

PREFACE

With its grounding in the “guiding pillars of Access, Equity, Equality, Affordability and Accountability,” the New Education Policy (NEP 2020) envisions flexible curricular structures and creative combinations for studies across disciplines. Accordingly, the UGC has revised the CBCS with a new Curriculum and Credit Framework for Undergraduate Programmes (CCFUP) to further empower the flexible choice based credit system with a multidisciplinary approach and multiple/ lateral entry-exit options. It is held that this entire exercise shall leverage the potential of higher education in three-fold ways – learner’s personal enlightenment; her/his constructive public engagement; productive social contribution. Cumulatively therefore, all academic endeavours taken up under the NEP 2020 framework are aimed at synergising individual attainments towards the enhancement of our national goals.

In this epochal moment of a paradigmatic transformation in the higher education scenario, the role of an Open University is crucial, not just in terms of improving the Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) but also in upholding the qualitative parameters. It is time to acknowledge that the implementation of the National Higher Education Qualifications Framework (NHEQF), National Credit Framework (NCrF) and its syncing with the National Skills Qualification Framework (NSQF) are best optimised in the arena of Open and Distance Learning that is truly seamless in its horizons. As one of the largest Open Universities in Eastern India that has been accredited with ‘A’ grade by NAAC in 2021, has ranked second among Open Universities in the NIRF in 2024, and attained the much required UGC 12B status, Netaji Subhas Open University is committed to both quantity and quality in its mission to spread higher education. It was therefore imperative upon us to embrace NEP 2020, bring in dynamic revisions to our Undergraduate syllabi, and formulate these Self Learning Materials anew. Our new offering is synchronised with the CCFUP in integrating domain specific knowledge with multidisciplinary fields, honing of skills that are relevant to each domain, enhancement of abilities, and of course deep-diving into Indian Knowledge Systems.

Self Learning Materials (SLM’s) are the mainstay of Student Support Services (SSS) of an Open University. It is with a futuristic thought that we now offer our learners the choice of print or e-slm’s. From our mandate of offering quality higher education in the mother tongue, and from the logistic viewpoint of balancing scholastic needs, we strive to bring out learning materials in Bengali and English. All our faculty members are constantly engaged in this academic exercise that combines subject specific academic research with educational pedagogy. We are privileged in that the expertise of academics across institutions on a national level also comes together to augment our own faculty strength in developing these learning materials. We look forward to proactive feedback from all stakeholders whose participatory zeal in the teaching-learning process based on these study materials will enable us to only get better. On the whole it has been a very challenging task, and I congratulate everyone in the preparation of these SLM’s.

I wish the venture all success.

Professor Indrajit Lahiri
Vice-Chancellor

Netaji Subhas Open University
Four Year Undergraduate Degree Programme
Under National Higher Education Qualifications Framework (NHEQF) &
Curriculum and Credit Framework for Undergraduate Programmes
Bachelor of Arts (Honours) Public Administration
Programme Code : NPA
Course Type: Discipline Specific Core (DSC)
Course Title: Comparative Public Administration
Course Code: 6CC-PA-05

First Print: March, 2025

Memo No. SC/DTP/25/066 Dated: 22.02.2025

Netaji Subhas Open University
Four Year Undergraduate Degree Programme
Under National Higher Education Qualifications Framework (NHEQF) &
Curriculum and Credit Framework for Undergraduate Programmes
Bachelor of Arts (Honours) Public Administration
Programme Code : NPA
Course Type: Discipline Specific Core (DSC)
Course Title: Comparative Public Administration
Course Code: 6CC-PA-05

**: Board of Studies :
Members**

Barnana Guha Thakurta (Banerjee)
Professor of Political Science
Director, School of Social Sciences, NSOU

Soma Ghosh
Professor of Political Science
Principal, HMM College for Women

Manoj Kumar Haldar
Associate Professor of Political Science,
NSOU

Debajit Goswami
Assistant Professor of Public Administration,
NSOU

Dipankar Sinha
Professor of Political Science
University of Calcutta

Basabi Chakraborty
Assistant Professor of Public Administration,
NSOU

: Writer :

Module I : Units 1-5

Kaushik Ghosh
Assistant Professor of Political Science,
Bankura University

Module II : Units 1-5

Titu Bardhan
Faculty of Political Science,
Vidyasagar Metropolitan College

Module III : Units 1-5

Nikita Rai
Scholar of Political Science,
University of North Bengal

: Course Editor & Format Editing :

Debajit Goswami
Assistant Professor of Public Administration, NSOU

Notification

All rights reserved. No part of this Study material be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from Netaji Subhas Open University.

Ananya Mitra
Registrar (Add'l Charge)



**Netaji Subhas
Open University**

**Subject :
Honours in Public
Administration (HPA)**

**UNDER GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMME
Choice Based Credit System (CBCS)
Course Title : Comparative Public Administration
Course Code : 6CC-PA-05**

Module I : Introduction

Unit-1	❑ Definition of Comparative Public Administration	9-20
Unit-2	❑ Nature and Scope of Comparative Public Administration	21-35
Unit-3	❑ Evolution of Comparative Public Administration	36-47
Unit-4	❑ Relationship with Public Administration	48-61
Unit-5	❑ An Assessment	62-72

**Module II : Theories and Models of Comparative
Public Administration**

Unit-6	❑ Rationale behind Theory and Model Building	75-85
Unit-7	❑ Fred Riggs	86-95
Unit-8	❑ A Critique of Riggs	96-105
Unit-9	❑ Ferrel Heady	106-114
Unit-10	❑ A Critique of Heady	115-122

Module III : Public Choice Theory

Unit-11	□ Background	125-135
Unit-12	□ Basic Tenets of Public Choice Theory	136-146
Unit-13	□ Contributions	147-157
Unit-14	□ Limitations	158-166
Unit-15	□ New Public Management	167-179

MODULE : I

INTRODUCTION

Unit 1 □ Definition of Comparative Public Administration

Structure

- 1.1 Learning Objectives**
- 1.2 Introduction**
- 1.3 Evolution of Comparative Public Administration**
- 1.4 Current Status**
- 1.5 Meaning of Comparative Administration**
- 1.6 Evolution of The Subject**
- 1,7 The Range of Comparative Studies**
- 1.8 What is Comparative Public Administration?**
- 1.9 Conclusion**
- 1.10 Summary**
- 1.11 Glossary**
- 1.12 Model Questions**
- 1.11 References**

1.1 Learning Objectives

This unit helps you to understand:

- How does Comparative Public Administration emphasize the socio-political-cultural development of the Third World Countries
- How does one country can get a lesson from the successes and failures (of public administration) of other countries
- Various approaches and models of Comparative Public Administration
- Relations between Comparative Public Administration and other disciplines of Social Sciences
- Evolution of the Comparative Public Administration as a discipline

1.2 Introduction

Comparisons of administrative systems have had a long tradition. The focus on this aspect of administrative studies is about forty years old. Only after the Second World War and with the emergence of new nations in Asia and Africa, a vigorous interest in comparative studies of Public Administration has evolved. Comparative Public Administration, in simple terms, refers to a comparative study of government administrative systems functioning in different countries of the world. The nature of Comparative Administration has vast ramifications and ranges from the narrowest of studies to the broadest of analyses. To understand the meaning of Comparative Public Administration, it would be desirable to look at the types of comparative public administration studies undertaken by scholars in the field. In this unit, we shall examine the meaning, scope, and nature of Comparative Public Administration. We shall also discuss its conceptual approaches.

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, and Portugal) required socio-economic-political development in their way. All these colonial countries had only one single common legacy among them 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 or answers to the problems of those countries exclusively. 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.

1.3 Evolution of Comparative Public Administration

Comparison of various political systems has been a key concern of a political thinker, since the time of Aristotle. In contemporary times, there have been published a good number of studies on comparative constitutions and governments. However, comparison of administrative systems has been undertaken only rarely by scholars. When political systems are compared, there is an obvious reference to their respective administrative systems that function within them, but such studies are only sketchy. 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 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”.

It should be appreciated that before the Second World War, there were hardly any ‘developing’ nations of contemporary times. Most of them were colonies of the Western powers and hence, there was hardly any interest in studying their government structures. Interest in comparative administration was only marginal in the pre-Second World War time, yet there were a few interesting exceptions. Woodrow Wilson in his seminal article “The Study of Administration” published in the *Political Science Quarterly* (1887) 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 textbook 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. Such a broad interest in traditional comparative public administration motivated the later advanced studies and orientations. Let us look at the factors that helped in the evolution of contemporary comparative public administration.

1. Experience during the Second World War

Several scholars of Western countries, particularly of the United States, had the opportunity to hold administrative positions in certain non-Western nations during the war. Their experience provided an important insight that there were noticeable differences among the Western and non-Western nations in the sphere of their administrative structures and behaviour. These differences were primarily because of the diversity in the socio-cultural and economic contexts of both types of nations. The Philippines and Japan, which were occupied by the USA for a few years, offered eminent examples of such diversity.

2. International Technical Assistance Programme

With the creation of the United Nations in 1945, there was a substantial emphasis on providing financial and technical assistance to non-western countries that were generally economically poor. Besides, there was the Marshal Plan of the US designed to provide such assistance to European countries. Several scholars of the US were engaged in the working of such institutions of technical assistance. They also gave recommendations on reforming the administrative systems of certain nations, including

India (Example: two reports of Paul Appleby in 1953 and 1956). Interest and insights into the administrative systems of developing countries thus became stronger and gave impetus to comparative administrative studies.

3. Administrative Reforms

Almost all developing nations conducted studies on the desirable areas of administrative reforms with the help of indigenous and foreign scholars. This created enormous information on the administrative systems of several countries. In the preparation of recommendations on administrative reforms, administrators and scholars of developing countries examined and borrowed from the administrative practices of developed nations. This led to cross-cultural and cross-national analyses of administrative systems.

4. Emergent Developing Nations

With the decline and fall of colonialism after the Second World War, many countries became independent in the continents of Asia and Africa. These countries faced acute problems of socioeconomic transformation. Systematically addressing these problems required the strengthening of administrative systems in the spheres of policy-making, planning, human resource management, financial administration, and administrative responsiveness. Several universities and private foundations, such as, the Ford Foundation joined the efforts intended to render technical assistance, guidance, and training to the administrative systems of developing nations. A good number of civil servants of such nations went to study and obtain training in several developed nations. Likewise, many foreign experts visited developing nations and worked, as advisors in administrative reforms and human resource development. These interactions led to remarkable interest and studies in comparative public administration.

5. Comparative Politics

Movement After the Second World War, the Comparative Politics Movement gained popularity and acceptance in the US and several other countries. A few scholars, while studying the political systems of different nations, also examined and analyzed their administrative systems. They had to do so because the administrative system is considered, as a subsystem of the political system. Some scholars took an interest in comparative politics as well as comparative public administration including Leonard Binder, Joseph La Palombara, Alfred Diamant, Fred Riggs, Edward Weidnar, and Ferrel Heady. The Comparative Public Administration Movement borrowed from the Comparative Politics Movement several concepts, methodologies, models, and theories.

6. Behavioural Movement

The behavioural movement encouraged a series of studies on administrative behaviour in ecological settings, thus strengthening comparative public administrative literature.

7. Comparative Administration Group

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.

However, with the discontinuation of assistance by the Ford Foundation, the CAG was weakened and eventually disbanded. Later in 1973, with the efforts of Fred Riggs and other scholars, a Section on International and Comparative Administration (SICA) was set up, as a section of the American Society of Public Administration, which continues to promote study, teaching and research in comparative public administration. SICA is comprised of practitioners and academics, who are involved in or have an interest in international and overseas public administration. It has done a commendable job of keeping an interest in comparative administrative studies alive and vital. It awards annually the Fred W Riggs Award for outstanding contribution in the field of comparative public administration. It has also started the practice of bringing out "SICA Occasional Papers" on the pattern adopted earlier by CAG.

1.4 Current Status

As of 2021, the discipline of comparative public administration is characterized by the following institutional initiatives:

- The subject of comparative public administration is taught in a large number of foreign and Indian universities and colleges at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels.

- Almost all journals on public administration carry articles on comparative administrative systems.
- The SICA of ASPA is vigorously strengthening research, communication, and teaching in comparative public administration.

However, the number of books on the subject is scarce and very few Ph.D. theses are being written on comparative aspects of administration in developing countries, including India.

1.5 Meaning of Comparative Administration

Comparative public administration is the study of the public administrative system from a comparative perspective and in cross-national and cross-cultural contexts. It is a branch of the parent discipline of Public Administration, but over the years, it has evolved and sustained its own identity. It focuses on the structure, processes, behaviour, roles, and impact of the public administrative system at the international level. Thus, it examines the similarities and differences among public administrative systems of various nations and regions and the sources of diversity among them. In this perspective, it also looks at the external environment of public administrative systems and the interaction between the two of them. Comparative public administration is considered to have the following purposes:

- To learn the distinctive features of a particular administrative system or a cluster of systems.
- To explain the factors responsible for cross-national and cross-cultural similarities and differences in administrative structure, functions, behaviour, and impact.
- 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.
- To understand the strategies of administrative reforms, their processes and impacts and the factors responsible for the level of success or failure of reforms.

1.6 Evolution of The Subject

There have been few studies on the evolution of public administration, although its importance has been widely recognized. For instance, like the erroneous impression that the nature of public past developments are of little consequence to the present ones with which most

Administration is actively concerned. But the question is whether the past can be separated from the present without rendering our understanding of the present incomplete and inadequate. Evolution refers to the gradual unfolding of the development of things over time. When the past, present and future are considered in terms of a continuum, the study of the past or history becomes all the more significant. The past not only foreshadows the present but also serves as its matrix. History, in the words of E.H. Carr, is an unending dialogue between the past and the present. In this sense, the study of history has a contemporary relevance. Indeed, it is necessary for the understanding of the contemporary! status of the subject and the critical issues therein, the genesis of which may be found in the past. There is much truth in the saying that 'a phenomenon can be understood only in a historical context' Again, the study of different phases and traditions in the evolution of Public Administration may also help in applying the 'lessons' or the indicators of the past to the consideration of the development of the subject in the present. Broadly, the study of evolution fulfills both theoretical and pragmatic purposes. From the theoretical point of view, it helps to locate the subject in a broader frame of reference and from the practical point of view it facilitates the use of the knowledge of the past to further the development of the subject in the presentage.'

1.7 The Range of Comparative Studies

Let us now briefly outline the types of comparative administrative studies. Broadly there, are five types of studies. They are:

- **Inter-Institutional Analysis**

It involves a comparison of two or more administrative systems. For instance, a comparison of the structure and working of the Home Ministry of the Government of India with the Defence Ministry will be a case of inter-institutional analysis. Such comparisons could involve the whole of an administrative organization or its various parts.

- **International Analysis**

When an analysis in a comparative perspective is taken up among various administrative systems functioning within a country, it would be an intra-national analysis.' A comparison of district administration in Bihar and Punjab would be an example of such an analysis.

- **Cross-national Analysis**

When two or more administrative systems (or their parts) are compared in the settings of different nations, this would be a cross-national analysis. For example,

comparing the recruitment of higher civil service in China, Thailand and Tanzania will form an example of a cross-national analysis. ‘

- **Cross-cultural Analysis**

A cross-national analysis of the administrative system involves countries forming part or different “cultures”, this would be called a cross-cultural analysis. For instance, comparing the administrative system of the USSR (a socialist state) with the U.S. (a capitalist system) could be termed a cross-cultural analysis. Even a comparison between a developed country (e.g. France) with a developing country (e.g. Algeria) or between a developing democratic country (e.g. Philippines) and a developing Communist regime (e.g. Vietnam) will be covered in a cross-country comparison. Thus the word “cultural” in the category “cross-cultural” has a broad connotation and involves an aggregation of distinctive political, economic and socio-cultural traits of a particular system and its environment. Such a comparison involves different time frames for analysis. For instance, a comparison between the administrative system prevailing during Ashoka’s reign and Akbar’s regime would be a cross-temporal analysis. Likewise, comparisons, between the administrative systems of ancient Rome and modern Italy, or between the administrative practices prevailing during the period of Jawaharlal Nehru and Indira Gandhi would fall under the rubric of cross-temporal analysis.

A cross-temporal analysis may be inter-institutional, intra-national, cross-national or cross-cultural. For instance, a comparison of the administrative control mechanisms prevailing during the times of Julius Caesar, Alexander, Harsha, Attaturk and Nasser will be cross-national as well as cross-cultural. Exactness in cross-temporal studies is not possible because of differences like historical sources available for various periods. However, some broad conclusions based on existing sources can be reached through several studies. Nimrod Raphaeli has defined Comparative Public Administration as a study of Public Administration on a comparative basis. The Comparative Administration Group referred to Comparative Public Administration as the theory of Public Administration which belongs to diverse cultures in the settings and the body of factual data by which it can be expanded and tested. Robert Jackson has defined it as the phase of the study which is consumed with rigorous cross-cultural concerns of the structures and processes involved in the activity of administering public affairs.

1.8 What is Comparative Public Administration?

“... 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 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*

Although scholars like Woodrow Wilson wanted to compare public administration from the very initial stage of this subject (he argued this in his famous article entitled “The Study of Administration” in 1887), most of his contemporary scholars were not in favour of comparing various administrations at 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 comparing one country’s administration with another. We may also say in this way that satisfaction over the traditional public administration, even though traditional public administration is non-comparative by nature, was one of the major causes that compare public administration took so many years to emerge. Why comparison in public administration is necessary? Actually, until or unless we compare one thing with another 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. Not only that but if I need to change, towards which direction do I need to change? In this connection, one thing we should remember is that the literature on the 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 what we should compare and what we should not (both methodically), — and the whole matter will be done systematically. In this particular point, modern comparative public administration differentiates itself from older classifications and analyses. Comparative public administration, here, is closely associated with nation building process since World War II.

One of the major 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 public administration should show much concern over a single country. Behind flourishing or spreading or popularising this comparative public administration 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 suitability. This helped comparative public administration to flourish as a specialized field. At the same time, we should not forget to mention another important objective or purpose of comparative public administration i.e., after comparing properly, applying the best administrative solutions assembled from anywhere in the world to solve a particular socio-economic-political problem anywhere and achieve better goals.

1.9 Conclusion

Throughout this unit, you've gained valuable insights into Comparative Public Administration (CPA) and its significance in understanding public administration across the globe. We explored how CPA sheds light on the socio-political-cultural development of Third World Countries. By comparing administrative systems, we can see how historical, cultural, and political contexts influence how these countries develop. This comparative approach allows us to learn from the successes and failures of other nations. By analyzing effective policies and programs in one country, others can adapt them to their own context, fostering better governance and public service delivery. We've also delved into various approaches and models within CPA, providing a framework for understanding and comparing administrative systems. You've learned how CPA interacts with other social science disciplines, drawing on political science, economics, and sociology to gain a holistic understanding of public administration. Finally, we traced the evolution of CPA as a discipline, understanding its historical development and its growing importance in today's interconnected world.

By studying Comparative Public Administration, you've gained the tools to critically examine different administrative systems, identify best practices, and promote better governance for all. This knowledge equips you to contribute to more effective public administration practices, both domestically and internationally.

1.10 Summary

- Comparative Public Administration can be branded as a movement to save the lives of the people of third world countries as well as to also develop that area.
 - Comparative Public Administration discipline is not a separate discipline from Public Administration, the former may be branded as an offshoot of Public Administration
 - This Comparative Public Administration discipline received most contributions from Fred W. Riggs
-

1.11 Glossary

- Comparative Public Administration (CPA): The study of public administration across different countries, emphasizing the influence of social, political, and cultural contexts.
 - Developing Countries: Nations undergoing rapid socio-economic change, often facing unique challenges in public administration due to historical and cultural factors.
 - Policy Transfer: The process of adopting successful policies and programs from one country to another, taking into account contextual differences.
 - Multidisciplinary Approach: Integrating knowledge from various social sciences like political science, economics, and sociology to understand public administration.
 - Evolution of CPA: The continuous development of the field, adapting to a globalized world and offering valuable insights for improving governance.
-

1.10 Model Questions

1. What do you mean by comparative public administration?
2. Discuss, in brief, the importance of 'The Study of Administration' (by Woodrow Wilson in 1887) in the development of administration as a separate discipline.
3. Write a short note on the objectives of comparative public administration.
4. Why comparison is needed in administration?
5. How far decolonization process is responsible for the development of comparative public administration discipline?
6. Why did comparative public administration emerge as a separate discipline?

7. Discuss the importance of the 'history of using comparativeness' in the study of government.

1.11 References

1. "Comparative Public Administration: The Essential Readings" Edited by Eric E. Otenyo and Nancy S. Lind (under 'Research in Public Policy Analysis and Management' Vol. 15)
2. 'The Ecology of Public Administration' by Fred W. Riggs
3. 'The Study of Public Administration' by D. Waldo
4. 'Political Culture and Political Development' by Lucian W. Pye and Sidney Verba
5. 'Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective' by Ferrel Heady
6. 'The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems' by Robert A Dahl
7. 'Modern Comparative Politics: Approaches, Methods and Issues' by S N Ray
8. 'Introduction to Comparative Political Analysis' by Rakhahari Chatterji

Unit 2 □ Nature and Scope of Comparative Public Administration

Structure

- 2.1 Learning Objectives**
- 2.2 Introduction**
- 2.3 Nature of Comparative Public Administration**
- 2.4 Scope of Comparative Public Administration**
- 2.5 Nature and Scope of Comparative Public Administration**
- 2.6 Major Approaches to Comparative Public Administration**
- 2.7 Significance of Comparative Public Administration**
- 2.8 Conclusion**
- 2.9 Summary**
- 2.10 Glossary**
- 2.11 Model Questions**
- 2.12 References**

2.1 Learning Objectives

This unit will help you to learn :-

- The factors that led to the evolution of comparative public administration;
- The meaning of comparative public administration in the context of its goals and objectives;
- The nature of comparative public administration in terms of important trends in its study;
- The scope of comparative public administration concerning its variegated studies and their content;
- The intellectual as well as applied significance of comparative public administration.

2.2 Introduction

Everybody wants the superiority of knowledge everywhere. That's why the comparison comes into a centrist position in the subject of comparative public administration. Post post-World War II era is the era when First World Countries tried to flourish the ideologies of Liberalization, Privatization and Globalization (LPG) among the Third World Countries. Even to do this, they even fought (ideologically) with the Second World Countries (Second World Countries here refer to those socialist countries led by the erstwhile Soviet Union). An offshoot of public administration, i.e., comparative public administration helped First World Countries largely to do these. This discipline was like a weapon to them. A weapon, which, First World Countries by using can develop in the administration of Third World Countries as well as they were able to snoop over the political affairs of underdeveloped and undeveloped countries. As various interests were found behind the emergence and evolution of this discipline, so, time to time nature and scope of this discipline also increased and developed in due course of time.

2.3 Nature of Comparative Administration

Fred W. Riggs in his seminal article 'Trends in the Comparative Study of Public Administration' published in International Review of Administrative Sciences (1962) observed that the discipline of Comparative Public Administration was experiencing three important trends, which are seen in the discipline even till today.

1. From normative to empirical studies
2. From ideographic to nomothetic studies
3. From non-ecological to ecological studies

It is interesting to note that even today all the six types of studies co-exist in the discipline of comparative public administration and this co-existence represents the nature of the discipline. A brief reference to these characteristics will be in order.

- **Normative Approach**

Traditional public administration focused on the themes of efficiency and economy in administration and stressed that these two goals were the key to administrative performance. To achieve these goals, certain principles of administration were devised that were prescriptive. Some of these principles were: hierarchy, unity of command, span of control, balance between authority and responsibility, specialization, and

others. The emphasis in this approach was on the ‘should’ aspects of administration rather than on the ‘is’ aspects.

Contemporary studies in comparative public administration continue to be characterized by the normative approach; the whole movement of administrative reforms is a testimony to this orientation. Substantial stress on increasing the capacity to achieve progressive socio-economic goals is the prime feature of administrative systems in the non-western world. That is why the notions of “administrative development” and “development administration” have attained equal significance in the literature on comparative public administration.

- **Empirical Analysis**

A large number of contemporary comparative public administrative studies are based on facts collected through observation, experimentation, and field surveys. Such studies have, as their ‘locus’ the national, state, regional, district, and local levels. There are a large number of studies on the existing nature and behaviour of administrative systems, using empirical methodology being conducted in the world, including India. Such studies relate to the administrative response to developments in agriculture, industry, education, health, environment, gender justice, child welfare, care for differentially abled persons, transport, communication, and other areas. Such studies have been sponsored by international organizations, private foundations, national bodies, universities, and NGOs. This is a trend prevailing throughout the world.

- **Ideographic Studies**

Ideographic studies are one-nation, one-society, one-institution or one-sector studies. Even Fred Riggs published, ‘Thailand: Modernization of a Bureaucratic Polity,’ (1966). Likewise, Michael Crozier’s ‘The Bureaucratic Phenomenon’ deals with French bureaucracy and Morroe Berger’s ‘Bureaucracy and Society in Modern Egypt’ is also a one-nation study. Interestingly, these ideographic studies are empirical in their methodology and serve a great purpose in facilitating comparative analysis and even in theory building. In developing nations, there are hundreds of studies focusing on specific institutions or programmes that have significantly contributed to the understanding of administrative reality in cross-institutional and cross-national settings.

- **Nomothetic Studies**

Fred Riggs uses the term nomothetic for studies that contain generalizations based on empirical research or observations and, which facilitate the process of theory

building. Such studies lend a scientific character to comparative public administration. However, it should not be ignored that even ‘ideographic’ studies can help in creating hypotheses, which after testing, might lead to the construction of generalizations. Studies by Riggs, Berger, and Crozier, as noted above, though ideographic are also nomothetic in character, for their analysis and conclusions have a great heuristic (helping further research) value.

In sum, both the ideographic and nomothetic approaches are mutually complementary.

- **Non-ecological Studies**

Indeed, a large number of traditional studies of comparative governments were only discussing the legal, formal, and defined functional aspects of governance, including administrative institutions. The aspect of environmental influence on the administrative system and, in turn, the impact of an administrative system on its environment was ignored or under-emphasized. Most studies on administrative law, personnel administration, and financial administration in most countries, even today, continue to be non-ecological. However, that does not negate their importance and contribution.

- **Ecological Analysis**

No doubt, the ecological approach is the key to the understanding of comparative public administration. For elevating the ecological approach to its present respectable status, credit goes to Fred W. Riggs, who in his analysis has emphasized the need to look at the relationship between an administrative system and its environment from a dynamic perspective. A large number of comparative studies in public administration, whether ideographic or nomothetic, have been ecological in orientation. Thus, the trend from non-ecological to ecological analysis undoubtedly is a preferred path in the journey of comparative public administration.

In sum, the nature of comparative studies is currently transformational in character and co-existential in orientation.

2.4 Scope of Comparative Public Administration

The scope of comparative public administration is, as large as that of public administration as such. Hence, any public administrative facet— structures, processes, behaviour, impact, environment— when examined from a comparative perspective, would fall within the scope of comparative public administration. A few types of studies in comparative public administration, which would explain its scope, are as under:

- **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 instance, there can be a comparison between the Police Department of Uttar Pradesh with that of Tamil Nadu or there can be a study of the Agriculture Department in all the major states of India. Likewise, a comparison can be made between the School Education Department with the Higher Education Department of West Bengal in terms of efficiency and innovativeness. There can be innumerable and diverse examples in this context. This approach is most evident in traditional comparative studies.

- **Intra-national and Cross-national**

Intra-national comparisons relate to the comparison of administrative structures within the same country. This comparison can be of interdistrict inter-division or inter-state levels, but within the same country (for instance, India). However, when any two administrative systems or their subsystems existing in two or more nations are compared, such a comparison will be called a 'cross-national' analysis. When we compare the health administrative systems of Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, and Bihar, these will be intra-national comparisons, but when India's health administrative system is compared with its counterpart in Bangladesh, it will be called a 'cross-national' comparison. Such studies are only a few because of the massive resources and distinctive methodology required for conducting them.

- **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. It is sometimes difficult to define the term 'culture' in this context. Yet, it is generally assumed that developed nations and developing nations belong to two different cultures. Thus, a study of the status of women in the administrative systems of India, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka will be cross-national but intra-cultural, but a similar study involving Germany and Nepal will be cross-national as well as cross-cultural.

- **Cross-national and Cross-cultural**

Studies of administrative systems in two or more nations belonging to various levels of socio-economic development will fall in this category. For instance, when comparisons are made between the administrative structures of social justice in the U.S., Argentina, UAE, and Nigeria, such studies will come under the category of

cross-cultural (and of course, cross-national) comparative analysis. A culture also demotes the nature of the political system. Thus, the People's Republic of China and Vietnam will fall in a similar culture (both are communist and economically progressive) but a comparison of India with Vietnam or of Cuba with Italy will be cross-cultural.

We should remember that the cultural category of nations can change from time to time.

- **Cross-temporal Studies**

Temporal relates to time. Comparative studies, which involve two or more specific distinguishable periods, are cross-temporal studies. For instance, district administration in pre-independence and post-independence periods will be considered cross-temporal. A comparison of environmental administration in the Mauryan period and of independent India will also be cross-temporal.

2.5 Nature and Scope of Comparative Public Administration

Thus other social science subjects, comparative public administration also have ambiguity and debates over what is its nature and what are its scope. By nature, one can say that comparative public administration is cross-cultural as well as cross-national. It is cross-cultural because different countries possess different administrative cultures of their own. It is cross-national because it studies the administration of various countries. 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 the USA, UK, and France (capitalist countries) with the administration of Cuba, and Vietnam (socialist countries). If any scholar wants to study the administration of developed countries and developing countries, he has to compare the USA's administration (developed) with that of India's administration (developing). That's why comparative public administration 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 the contrary is very much empirical and survey-based at the grassroots level. From the above point, another nature of comparative public administration comes forward i.e. while traditional public administration emphasized theories (e.g. what to do or what not to do), on the contrary, comparative public administration emphasized how to do.

Comparative public administration also transformed from an ideographic to a nomothetic nature. According to Fred W. Riggs, the ideographic approach means those approaches

which emphasize a particular case, a particular historical event or a single nation-state. On the contrary, the nomothetic approach wants to generalize various theories. So, the ideographic approach was a descriptive one only. However, the nomothetic approach is full of writing on comparing various political, social, and administrative systems.

No one can deny that comparative public administration helps public administration move from non-ecological to ecological. Most of its credit goes to Fred W. Riggs (in this connection we must mention one of his famous books 'Administration of Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society' published in 1964). Ideas depicted in this book influenced the subject for a long time. Although few experts in comparative public administration introduced or discussed ecology in comparative public administration, a theoretical form of this in comparative public administration was first given by Fred W. Riggs. Now, one may ask what is the 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 and with economic, political and social factors of that particular country.

Institutions play a very important role in comparative public administration. Here institutions mean legislature, executive and judiciary. Because state or administrative authority cannot do anything without the various institutions mentioned above of the state. For example, in any country legislature passes a bill into law, the executive organ executes those laws and the judiciary interprets the law and if anything is found wrong in execution, the judiciary corrects the same. comparative public administration 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 the individual rather organization. For example, while traditional public administration emphasizes any particular organization of a state like NASA, or Soviet ROSCOSMOS State Corporation of Space Activities (erstwhile Soviet Space Programme), comparative public administration here emphasizes on individual.

Traditional public administration surveys any particular country's administration and then applies this to other administrative systems. However comparative public administration under Fred W. Riggs had multiple focuses. 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 a special multiple focus on comparative public administration to become the best solution to old exploited colonial countries.

Comparative public administration not only emphasizes inter-government analysis but also emphasizes intra-governmental activities. It means comparative public administration tries to

compare administrative systems between or among the countries as well as between or among the various ministries/ departments within the same government. It is one of the most important natures of comparative public administration.

Comparative public administration emphasizes studying the voting behaviour of the various countries. Why do people cast vote? Why does a section of people cast votes in favour of a particular political party for a long time? Why does a section of people always shift their political loyalty from one particular political party to another— all these queries are traced and discussed by comparative public administration. For example, we know that India, Pakistan and Bangladesh are neighbours. But since 1947, Pakistan and Bangladesh (including its period as erstwhile East Pakistan) were ruled by the military junta. But, in India, democracy successfully run since independence (except, for 1975-1977, two years of emergency period). What are the major causes behind this? How did various forms of the political system (democracy, autocracy) affect administration? Comparative public administration tries to search out the answer to all these questions.

Another important subject matter of comparative public administration is the 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 scholars want to discuss comparative public administration mainly at three broad levels i.e. i) Macro; ii) Middle-range; and iii) Micro.

- **Macro Level:**

At the macro level, for example, India's administrative system will be compared with France's administrative system. Two states' administrative systems will be discussed here, in detail.

- **Middle-range Level:**

In this approach, local-level governments of the various states are compared and analysed.

- **Micro Level:**

Under this approach, comparison took place at the grassroots level with similar types of organizations. For example, the Railway administrative system and banking system of various states can be compared and discussed under micro-level analysis.

Another important scope of comparative public administration is the management of human resources including financial management. These areas are mostly needed while discussing or analyzing third-world countries' administration.

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

2.6 Major Approaches to Comparative Public Administration

Major approaches under this discipline may be identified as:

- 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 the desired goal. For the sake of maximum interest gain, each organization develops a specialized system and a few systematic rules and regulations.
 - ii) Behavioural approach: This approach is related to the scientific study of human behaviour in different social environments. This approach demands that comparative public administration should include individuals in the study. As this approach also stresses ‘fact’, the, collection of data and analysis the same, quantification and verification of those 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 the same as applied in anthropology. In this approach, two major keywords 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. 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 mono functional

or multifunctional. If a structure like the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) is noticed, we'll find out that it is mono functional 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 Fred W. Riggs is the father of this approach and according to him, this ecological approach is based on the communication between the 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, the influence of the administrative system over the environment and vis-a-vis is the main discussion matter of this approach. In his famous book 'Ecology of Public Administration (1962)', Fred W. Riggs nicely discussed the relationship between the administration and its environment or surroundings. To Riggs, administration, social, economic, and political— all are subsystems of a society.

2.7 Significance 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) 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 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.

- **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.

- **Universalism**

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

- **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.

- **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.

- **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 gets speed up through effective administrative practices.

- **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 the holistic transformation of various societies. It is accepted widely that development administration is a goal-oriented and change-oriented administration and is the main engine of the all-round progress of a country.

- **Administrative Reforms**

Cross-national experiences of administrative reforms, such as those of Britain, Zaire, Indonesia, Bolivia, Sweden, and India have inspired the process of goal-directed administrative change throughout the international community. Even international agencies, such as the UNDP and World Bank, have given a fillip to this movement of administrative reforms. Little wonder, good governance has become a sterling strategy of administrative change in a large number of countries of the non-western world.

- **Responsiveness**

An outcome of the systems and ecological approaches in comparative public administration has been the stress on 'inputs' from the environment in terms of 'demands' and 'support'. The demands and aspirations of the common man and social groups have taken a central position in the analysis of the governance systems. It is now expected that the outcomes of administrative systems in the form of decisions and actions should align with their 'inputs'. This approach has helped in making the administrative system more responsive to people's needs and aspirations. Moreover, the 'throughputs' of an administrative system have made such systems more rational in their approach and functioning.

- **Overcoming False Impressions**

In traditional administrative theory, a purely 'structural' approach was adopted and hence the non-western countries, not having certain conventional structures of the West, were considered to be less developed. The structural-functional approach in comparative public administration has highlighted that common functions are being performed by the administrative systems of most nations. In developing nations, there may not be one-to-one relations between structures and functions, since a large number of administrative structures in such nations are multi-functional. This insight has thrown new light on the competence of administrative systems in developing nations.

In sum, the comparative study of public administration has positively influenced the intellectual development of the discipline of public administration and has broadened its structure, processes, roles, and behaviour.

2.8 Conclusion

This Unit has discussed the evolution of CPA since post–Second World War time to its current status and its meaning, nature, scope, and significance. It highlights 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. The structures, processes, behaviour, impacts, and environment of public administration, when examined from a comparative perspective define the scope of comparative public administration. Finally, CPA contributing to the science of public administration, re-enforcing the Interdisciplinary and ecological orientation, calling for development administration and administrative development has positively influenced the intellectual development of the discipline of public administration and has broadened its structure, processes, roles, and behaviour, as such.

2.9 Summary

- Ideological rivalry between First World Countries and Second World Countries is one of the major reasons behind the emergence of Comparative Public Administration.
- Pointing out the scope or subject matter of Comparative Public Administration is very tough, as different nations have different political cultures (e.g. India is secular, democratic, obtained mixed-economy till 1991 and after that Liberalisation, Privatisation, Globalisation; Pakistan is an Islamic country, by political nature it was democratic since its independence, but at the same time was under military rule for a long time, obtained mixed-economy after independence and from late 1980s, privatization was initiated in Pakistan. So, due to these types of dissimilarities, comparison becomes more and more difficult).
- Without studying Comparative Public Administration, no administrative development is possible in the current world.

2.10 Glossary

- Comparative Public Administration (CPA): A field studying public administration across countries, encompassing various approaches like normative (ideal-based) and empirical (data-driven) studies.

- Evolution of CPA: The continuous development of CPA from its post-World War II emergence to its current state.
- Scope of CPA: Examining public administration structures, processes, behaviors, impacts, and environments from a comparative perspective.
- Interdisciplinary Approach: Integrating knowledge from various disciplines to understand public administration, as emphasized by CPA.
- Development Administration: A focus within CPA on administrative practices that support development in nations undergoing rapid socio-economic change.
- Liberalization: Reducing government control on businesses and trade, allowing for more competition and market forces.
- Privatization: Transferring ownership of government-run businesses to private entities.
- Globalization: The increasing interconnectedness of economies and cultures around the world.

2.11 Model Questions

1. Write a short note on the bureaucratic approach of comparative public administration.
2. Discuss, in brief, the structural-functional approach in comparative public administration.
3. What is an ecological approach in comparative public administration?
4. What is the scope of comparative public administration?
5. Write a note on shifting ideographic nature to a nomothetic nature.
6. Discuss the importance of studying comparative public administration by macro, middle-range and micro levels.
7. Write a note on the contribution of Fred W. Riggs in the emergence of comparative public administration.
8. Write a note on the various approaches of the comparative public administration.
9. Examine the nature of comparative public administration.

2.12 References

- 1 “Comparative Public Administration: The Essential Readings” Edited by Eric E. Otenyo and Nancy S. Lind (under ‘Research in Public Policy Analysis and Management’ Vol. 15)

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

Unit 3 □ Evolution of Comparative Public Administration

Structure

- 3.1 Learning Objectives**
- 3.2 Introduction**
- 3.3 Factors that Led to the Evolution**
- 3.4 The Scope of the Evolution**
- 3.5 Evolution of Comparative Public Administration**
- 3.6 Various Thinkers**
- 3.7 Conclusion**
- 3.8 Summary**
- 3.9 Glossary**
- 3.10 Model Questions**
- 3.11 References**

3.1. Learning Objectives

This unit will explain the evolution of Comparative Public Administration. You will be able to:

- Highlight the factors that led to the evolution of comparative public administration;
- Explain the meaning of comparative public administration in the context of its goals and objectives;
- Discuss the nature of comparative public administration in terms of important trends in its study;
- Analyse the scope of comparative public administration concerning its variegated studies and their content;
- Explain the intellectual as well as applied significance of comparative public administration.

3.2 Introduction

This Unit discusses the evolution, meaning, nature, scope, and significance of comparative public administration. Besides, Comparative Public administration contributing to the science of administration by studying administrative systems in cross-institutional, intra-national, cross-national, intra-cultural, cross-cultural, and cross-temporal studies has also been explained. The world of public administration has become increasingly interconnected, with nations facing similar challenges and opportunities. In this context, Comparative Public Administration (CPA) has emerged as a vital field of study. This chapter delves into the evolution of CPA, exploring the factors that drove its development. We will examine the core meaning of CPA, its goals and objectives in today's world.

Furthermore, we will explore the nature of CPA by analyzing key trends in its research and scholarship. Finally, the unit will delve into the vast scope of CPA, examining the diverse range of studies it encompasses and the content they analyze. By understanding the evolution, meaning, nature, and scope of CPA, we gain valuable insights into how public administration functions across different countries, fostering better governance and knowledge exchange in an interconnected world.

3.3 Factors that Led to the Evolution

Comparison of various political systems has been a key concern of a political thinker, since the time of Aristotle. In contemporary times, there have been published a good number of studies on comparative constitutions and governments. However, comparison of administrative systems has been undertaken only rarely by scholars. When political systems are compared, there is an obvious reference to their respective administrative systems that function within them, but such studies are only sketchy. 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 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”.

It should be appreciated that before the Second World War, there were hardly any ‘developing’ nations of contemporary times. Most of them were colonies of the Western

powers and hence, there was hardly any interest in studying their government structures. Interest in comparative administration was only marginal in the pre-Second World War time, yet there were a few interesting exceptions. Woodrow Wilson in his seminal article “The Study of Administration” published in the *Political Science Quarterly* (1887) 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 textbook 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. Such a broad interest in traditional comparative public administration motivated the later advanced studies and orientations. Let us look at the factors that helped in the evolution of contemporary comparative public administration.

- **Experience during the Second World War**

Several scholars of Western countries, particularly of the United States, had the opportunity to hold administrative positions in certain non-Western nations during the war. Their experience provided an important insight that there were noticeable differences among the Western and non-Western nations in the sphere of their administrative structures and behaviour. These differences were primarily because of the diversity in the sociocultural and economic contexts of both types of nations. The Philippines and Japan, which were occupied by the USA for a few years, offered eminent examples of such diversity.

- **International Technical Assistance Programme**

With the creation of the United Nations in 1945, there was a substantial emphasis on providing financial and technical assistance to non-western countries that were generally economically poor. Besides, there was the Marshall Plan of the US designed to provide such assistance to European countries. Several scholars of the US were engaged in the working of such institutions of technical assistance. They also gave recommendations on reforming the administrative systems of certain nations, including India (Example: two reports of Paul Appleby in 1953 and 1956). Interest and insights into the administrative systems of developing countries thus became stronger and gave impetus to comparative administrative studies.

- **Administrative Reforms**

Almost all developing nations conducted studies on the desirable areas of administrative reforms with the help of indigenous and foreign scholars. This created enormous information on the administrative systems of several countries. In the

preparation of recommendations on administrative reforms, administrators and scholars of developing countries examined and borrowed from the administrative practices of developed nations. This led to cross-cultural and cross-national analyses of administrative systems.

- **Emergent Developing Nations**

With the decline and fall of colonialism after the Second World War, many countries became independent in the continents of Asia and Africa. These countries faced acute problems of socioeconomic transformation. Systematically addressing these problems required the strengthening of administrative systems in the spheres of policy-making, planning, human resource management, financial administration, and administrative responsiveness. Several universities and private foundations, such as, the Ford Foundation joined the efforts intended to render technical assistance, guidance, and training to the administrative systems of developing nations. A good number of civil servants of such nations went to study and obtain training in several developed nations. Likewise, many foreign experts visited developing nations and worked, as advisors in administrative reforms and human resource development. These interactions led to remarkable interest and studies in comparative public administration.

- **Comparative Politics Movement**

After the Second World War, the Comparative Politics Movement gained popularity and acceptance in the US and several other countries. A few scholars, while studying the political systems of different nations, also examined and analyzed their administrative systems. They had to do so because the administrative system is considered, as a subsystem of the political system. Some scholars took an interest in comparative politics as well as comparative public administration including Leonard Binder, Joseph La Palombara, Alfred Diamant, Fred Riggs, Edward Weidnar, and Ferrel Heady. The Comparative Public Administration Movement borrowed from the Comparative Politics Movement several concepts, methodologies, models, and theories.¹² Comparative Public Administration: An Introduction

- **Behavioural Movement**

The behavioural movement encouraged a series of studies on administrative behaviour in ecological settings, thus strengthening comparative public administrative literature.

- **Comparative Administration Group**

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.

However, with the discontinuation of assistance by the Ford Foundation, the CAG was weakened and eventually disbanded. Later in 1973, with the efforts of Fred Riggs and other scholars, a Section on International and Comparative Administration (SICA) was set up, as a section of the American Society of Public Administration, which continues to promote study, teaching and research in comparative public administration. SICA is comprised of practitioners and academics, who are involved in or have an interest in international and overseas public administration. It has done a commendable job of keeping an interest in comparative administrative studies alive and vital. It awards annually the Fred W Riggs Award for outstanding contribution in the field of comparative public administration. It has also started the practice of bringing out "SICA Occasional Papers" on the pattern adopted earlier by CAG.

Current Status

As of 2021, the discipline of comparative public administration is characterized by the following institutional initiatives:

1. The subject of comparative public administration is taught in a large number of foreign and Indian universities and colleges at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels.
2. Almost all journals on public administration carry articles on comparative administrative systems.
3. The SICA of ASPA is vigorously strengthening research, communication, and teaching in comparative public administration. However, the number of books on the subject is scarce and very few Ph.D. theses are being written on comparative aspects of administration in developing countries, including India.

3.4 The Scope of the Evolution of Comparative Public Administration

The scope of comparative public administration is, as large as that of public administration as such. Hence, any public administrative facet— structures, processes, behaviour, impact, environment— when examined from a comparative perspective, would fall within the scope of comparative public administration. A few types of studies in comparative public administration, which would explain its scope, are as under:

- **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 instance, there can be a comparison between the Police Department of Uttar Pradesh with that of Tamil Nadu or there can be a study of the Agriculture Department in all the major states of India. Likewise, in 16 Comparative Public Administration: An Introduction a comparison can be made between the School Education Department with the Higher Education Department of West Bengal in terms of efficiency and innovativeness. There can be innumerable and diverse examples in this context. This approach is most evident in traditional comparative studies.

- **Intra-national and Cross-national**

Intra-national comparisons relate to the comparison of administrative structures within the same country. This comparison can be of inter district inter-division or inter-state levels, but within the same country (for instance, India). However, when any two administrative systems or their subsystems existing in two or more nations are compared, such a comparison will be called a ‘cross-national’ analysis. When we compare the health administrative systems of Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, and Bihar, these will be intra-national comparisons, but when India’s health administrative system is compared with its counterpart in Bangladesh, it will be called a ‘cross-national’ comparison. Such studies are only a few because of the massive resources and distinctive methodology required for conducting them.

- **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. It is sometimes difficult to define the term ‘culture’ in this context. Yet, it is generally assumed that developed nations and developing nations

belong to two different cultures. Thus, a study of the status of women in the administrative systems of India, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka will be cross-national but intra-cultural, but a similar study involving Germany and Nepal will be cross-national as well as cross-cultural.

- **Cross-national and Cross-cultural**

Studies of administrative systems in two or more nations belonging to various levels of socio-economic development will fall in this category. For instance, when comparisons are made between the administrative structures of social justice in the U.S., Argentina, UAE, and Nigeria, such studies will come under the category of cross-cultural (and of course, cross-national) comparative analysis. A culture also demotes the nature of the political system. Thus, the People's Republic of China and Vietnam will fall in a similar culture (both are communist and economically progressive) but a comparison of India with Vietnam or of Cuba with Italy will be cross-cultural. We should remember that the cultural category of nations can change from time to time.

- **Cross-temporal Studies**

Temporal relates to time. Comparative studies, which involve two or more specific distinguishable periods, are cross-temporal studies. For instance, district administration in pre-independence and post-independence periods will be considered cross-temporal. Meaning, Nature, Scope, and Significance comparison of environmental administration in the Mauryan period and of independent India will also be cross-temporal.

3.5 Evolution of Comparative Public Administration

When a new discipline or a branch of a new discipline emerges in the academic arena, a thought first comes to the mind what is the inevitability of this new discipline? In the case of comparative public administration, this question also arose and the simple answer is that it is the independence of colonial countries after World War II which forced comparative public administration. As we have already discussed despite Aristotle's attempt in ancient Greece, we consider that comparative politics emerged as a separate discipline only after World War II. To serve the people of third-world countries, it is necessary to make the administration suitable for them. To do this, no administration of the first world country could help them during that period. Because the demands and priorities of the first world countries are different from the demands and priorities of the poor countries. Malnutrition is a problem found among the people of third-world countries. Famine was very much

normal for the people of newly independent countries. Illiteracy, superstition, and scarcity of funds— all factors that created hindrances in the path of development. On the contrary, these words were uncommon to the people of first-world countries. Over-nutrition is a problem in first-world countries. They do not have any idea that illiteracy and superstition can become a problem for development. So, a new discipline was required and Fred W. Riggs has been given the most of the credit behind the flourishing of this new discipline i.e. comparative public administration. Dwight Waldo, Ferrel Heady, L D White, and R A Dahl are also regarded as eminent scholars in the field of comparative public administration, but the contribution of Fred W. Riggs is the most remarkable one. To him, earlier studies should not be considered as ‘comparative governments’, rather those studies one merely called as ‘governments of foreign countries’. Not only did they lack comparativeness in nature but also these were not written in an 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 the available literature 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 the financial patronage (one-half million dollars) of the Ford Foundation, a group of people started to discuss 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 (more or less this period was also called the ‘golden era’ of comparative public administration). Scholars gradually believed that the Weberian model was not sufficient enough to understand the 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 introduced structural functionalism in the study of comparative public administration. Marshall Plan (1948) also played an important role in the emergence of comparative public administration. On 3 April 1948, US President Harry S. Truman signed the Economic Recovery Act of 1948. Later this came to be known as the Marshall Plan. After World War II, undoubtedly Europe suffered a lot socioeconomically. The economy was disrupted, and famine was a natural consequence in Europe during that time. Furthermore, Soviet Union-led communist aggression in Eastern Europe became a matter of permanent tension for the USA and Western European countries. During this time, under this plan, the USA decided to provide foreign aid to Western Europe. Earlier, on 5 June 1947, US Secretary of State George Marshall in a speech said that if European Nations prepared a plan to restructure their economy, the USA would be ready to provide financial assistance. Later, the USA all total transferred 13.3 billion dollars to Western Europe to recover their economy. But, in return, this Marshall Plan formulated a very good economic market for

the USA in Europe as well as making a stronghold of the democratic governments in Western Europe. One may raise one important question here, how did the Marshall Plan relate to comparative public administration? The answer here is that, as Europe was completely devastated socioeconomically and could not find any answer on how to rebuild Europe through traditional public administration, so, financial assistance received from the Marshall Plan, they utilized to find out the ways to reconstruct Europe by implementing a new public administration which later turned to comparative public administration.

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

3.6 Various Thinkers

(A) Fred W. Riggs (1917-2008):

Riggs' famous works are 'Applied Prisms: A Development Perspective', 'Prismatic Society Revisited', 'Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society', 'Administration and a Changing World Environment' and many more. In his famous 'Prismatic Sala Model', Riggs explained that, if a ray of light we see before it enters into a prism, has no refraction and it represents a 'fused society' which does not have any specialization. After that, when this ray of light enters into the prism, it is not fully refracted, there is a progression of refraction is noticed. This type of state is called a 'prismatic state'. And, in the end, when a ray of light comes out from the prism fully, it is shown as a rainbow with seven distinct colours and it indicates a 'diffracted society' based on specialization.

(B) Dwight Waldo (1913-2000):

Waldo's famous books are 'The Administrative State: A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration', 'The Study of Public Administration', and 'Comparative Public Administration: Prologue, Performance, Problems, and Promise'. Dwight Waldo, as a scholar, did not support the politics-administration dichotomy. Rather he believes that politics and administration are the paths which can bring democracy and bureaucracy. Moreover, before Waldo, it was believed that public administration should be value-neutral, placed in a dispassionate way, something which is mechanical. But, on the contrary, Waldo believed that servants of public administration should become active, equipped with political knowledge and work according to law.

(C) Ferrel Heady (1916-2006):

Heady's famous books are 'Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective', 'State

Constitutions: The Structure of Administration'. Heady firmly believed that experts in public administration should gather their knowledge outside the United States of America. This means experts of public administration should emphasis on comparison and they should focus outside the First World Countries and on the Third World Countries.

3.7 Conclusion

The scope of Public Administration has increased enormously during the twentieth century. ' The importance of Public administration has grown substantially with the success of the industrial revolution and modernization, the increased role of the state during and after the Second World War, measures of welfare adopted in most of the countries and growth of a large number of developing countries. Today, Public Administration influences almost all aspects of human life. Even in a capitalistic country like the USA, the role of government has expanded effectively. The net result of this increased role of state or government has been that a large number of specialized branches of Public Administration have come upon the scene. Some of these branches are economic administration, social administration, educational administration, health administration, transport administration, space administration, etc. Besides, there are areas such as state administration, urban administration, rural administration, financial administration and personnel administration which have *become listed p&s 6f the vocabulary of government. Therefore, when we compare administrative systems existing in various nations or cultures, we can compare either the whole of the administrative systems or some important parts of such systems. Today, we find several studies on comparative educational administration, comparative health administration, comparative economic administration, comparative social administration and other related areas. Further, there are a very large number of, publications on comparative urban administration and comparative rural administration. It seems that the topic of Comparative Public Administration is as vast as that of its mother discipline, Public Administration. Anything that Administrative can be compared.

While discussing the scope of Comparative Public Administration, not only the special, lead; branches, of administration have to be taken into. Further, it also needs to be stressed once again that comparative studies can be conducted at macro, middle-range and micro levels. These studies can be inter-institutional, cross-national, cross-cultural and cross-temporal

Here an interesting question arises: what do we include under the rubric of "nature" of Comparative Administration and what do we put under the heading of "scope" of comparative Administration? The best advice that can be given to students of Public. Administration is

that to attempt a neat distinction between the ‘nature’ and ‘scope’ of comparative Public Administration may not be a very useful effort. These two aspects overlap and have common stress on the types, levels, and range of comparative studies.

3.8 Summary

- Comparative Administrative Group (CAG) did a remarkable job of popularizing comparative public administration.
 - The Marshall Plan also played an important role in flourishing comparative public administration.
 - At present this comparative public administration discipline is receiving importance throughout the world, beyond boundaries.
 - Comparative public administration provides insights into how socio-political and cultural contexts influence public administration practices in different countries.
 - Comparative public administration enables learning from successful policies and failures of other nations, fostering better governance and service delivery.
 - It emerged from post-WWII interest in understanding diverse administrative systems.
 - Comparative public administration has expanded its scope to include various approaches, address development challenges, and embrace an interdisciplinary perspectives.
-

3.9 Glossary

- Prismatic Society Model (Fred W. Riggs): A model explaining societal development through light refraction. A “fused society” (no specialization) becomes “prismatic” (partially specialized) and progresses towards a “diffracted society” (highly specialized).
- Politics-Administration Dichotomy (Dwight Waldo): A traditional view separating political decision-making from administrative execution. Waldo argued for their interconnectedness in fostering democracy.
- Value-Neutral Administration (Dwight Waldo): The traditional view of public administration as objective and non-political. Waldo challenged this, advocating for public servants informed by political knowledge and legal frameworks.
- Comparative Public Administration (Ferrel Heady): The study of public administration across different countries, emphasizing the importance of learning from non-Western nations.

- Specialization in Public Administration: The development of distinct branches within the field, such as economic, social, and educational administration.
- Levels of Comparative Analysis: Public administration can be compared at macro (whole systems), middle-range (specific areas), and micro (individual organizations) levels.expand_more
- Types of Comparative Studies: Public administration can be compared across institutions, nations, cultures, and time periods.

3.10 Model Questions

1. Write a short note on the contribution of Ferrel Heady in comparative public administration.
2. Discuss, in brief, the contribution of Dwight Waldo in comparative public administration.
3. Write a short note on the Marshall Plan.
4. Do you think that the failure of the Weberian model was one of the major causes behind the emergence of comparative public administration?
5. Which period is called the ‘golden era’ in comparative public administration?
6. Examine the evolution of comparative public administration.
7. Discuss the role of comparative administrative groups in comparative public administration.

3.11 References

1. “Comparative Public Administration: The Essential Readings” Edited by Eric E. Otenyo and Nancy S. Lind (under ‘Research in Public Policy Analysis and Management’ Vol. 15)
2. ‘The Ecology of Public Administration’ by Fred W. Riggs
3. ‘The Study of Public Administration’ by D. Waldo
4. ‘Political Culture and Political Development’ by Lucian W. Pye and Sidney Verba
5. ‘Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective’ by Ferrel Heady
6. ‘The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems’ by Robert A Dahl
7. ‘Modern Comparative Politics: Approaches, Methods and Issues’ by S N Ray
8. ‘Introduction to Comparative Political Analysis’ by Rakhahari Chatterji

Unit 4 □ Relationship with Public Administration

Structure

- 4.1 Learning Objectives
- 4.2 Introduction
- 4.3 Integrated Nature of Social Phenomena
- 4.4 Public Administration as a Social Science
- 4.5 Relationship Between Public Administration and Comparative Public Administration
- 4.6 Relationship Between Comparative Public Administration and Other Social Sciences
- 4.7 Conclusion
- 4.8 Summary
- 4.9 Glossary
- 4.10 Model Questions
- 4.11 References

4.1 Learning Objectives

In this unit, you will learn the relationship and position of Public Administration and Comparative Public Administration and its place among social science disciplines including its relations with other Social Sciences, in particular, with Political Science. ‘ Sociology, Economics, History and Law.

After studying this unit you will be able to:

- Describe the integrated nature of knowledge
- Explain the inter-relatedness of different Social Sciences and
- Describe how the concepts and issues of Public Administration are related to those of political Science, Sociology, Economics, History, Law etc.

4.2 Introduction

“All Political Science and any scientific understanding of Public Administration needs to be comparative”... Fred W. Riggs

No discipline, under any school of knowledge, is sufficient enough to discuss things without comparing or relating with other discipline's knowledge. So is the case of comparative public administration too. This discipline needs to be compared with its mother subject i.e. public administration as well as obviously with other social science subjects too. Because social happenings do not transpire alone. Behind any social happening, various socio-political-cultural intercourses are there. This unit will focus on these elements.

From the time of Plato and Aristotle of ancient Greece to the 18th Century, Social Sciences have been regarded as a single subject of study. With analysis of different, aspects of it, it has split into different! disciplines. Their development was hastened by the Industrial Revolution which gave rise to issues requiring investigation by the Industrial Revolution. The broad division of Social Science into Economics into History, Political Science, Public Administration, Sociology, etc. has proved inadequate to the understanding of the solving of several problems posed by social phenomena. This has led to specialization in different areas of a subject (e.g. ~Economics into Applied Economics, economics, etc. Political Science into Political Sociology, Political Anthropology, etc.). As a result, it has become increasingly difficult to realize an integrated perspective of social events. Indeed, the writings in Social Sciences in the 20th century testify to the phenomenal expansion of. specialization. However, too much specialization may lead to unrealistic results ignoring “ social phenomenon in its totality. It is like missing the wood for the trees. This is so, because, no social event is uni dimensional nor does it occur in isolation. It is linked with, the economic, political, administrative and social systems of a country. To understand the role of the administrative system of Public Administration in a social setting, it. is necessary to know the relationship between Public Administration and other Social Sciences. This unit is designed to help you not only to understand the nature of social, phenomena but also to whether social Sciences can be regarded as Sciences; what features Public Administration have, and how it is related to other Social Sciences.

4.3 Integrated Nature Of the Social Phenomena

No social event can be studied in isolation without reference to other events. Consider, for instance, the policy on Reservations. A good section of people are supporting it and an equal number are opposing it. If it is viewed only as a policy, for raising or reducing the percentage of reservations we would be facing difficulties. We have to take into consideration its root cause which is the outcome of the historical development of the local society. This means that we have to analyse the social, economic, political and ‘ “ cultural aspects of reservation policy to be able to formulate it in such a way that it meets the ends of social

justice and ensures national progress. Likewise, about the problem of growing inefficiency in public offices, you have to take this into account. a whole spectrum of policies ranging from the recruitment policy through educational policies to the absence of 'achievement' motivation. Then only you will know what has caused it. If you view inefficiency only as a matter of discipline in the offices' you may not be able to. solve the problem of inefficiency. For that one has to search the causes of inefficiency, which lies either in educational lacunae or motivation of work.

4.4 Public Administration as a Social Science

One of the problems faced by almost all Social Sciences is the absence of some important features of Science. The main features of science are (a) exactness, (b) validity and (c) predictability. Sciences have verifiable laws; Sciences follow a systematic procedure of observation, investigation, experimentation, the building of a hypothesis, verification of the hypothesis by facts, tabulation, classification and correlation of facts, etc. to arrive at conclusions that can be put forward as generalizations. Thus exactness, universal validity and predictability are ensured.

As observed by Aristotle, a great Greek philosopher, Art is to do and Science is to know. If Science is called a systematic body of knowledge, it can be acquired only through the application of the scientific method. At first, knowledge was viewed as a single entity in which various subjects of study could be regarded as having different dimensions. Later, we find subjects divided into sciences such as Physical Sciences, Life Sciences and Social Sciences. But just as the way we call Physical Sciences which deal with physical phenomena exact Science or Sciences, we cannot call Social Sciences which deal with human beings Sciences. The reason is that the social phenomena in which human beings play a major role cannot be studied in as rigorous a way as the physical phenomena can be. Moreover, no Social Scientists can claim such exactness required to be able to make predictions. This, however, does not mean that it is impossible to evolve valid laws about human - behaviour. The contribution of Sigmund Freud to Psychology cannot be ignore. The point is that the level of exactness which is attainable in physical sciences is not possible in Social Sciences. 'Facts' in Physical Sciences, unlike those in Social Sciences, need not be Public Administration and other Social Sciences related to any prescribed setting or context.

To be regarded as Science, Social Sciences have to have principles which are of universal applicability and validity. While some subjects in Social Sciences can claim to have developed such principles, others can prove no such claim. The reason is that human behaviour is, so complex that it is difficult to account for it, using the same principles in every context. For

example, no political scientist can trace certain political developments to any one cause. However, you should not assume that there are no principles in any discipline of Social Sciences. Not all Social Sciences have such principles to which the criteria of exactness, universal validity and predictability can be strictly applied. The scientific methods which are used for arriving at accurate results are now being borrowed by Social Sciences. The behavioural movement which has called for extensive use of empirical techniques for the scientific study of human behaviour, has made an inter-disciplinary approach possible. It is against this background that we shall consider Public Administration as a Social Science.

Public Administration deals with certain aspects of human society. Various public organizations are supposed to serve the public in different ways. To the extent to which the administration deals with the public, Public Administration can be called a Social Science. Public Administration is a Social Science having techniques and abstractions of its own concerning the concepts of action and its problems of theory. It is vitally concerned with, the integration of knowledge in other Sciences, physical, biological, and psychological. Further, Public Administration relies on the method of observation rather than on experimentation. Although experimentation in a laboratory is not possible in the case of Public Administration, the advent of behaviouralism has made it possible. Public Administration appears to be both positive and normative. Questions of 'What is' and 'What ought to be' are as much relevant to Public Administration as they are to Political Theory. Public Administration has been passing through various ages of theory building. In other words, it 'is a discipline in the making.'

4.5 Relationship between Public Administration and Comparative Public Administration

The relationship between Public Administration and Comparative Public Administration should be like a mother and child relationship because Comparative Public Administration was born and nourished under the patronage of Public Administration. If we consider, 1887 as the birth of Public Administration, Comparative Public Administration emerged after World War II. Discussing matters of both disciplines is mostly the same. Public policy formulation and implementing the same, POSDCORB (Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Co-ordinating, Reporting and Budgeting) approach of public administration—all are the major subject matters of comparative public administration too. Chiefly, public administration, especially emphasizes how the governments implement their policies, and accomplish the functions of various organizations (both, governmental and non-governmental) in a particular country having a particular culture. It is very much a challenge to the scholars

of public administration. On the other hand, comparative public administration also tries to search out the possible solutions through which it can serve impoverished people in a better way. As today's world is very much dynamic, one will be lagging of others, if he cannot collect the current and proper information of others before serving impoverished people. That's why, when in 1953, the American Political Science Association set up a committee to compare various administrative systems, actually it gave the laissez-passer to the Public Administration to move towards Comparative Public Administration.

4.6 Relationship between Comparative Public Administration with Other Social Sciences

Relationship between Comparative Public Administration with other social sciences are as follows:

4.6.1 Comparative Public Administration and Public Administration

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 looks to test the effectiveness of the Classical Theorists (Fayol, Taylor, Urwick, etc.) Principles of Administration effectiveness on a universal level (different political and administrative setups in developing and developed countries and their ecology) as well as develop a comparative theory of Public Administration.

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. Also, it helps improvise administrative systems making them more efficient together with helping in adding and improvising the already existing literature/theories of Public Administration thus leading to a strong and practical theory of the subject with the help of practical experiments and analysis.

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. Also, it helps improvise administrative systems making them more efficient together with helping in adding and improvising the already existing literature/theories of Public Administration thus leading to a strong and practical theory of the subject with the help of practical experiments and analysis.

The study of comparative public administration contributes to a greater understanding of the individual characteristics of administrative systems functioning in different nations and then

we can endeavour to adopt those practices which can fit in our nations and systems. In addition, comparative studies also help in explaining factors responsible for cross-national and cross-cultural similarities as well as differences 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.

Through comparative public administration, the achievements and political systems of different countries are compared. The analysis is made to learn in any specific country, how some specific plan was launched and how many people benefited from it. In this vein, an eminent author observes,

Comparative public administration is a quest for patterns and regularities of administrative action and behaviour. Through comparative analysis, we can show not only the diversity of human experience but also the amazing uniformity within and among states. Comparison extends our knowledge of how to explore, reflect, and better understand universal administrative attributes, instead of being confined to ethnocentric views. Under comparative public administration, it has become easier to study the administrative systems of developing and developed countries.

4.6.2 Comparative Public Administration and Political Science:

Of all internet: relationships among Social Sciences, those between Political Science and Public Administration stand apart from others. Political, Science, according to a Social Scientist, is concerned with the study of “authoritative allocations of values”. It focuses on the relationship between the State and the individual. it provides answers to questions concerning the origin and nature of the State and also considers the institutions through which the administrative members of society exercise power. For a long time, Public Administration has been regarded as a part of Political Science. About 100 years ago Woodrow Wilson called for the separation of Public Administration from Political Science on the ground that ‘the field of administration is the field of business’. Following Woodrow Wilson, Frank Goodnow, yet another protagonist of the separation of Public Administration from Political Science has observed that since a large part of administration is not directly connected with politics it needs to be removed from the control of political parties. Writers from the US were largely influenced by the above-mentioned argument and emphasized the need for overcoming the ill-effects of the ‘spoils system’ according to which the party coming into power replaces the officials appointed by its predecessor with those chosen by it to run the administration. However, the hundred-year-old history of Public Administration brings out the severe limitations to which the growth of Public Administration as an independent discipline is subjected. It is, therefore, not surprising that the contemporary theoreticians of Public Administration have advocated its re-unification with its parent discipline, i.e. Political Science.

We know that the political system of every country is related to its administrative system. Indeed, it is the country's political system which creates its administrative system. Conventionally speaking, Political Science deals with policy-making and the implementation of policies is left to the administrators. Thus the administration is charged with the responsibility of translating the political will of a country into practical forms of action. However, this is easier said than done. Again, it would be noted that the administration plays a significant role in the formulation of policies. It follows that the political system and administration influence each other to such an extent that it will be sometimes difficult to demarcate between the roles played by them respectively in the given case. In a parliamentary government like India, while the minister, as a political leader and member of the Cabinet, participates in policy-making, but as the top boss of the Ministry/Department, is also involved in administrative decision-making. Similarly, though the civil servants are supposed to implement the policy decisions, the senior administrators are also involved in policy formulations by way of providing data/information/advice to the Minister. As has been pointed out by some writers, the character and form of administration of a country are influenced by its political system. If this view is accepted, it may be asked whether one can understand the administrative system without understanding the political system. For instance, in a democratic system of governance, the bureaucracy (or the administrative system) is expected to obey its political master. In such case, the concept of bureaucratic neutrality put forward by Weber (a German Sociologist who is considered an authority on types of bureaucracy) does not hold good.

Comparative Public Administration is the study of government and administration. And perhaps no other subject than Political Science discusses government and administration more and more. Comparative Public Administration wanted to promote the best administrative decisions by comparing various administrative systems (of various countries) so that poor and needy people could get the best output. As an academic subject, Political Science plays the role of a supplier of information to Comparative Public Administration. We know that the term government comprises three wings i.e. legislature, executive and judiciary. The functions of these three organs of the government, or, rather we say how these three organs can perform their best, are the main discussing matters of Political Science. Comparative Public Administration also wants to give the best to the people of the country through the best functions of these governmental organs. So, close and inevitable relations exist between these two disciplines.

4.6.3 Comparative Public Administration and History:

History, as a subject, partially we may say is the source of studying past memorable events and eventful movements including various causes and effects of those events and movements.

It is partially, because, History as a subject comprises a vast, really vast scope, which perhaps is equal to the total sources of Political Science, Economics, Sociology etc. Earlier, subject matters of these disciplines were taught under History. Gradually these disciplines were separated from History in due course of time. Comparative Public Administration as a separate and new discipline, very much indebted to History. Comparative Public Administration collects information from History. History is the test centre where everything has been kept since the inception of human civilization. While serving common and needy people, Comparative Public Administration first collects data from History and then evaluates those data before making any administrative decision. The reason behind this is that, to compare the current situation with past situations (similar) and then take the most suitable one. This comparison will guide administrators on what to do in which type of situation.

According to E. H. Carr, 'history is a continuous process of interaction (between the historian and his facts) an unending dialogue between the present and the past'. History provides an insight into the past. The study of the historical background of a country enables us to understand its administrative systems. Historians have recorded, not only political events like battles and the deeds of rulers but also particulars of administration., L.D. White in his book on the early history of American administration wrote, 'The Administrative History of Medieval England' provided useful material for understanding the systems of administration of those times, History tells us how administrative problems arose in the past and how they were solved.

Significantly, modern historians have been paying increasing attention to the prevalent administrative systems.'This augurs well for Social Sciences like Public Administration since it will provide valuable information to them.

4.6.4 Comparative Public Administration and Economics:

"Economics is a science concerned with those aspects of social behaviour and those institutions which are involved in the use of scarce resources to produce and distribute' goods and services in the satisfaction of human want"- ' This definition of Economics may be said to have been modified by the well-known economist, L.Robbins, who defines it as "the science which studies human behaviour as a relationship between ends and scarce. means which have alternative uses".

These definitions suggest that economics is as much concerned with human behaviour as any other Social science.

The major objectives of administration during the 18th and a good part of the 19th century were the maintenance of law and order and the collection of revenue. In the wake of Industrial evolution there occurred a radical transformation of the concept of the State. This

was due to its being compelled to become more responsive to the needs of the masses, especially the working classes than ever before. Industrial Acts fixing working hours and minimum wages put enormous pressure on the administration. Goals like the establishment of a socialist society led to the expansion of the role of administration in development. Those industries which had been hitherto managed by the private sector had come under the direct administration of the government. The fast-growing Public sector (i.e. industries directly under the government) illustrates the relationship between Economics and Public Administration. Indeed, the expanding role of the Public Sector and direct intervention of the government to regulate extreme swings in the economy place a great burden on Public Administration.

Planning has been chosen as the means to realize the goal of a Socialist society. If efficient implementation of plans ensures goal attainment, the task of the administrators is to choose methods for effective implementation of plans. The administrators today, have been entrusted with the responsibility of managing railways, and insurance companies and tackling issues concerning agriculture, banking, etc. They, therefore, have got to have an ‘ understanding of the economic problems of the country.

Economics, as a subject, comprises the following broad topics under its scope e.g. product pricing, wages, rent, national income, welfare economics, economic growth, and distribution of goods (both, public and private). Although we know that these are only the tip of the iceberg of its scope. Despite that, if anybody deeply follows the scope of Economics, will find out that all these are closely related to comparative public administration too. The main objective behind the emergence of comparative public administration was to construct and build the newly independent colonial countries got independence after World War II. In these countries, welfare economics, economic growth, and distribution of goods— all were the important tasks comparative public administration had to perform and to do all these, nothing other than Economics was found better.

4.6.5 Comparative Public Administration and Sociology:

Sociology is concerned with the scientific study of social structure. It is a Science which studies the form of human actions in society. It also studies the inter-relatedness of the other Social Sciences. It is called by some a ‘super science’ unifying the generalizations of ‘ the other Social Sciences. Post-colonial societies continue to be in the grip of an all-pervasive bureaucracy. They are marked by inequalities of every kind. This is why the policies and their implementation in such countries need to be studied within a broad framework of class, caste and power. American scholars like Riggs and Presthus have brought out the undifferentiated nature of social reality characterized by a close nexus between society, polity and its administrative system.

Administration as we are aware, operates in the context of the society of which it is a part. Hence, just as society is concerned with goals, values, and belief systems, so also should the administration. Thus we notice a two-way relationship; administration exists in a social setting and the pattern of administration theoretically is determined by society. Through administrative leadership, society may be influenced. Sociology is concerned with the human behaviour in a group, the various types of groups and how they influence human instincts and activity. Administration is a cooperative endeavour in which, a large number of people are engaged in achieving certain objectives. The 'administrators themselves form a distinct group known as bureaucracy which, while, maintaining its identity frequently interacts with its social environment. If the organization is big enough there will be small groups and even sub-groups within it. These small groups and sub-groups have their loyalties, sympathies, antipathies; ethics, and outlook which would influence the administrative apparatus. Sociology offers Public Administration information about groups, their behaviour, and the way they affect social life. It is, therefore, not surprising that writers regarded as eminent in Public Administration primarily belong to Sociology. Max Weber's essay on bureaucracy has influenced many other writers in Public Administration. Some of the recent works in Sociology on status, class, power, occupation, family, etc., provide useful information and a theoretical base for the Sociology of Public Administration.

The classical theories of administration tell us about the importance of structures in administration, considering 'human behaviour to be static, The contemporary theories, regarding it as being dynamic, investigate why a particular decision is taken by an administrator in a particular situation. In the course of such an investigation, the study of the social background of administrators will be found necessary. The tools developed by Sociology are used by the scholars of Public Administration to understand the sociology of administrators.' A notable work in this, field is that by V. Subrahmaniam on the social background of Indian Administrators. The interest in studies of the representativeness of a country's bureaucracy makes for the study of the relationship between Sociology and Public administration. If one looks at the administrative structures engaged in the reconstruction of societies, especially those of developing countries, one will find that the bureaucracy is engaged in community action.

A good number of institutions/universities offer a course in Social Administration as part of the Postgraduate and other programmes. Premier institutes like the Tata Institute of Social Sciences are offering special training programmes to the officials of welfare agencies like Tribal Development, etc. The National Institute of Rural Development special training courses for the personnel of All India Services are intended to acquaint the administrators with the 'sociology of rural India.

Sociology, as a subject under social science, has a divergent scope. Family, state, race, caste, class and last but not least, culture— all are the major subject matters of Sociology. Now, the key objective behind the emergence of Comparative Public Administration was that the caste system, nature of class, and culture of the people are found different in First World Countries (where public administration emerged and developed but later found it is not suitable for undeveloped and underdeveloped countries) than Third World Countries. Even, within Third World Countries, nations have a big gap in their socio-economic condition and culture. So, if Comparative Public Administration wants to develop the socio-economic condition of the people of world Countries, Sociology as a social science discipline can play the role of a pole star by providing information to the administrators on what type of developmental policies will suit best which type of socio-political culture area.

4.6.6 Relation with Law

According to Malinowski. Law is a ‘sanctioned norm’. According to Gadhart, Law is any rule recognized as being obligatory by the bulk of the community. In other words, violation of norms is usually followed by counteraction. A legal norm is marked by the probability that it is Public administration and will be enforced by specialized staff. The authority to enforce rules is vested in the administration. This explains the relationship between Law and Public Administration.

Public Administration has to function within the framework of the law of the country. In other words, the law sets the limits of administrative action, though it allows considerable discretion to the administration. A subject common to these two disciplines is Administrative Law. The legislature enacts laws (acts) that the administration has to implement. ‘The role of administration is not restricted to implementation only; it has a role to play in law-making also. Civil servants have a say in the formulation, presentation and enactment of laws.

In fact, Public Administration has been described by a writer as a machinery concerned with the ‘systematic and detailed execution of law’. The relationship between administration and law appears to be so close that in some countries Public administration is studied as part of some law courses. Some subjects like Delegated Legislation, structure and functioning of Administrative Tribunals are studied by both the students of Law and those of Public Administration.

The Indian form of Ombudsman (i.e., Lokpal and Lokayukta) are studied by students of Public Administration as an institution for the redressal of public grievances. The study of such institutions shows the increasing importance of the relationship between Law and Public Administration.

4.7 Conclusion

All social phenomena are found integrated in nature. No social event can be understood completely without an understanding of its various dimensions. While knowledge is regarded as a single entity, the need to study different aspects of it led to specialization. While the mushroom growth of specialization led to a spin in research, the need for an integrated approach to social reality has not been met. Therefore, the study of various disciplines vis-a-vis others has become necessary. Public Administration as a discipline is only about 100 years old. It got separated from Political Science a few decades ago. It has close relations with other Social Sciences. It owes its emergence to Political Science, But it is finding it difficult to sustain itself as an independent discipline. it is being increasingly felt that it must be strengthened with concepts drawn from Political Science. Public Administration is related to Sociology. also. Public administration cannot be appreciated without an understanding of the social reality around it. Works of Sociologists like Max Weber influenced the theory and practice of Public Administration. The fact is that the modern administrator is known as a social engineer, confirming the close relationship between Sociology and Public Administration. With the advent of planning the 'relationship between Public Administration with Economics has grown stronger, 'The present-day administrators ought to know the economic aspects of the polity for effective implementation of policies. 'The focus of administration. in the Third World countries is on removal of poverty. Matters connected with the mobilization of resources (taxes, exports, imports, etc.) have a great bearing on administration. History is yet another subject with which Public Administration has a close relationship. Knowledge of the past enables us to ' understand the present.

4.8 Summary

- No discipline or subject in this world of knowledge is self-sufficient.
- Comparative Public Administration as a discipline, is highly influenced and dependent on Public Administration, Political Science, History, Economics and Sociology.
- Study of public administration on a comparative basis.
- Explain factors responsible for cross-national or cultural differences in bureaucratic behaviour. .
- Study of public administration applied to diverse cultures and national settings.
- Learn distinctive features of a system or a group of systems.

- Examine the success or failures of a particular administrative feature in a particular ecological setting.
- Understand strategies for administrative reforms.

4.9 Glossary

- **Comparative Public Administration:** Analyzes public administration across countries to understand best practices and diverse approaches.
- **Social Sciences:** Disciplines like economics, sociology, and political science that study human society and its institutions.
- **Political Science:** Examines how power is acquired, distributed, and used within governments and societies.
- **History:** Studies past events and their influence on the present.
- **Economics:** Analyzes production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services.
- **Sociology:** Investigates human behavior, social structures, and the development of human societies.
- **Law:** The system of rules and regulations that govern a society.
- **Representativeness:** The degree to which a group or institution reflects the characteristics of a larger population.
- **Lokpal and Lokayukta:** Anti-corruption ombudsman institutions in India, with Lokpal at the national level and Lokayukta at the state level.

4.10 Model Questions

1. Write a short note on the relationship between Political Science and Comparative Public Administration.
2. Discuss, in brief, the relationship between Sociology and Comparative Public Administration.
3. Write a note on the relationship between Public Administration and Comparative Public Administration.
4. Do you think that the basic objective of Comparative Public Administration was to advance the administrative acquaintance — argue in favour of your answer.
5. “Comparative Public Administration is a study of Public administration on a Comparative basis”— Examine the statement.

6. Do you think that Comparative Public Administration is very much indebted to the subject of History— argue in favour of your answer.
-

4.11 References

1. “Comparative Public Administration: The Essential Readings” Edited by Eric E. Otenyo and Nancy S. Lind (under ‘Research in Public Policy Analysis and Management’ Vol. 15)
2. ‘The Ecology of Public Administration’ by Fred W. Riggs
3. ‘The Study of Public Administration’ by D. Waldo
4. ‘Political Culture and Political Development’ by Lucian W. Pye and Sidney Verba
5. ‘Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective’ by Ferrel Heady
6. ‘The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems’ by Robert A Dahl
7. ‘Modern Comparative Politics: Approaches, Methods and Issues’ by S N Ray
8. ‘Introduction to Comparative Political Analysis’ by Rakhahari Chatterji

Unit 5 □ An Assessment

Structure

- 5.1 Learning Objectives**
- 5.2 Introduction**
- 5.3 What to Compare in Comparative Public Administration**
- 5.4 Levels and Range of Comparative Analysis**
- 5.5 Nature of Comparative Studies of Administration**
- 5.6 Problems of Comparative Studies**
- 5.7 Evaluation**
- 5.8 Conclusion**
- 5.9 Summary**
- 5.10 Glossary**
- 5.11 Model Questions**
- 5.12 References**

5.1 Learning Objectives

The objective of this unit is to explain the following aspects of Comparative Public Administration. Completing this unit, you will be able to understand:

- The essential significance of Comparative Public Administration
- The basic nature and range of comparative studies
- The conceptual approaches in Comparative Public Administration.

5.2 Introduction

Comparisons of administrative systems have had a long tradition. But a focus on this aspect of administrative studies is about forty years old. Only after the Second World War and with the emergence of new nations in Asia and Africa, a vigorous interest in comparative studies of Public Administration has evolved. Comparative Public Administration, in simple terms, refers to a comparative study of government administrative systems functioning in

different countries of the world. The nature of Comparative Administration has vast ramifications and ranges from the narrowest of studies to the broadest of analyses. To understand the meaning of Comparative Public Administration, it would be desirable to look at the types of comparative public administration studies undertaken by scholars in the field. In this unit, we shall examine the ‘. meaning, scope, and nature of Comparative Public Administration. We shall also discuss its conceptual approaches.

No one can deny the reality that, after World War II, as a separate discipline, Comparative Public Administration played a vital role in rebuilding Third World Countries. Theoretically, it provided a lot of information to the nation-builders of undeveloped and underdeveloped countries. But, in reality, there are few theoretical as well as few practical problems are there where Comparative Public Administration has failed or received hindrances. In this unit, these will be discussed.

5.3 What to Compare in Comparative Public Administration

In comparative (public) administrative studies, the unit of analysis is an administrative system. Therefore, the focus is either on the whole of an administrative system or on its various parts. Briefly, the subject matter of comparison would be one or all of the following phenomena:

The environment of the administrative system.

- The whole administrative system.
- The formal structure of the administrative system with a focus on the pattern of hierarchy, division of work, specialization, authority-responsibility network, decentralization, delegation, control mechanisms, procedures, etc.
- The informal organizational patterns existing in an administrative set-up, including the nature of human groups, the relationships among individuals, the motivational system, the status of morale, patterns of informal communication and the nature of leadership.
- The roles of the individuals.
- The interaction between the personality of individuals and the organisational system.
- The policy and decisional systems of the organisation that link its various parts.
- The communication system also involves the feedback mechanism.
- The performance of an administrative system.

One can notice from the foregoing discussion that an administrative system is not a simple entity. There are intricacies of its functioning which will be highlighted in any comparative analysis.

5.4 Levels and Range of Comparative Analysis

Comparative administrative studies can be conducted at three analytical levels: macro, middle-range and micro. Macro studies focus on the comparisons of whole administrative systems in their proper ecological contexts. For instance, a macro study would involve a comparison of the administrative systems of India and Great Britain. It will comprise a detailed analysis of all important aspects and parts of the administrative systems of the two nations. It will be comprehensive in its scope. Though the studies of the macro level are rare, they are not impossible to be taken up. Generally, the relationship between an administrative system and its external environment is highlighted in the macro-level studies. The middle-range studies are on certain important parts of an administrative system that are sufficiently large in size and scope of functioning. For instance, a comparison of the structure of higher bureaucracy of two or more nations, a comparison of agricultural administration in two or more countries or a comparison of local government in different countries will form part of middle-range studies.

Micro studies relate to comparisons of an individual organisation with its counterparts in other settings. A micro study might relate to an analysis of a small part of an administrative system, such as the recruitment or training system in two or more administrative organisations. Micro studies are more feasible to undertake and a large number of such studies have been conducted by scholars of Public Administration. In the contemporary collaborative public Administration, all three types of studies coexist.

Another relevant question that arises is what is the range of comparative administrative studies? What types of studies are generally included in this realm? The scope of Comparative Public Administration studies is so wide that a variety of analyses form part of this branch of knowledge.

Like the levels of Public Administration, there are also different ranges of studying Public administration. The outline of those types of comparative administrative studies can also be brought together for better understanding. Broadly there, are five types of studies. They are:

5.4.1. Inter-Institutional Analysis

It involves a comparison of two or more administrative systems. For instance, a comparison of the structure and working of the Home Ministry of the Government of India with the

Defence Ministry will be a case of inter-institutional analysis. Such comparisons could involve the whole of an administrative organization or its various parts.

5.4.2 Intra-national Analysis

When an analysis in a comparative perspective is taken up among various administrative systems functioning within a country, it would be an intra-national analysis.' A comparison of district administration in Bihar and Punjab would be an example of such an analysis.

5.4.3 Cross-national Analysis

When two or more administrative systems (or their parts) are compared in the settings of different nations, this would be a cross-national analysis. For example, comparing the recruitment of higher civil service in China, Thailand and Tanzania will form an example of a cross-national analysis.

5.4.4 Cross-cultural Analysis

A cross-national analysis of the administrative system involves countries forming part of different "cultures", this would be called a cross-cultural analysis. For instance, comparing the administrative system of the USSR (*a socialist state*) with the U.S. (*a capitalist system*) could be termed a cross-cultural analysis. Even a comparison between a developed country (e.g. France) with a developing country (e.g. Algeria) or between a developing democratic country (e.g. Philippines) and a developing Communist regime (e.g. Vietnam) will be covered in a cross-cultural comparison. Thus the word "cultural" in the category "cross-cultural" has a broad connotation and involves an aggregation of distinctive political, economic and socio-cultural traits of a particular system and its environment.

Cross-temporal analysis refers to the process of analyzing data or information from different periods to identify patterns, trends, and changes over time. Such a comparison involves different time frames for analysis. For instance, a comparison between the administrative system prevailing during Ashoka's reign and Akbar's regime would be a cross-temporal analysis. Likewise, comparisons, between the administrative systems of ancient Rome and modern Italy, or between the administrative practices prevailing during the period of Jawaharlal Nehru and Indira Gandhi would fall under the rubric of cross-temporal analysis.

A cross-temporal analysis may be inter-institutional, intra-national, cross-national or cross-cultural. For instance, a comparison of the administrative control mechanisms prevailing during the times of Julius Caesar, Alexander, Harsha, Ataturk and Nasser will be cross-national as well as cross-cultural. Exactness in cross-temporal studies is not possible because of differences like historical sources available for various periods.

However, some broad conclusions based on existing sources can be reached through scientific studies. Nimrod Raphaeli has defined Comparative Public Administration as a study of Public Administration on a comparative basis. The Comparative Administration Group referred to Comparative Public Administration as the theory of Public Administration which belonged to diverse cultures in the regional settings and the body of factual data by which it can be expanded and tested. Robert Jackson has defined it as the phase of the study which is -consumed. with rigorous cross-cultural connections to the structures and processes involved in the activity of administering public affairs.

5.5 Nature of Comparative Studies of Administration

Some scholars believe that comparison is an inherent part of any social analysis and whenever we examine any social problem or issue, we cannot do so without employing the comparative approach. Famous social scientist, Durkheim, subscribed to this approach.

Further, Eisenstadt believes that there is no distinction between comparative research and general social research, for the methods of the two are similar. On the other hand, other scholars believe that comparative inquiry has a special focus and techniques.

Before the Second World War, there were; several studies on comparative politics and administration but such studies were primarily descriptive and normative. Fred Riggs, the foremost scholar of Comparative Administration observed that there were three trends which were noticeable in the comparative study of Public Administration. These were. 1) “normative” to “empirical”, 2) “ideographic” to ‘nomothetic” and 3) “non-ecological” to “ecological”. We shall now briefly refer to these trends.

5.5.1 Normative to Empirical

Traditional studies of Public Administration were very much influenced by the classical approach. These studies emphasised ‘good administration’ which was based on following certain ideal principles. Efficiency and economy were considered to be the primary goals of all administrative systems and there were certain principles of formal organisation which helped in the achievement of these goals, therefore, a few models of administration, primarily of the Western democratic world, were considered to be useful for all other administrative systems. As several developing countries emerged on the scene and with the success of the communist systems in various parts of the world, it became clear that a limited culture-bound normative approach to the study of Public Administration was not adequate. The behavioural approach highlighted the value of studying the facts and reality in, a significant manner and therefore the comparative studies of Public Administration after the Second World War started assigning greater importance to the study of

administrative “reality” existing in different countries and cultures. These studies were more interested in finding out facts about structural patterns and behaviour of administrative systems rather than in describing what was good for each system.

In this context, it may be mentioned that two important trends have influenced the character of some administrative studies in the past two decades or so. First, the concept of “development Administration” which focuses on the goal orientation of the administrative system is basically a nonnative concept. Though it considers reality as the basis of such goal orientation, the emergence of Development administration as a focused inquiry since the early sixties, Comparative Public Administration (encompassing the field of Comparative Development Administration) has evolved a synthesis between the normative and the elements of analysis.

The second movement that has influenced the nature of Comparative administrative studies is the Flow of Public Administration which stresses the idealistic goal to be achieved by an administrative system and thus tries to bridge the gap between the “is” and “should” aspects of Public Administration. In the late sixties, the New Public administration marked the “post-behavioural” trend and its impact on most administrative analyses has been profound.

5.5.2. Ideographic to Nomothetic

The words “ideographic” and “nomothetic” have been used by Riggs in specific contexts. An ideographic approach concentrates on unique cases, e.g. a historical event, the study of a single agency, a single country or even a single cultural area.

The nomothetic approach, on the other hand, seeks to develop generalisations and theories which are based on analysis of regularities of the behaviour of administrative systems. Thus earlier studies of Comparative Public Administration which were ideographic focused on the study of individual nations or institutions and their approach was primarily descriptive. No serious attempt was made to compare various nations and systems. Generally, within a volume on comparative governmental administration, there were separate chapters on different nations, without any attempt to look at the similarities or differences among such nations in terms of their administrative systems. These studies, therefore, were ‘comparative’ only in name and did not help in the process of, theory-building or in developing generalizations concerning the functioning of administrative systems in different settings.

Nomothetic studies analyse various administrative systems in a comparative context in a manner that will help in the generation of hypotheses and theories. The objective of such studies is to look at the similarities and differences of various administrative systems existing in different nations and cultures and then draw certain generalisations relating to administrative systems functioning at various levels and in different settings.

It may be noted that the emphasis on nomothetic comparative studies is more noticeable in the United States of America than in Europe or Asia. Presently, a large number of comparative administrative studies are ideographic. Even these studies, it must be admitted, contribute to knowledge in Comparative Public Administration. Analysis or theory-building has to be based on facts and description. Therefore, in the present state of comparative administrative studies, a co-existence of ideographic and nomothetic studies may have to be accepted.

5.5.3. Non-ecological to Ecological

The traditional studies of Comparative Public Administration were mainly non-ecological. These studies mentioned the environment of the administrative system only in a casual manner. There was no serious attempt to examine the relationship between the administrative system and its environment. Thus, it had become very difficult to identify the sources of differences among various administrative systems. However, studies undertaken after the Second World War have been specifically looking at similarities and differences among environmental settings prevailing in different nations and cultures and have been attempting to examine the impact of the environment on the administrative system on one hand and the influence of the administrative system on the environment, on the other. The well-known ecological approach relates to the study of the interrelationship between the system and its environment. This approach, popularized by Fred Riggs, has been regarded as an important development in the study of Public Administration.

It may be noted that most of the comparative studies of Public administration after the “Second World War have been referring to the environment of the administrative systems, but the main emphasis is still on analyzing the impact of the environment on Public Administration). The analysis relating to the influences of the administrative system on the ‘environment is still inadequate. Nevertheless, a change in emphasis is noticeable and the ecological orientation is gaining stronger footing in the contemporary comparative analysis.

At this stage, it may be pointed out that when Riggs presented the above three trends in Administration in 1962; he was conscious of the fact that there is bound to be a co-existence of older as well as the newer emphasis in the comparative studies. Accordingly, today there are normative as well as empirical, ideographic as well as nomothetic and non-ecological as well as ecological approaches co-existing in the literature on Comparative administration

5.6 Problems of Comparative Studies

The study of comparative public administration depends very much on the political culture of that country. Sometimes, country or specifically express, ruler of that country does not want 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 in his country and collect information about his nation. Even, he sometimes arrested foreign media personnel and tortured them on the grounds of spying in North Korea. So, now one scholar decided to compare a capitalist country's administration with a socialist country's administration and he chose the USA as a sample from a capitalist country and North Korea as a sample from the socialist block, that researcher might face a big problem in collecting 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.

Ferrel Heady points out another important theoretical drawback of Comparative Public Administration. Comparative Public Administration, to him, later failed to prove that it possesses a distinct area of knowledge having definite issues. This, in due course of time, prevents the growth of Comparative Public Administration from flourishing as a separate discipline. Because, without a proper ideological base, no discipline can be established.

Another practical problem which hurt Comparative Public Administration was the growth of corruption in Third World Countries. As an academic discipline, Comparative Public Administration failed to prevent or stop corruption among the political leaders and administrators of the Third World Countries. Rather, one may say in this way, that, Comparative Public Administration initially could not think at all that corruption could take place this shape in this area. Throughout the Third World Countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America—the case was found to be almost the same. Corruption hampers the pace of the developmental process in these areas. In 1985, the then Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi expressed that, if his government allots 1 rupee to common people, only 15 paise reached the beneficiary. This reflects the situation of the whole Third World. Here, again the objective of Comparative Public Administration again facing undesirable hindrances.

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 can use in first world countries are not easy to use the same in third world countries. For example, if one researcher is collecting data and analyzing the same with 5G technology sitting in a developed country and that researcher uses 3G technology while surveying and analyzing in a third-world country, findings might not give the same outcome.

5.7 Evaluation

In conclusion, we may remind that comparative public administration is not only a subject. Comparative public administration has become a tool for development of the developing

and underdeveloped countries. A question sometimes comes, as to whether was it too late to introduce the discipline of comparative public administration as a tool for development. It means scholars should introduce or implement comparative public administration before World War II. The simple answer is no. Reality is something different. If we deeply notice, we'll find out that, till the end of World War II, the concept of developing and undeveloped countries was almost absent. These areas (e.g. India, and Sri Lanka) were captured by the colonial superpowers and they gave independence to these countries only after World War II. So, in practice, the main subject matter (i.e. developing countries) of comparative public administration did not exist at all before World War II. Till that time, their identity was just they were the 'colonies'. So, as the main subject matter was absent before World War II, how did comparative public administration emerge as a separate discipline?

5.8 Conclusion

This Unit has discussed the evolution of CPA since post-Second World War time to its current status and its meaning, nature, scope, and significance. It highlights 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. The structures, processes, behaviour, impacts, and environment of public administration, when examined from a comparative perspective define the scope of comparative public administration.

5.9 Summary

- The study of comparative public administration depends on the political culture of a particular nation.
- Corruption may be a challenge for comparative public administration.
- Comparative public administration has become a tool for development of the developing and underdeveloped countries.
- Comparative Public Administration and the process of comparative studies has its own set of problems which may be obstacles in its flourishing as a separate discipline of study.

5.10 Glossary

- Approaches to Comparative Public Administration: Different theoretical frameworks used to analyze and compare public administration systems across countries.
- Developing Countries: Nations undergoing rapid socio-economic change and modernization.
- Third World Countries: A term sometimes used interchangeably with ‘developing countries,’ though it can have political connotations. (Note: The term “Third World” is often considered outdated or insensitive. It’s advisable to use “developing countries” unless the context specifically refers to the historical division of the Cold War era.)
- Comparison of Administration: The process of examining and evaluating public administration systems across different countries, focusing on structures, processes, and outcomes.
- Comparison of Socio-political-economic Conditions: Analyzing the social, political, and economic contexts that influence how public administration functions in different countries.
- Comparative Administration Group (CAG): A professional association dedicated to the study and advancement of Comparative Public Administration, particularly influential in the mid-20th century

5.11 Model Questions

1. Do you think that technology is a challenge to the study of comparative public administration?
2. What are the major problems in comparative public administration?
3. Do you think that corruption hampers the development process in Third World Countries— Argue in favour of your answer.
4. Evaluate the role of comparative public administration in connection with its relation in developing third-world countries.
5. How far corruption is responsible for creating hindrances in the process of development?

5.12 References

1. “Comparative Public Administration: The Essential Readings” Edited by Eric E. Otenyo and Nancy S. Lind (under ‘Research in Public Policy Analysis and Management’ Vol. 15)
2. ‘The Ecology of Public Administration’ by Fred W. Riggs
3. ‘The Study of Public Administration’ by D. Waldo
4. ‘Political Culture and Political Development’ by Lucian W. Pye and Sidney Verba
5. ‘Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective’ by Ferrel Heady
6. ‘The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems’ by Robert A Dahl
7. ‘Modern Comparative Politics: Approaches, Methods and Issues’ by S N Ray
8. ‘Introduction to Comparative Political Analysis’ by Rakhahari Chatterji

MODULE : II
THEORIES AND MODELS OF
COMPARATIVE PUBLIC
ADMINISTRATION

Unit 6 □ Rationale behind Theory and Model Building

Structure

- 6.1 Learning Objectives**
- 6.2 Introduction**
- 6.3 Theory Building**
 - 6.3.1 Administrative Management**
 - 6.3.2 Scientific Management Approach**
 - 6.3.3 Bureaucratic Approach**
 - 6.3.4 Human Relations Approach**
 - 6.3.5 Behavioural Approach**
 - 6.3.6 Public Policy Making**
 - 6.3.7 New Public Administration**
- 6.4 Model Building**
 - 6.4.1 Systems Model**
 - 6.4.2 Institutional Model**
 - 6.4.3 Rational Policy-making Model**
 - 6.4.4 Incremental Model**
- 6.5 Conclusion**
- 6.6 Summary**
- 6.7 Glossary**
- 6.8 Model Questions**
- 6.9 References**

6.1 Learning Objectives

After reading this Unit, you should be able to:

- Explain why there was a need to devise and theorize newer theories and models in public administration
- Discuss various advantages and disadvantages of theory and model making,
- Highlight traditional theorizing 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 Estonian 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

6.2 Introduction

Modern day states are highly bureaucratic in nature. Since the 19th century throughout the 20th and in the 21st 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, analyzing 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.

6.3 Theory Building

Theory building in public administration is not an easy task to do, because there are various kinds of public organizations, 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:

6.3.1 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 organization 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 focuses 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.

6.3.2 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 organization. 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 organizational efficiency and economy for the sake of creational production. Taylor's belief that economic incentives are strong enough to motivate the worker for the increased production in the organization.

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.

6.3.3 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 organization is based on Division of Labour, Hierarchy, Rules, Rationality, Inter personality, Rule orientation and Neutrality.

6.3.4 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 organization. This theory focuses on management as a web of interpersonal relationships and it is also based on the behaviour of role occupants in an organization than on the formal structure of the organization.

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 organization which it is now realized exists in all organizations.

6.3.5 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 organization. Behavioural scientists explain that an industrial organization should be considered a social system which has both economic and social dimension. Every member of the organization is unique to some degree.

6.3.6 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 Organizations.

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.

6.3.7 New 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 organization. It goals to improve production and create efficiency of workers. In the public administration, the organization 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 organization. At last, it brings a new kind of public administration in the modern state, of which basic aim is managerial orientation.

6.4 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.

6.4.1 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 analyzing 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 policy making. 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.

6.4.2 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”

6.4.3 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

6.4.4 Incremental Model

Charles Lindblom (1917- 2018) is a critic of the traditional rationality model. In criticizing 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 analyzed.
- 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 focusing” 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) focusing on ills to be remedied rather than on goals to be sought; (iv) trial-and-error learning; (v) analyzing a limited number of options and their consequences; (vi) fragmenting of analytical work to many partisan participation in policy-making.

6.5 Conclusion

The Unit dealt with the various approaches and models of public policy. It emphasizes 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 labeled 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.

6.6 Summary

- Public administration is one of the most important parts of modern-day state system where proper legalized 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.

6.7 Glossary

- **Universal-** relating to or done by all people or things in the world or in a particular group; applicable to all cases.
- **Policy making-** the activity of deciding on new policies, especially by a government or political party.
- **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.
- **Systematic-** a systematic approach to learning that involves carefully following the program's steps. Systemic describes what relates to or affects an entire system.

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

6.8 Model Questions

1. What is new public administration?
2. What are the various facets that administrative theory deals with?
3. Name a few policy making organizations in India?
4. What is black box model?
5. Write a short note on the incremental model?
6. What are the major principles of scientific management?
7. Critically examine the policy-making models and suggest best suitable model/ models for a democratic country?
8. Theories and models are the soul of administration while institutions are the body-justify this statement?
9. Explain rational decision-making model in detail?

6.9 References

1. Buchanan, J.M. (1988). Market Failure and Political Failure. Cato Journal. 8(1).
2. 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/>
3. Dror, Y. (1964). Muddling through-science or inertia? Public Administration Review.24.
4. Dror, Y. (1989). Public Policy-Making Re-examined. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
5. Dye, T.R. & Gray, V. (Eds.). (1980). The Determinants of Public Policy. Toronto.
6. Dye, T.R. (2004). Understanding Public Policy. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
7. Easton, D. (1957). An approach to the analysis of political systems. World Politics. 9(1).
8. Easton, D. (1965). A Systems Analysis of Political Life. New York: Wiley.

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

Unit 7 □ Fred Riggs

Structure

- 7.1 Learning Objectives
- 7.2 Introduction
- 7.3 Ecological Approach
- 7.4 Agraria Industria Models
 - 7.4.1 Agraria
 - 7.4.2 Industria
- 7.5 Fused Prismatic Societies
- 7.6 Prismatic Sala theory
- 7.7 Conclusion
- 7.8 Summary
- 7.9 Glossary
- 7.10 Model Questions
- 7.11 References

7.1 Learning Objectives

After studying this unit, you will be able to:

- Discuss the essential features, merits, and limitations of the Ecological Approach to the study of Comparative Public Administration;
- Appreciate the way Fred W. Riggs has used the Ecological Approach in the creation of his models;
- Understand the key elements of the Riggsian models of Agraria and Industria and their limitations;
- Examine the attributes of Fused, Prismatic, and Diffracted societies, more particularly the Prismatic system and its administrative subsystem, the Sala;
- Develop insights into the utility and limitations of the Prismatic-Sala model in the context of ‘developing societies’; and
- Have a brief view of the concepts of Development Administration and Administrative Development.

7.2 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 organization 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 realization 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 model 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 analyzing 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 analyzing 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 "diffract" 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 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 procedure itself as creating a continuum.

7.3 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 India. In his study of the administrative systems of developing societies, Riggs analyzed 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 organization 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.

7.4 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.

7.4.1 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.

7.4.2 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.

7.5 Fused Prismatic Societies

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.

7.6 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.

7.7 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

7.8 Summary

- Classical organizational theories mainly emphasize organizational structures and principles and behavioural theories concentrate on human behaviour in the organization. But ecological theories emphasize 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.

7.9 Glossary

- **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

7.10 Model Questions

1. Who are the theorists who initiated the ecological approach?
2. What is the origin of the 'sala'?
3. Who inspired Riggs to write 'Agraria and Industria- Toward a Typology of Comparative Administration'?
4. What is the major criticism of the ecological approach?
5. Public administration without comparison will not develop- justify the statement?
6. What objections did F. Riggs have to the traditional society theory?
7. What is the Riggsian model of public administration?
8. Explain prismatic sala theory?
9. Write a short note on the need for governments to compare to serve the public better through public administration?

7.11 References

1. Arora, Ramesh K. 2021. Comparative Public Administration: An Ecological Perspective. New Delhi: New Age International.
2. Heady, Ferrel. 1995. Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective. New York. Marcel Dekker.
3. Heady, Ferrel. 1979. Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
4. Riggs, Fred. 1964. Administration in Developing Countries: Theory of Prismatic Society. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. Riggs, Fred.
5. Riggs, Fred W. 1961. The Ecology of Public Administration. New Delhi: Asia Publishing House.
6. 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.
7. Shen, Chu-Ta. 1987. "A Study on Riggs' Ecological Public Administration Model," Journal of Su Chou University, 9-10.

Unit 8 □ A Critique of Riggs

Structure

- :.1 Learning Objectives**
 - :.2 Introduction**
 - :.3 Riggs, CAG and Ecological Approach**
 - :.4 Criticism of Fred Riggs**
 - :.5 Conclusion**
 - :.6 Summary**
 - :.7 Glossary**
 - :.8 Model Questions**
 - :.9 References**
-

8.1 Learning Objectives

After studying this unit, you 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.
-

8.2 Introduction

One cannot criticize 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.

8.3 Riggs, CAG and 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 realized 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 FW. 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 analyzing 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 analyzed 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.

8.4 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 analyzing 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 analyzing 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.

8.5 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 criticized 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.

8.6 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.

8.7 Glossary

- **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.

- **Prismatic**- the colours formed by the refraction of light through a prism. prismatic effects. In Public Administration shows various formulations in the same society.
- **Pan-disciplinary**- an approach that brings together knowledge from various disciplines such as literary, anthropological, political etc. to make the research more coherent.
- **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.
- **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.

8.8 Model Questions

1. Name the people associate with the Comparative public administration group?
2. Name the book written by Fred Riggs and its core contents?
3. Which conference in 1968 changed the orientation of public administration towards comparative analysis?
4. Explain with suitable examples how the ecological approach began to change the domain of public administration?
5. Explain prismatic society?
6. Explain the terms Agraria and Industria?
7. Write a brief note on what are the limitations of the Riggsian model of comparative public administration?
8. Explain with examples the fused diffracted prismatic model?
9. Public administration has come a long way since the second world war Justify this statement in light of the contribution of Fred Riggs.

8.9 References

1. Dahl Robert A. (1947) “The Science of Public Administration USA: Blackwell Publishing.
2. Easton David (1957) “An Approach to the Analysis of Political system New York: Ardent Media Inc

3. Heady, F. (1979). *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
4. 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>
5. Pfiffner, J.M. (1946) "Public Administration New York: The Ronald Company.
6. Riggs, F.W. (1961) "The Ecology of Public Administration New York: Asia Publishing House.
7. Riggs, F. W. (1962). "Trends in the Comparative Study of Public Administration," *International Review of Administrative Science* Vol. 27(1),
8. Riggs, F. W. (1964). *Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
9. Riggs, F. W. (1964). *The Ecology of Development*. CAG Occasional Paper
10. Waldo, D. (1967) "The study of Public Administration New York: Random House.
11. Willoughby, W.F. (1927) "Principles of Public Administration Washington: Publications of Institute for Government Research.

Unit 9 □ Ferrel Heady

Structure

- ; .1 Learning Objectives**
- ; .2 Introduction**
- ; .3 Ferrel Heady's Comparative Perspective**
- ; .4 Advantages of Comparative Public Administration**
- ; .5 Conclusion**
- ; .6 Summary**
- ; .7 Glossary**
- ; .8 Model Questions**
- ; .9 References**

; .1 Learning Objectives

After studying this Unit, you 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 21st century.

; .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.

; .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 Advantages of Comparative Public Administration

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

1. 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.

2. 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 socioeconomic and even political development get speed 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.

; .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 civilizations 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 popularized 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.

;.6 Summary

- Ferrel Heady has been one of the most prominent comparative public administration theorists of the 20th 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.

9.7 Glossary

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

; .8 Model Questions

1. Mention the prominent members of the comparative public administration group (CAG)?
2. What were the two incidents that affected the thoughts of Ferrel Heady at the University of New Mexico?
3. Why thousands of individuals were sent to developed countries and the establishment of about seventy institutes in developing countries, undertaken by the US government?
4. Write a short note on comparative public administration in the 21st century?

5. Mention any 2 prominent criticisms of a comparative approach to public administration?
6. What are the supportive concepts of administration? Explain
7. Write a short note on the contributions of Ferrel Heady to the discipline of comparative public administration?
8. Explain in detail about Comparative Public Administration Group?
9. A comparative approach to public administration has expanded the domain of knowledge of public administration to newer areas- justify this statement?

; .9 References

1. Arora, Ramesh K. 2021. Comparative Public Administration: An Ecological Perspective. New Delhi: New Age International.
2. Dahl, Robert, 1947. "The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems," Public Administration Review 7, No.1.
3. Heady, Ferrel. 1995. Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective. New York: Marcel Dekker.
4. 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
5. Henry, Nicholas. 2004. Public Administration and Public Affairs. Upper Sadle River, N.J.: Pearson.
6. 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>
7. Riggs, Fred W 1961. Ecology of Public Administration. London: Asia Publishing House
8. Rosenbloom, David H. 1998. Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics, and Law in the Public Sector. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill
9. Siffin, William J., ed. 1957. Toward the Comparative Study of Public Administration. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Unit 10 □ A Critique of Heady

Structure

- 10.1 Learning Objectives
- 10.2 Introduction
- 10.3 Riggs and Heady
- 10.4 Ferrel Heady's Comparative Perspective
- 10.5 Conclusion
- 10.6 Summary
- 10.7 Glossary
- 10.8 Model Questions
- 10.9 References

10.1 Learning Objectives

After studying this unit, you 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

10.2 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.

10.3 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

10.4 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.

32.5 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.

10.6 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.

10.7 Glossary

- **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.
- **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.
- **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.
- **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.
- **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.

10.8 Model Questions

1. How did Heady define and approach the study of administrative culture?
2. In which areas did Riggs and Heady differ?
3. What is the Germanic model proposed by Heady?
4. In what ways did Ferrel Heady's approach to comparative public administration reflect broader intellectual trends and debates in the social sciences during the mid-20th century?
5. What was Ferrel Heady's main contribution to the field of comparative public administration?
6. In what ways did Heady's work challenge traditional assumptions about public administration?
7. 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?

8. 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?
9. 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?

10.9 References

1. Heady, F. (1956). Public Administration and the Comparative Method. *Public Administration Review*, 16(2), 81-89.
2. Heady, F. (1966). The Comparative Approach to Public Administration. In R. C. Macridis (Ed.), *Modern Comparative Politics* (pp. 582-603). Prentice-Hall.
3. Jones, L. R. (2007). The Consummate Comparative Public Administrationist: A Tribute to Ferrel Heady (1916-2006). *Public Administration Quarterly*, 31(1), 132-136.
4. 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.
5. Stillman II, R. J. (Ed.). (2015). *Ferrel Heady: A Pioneer in Comparative Public Administration*. Lexington Books.
6. Stillman II, R. J. (2016). A Tribute to Ferrel Heady: A Pioneer in Comparative Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 76(6), 856-858.

MODULE : III
PUBLIC CHOICE THEORY

Unit 11 □ Background

Structure

- 11.1 Learning Objectives
- 11.2 Introduction
- 11.3 What is Public Choice
- 11.4 Background and Development
- 11.5 Basic Premises of Public Choice Theory
- 11.6 Applying Economics to Politics and Governance
- 11.7 Basic Methodology of Public Choice Theory
- 11.8 Public Choice Challenge to Orthodox Thinking
- 11.9 Public Choice Theory a Paradigm Shift in Public Administration
- 11.10 Conclusion
- 11.11 Summary
- 11.12 Glossary
- 11.13 Model Questions
- 11.14 References

11.1 Learning Objectives

After reading this unit, you will be able to

- Understand the basic concept of Public Choice Theory
- Realize the origin and development of Public Choice Theory
- Know the methodology of Public Choice Theory

11.2 Introduction

‘Public Choice Theory’, a relatively new science located at the interface between economics and politics was explored 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 attempts to explain the origin and development of the modern public choice theory, go through the early writings, discuss the premises of the theory and an attempt to focus on emergence of public choice theory in the broad discipline of public administration.

11.3 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 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.

11.4 Background and Development

13.4.1 History of Public Choice Theory

An early precursor of modern public choice theory was the work of the two French mathematician J. C. de 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 Condorcet work has raised some important questions which modern public choice is also concerned. Following Borda and Condorcet, Lewis Carroll wrote a series of pamphlets analyzing the properties of voting procedures roughly a century after the work of Borda and Condorcet. Wickseil and John C. Calhoun were also seen as forerunner of the public choice theory. Wickseil wrote the classic essay on Just Taxation and his normative inquiry regarding the economic justification of the state. John C. Calhoun writing on political economy anticipate the “public choice revolution” in modern economics and an administration.

11.4.2 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 Theory”. 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 have mainly led the foundation stones to Public Choice Theory and later 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) have 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."

11.5 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.
- James M 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 pubic 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.

11.6 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.

11.7 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 pubic 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 analyzed 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

realization 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.

11.8 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 maximized 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 theorist 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 action 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.

11.9 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”

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.

11.10 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 challenged 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.

11.11 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.

11.12 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.

11.13 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

11.14 References

1. Aligica, Paul Dragos. (2015) *Public Administration, Public Choice and the Ostoms: the achievements, the failure, the promise*. NewYork. SpringerScience Business Media.DOI 10.1007/s11127-014-0225-8.
2. 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.
3. Sen. S (2010). *Consent, Constitutions and Contrast; Public Choice Perspectiveon the state*. In Dhameja, A Contemporary Debate in Public Administration. New Delhi, India: PHI Learning Pvt Ltd.
4. Ostrom, Vincent and Ostrom, Elinor. (1971). *A Different Approach to The Study of Public Administration*. Wiley. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/974676>

5. 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)
6. Basu, Rumki (Revised Edn.) (2004) *Public Administration: Concepts and Theories*. New Delhi, India: Sterling Publishers
7. 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.
8. Schneider, C. K. (2008). *Readings in Public Choice and Constitutional Economy*. Springer.

Unit 12 □ Basic Tenets of Public Choice Theory

Structure

- 12.1 Learning Objectives**
- 12.2 Introduction**
- 12.3 Basic Tenets of Public Choice Theory**
- 12.4 Collective Decision Making**
- 12.5 Governmental Failure**
- 12.6 Various Schools of Thought**
- 12.7 Conclusion**
- 12.8 Summary**
- 12.9 Glossary**
- 12.10 Model Questions**
- 12.11 References**

12.1 Learning Objectives

After reading this unit, you 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

12.2 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.

12.3 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.

12.4 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.

12.4.1 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.

12.4.2 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.

12.4.3 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.

12.5 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.

12.5.1 Legislature

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 analyzed 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.

12.5.2 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 the 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 determined 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 distresses public decisions.

12.5.3 Bureaucracy

Another major sub-field 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 maximize 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 criticized 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.

12.5.4 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 have made studies 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 emphasized much about the Democratic theory also. They observed that the democracy could be functioning properly by the continuous struggle for power between the parties, just as the markets could be functioning well 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 side of the modern life in the welfare state. They claimed that the public sector has been suffering from inherent systematic failure in terms of policy-making and implementation.

12.6 Various Schools of Thought

12.6.1 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, aims 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. As the many practitioners belonging 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 making theory and the historical narratives and experiments.

Secondly, Rational Choice Theory attempts to realise 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 basic ideas of the school in are that political studies are much effective from rational choice perspective than the public interest perspective.

12.6.2 Chicago School

The Chicago School, a very distinct school of the political economy, has long been recognized by the economists. 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 Pubic Choice economists are different from other Chicago economists. 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 schools of public choice is Stigler's theory of 'regulatory capture' where he emphasized that those who are regulated by the state, themselves capture the regulatory process and earn benefits at the cost of consumers.

12.6.3 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 taking 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.

12.6.3.1 Difference of Individual Choice in Market and Political Realm

The public choice theorist of the Virginia School (one of the schools of Public Choice Tradition) has mainly advocated 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:

Firstly, 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.

Secondly, In the market, each individual 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.

Thirdly, difference is that since decision-making through voting is dependent on the choices of all, each individual 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.

Fourthly, distinction rests on the difference in the nature of the alternatives offered in the two environments. A consumer can allocate his budget according to the range of alternatives. In the market, a combination of goods and services may be purchased. A voter, on the other hand, has to choose one candidate (alternative) to the exclusion of others.

Fifthly, difference between choices 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 can cast his vote for such a candidate who may be a loser.

12.7 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 administration.

In this unit, attempt has been made to explore the principle of public choice theory, assumptions of public choice approach such as methodological individualism, rational choice and the politics of exchange. The unit also has highlighted on elections, bureaucracies and legislature. The unit also has emphasized on the different schools of thought on public choice.

12.8 Summary

- The Methodological Individualism, Rational Choice and politics as exchange is the basic premises 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 cast their votes.
- Rent seeking is the attempt by particular group 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
-

12.9 Glossary

Welfare Economics: 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 has been conducted.

12.10 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. Welfare Economics
 4. Chicago School
-

12.11 References

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.

4. Shaw S. Jane. *Public Choice Theory*. library of Economics and Liberty. <https://www.eolib.org/library/Enc/PublicChoiceTheory>
5. Buchanan, James M. *The Calculus of Consent* 1962
6. Basu, Rumki. (Revised Edn.) (2004) *Public Administration: Concepts and Theories*. New Delhi, India: Sterling Publishers.
7. 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 33 □ Contributions

Structure

- 33.1 Learning Objectives**
- 33.2 Introduction**
- 33.3 Major Contributors of Public Choice Theory**
 - 33.3.1 Knut Wicksell**
 - 33.3.2 Gordon Tullock**
 - 33.3.3 James M. Buchanan**
 - 33.3.4 Anthony Downs**
 - 33.3.5 William Niskanen**
 - 33.3.6 Vincent Ostrom**
- 33.4 Conclusion**
- 33.5 Summary**
- 33.6 Glossary**
- 33.7 Model Questions**
- 33.8 References**

33.1 Learning Objectives

After reading this unit, you will be able to

- Realize 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.

33.2 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 process, 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*.

13.3 Major Contributors of Public Choice Theory

Sugato Sen in his work '*Consent, Contribution and Contrasts: The Public Choice Perspective on the State*' (2010) has pointed out 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 is that they have largely managed to convince economists about the limitedness of economic policy, and public finance, without the inclusion of 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.

13.3.1 Knut Wicksel

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 James Buchanan who had done tremendous work in the socio-economic-political field called 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.

13.3.2 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 Theory. 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 impact public decisions.

13.3.3 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 analyzing 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 rule:

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, 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.”

13.3.4 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.

13.3.5 William A. 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 maximization 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.

13.3.6 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 Ostrom 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 centralized bureaucratic agencies but rather more fragmented multi organizational 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 decentralization creates diversity and offers more opportunity for citizen’s choice. He further proposes d bureaucratization of all administrative units and states that decentralization and democracy enhance participation at the work place and grass root level empowerment of the people.

13.4 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.

13.5 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’.
-

13.6 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.
-

13.7 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

13.8 References

1. 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.
2. Butler. E (2012). *Public Choice- A Primer*. Westminster, London: The Institute of Economic Affairs.
3. Rowley and Friedrich (2008) *Readings in Public Choice and Constitutional Political Economy*: Springer Science Business Media, LLC.
4. Muller, D. (1979). *Public Choice*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
5. Mitchell, William.C.(1989). *Chicago Political Economy: A Public Choice Perspective*. Springer. Retrieved from. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30025197>
6. Atkinson, Anthony. (1987) B. *James M. Buchanan Contributions to Economics*. Wiley. Retrieved from. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3440481>
7. Mueller Dennis.C.(2012) *Gordon Tullock and Public Choice*. Springer. Retrieved from. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41483751>

Unit 14 □ Limitations

Structure

- 14.1 Learning Objectives
- 14.2 Introduction
- 14.3 A Question of Self Interest
- 14.4 Other Critical Views
- 14.5 Critics and Public Choice Response
- 14.6 Current and Future Horizon
- 14.7 Game Theory
- 14.8 Conclusion
- 14.9 Summary
- 14.10 Glossary
- 14.11 Model questions
- 14.12 References

14.1 Learning Objectives

After reading this unit, you 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

14.2 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.

14.3 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:

14.3.1 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 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, Wright specifies 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.

14.3.2 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 theorist argues, 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 non economic 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.

14.3.3. 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.

14.4 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 was 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'.

14.5 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 the Public Choice Theory has been criticised 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.

14.6 Current and Future Horizon

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.

14.7 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.

14.8 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.

14.9 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.

14.10 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 state control.
 - Proportional representation: Type of electoral system under which subgroups of an electorate are reflected proportionately in the elected body.
-

14.11 Model questions

1. Describe the limitations of Public Choice Theory
2. Discuss the three criticisms 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. Self Interest
-

14.12 References

1. Aldrich (1993). *Rational Choice and Turnout*. American Journal of Social Science
2. Pressman, Steven (2004). *What is wrong with public choice*. Journal of Post Keynesian Economics.
3. Orchard, Lionel and Stretton, Hugh. (1997). *Public Choice*. Oxford University Press. Retrieved from. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23599913>
4. 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.
5. Butler. E (2012). *Public Choice- A Primer*. Westminster, London: The Institute of Economic Affairs.
6. 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 15 □ New Public Management

Structure

- 15.1 Learning Objectives**
- 15.2 Introduction**
- 15.3 New Public Management: Genesis**
- 15.4 Salient features of New Public Management**
- 15.5 Principles of New Public Management**
- 15.6 Impact of New Public Management**
- 15.7 New Public Management reforms: Appraisal**
- 15.8 Conclusion**
- 15.9 Summary**
- 15.10 Glossary**
- 15.11 Model questions**
- 15.12 References**

15.1 Learning Objectives

After reading this unit, you 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

15.2 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 1992 heralded 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.

15.3 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:

15.3.1 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.

15.3.2 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.

15.3.3 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.

15.3.4 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 maximizer, 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. This has become attractive as a consequence of this approach.

15.3.5 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.

15.4 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, de-bureaucratization, 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'.

15.4.2 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.

15.4.3 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.

15.4.4 Shift to dis-aggregation 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 dis-aggregation of bureaucratic units in order to form a more efficient, accountable public service. This is called ‘dis-aggregation 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

15.4.5 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’.

15.4.6 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.

15.4.7 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).

15.5 Principles of New Public Management

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

- Firstly, 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.
- Secondly, 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).
- Thirdly, 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.

- Fourthly, 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.
- Fifthly, 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.
- Sixthly, 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.
- Seventhly, 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 eight 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 in 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.

15.6 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.

15.7 New Public Management reforms: 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 mechanisms¹⁴ 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.

15.8 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.

15.9 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.

15.10 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.

15.11 Model Questions

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

5. Principles of NPM.
6. Washington Consensus.
7. Write down the limitations of NPM.
8. Give an overview of the New Public Management.

15.12 References

1. 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.
2. Fredriksson, Magnus, and Pallas, Josef. (2018) New Public Management, The International Encyclopaedia of Strategic Communication.
3. Bhattacharya, Mohit, 1999, *Restructuring Public Administration Essays in Rehabilitation*, Jawahar Publishers, New Delhi.
4. Basu, Rumki (Revised Edn.) (2004). *Public Administration: Administrative Theories and Concepts*. Sterling Publishers

