field”. The conference was held on 3-7 September 2008 and coordinated by Rosemary O’Leary a distinguished Professor at Syracuse University.

It was held in two phases: the first was at the Department of Public Administration, Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University. A pre-conference workshop was organised which was attended by 56 scholars at the same conference site at Blue Mountain Lake, New York, where the first two conferences were held. This was the first phase.

The second phase was much larger and more traditional that was held at Lake Placid, New York, which was attended by 220 participants from 13 countries. The papers and articles of both the phases were published in a book titled: “The Future of Public Administration Around the World: The Minnowbrook Perspective” edited by Rosemary O’Leary, David Van Slyke and Kim in 2010.

The conference accepted the spirit of critical inquiry which is related to the question “what is the importance and relevance of what we do?” this was one of the key theme that kept coming up over and over again at Minnowbrook III. According to Rosemary O’Leary, there was also an inherent desire “to make a positive difference in the world in a very concrete way.” The mood of the conference was such that every participant viewed the experience as “an opportunity to raise questions about the relevance of the field or recommending a better integration of public administration research with social sciences, management, law and other disciplines”

### **Key Themes of the Minnowbrook III Lake Placid Conference**

- How is the field of Public Administration different in 2008 from 1968 and 1988? What is Public Administration in 2008? [L] [SEP]
- Can we draw important theoretical and empirical conclusions about the market-oriented New Public Management that now has a 30-year history? [L] [SEP]
- Given the influx of scholars from many disciplines into Public Administration, is Public Administration closer or farther away from developing a core theoretical base? [L] [SEP]
- How are new ideas about networked governance and collaborative public management changing the way we look at Public Administration, Public Management, and Public Service? Are they changing the practice of Public Administration? Should they change what we teach in our programs? [L] [SEP]
- How has globalization affected our understanding of the key challenges that face the study and practice of Public Administration, Public Management, and Public Service in the United States, the developed world, and developing and transitional countries? [L] [SEP]

### **Statement of Commitment for New Public Administration Scholars**

The following is the statement drafted by the scholars-Leisha DeHart-Davis, Mary Feeney, Beth Gazley, Yilin Hou, Stephanie Moulton, Rebecca Nesbit, Craig Smith, Jodi Sandfort, Scott Robinson, and David Van Slyke, with contributions from other Minnowbrook III participants. Here they reflected that the strength of public administration today is the diversity of disciplines, methods, theories and approaches. However, they also believed that the future of public administration is limited by the institutional and personal barriers that researchers and scholars confront in their work. Such barriers were understood as:

- institutional incentives for promotion and tenure, [L] [SEP]
- curricular limitations (such as budgetary incentives to restrict interdisciplinary approaches), [L] [SEP]
- publication issues (including editor consistency, reviewer supply and reviewer timeliness), [L] [SEP]
- limited funding for PA research, and [L] [SEP]
- the challenge of conducting international and comparative public administration research. [L] [SEP]

The scholars at Minnowbrook III also committed to serve as change agents to uphold and shape the culture of Public Administration, a culture that is open minded to and appreciates multiple theoretical and methodological perspectives, with an emphasis on “publicness.” [L] [SEP]

In the research process they agreed to...

- Expand the discipline's acceptance of various units of analysis (local, state, national and international actors; government, non-profit and private organizations; individuals at various levels of organizational hierarchy; and stakeholders and citizens).
- Create a research environment that promotes the sharing of data and collaboration among colleagues to advance the availability of quality data within the field.
- Acknowledge the limitations of research methods and design in order to provide direction for future research and to avoid foreclosing questions that merit further attention.
- Strive to create research-based tools that reinforce the utility of a good theory.
- Promote rigorous research methodological training and the use of mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative).
- Invest appropriate time in sharing knowledge with practitioners.
- Cultivate the ability among practitioners to reflect in the moment and adapt when faced with complexity.

They also agreed that in the publication process they will . . .

- Strive to publish relevant work (for practice and/or theory).
- Expand the field's use and appreciation of cross-disciplinary theory while emphasizing the role of "publicness."
- Seek to promote the inclusion of multiple methods and rigorous methods of all types.

### 3.5 Impact of Minnowbrook III

The first outcome of Minnowbrook III had fifty-six critiques of the field of public administration by the scholar participants which they had also presented at the preconference workshop. Some of the examples are— "The Challenge of Remaining Relevant", "Public administration and the Black Public Administrator", "The Challenge of Teaching Public Administration in Asia", "Is There a Global Public Administration?", "Has Public Administration Been Roofied (Drugged) and Rolled (Mugged) by Economics?" Such critiques have been used by various university public administration, public affairs, and public management programs in their "intellectual history" courses, and this has helped them in developing newer discussions concerning their own planning.

After the presentations were made, the participants were led into a “Future Search” exercise, where they were asked to envision public administration in 2018. This envision for the future is quite reminiscent of Minnowbrook I that highlighted themes such as: relevance, action-oriented, and practitioner friendly. Minnowbrook III was interdisciplinary, methodologically diverse and was accepting of varied ways of doing quality research. It had publications that were new, open source, timely, used, accessible, and useful. In this “Future Search” endeavour, the scholars also expressed a desire to “contribute to practice”. This meant a stronger link between research and practice and that public administrators should be sought out as valuable experts for solving real problems so that they could make real difference. They discussed and wrote a “Statement of Commitment for New Public Administration Scholars” that captured the sentiments of the group in this regard. The phase Two of Minnowbrook III involved formal paper presentations in a dozen focal areas and it also had a more traditional format wherein two hundred scholars and practitioners from across thirteen countries.

The topics highlighted in the conference are as follows:

1. Academic-practitioner relations

One of the many issues taken up by Minnowbrook I conference, revisited at the Minnowbrook II and had become the dominant theme of Minnowbrook III was how the theoretical field of public administration connected with the practical field of public administration. There was a need to closely examine the extent of the research and how it impacts practice and furthermore, how the research can be made more approachable and useful for the practitioner.

2. Democratic Performance Management:

The participants of Minnowbrook III “agree on the merit of an approach to public accountability that includes market based efficiency, programme performance, and law based democratic values such as equity and transparency”. Efficiency plus effectiveness within the constitutional democracy framework has been the most desired approach.

3. Financial Management:

Proper utilisation of finances has always been the lifeline of public organisations. For this determines the effectiveness of public service delivery networks, performance, entrepreneurial activities and to undertake reforms. Some of the key concerns are “accounting

and financial reporting, auditing, fiscal policy making, cost analysis, cash management and others.”

#### 4. Globalization and Comparative Perspectives:

The academic field and practice of public administration has been impacted by globalisation. We know that we are living in the age of globalisation where every policy whether domestic or national or international, it cannot be constricted to the national boundaries. Thus, there was a need for Public Administration with a Global Perspective (PAGP). The PAGP is oriented “to advance knowledge building, address practical issues, improve public administration education, and ultimately, increase the relevancy of the field.”

#### 5. Law, Politics, and Public Administration:

The relationship between public administration and law has been studied in all the three Minnowbrook Conferences. The Minnowbrook III which has taken place in the environment of Market based reforms of New Public Management, emphasized the value of efficiency and performance in Public Administration.

#### 6. Leadership:

Getha-Taylor et.al. opined, “A central theme across all three Minnow brook gatherings ..... has been the development of public administrators who truly makes a difference who act as “agents of change” to transform public problems into solutions that reflects a commitment to public values”. The participants in Minnow brook III argued “for a heightened commitment to the study of public leadership, discuss conceptual challenges and offer propositions to direct future research”.

#### 7. Research Methods and Interdisciplinary Research:

The intellectual diversity of Public Administration, both in terms of method and theory, and the public relevance of Public Administration, offer both benefits and costs. The diversity in public administration calls for supporting the application of diverse and rigorous methodological approaches, to continue with the theoretical diversity and theoretical depth and promoting relevance (Nesbit et.al. 2011).

#### 8. Social Equity and Justice:

Social equity means that Public Administration should become champion of underprivileged sections of the society. Social equity's place within the academic field of public administration is rooted in the first Minnowbrook conference. Since then, "the concern for social equity has grown to the point where it now occupies a firm place within the academics, as well as the world of practice."

### **3.6 Conclusion**

Scholars addressed issues of governmental capacity and also the place of government in the twenty-first century. This is because there was a gap between the issues faced by the public and the government's capacity and capability to address them. The two phases of Minnowbrook III provided a useful analytic understanding regarding the scholarly evolution of the field of public administration. One could see the 'influence of Waldo and Simon "alive in the analytical frames, methodological tools, foci of inquiry, and theoretically informed research that participants presented." Those who were influenced by Simon used theories whose "roots are in economics, organizational theory, and management"; those more aligned with the perspective offered by Waldo used frameworks and models from political science, sociology, philosophy, and history."

What was missing in the Minnowbrook III conference was the reminiscing of the "golden age" of public administration. The group of scholars were mostly interested in looking forward. As they had access to a range of methodological, analytical, and technological tools, they were able to offer contributions to the field that were evidence based. The future lied in a more global approach to thinking about institutions and the work of public administrators.

### **3.7 Summary**

- Public administration as a discipline has evolved for many decades. Academic efforts like the past three Minnowbrook Conferences have helped in proper diagnosis of the field of public administration is developing.
- The purpose of Minnowbrooks have been to develop a better understanding of the different positions and start building a consensus about the construction of a science of Public Administration.
- Developed in two phases, Minnowbrook III aimed at critiquing the current state of public administration and examine it for the future. Held in 2008, the USA had seen major political changes.
- Minnowbrook III was an attempt at understanding the role of public administration in not only theory but also in practice so that it was in a position to offer solution to the changes that



were unfolding in the society.

### **3.8 Glossary**

**Global Terrorism:** according to Global Terrorism Database, terrorism is defined as “acts of violence by non-state actors, perpetrated against civilian populations, intended to cause fear, in order to achieve a political objective.”

**Positivism:** recognising only that which can be scientifically verified or which is capable of logical proof.

**Relevance:** a change in the discipline of public administration to make it more socially relevant, where the focus is on policy issues.

**Social Equity:** distributive justice such that there is reduction of economic and social discrimination and promotion of life opportunities for all groups.

**De-bureaucratisation:** a form of decentralisation involving transfer of powers and function from government to non-government organisation or private sectors.

**Centralisation:** concentration of power and function under a single authority.

**Globalisation:** a phenomenon in which there is growing interdependence of world’s economies, cultures, goods and services, technology, and flows of investment, people, and information.

### **3.9 Questions**

Long Questions:

- Discuss the events leading to Minnowbrook III?
- What have been the major contributions of Minnowbrook III conference?
- Analyse the statement of Commitment published by the scholars of Minnowbrook III for the field of Public Administration.
- Which areas were highlighted by the new generation scholars of Minnowbrook III?

Short Questions:

- In which ways can one say Minnowbrook I was similar to Minnowbrook III?
- Identify what was unique in Minnowbrook III compared to the previous Minnowbrooks.
- Which themes were highlighted in the third conference held in 2008?
- Briefly discuss the contributions of the two phases in Minnowbrook III
- What do you understand by the academic-practitioner dichotomy?

### 3.10 References

- Bhattacharya, Mohit. 2001. *New Horizons of Public Administration*, New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers,
- Bhattacharya, Mohit. *Development Administration*. New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers and Distributors, 1997.
- Dahl, Robert. 1947. The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems. *Public Administration Review* 7:1–11
- Frederickson, G. 1989. Minnowbrook II: Conclusions”, *Public Administration Review*. 49(2), pp. 95-100
- Frederickson, George F., and Ralph Clark Chandler. 1997. Democracy and Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective. *International Journal of Public Administration* 20, nos. 4–5 (Special Issue): 817–1155.
- Frederickson, George F., and Richard Mayer. 1998. Minnowbrook II. *Public Administration Review* 49 (Special Issue).
- Frederickson, George H. 1997. Introduction, *International Journal of Public Administration*, 20:4-5, 817-835
- Gil-Garcia, J. Ramon. 2003. “Towards a Public Administration: Minnowbrook III. A Reflection and Proposal”, in <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/104/10410111.pdf>
- Guy, M. E. 1989. “Minnowbrook II: Conclusions”, *Public Administration Review*. 49(2), pp. 219-220.
- Heady, Ferrel. 1966. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, Prentice-Hall.
- Henry, Nicholas. 1975. *Public Administration and Public Affairs*, New York: Prentice Hall.
- Hildreth, W. Bartley, et.al. 2021. *Handbook of Public Administration*, New York and London: Routledge
- Marini, Frank. ed. 1971. *Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective*. Scranton, PA: Chandler.
- Mathur, Kuldeep. 1985. "Development Administration in India: Old Lessons and New Concerns," *Journal of Social and Economic Studies*, 2:4.
- Nabatchi, Tina and Julia L. Carboni. 2019. “Assessing the Past and Future of Public Administration: Reflections from the Minnowbrook at 50 Conference” *IBM Centre for The Business of Government* in [https://www.businessofgovernment.org/sites/default/files/Assessing%20the%20Past%20and%20Future%20of%20Public%20Administration%20-%20Reflections%20from%20the%20Minnowbrook%20at%2050%20Conference\\_0.pdf](https://www.businessofgovernment.org/sites/default/files/Assessing%20the%20Past%20and%20Future%20of%20Public%20Administration%20-%20Reflections%20from%20the%20Minnowbrook%20at%2050%20Conference_0.pdf)
- O’Leary, Rosemary. Et.al. 2008. *The Future of Public Administration Around the World: The Minnowbrook Perspective*, Washington D.C: Georgetown University Press.
- Otenyo, Eric E. and Nancy S. Lind (ed.). 2006. *Comparative Public Administration: The Essential Readings*, Elsevier.
- Peters, B. Guy and Jon Pierre (ed). 2003. *Handbook of Public Administration*, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

- Simon, Herbert. 1947. A Comment on “The Science of Public Administration.” *Public Administration Review* 7:200–203.
- Waldo, D. 1980. *The Enterprise of Public Administration*. Chandler and Sharp Publishers, Novato C.A.
- Waldo, Dwight. 1952a. “The Development of Theory of Democratic Administration”. *American Political Science Review* 46:81–103

## UNIT IV

### Changing Agenda of New Public Administration

Structure

Structure

#### 4.1 Learning Objectives

4.2 Introduction

4.3 Changing Social Environment: A Background Study

4.4 The Honey Report on Higher Education of Public Service

4.5 The Philadelphia Conference on the Theory and Practice of Public Administration, 1967

4.6 Minnowbrook Conferences: Minnowbrook Conference

I

4.7 Goals of New Public Administration

4.8 New Public Administration: Anti-Goals

4.9 Features of New Public Administration

4.10 Minnowbrook Conference II

4.11 Changing Role of New Public Administration

4.12 Conclusion

4.13 Summary

4.14 Glossary

4.15 Model Questions

4.16 References

#### **4.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES**

- To understand the emergence and growth of New Public Administration
- To explain the reasons behind the need to have a New Public Administration
- Highlight the concerns raised in various conferences
- To examine the thrust areas of Minnowbrook Conferences.
- To Make an appraisal of New Public Administration

#### **4.2 Introduction**

In the 1960s and 1970s, United States of America faced a turbulent period with bouts of instability and social unrest. In such a time, the field of public administration and its relevance was questioned. This is because the earlier principles of public administration such as 'economy' and 'efficiency' were found to be inadequate and incapable to achieving the objectives of administrative activities. It was soon realised that as much as it was wanted, public administration cannot be "value free". In fact, what was desirable was to be "value oriented" meaning reference to certain human values should be promoted if one was to work for the society.

This shift in the orientation was termed as 'New Public Administration'. Two scholarly works "Towards a New Public Administration, The Minnowbrook Perspective" edited by Frank Marini, and "Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence" edited by Dwight Waldo, both published in 1971 gave a fresh lease of life to the concept of public administration by adding the prefix "new". These two books played an important role in shaping the minds of the public administration scholars as they decided to come together and discuss where the field of public administration was going? This led to the Minnowbrook Conference in 1968. Here, the participants expressed their dissatisfaction with the state of the discipline of public

administration. They sought to give it a new image by discarding the traditional concepts and make it sturdy enough to solve the problems presented by the “turbulent times.”

#### **4.3 CHANGING SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT: A BACKGROUND STUDY**

The USA was undergoing rapid changes, which the state was unable to handle. There were social tensions and unrest among several sections of the people. The worst impacted were the minorities, unemployed, and the youth. These problems were dissatisfaction with the Vietnam war, increase in population, environmental problems, economic crisis etc., all of which was questioning the efficacy of the political and administrative system.

It soon started affecting the day to day workings and it became a matter of primary importance to the elected officials, administrators and public leaders. Several changes in policies and institutions began to be undertaken and debates were held in trying to figure out different ways to strengthen political and administrative capabilities for coping with the rapidly changing environments: economic, social, political, technological, as well as human. Human and value-oriented administration was suggested. It was felt necessary to inject the goals of being responsive to the needs of clients and ensuring social equity in service delivery. This led to the development of New Public Administration (NPA) which intended to provide for a more philosophical outlook for public administration.

By 1967-68, several efforts were initiated to make the field multidisciplinary and social equity-oriented.

#### **4.4 The Honey Report on Higher Education for Public Service:**

The American Society of Public Administration had been concerned with regard to the growth of public administration and also the ways in which its scope can be enlarged especially in the academic curriculum offered by university departments. In 1966, John Honey from the Syracuse University did an evaluation of Public Administration that was being taught in the universities. He highlighted a series of problems:

1. There was an uncertainty and confusion with regard to the status of the discipline.
2. There were inadequate funds, due to which the university department were unable to promote the discipline.
3. There was an underlying problem relating to lack of communication between the scholars and practitioners of the field.

4. Finally, there were certain institutional shortcomings too.

It therefore recommended generation of resources from both government as well as private organisations to encourage higher studies in public administration. Furthermore, it also suggested that there should be a link between the departments and government through appointment of professors to position in government and vice-versa. Lastly, setting up a National Commission on Public Service Education to provide leadership in the field.

#### **4.5 The Philadelphia Conference on the Theory and Practice of Public Administration, 1967**

In 1967, the American Academy of Political and Social Science organised a conference in Philadelphia under the chairmanship of James C. Charlesworth titled, “The Theory and Practice of Public Administration.” Some of the major points raised in the Conference are as follows:

- The massive increase in the functions and responsibilities of the government calls for widening of the scope of public administration. This is especially in the context of the progressive transformation of the limited function of the state into a welfare state, the responsibilities and functions of the administration. Since these changes are a continuous affair therefore it would not be correct to compartmentalise it. Therefore, the scope of the discipline should be flexible such that it would facilitate its development.
- The dichotomy between policy and administration was considered meaningless, due to the interlinkages between the policy making and implementation functions of the discipline. [L] [SEP]
- Public administration as a discipline and practice needs to focus more on social problems such as poverty, unemployment, environment pollution and degradation and so on. [L] [SEP]
- Socio-economic disparities have been plaguing the society since a long time. Thus, promoting social equity and other values such as efficiency, accountability, administrative responsiveness, people’s participation in decision-making should be seen as an important administrative value.
- Excessive emphasis on adherence to other internal mechanisms increases the hierarchy, and administrative rigidity. Hence to enhance its efficacy, there is need for management flexibility and other innovations. [L] [SEP]
- Training of administrators in professional schools. [L] [SEP]
- Training programmes in Public Administration to sharpen not just [L] [SEP] managerial abilities and skills but to deepen the social sensitivity of [L] [SEP] the trainees. [L] [SEP]

- Emphasis on administrative ethics in the training programmes. [17]  
[SEP]

#### 4.6 MINNOWBROOK CONFERENCES: MINNOWBROOK I

In 1968 Dwight Waldo of Syracuse University took the key initiative to look into changing perspectives in the discipline of public administration. The conference was held in Minnowbrook by the young scholars of Public Administration under Waldo's guidance. The main objective was to make public administration responsive to the social concerns and assume the role of change in reforming the society. Various facets of the New Public Administration emerged out of the discourses from this conference.

The following are the concerns raised in the Minnowbrook Conference:

1. There should be a public policy approach to public administration as this can have a significant effect on the quality of administration.
2. While efficiency and economy are essential part, what is even more important is to have the values of social equity in the implementation of policies.
3. Along with the above point, values such as ethics, honesty and responsibility in public service is also a good part of public administration.
4. Change is inevitable. Government agencies can outlive their purposes, thus whenever need be there can be cut back of government agencies.
5. A responsive government has to manage change along with growth.
6. Active and participative citizenry needs to be an essential part of public administration.
7. Pluralism is accepted as a useful device in the practice of public administration.

#### 4.7 GOALS OF NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The scholars discussed on five major goals of the New Public Administration in the course of the conference:

##### **Relevance:**

The argument made by the advocates of these changes was that academic public administration was no longer "relevant" to the real problems of the day, most of those problems being concerned with policy—and particularly policy analysis—rather than administration.

##### **Values:**

The new public administration rejected the value-neutral position taken by the behavioural political science and also the management-oriented public administration. They argued that such a position is difficult to maintain, rather they should explicitly espouse the cause of the disadvantaged sections of the society.

### **Social Equity**

According to new public administration, distributive functions and impact of governmental institutions should be public administration's basic concern. Frederickson adopted a bold social-equity attitude: "a public administration which fails to work for changes which tries to redress the deprivation of minorities will likely be eventually used to repress those minorities."

### **Change:**

It goes without saying that any efforts to serve the cause of social equity is to actively work towards social change. The conference attempted to make the discipline more relevant and social equity oriented through change and innovation.

Along with this it was in the first Minnowbrook Conference that a decision was taken to identify client orientation as a key goal of public administration. This called for a change in the attitudes of bureaucrats and the administrators to be more people- oriented.

## **4.8 NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: ANTI-GOALS**

Robert Golembiewski identified three anti-goals or situations that should be abandoned by the NPA

1. Anti-positivism: this means that they reject the definition of public administration as "value-free" and also reject the rationalist or deterministic view of humankind. It is because otherwise it makes the administration more rigid and the attempt has been to reduce the rigidities and make administration more adaptable, receptive and problem solving.
2. Anti-Technology: human beings are not treated as some cogs in the machine. Thus, the need is to foster traditional goals of economy and efficiency. Humans should not be sacrificed to the logic of machine and its system.
3. Anti-Hierarchy: it was argued that hierarchy in bureaucracy brings in rigidity and has the capacity to kill creativity, innovation and isolates the administrator from the surrounding environment. Hence the NPA scholars rejected the hierarchical structures as understood



traditionally by public administration.

In the words of Frederickson “The essence of New Public Administration is some sort of movement in the direction of normative theory, philosophy, social concern and activism. It is less generic and more public, less descriptive and more perspective less institutional oriented less mental and more normative”. Nigro and Nigro observe, “In the past public administration has neglected the question of values in relation to the social purposes of government and that public officials have emphasized efficiency and economy of execution often at the expense of social equity. These officials profess neutrality but in fact have been far from neutral even catering to special interests”.

#### **4.9 FEATURES OF NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION**

George Frederickson referred to certain key features of the NPA

1. Change and Responsiveness: there should be necessary flexibility and adaptability in the administration such that it is able to bring about the desired and appropriate changes in the society in all spheres- social, political, technological, economic, etc.
2. Rationality: the efficacy of the administration must be seen not only from the point of view of the government but also from the active citizens’ perspective.
3. Structural Change: a revamping of the organisational structures fine-tuned to the relevant situation and needs of the environment.
4. Multi-disciplinary perspective: the field of public administration has been influenced by not one but several streams of knowledge. A multi-disciplinary approach would contribute to the growth of public administration in a holistic manner.

#### **4.10 MINNOWBROOK CONFERENCE II**

In contrast to Minnowbrook I, which challenged Public Administration to become proactive with regard to social issues, Minnowbrook II retreated from an action perspective to cerebral examinations of democracy, ethics, responsibility, philosophy, and even economics. (Mary Timney Bailey, 1989)

Holzer (1989) says that the conferees at the Minnowbrook II evidenced a 'constrained hopefulness' for the 1990s. He identifies two main arguments for Public Administration as a challenging pursuit. First, citizens are again seeking a renewed sense of community and shared endeavour, emphasizing interpersonal values and de-emphasizing personal gain. Second, public servants are an important link in the social system. Society will have to look to Public Administrators to solve a continuing stream of problems. Guy (1989) establishes that the eleven themes emerged from the deliberations of Minnowbrook II.

#### Summary of Minnowbrook II:

1. The concerns for social equity that pre- dominated at Minnowbrook I are largely at peace now. Guy argues that here was a concomitant sense that social equity was much closer to reality in 1989 than it was in 1968.
2. Strong concerns were expressed about democratic values and the centrality of Public Administration to promoting them. This concern was manifest in the focus on ethics, accountability, and leadership in Public Administration.
3. The debate between the normative and behaviourist perspectives has not diminished
4. Diversity in society and in the work force was accepted as a basic value among participants.
5. According to Guy, the tone of Minnowbrook II was one of constrained hopefulness. A revised sense of what government should do and what government can do was being debated in the nation at the time. Participants seem to have come to terms with this change and are hopeful for a constructive role for Public Administration to play on both the national and global scale.
6. Certain 'rules of the road' were accepted. Visions were of the near future, not the long-term future, and the participants were voluntarily constrained to that which was judged by participants to be realistic.
7. A professional 'ethnocentricity' or parochialism prevailed, indicating that Public Administration as a field is having a hard time dealing with its interdisciplinary roots.
8. Innovative personnel practices were described or called for in order to move away from public manager's current inability to hire employees on a timely basis, promote the best employees, and reinforce high productivity while being able to discharge non-productive employees.

9. Unwillingness to address technological issues was evident. Technology was seen as diminishing public service rather a tool to improve it.
10. Unwillingness to look at the specifics of what government should do was evident. According to Guy, even in the midst of discussions on the inevitability of administrators exerting control over policy agendas, the politics/administration dichotomy appears to be alive and well.

#### 4.11 CHANGING ROLE OF NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION:

The critics of the doctrine held that NPA only possesses one kind of difference by definition. Alan Campbell argued “it differs from the ‘old’ public administration only in that it is responsive to a different set of societal problems from those of other periods.” He states that many of the issues brought to the surface quite vigorously by the advocates of the NPA were not new. They were often raised by scholars from time to time. However, the proponents of NPA have raised this matter quite forcefully and also with a strong commitment to social change. The strong emphasis on citizens’ participation in decision making, on normative value of social equity, and human relations approach is a reminder regarding the need for reorientation of theory and practice of public administration.

Dwight Waldo in his book “Enterprise of Public Administration” (1980) highlighted that NPA projects three perspective- client (citizen)oriented bureaucracy, representative bureaucracy, and people’s participation. When these three are woven together it would tend to only democratise the discipline even more.

Carter and Duffey writing on NPA in the International Journal of Public Administration (1984) however, expressed doubts whether “the objective of social equity is actually getting recognised as a well-established administrative objective or value in addition to the existing ones of efficiency, effectiveness, and public accountability. This is because the disparities of wealth and income continue to increase in the USA to a large extent. When the government curtailed spending on social welfare programmes, it was the deprived section that did not even have adequate access to all the requisite economic and social facilities for their substantial betterment. While it is understood that the adoption of social equity as a policy and administrative objective is not an easy proposition to be implement. Further, the concept

of social equity is vague. What it means, what it requires in public programmes, opinions vary greatly.

However, one can only hope that perhaps the progress towards such a policy become more encouraging due to societal pressures. Robert T. Golembiewski holds that New Public Administration must be counted a partial success, at best and perhaps only a cruel reminder of the gap in the field between aspiration and performance. He describes it “revolution or radicalism in words and (at best) status quo in skills or technologies.”

Recent trends in the study and practice of public administration in several countries both developed and developing has indicated similar revisions and additions. It is true that the impact and intensity may vary from country to country depending on numerous factors such as their history, national resources, the nature of the political system, the cultural and demographical patterns etc. Depending upon these factors the impact can be weak in some countries and strong in others. On the whole, these trends indicate:

- a) growing emphasis on social equity in public policies and administrative actions;
- b) devising of institutional arrangements to facilitate increased public participation in administrative processes (i.e. decision-making, operations, etc.) at local and grassroots levels;
- c) strengthening of political direction of administration as well as of administrative accountability to the political authorities within the government;
- d) adoption of innovative (new) types of organisations as well as of modern management practices, and techniques and technologies to raise the administrative capability (i.e. efficiency and effectiveness) to deal with highly diverse, complex and numerous governmental tasks.
- e) growth of unionism among the public personnel (government employees) of various grades and departments of organised arrangements for government-employee's consultations and negotiations well as for arbitration of disputes.

#### **4.12 CONCLUSION**

The New Public Administration has not yet developed a theory of its own. It was the product of the social ferment of the 1960's and early 1970s in the United States. The Minnowbrook Conference was a youth conference which felt that old public administration had failed to solve the current social problems. Thus, because of the above trends the scope and nature of the discipline of public administration has increased considerably. It is no longer constricted to administrative phenomena, policies, organisation or processes. It is interested in issues of social equity, citizens' participation and also continuously expanding administrative system that is adapting according to the changing environment. In short one can say that the New Public Administration both in theory and practice tends to be comprehensive in scope, descriptive cum normative in character and multidisciplinary in substance.

#### **4.13 SUMMARY**

- New Public Administration that evolved in 1960s in the aftermath of the first Minnowbrook Conference gave primacy to key concerns that had relevance during those times.
- They included social equity, policy issues, change, participative citizenry, etc.
- The second Minnowbrook Conference, attempted to examine the future of public administration. The conference made a sincere attempt to highlight some of the themes such as ethics, human relations, social equity, concern for the state of the field, along with current themes such as technology policy, economic and legal perspectives etc.
- Public administration, should draw from, various disciplines that intersect the field and construct a new, more relevant discipline that integrates several selected areas.
- It was felt that there is need for a theory of public administration with an overarching epistemology and research methodology.

#### **4.14 Glossary**

Social Equity: distributive justice such that there is reduction of economic and social discrimination and promotion of life opportunities for all groups.

Efficiency: the degree of objective/goal achieved by the organisation.

Minnowbrook Conference: outcome of the social disturbances in the late 1960s and early 1970s to bring a change in the orientation of public administration.

Environment Sensitivity: Awareness of the surrounding cultural, social, economic, religious etc. factors

Values: arguing for normative concerns in administrative analysis and rejection of value neutrality.

#### 4.15 Questions

1. Discuss the goals of New Public Administration.
  2. What has been the main role and contribution of the Minnowbrook Conferences in the emergence of the New Public Administration?
  3. What is New Public Administration? Analyse the main features.
  4. Critically analyse the changing dimension of the New Public Administration
1. Discuss the major suggestions made in the Honey Report on Higher Education on Public Service?
  2. Highlight the main tenets discussed in the Philadelphia Conference.
  3. Explain the trends in New Public Administration.
  4. If a Minnowbrook Conference was to be held this year, what according to you, should be the focus of public administration in present times?
  5. Briefly discuss by what do you understand by the anti-goals of New Public Administration
  6. What was the socio-political context of the United States of America that created a need for New Public Administration?

#### 4.16 References

- Bhattacharya, Mohit. 2001. *New Horizons of Public Administration*, New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers,
- Bhattacharya, Mohit. *Development Administration*. New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers and Distributors, 1997<sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>
- Dahl, Robert. 1947. The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems. *Public Administration Review* 7:1–11
- Frederickson, G. 1989. Minnowbrook II: Conclusions”, *Public Administration Review*. 49(2), pp. 95-100
- Frederickson, George F., and Ralph Clark Chandler. 1997. Democracy and Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective. *International Journal of Public Administration* 20, nos. 4–5 (Special Issue): 817–1155.

- Frederickson, George F., and Richard Mayer. 1998. Minnowbrook II. *Public Administration Review* 49 (Special Issue).
- Frederickson, George H. 1997. Introduction, *International Journal of Public Administration*, 20:4-5, 817-835
- Gil-Garcia, J. Ramon. 2003. "Towards a Public Administration: Minnowbrook III. A Reflection and Proposal", in <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/104/10410111.pdf>
- Guy, M. E. 1989. "Minnowbrook II: Conclusions", *Public Administration Review*. 49(2), pp. 219-220.
- Heady, Ferrel. 1966. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, Prentice-Hall.
- Henry, Nicholas. 1975. *Public Administration and Public Affairs*, New York: Prentice Hall.
- Hildreth, W. Bartley, et.al. 2021. *Handbook of Public Administration*, New York and London: Routledge
- Marini, Frank. ed. 1971. *Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective*. Scranton, PA: Chandler.
- Mathur, Kuldeep. 1985. "Development Administration in India: Old Lessons and New Concerns," *Journal of Social and Economic Studies*, 2:4.
- Nabatchi, Tina and Julia L. Carboni. 2019. "Assessing the Past and Future of Public Administration: Reflections from the Minnowbrook at 50 Conference" *IBM Centre for The Business of Government* in [https://www.businessofgovernment.org/sites/default/files/Assessing%20the%20Past%20and%20Future%20of%20Public%20Administration%20-%20Reflections%20from%20the%20Minnowbrook%20at%2050%20Conference\\_0.pdf](https://www.businessofgovernment.org/sites/default/files/Assessing%20the%20Past%20and%20Future%20of%20Public%20Administration%20-%20Reflections%20from%20the%20Minnowbrook%20at%2050%20Conference_0.pdf)
- O'Leary, Rosemary. Et.al. 2008. *The Future of Public Administration Around the World: The Minnowbrook Perspective*, Washington D.C: Georgetown University Press.
- Otenyo, Eric E. and Nancy S. Lind (ed.). 2006. *Comparative Public Administration: The Essential Readings*, Elsevier.
- Peters, B. Guy and Jon Pierre (ed). 2003. *Handbook of Public Administration*, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Simon, Herbert. 1947. A Comment on "The Science of Public Administration." *Public Administration Review* 7:200–203.
- Waldo, D. 1980. *The Enterprise of Public Administration*. Chandler and Sharp Publishers, Novato C.A.
- Waldo, Dwight. 1952a. "The Development of Theory of Democratic Administration". *American Political Science Review* 46:81–103

E-articles: [New Public Administration](https://cbpbu.ac.in/userfiles/file/2020/STUDY_MAT/POL_SC/New%20Public%20Administration,%202nd%20Semester-converted.pdf)

New Public Administration <https://egyankosh.ac.in/bitstream/123456789/19175/1/Unit-7.pdf>

## UNIT V

### Future of Comparative Public Administration

#### Structure

- 5.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES
- 5.2 INTRODUCTION
- 5.3 DEFINING COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
- 5.4 THE ROLE OF COMPARATIVE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP
- 5.5 FEATURES OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
- 5.6 SCOPE OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
- 5.7 SIGNIFICANCE AND FUTURE OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
- 5.8 CONCLUSION
- 5.9 SUMMARY
- 5.10 GLOSSARY
- 5.11 QUESTIONS
- 5.12 REFERENCES

#### 5.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

- To understand the factors that led to the evolution of Comparative Public Administration
- To look into the definitions of Comparative Public Administration and its difference with Public Administration.
- Analyse the scope and significance of Comparative Public Administration.

#### 5.2 INTRODUCTION

Mohit Bhattacharya argues, “as a subfield Comparative Public Administration (CPA) is not in a position to claim an elaborate and long history”. The interest in comparative governmental systems has been a lively field of both academic and practical enquiries. In the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, leaders looked across borders for institutions from which they could either copy or reject. “the most important comparative research was done between 1895 and 1920, not by comparative law professors or participants of international congress, but by a sociologist Max Weber.”

Traditional comparative government and administrative studies were confined to big powers, such as the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, the Soviet Union, and Italy. This was a limitation in the traditional studies. Besides, the traditional analysis focused mainly on the organization of government institutions, with a negligible emphasis on the behavioural or dynamic aspects of the government systems. Besides, most studies were descriptive in nature



and not analytical or explanatory or problem-oriented. Moreover, these studies did not take into account the interaction between the government systems and their environment. Fred Riggs calls these studies the “governments of foreign countries” rather than “comparative governments”.

Comparative public administration has been of scholarly interest especially after the World War II. It has been interested in cross-cultural public administration. Woodrow Wilson in his seminal article “The Study of Administration” published in the *Political Science Quarterly* (1887) had suggested that the USA should learn from the patterns of European administrative systems without borrowing from them their centralized monarchical political systems. This was a clear comparative orientation. Even L. D. White, who published the first text book in Public Administration ‘Introduction to the Study of Public Administration’ in 1926, was interested in constructing principles of administration that would provide guidelines of action in public administration of Russia, Great Britain, Iraq, and the United States.

Leonard White argued that “cultural factors did not make any difference in administrative settings, as in their view there were universal principles applicable to situations anywhere and everywhere.” However, scholars such as Robert Dahl and Dwight Waldo argued that cultural factors cannot be ignored for it is them that could make public administration in one nation different from that in another. Dahl explained, “the comparative aspects of public administration have largely been ignored and as long as the study of public administration is not comparative, claim for ‘science of administration’ sounds rather hollow.”

### 5.3 DEFINING COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Comparative public administration is a branch of public administration as it considers the workings of government in different socio-economic and cultural settings. Like public administration, comparative administration covers a wide variety of activities. Scholars interested in employing comparative approach focus varied issues ranging from public policy making and implementation in both developed and developing areas. Such a study strengthens our understanding of public administration by expanding the empirical basis of the field. For “by taking a keen look at administrative processes in all socio-economic and ecological settings, we have a more holistic view of the larger field.” (Otenyo, 2006:1)

Quite simply, comparative public administration is defined as the study of administrative systems in a comparative fashion or the study of public administration in other countries. Another definition for "comparative public administration" is the "quest for patterns and regularities in administrative action and behaviour". It is quite helpful in understanding administrative setups and their functioning in various societies or countries. It helps us in answering questions such as what works and why it works. Furthermore, it helps in improvising administrative systems by making them more efficient as we study the literature and theories on public administration across the familiar system with the help of practical experiments and analysis. One can also hope to adopt some of the administrative features if they can fit in our own systems. In addition, comparative studies also help in explaining factors responsible for cross-national and cross-cultural similarities as well as difference in the administrative systems. Thus, comparative public administration is a comparative study of diverse administrative systems, on whose conclusions most scientific efforts are made in public administration.

What is interesting is that comparative public administration can help in map patterns and regularities of administrative action and behaviour. Thus, one not only can gain information on the diversity of human experience, but also the similarities and uniformities within and among states. For a comparison extends our knowledge of how to explore, reflect, and also better understand universal administrative features instead of being just restricted to ethnocentric views. As society is dynamic, it becomes imperative to reinterpret and re-evaluate administrative structures to be in line with the ever changing trends in life. This is best done through Comparative Public Administration. A comparative study is usually done on an interdisciplinary format, thus encouraging more analysis on social phenomena.

Comparative public administration is considered to have the following purposes:

1. To learn the distinctive features of a particular administrative system or a cluster of systems.
2. To explain the factors responsible for cross-national and cross-cultural similarities and differences in administrative structure, functions, behaviour, and impact.
3. To examine the causes for the success or failure of particular administrative systems in their ecological settings. Thus, the discipline looks closely at the dynamic

interaction between administrative systems and their respective environments, including their positive and negative influences.

4. To understand the strategies of administrative reforms, their processes and impacts and the factors responsible for the level of success or failure of reforms.

#### 5.4 THE ROLE OF COMPARATIVE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP

Comparative politics movement became quite popular after the Second World War and found acceptance in the USA and several other countries. While studying the political systems of different countries, scholars also examined and analysed their administrative systems. Some of the scholars who took interests in comparative politics as well as comparative public administration are Leonard Binder, Joseph La Palombara, Alfred Diamant, Fred Riggs, Edward Weidnar, and Ferrel Heady. The Comparative Public Administration Movement borrowed from Comparative Politics Movement several concepts, methodologies, models, and theories.

Comparative Public Administration got its real impetus in 1962 when the Comparative Administrative Group of the American Society for Public Administration (APSA) received funding from the Ford Foundation. This was the time when the Cold War was at its height. Fred W. Riggs was the chairman of the group from its inception till the end of 1970. The CAG conducted a series of seminars on comparative administrative systems, focusing on theoretical as well as applied perspectives. It published more than one hundred monographs and brought out several edited anthologies on various themes.

The group also sponsored many research studies in countries of Asia, Europe, Latin America, and Africa. Besides, it was instrumental in publishing a quarterly, 'Journal of Comparative Administration' through SAGE publishers; the journal was later re-named as Administration and Society, which still continues to be published. Among the scholars, who were pioneers in the Comparative Public Administration Movement were Ralph Braibanti, Milton Esman, Ferrel Heady, John Montgomery, Fred Riggs, William Siffin, and Dwight Waldo.

The Ford funding was terminated in 1971, as research was oriented more towards research building rather than empirical and practical problem-solving. Ferrel Heady explains five motivating concerns as addressed by CPA:

1. Search for theory
2. Urge for practical application
3. Incidental contribution of the broader field of comparative politics
4. Interest of researchers trained in the tradition of administrative law
5. Comparative analysis of ongoing problems of public administration.

#### DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CPA AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

It is important to point out certain difference between CPA and public administration. Mohit Bhattacharya argues, first, public administration has generally been culture-bound. The discipline in USA and UK, for instance, is grounded in politico-administrative realities of the two countries. Second, public administration generally differs from CPA in respect of its origin. The discipline, as it has evolved in the USA, has been practitioner-oriented and involved in the real world of administration. CPA, by contrast, has attempted to build theory and seek knowledge for the sake of knowledge.

The beginning of CPA was enriched by the steady growth of the subfield called development administration. During the period between 1960s to 1970s, development administration dominated CPA, this was the time when Fred Riggs chaired ASPA's CAG group. This explains the interest in the public administration of the developing countries as Riggs was interested in it. Riggs desired CPA to be "empirical, nomothetic and ecological- that is, to put crudely, factual and scientific, abstracted and generalised, systematic and non-parochial."

In 1973, with the efforts of Fred Riggs and other scholars, a Section on International and Comparative Administration (SICA) was set up which continues to promote study, teaching and research in comparative public administration. This comprised of practitioners and academics, who are interested in global public administration. It has done a praiseworthy work of maintaining a key interest in the field comparative public administration. Annually, it awards Fred Riggs Award for outstanding contribution in the subfield.

Through their aegis, the CAG movement churned out voluminous publications. These included Dwight Waldo (1963), *Comparative Public Administration: Prologue, Problems, and Promise*, and Ferrel Heady, *Comparative Public Administration: Concerns and Priorities*;

also in this genre was Ferrel Heady and Sybil Stokes (1962), Papers in Comparative Administration among others. Since this is not the central issue of the essay, our attention is directed to Comparative Public Administration: An Annotated Bibliography by Mark Huddleston (1984).

### **5.5 FEATURES OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION:**

The emergence of CPA can be summed up in two broad arguments: one, there was a need for comparison as a pre-requisite for the development of a science of public administration. Two, the need for comparison in the interest of practical governance and knowledge of facts.

1. It is relatively a young sub-field as it emerged only the Second World War.
2. There are competing and diverse approaches to the study of CPA and this is due to the different disciplinary contributions, along with the enthusiasm of the scholars who wished to chart out new directions.
3. By 1962, Riggs noted more and more nomothetic and ecological approaches, thus indicating the application of scientific rigour to analysis. Emphasis on normative considerations could be seen side by side with empirical analyses.
4. The field has been dominated by American scholars. This is because it received the initial support of Ford Foundation and also due to the deep interest expressed by the American scholars in studying the newly independent nations, especially their culture, politics and administration.
5. CPA has two basic motivational concerns: theory-building and administrative problems of the developing countries.

### **5.6 SCOPE OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION:**

It goes without saying that the scope of CPA is as large as that of public administration. For any public administration aspect whether they are structures, processes, behaviours, impacts, environments, all of these can be examined through comparative lens. Thus inevitably, they would fall under the scope of comparative public administration. The following studies in comparative public administration will explain its scope:

1. Cross-institutional Analysis: when two or more institutions or organizations are compared in terms of their structure, functions, processes, environment, and impact; such an analysis is called cross-institutional analysis. For example, a comparison can

be made between the School Education Department with the Higher Education Department of West Bengal in term of efficiency and innovativeness.

2. Intra-national and Cross-national: the word intra indicates it will be a comparative study of administrative structures within a country. The comparison can be inter-district or inter-state but it takes place within the same country. In contrast, when we compare two administrative systems or their subsystems in two or more countries we refer to them as cross-national study or analysis.
3. Cross-national but Intra-cultural: When comparisons are made between the administrative systems of two or more nations belonging to the same 'culture', these are called cross-national but intra-cultural comparisons. The word culture can raise questions, for it is not an easy term to define. Yet, studies are conducted with a working definition. For example, a study of the status of women in the administrative systems of India, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka will be cross-national but intra-cultural. For they belong to the South Asian nations that have some marked commonalities.
4. Cross-national and Cross-cultural: studies made in two or more nations belonging to various levels of socio-economic development will come under the category of cross national. Culture also the nature of political system, when two countries of different political culture are compared we refer it to be cross –cultural. However, one should also remember that cultural category of nations can change from time to time.
5. Cross-temporal studies: the word temporal refers to time. When a comparison is made involving two or more specific distinguishable time-periods, are cross-temporal studies. For instance, district administration in pre-independence and post-independence periods will be considered cross-temporal

## **5.7 SIGNIFICANCE AND FUTURE OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION:**

Robert Dahl in his well-known article entitled 'The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems' published in Public Administration Review, (1947) had observed that there cannot be a science of public administration without a comparative analysis. James Coleman, an eminent scholar of comparative politics, had observed "You cannot be scientific if you are

not comparative.” So we can see that through comparative analysis of administrative systems, we can get new insights into the administrative reality across national realities.

Comparative public administration draws from several concepts and methodologies from disciplines such as Political Science, Sociology, Economics, Anthropology etc. Such interdisciplinary approach can broaden and enrich the study of public administration to a greater extent.

Traditionally we saw that public administration was confined to the study of only a select western countries and the environment of public administration was treated as ‘given’. However, with comparative public administration what we see is that there is an advocacy for the adoption of an ecological approach to the study of administrative systems. In this way, comparative studies have challenged parochialism in western studies. That the non-western world has its own administrative reality which has been of interest of many western scholars shows the conceptual transformation that has taken place in the field.

History is a witness how due to financial support, once upon a time, led to the reduction of academic interest in comparative administrative research. The reality is the work of public administration has from time and again provided ample opportunities for innovative comparative studies.

We are living in a globalised world, there is no escape from inter-state interaction. In a world dominated by the principles of liberalisation, policies are often made not within the realm of national borders, but rather by international funding agencies and are also influenced by the forces of international economic transactions. How states interact with these agencies can be an interesting area of research through comparative analysis.

Human Rights as an area of study that has been getting a lot of attention from international institutions and national governments. A comparative study of human rights enforcement and the challenges that they face can be of research interest.

Public bureaucracies, private firms, voluntary agencies and community based organisations are coming together more and more and in the process the distinction between ‘public’ and ‘private’ is fading. What we are seeing is the how in different situations, nations are

promoting co-production and creating a climate of networking of 'governance'. All of these provide new thrust areas in comparative government analysis.

The discipline of comparative public administration today is characterised by various institutional initiatives. The subject is now taught in a large number of foreign and Indian universities and colleges both at undergraduate as well as postgraduate levels. Journals on public administration encourages authors to submit their research work on comparative administrative systems.

Robert Fried sums up the optimistic climate of comparative administrative studies, "the international interdependency of bureaucracies... the universalising of demands for human rights; the crucial role of publics in resisting or promoting reform, the nature of the status as members of first, second, or third worlds-all of these present students and practitioners of comparative public administration with unexpected challenges to understanding, unexpected opportunities for research and conceptual development." Mohit Bhattacharya adds to this with his own words of optimism, "it seems CPA is poised today for resurrection as the situation worldwide is getting more and more propitious for comparative administrative analysis."

## **5.8 CONCLUSION**

Comparative studies of public administration have stressed improvements in the structures, processes, and behavioural patterns of public administrative systems in diverse settings. One of the related benefit of the study of comparative public administration has been in the emergence of the concept of 'development administration,' which has become a key strategy for holistic transformation of various societies. It is accepted widely that development administration is a goal-oriented and a change-oriented administration and is the main engine of all round progress of a country.

## **5.9 SUMMARY**

- Comparative public administration is a branch of public administration.
- As an approach, it considers the workings of government in different socio- economic and cultural settings.



- It is a very significant area of study in Public Administration as it helps in understanding administrative setups and their functioning in various settings and societies/countries and what works and why it works.
- CPA evolved post Second World War and since then the subfield has been in an ever-growing trajectory.
- Comparative administration seeks to strengthen our understanding of broader public administrative processes by trying to expand the empirical basis of the field.
- By taking a keen look at administrative processes in all socio-economic and ecological settings, we have a more holistic view of the larger field of public administration.

### 5.10 Glossary

- Comparative method: a method by which a study is made on two or more variables, where the aim is to find out both the similarities as well as the dissimilarities.
- Cultural factors: a set of values and ideologies of a particular community or group of individuals.
- Comparative Administrative Group: Comparative Public Administration got its real impetus in 1962 when the Comparative Administrative Group of the American Society for Public Administration (APSA) received funding from the Ford Foundation.
- Development Administration: the term came to be used in 1950s to represent those aspects of public administration and those changes in public administration which are needed to carry out policies, projects and programmes to improve social and economic conditions.
- Nomothetic: relating to the study or discovery of general scientific laws.

### 5.11 Questions

#### Long Questions

1. Analyse the emergence of Comparative Public Administration as a sub-field in public administration.
2. What do you understand by Comparative Public Administration? Discuss its features.

3. Discuss the role of the Comparative Administrative Group in the development of Comparative Public Administration.
4. Critically analyse the scope and significance of Comparative Public Administration in the field of Public Administration.

#### Short Questions

1. What do you understand by Comparative Public Administration?
2. Explain the difference between Comparative Public Administration and Public Administration.
3. Discuss the five concerns addressed by Comparative Public Administration explained by Ferrel Heady.
4. Analyse the main purposes of Comparative Public Administration.
5. In which ways has Comparative Public Administration contributed in making Public Administration more holistic in nature.
6. Discuss the studies that can be made in public administration using the comparative method.

#### 5.12 References

- Arora, Ramesh K. 2021. *Comparative Public Administration: An Ecological Perspective*. New Delhi: New Age International.
- Bhattacharya, Mohit. 2001. *New Horizons of Public Administration*, New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers,
- Bhattacharya, Mohit. *Development Administration*. New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers and Distributors, 1997<sup>[L]</sup><sub>[SEP]</sub>
- Dahl, Robert. 1947. The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems. *Public Administration Review* 7:1–11
- Eric E. Otenyo, Nancy S. Lind. "Part I: Comparative Public Administration: Growth, Method, and Ecology" In *Comparative Public Administration*. Published online: 09 Mar 2015; 1-7
- Frederickson, G. 1989. Minnowbrook II: Conclusions”, *Public Administration Review*. 49(2), pp. 95-100
- Frederickson, George F., and Richard Mayer. 1998. Minnowbrook II. *Public Administration Review* 49 (Special Issue).
- Frederickson, George H. 1997. Introduction, *International Journal of Public Administration*, 20:4-5, 817-835
- Gil-Garcia, J. Ramon. 2003. “Towards a Public Administration: Minnowbrook III. A Reflection and Proposal”, in <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/104/10410111.pdf>
- Guy, M. E. 1989. “Minnowbrook II: Conclusions”, *Public Administration Review*. 49(2), pp.

219-220.

- Heady, Ferrel. 1995. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Henry, Nicholas. 2004. *Public Administration and Public Affairs*. Upper Sadle River, N.J.: Pearson.
- Hildreth, W. Bartley, et.al. 2021. *Handbook of Public Administration*, New York and London: Routledge
- Jain. R. B. 1991. "The state of the study of Comparative Public Administration in India", *The Indian Journal of Public Administration*.
- Marini, Frank. ed. 1971. *Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective*. Scranton, PA: Chandler.
- Mathur, Kuldeep. 1985. "Development Administration in India: Old Lessons and New Concerns," *Journal of Social and Economic Studies*, 2:4.
- Nabatchi, Tina and Julia L. Carboni. 2019. "Assessing the Past and Future of Public Administration: Reflections from the Minnowbrook at 50 Conference" *IBM Centre for The Business of Government* in [https://www.businessofgovernment.org/sites/default/files/Assessing%20the%20Past%20and%20Future%20of%20Public%20Administration%20-%20Reflections%20from%20the%20Minnowbrook%20at%2050%20Conference\\_0.pdf](https://www.businessofgovernment.org/sites/default/files/Assessing%20the%20Past%20and%20Future%20of%20Public%20Administration%20-%20Reflections%20from%20the%20Minnowbrook%20at%2050%20Conference_0.pdf)
- O'Leary, Rosemary. Et.al. 2008. *The Future of Public Administration Around the World: The Minnowbrook Perspective*, Washington D.C: Georgetown University Press.
- Otenyo, Eric E. and Nancy S. Lind (ed.). 2006. *Comparative Public Administration: The Essential Readings*, Elsevier.
- Peters, B. Guy and Jon Pierre (ed). 2003. *Handbook of Public Administration*, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Sahni, Pradeep and E. Vayunandan. 2009. *Administrative Theory*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall.
- Simon, Herbert. 1947. A Comment on "The Science of Public Administration." *Public Administration Review* 7:200–203.
- Waldo, D. 1980. *The Enterprise of Public Administration*. Chandler and Sharp Publishers, Novato C.A.
- Waldo, Dwight. 1952 a. "The Development of Theory of Democratic Administration". *American Political Science Review* 46:81–103
- Waldo, Dwight. 1955. *The Study of Public Administration*. New York: Double day.

E-articles:

- Comparative Public Administration <https://egyankosh.ac.in/bitstream/123456789/78049/3/Block-1.pdf>
- Comparative Public Administration <http://eflorakkl.in/staff/uploads/sem2%20cpa%20unit1.pdf>
- Comparative Public Administration <https://gacbe.ac.in/pdf/ematerial/18MPA25E-U1.pdf>

