

PREFACE

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

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

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

I wish the venture a grand success.

Professor Indrajit Lahiri
Authorised Vice-Chancellor
Netaji Subhas Open University

Netaji Subhas Open University
Four Year Under-Graduate : Degree Programme
Under National Higher Education Qualifications Framework (NHEQF) &
Curriculum and Credit Framework for Undergraduate Programmes
Subject : Honours in Public Administration (HPA)
Course Title : Understanding Public Administration
Course Code : NEC-PA-01

First Print : March, 2025

Printed in accordance with the regulations of the
Distance Education Bureau of the University Grants Commission.

Netaji Subhas Open University
Four Year Under-Graduate : Degree Programme
Under National Higher Education Qualifications Framework (NHEQF) &
Curriculum and Credit Framework for Undergraduate Programmes
Subject : Honours in Public Administration (HPA)
Course Title : Understanding Public Administration
Course Code : NEC-PA-01

: Board of Studies :

Members

Barnana Guha Thakurata (Banerjee)

*Professor of Political Science,
Director, School of Social Sciences, NSOU*

Soma Ghosh

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

Basabi Chakraborty

*Assistant Professor of Public
Administration, NSOU*

Dipankar Sinha

*Professor of Political Science,
University of Calcutta*

Debajit Goswami

*Asst. Professor of Public Administration,
NSOU*

Manoj Kumar Haldar

*Asst. Professor of Public Administration,
NSOU*

: Course Writers :

Module-I : Units 1-5 & Module-II Units 6-10

Arindam Roy

Associate Professor, University of Burdwan

Module-III : Units 11-15

Debajit Goswami

Assistant Professor of Public Administration, NSOU

: Course Editors :

Basabi Chakraborty

*Assistant Professor of Public
Administration, NSOU*

: Format Editor :

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**

Course : Understanding Public Administration

Course Code : NEC-PA-01

**Module-I
Introduction**

Unit-1	:	Public Administration : Definition, Nature and Scope	9
Unit-2	:	Public Administration and Private Administration	18
Unit-3	:	Evolution of Public Administration	26
Unit-4	:	Impact of Globalization on Public Administration	39
Unit-5	:	Comparative Public Administration, Development Administration, New Public Administration, New Public Management	48

**Module-II
Relationship between Public Administration and
other Social Sciences**

Unit-6	:	Political Science	67
Unit-7	:	Sociology	77
Unit-8	:	History	87
Unit-9	:	Economics	97
Unit-10	:	Psychology	106

Module-III

Society, Politics and Administration

Unit–11 :	Politics and Administration	115
Unit–12 :	Politicians and Bureaucrats	125
Unit–13 :	Ministers and Civil Servants Relations : Case Studies	134
Unit–14 :	Bureaucracy and the Public	144
Unit–15 :	Administration and Civil Society	154

MODULE – I

Introduction

Unit-1 : Public Administration : Definition, Nature and Scope

Structure

- 1.1 Learning Objectives**
- 1.2 Introduction**
- 1.3 Definition of Public Administration**
- 1.4 Nature of Public Administration**
- 1.5 Scope of the discipline**
- 1.6 Conclusion**
- 1.7 Summary**
- 1.8 Glossary**
- 1.9 Model Questions**
- 1.10 References**

1.1 Learning Objectives

After studying this unit, the learners will be able :

- To understand the meaning and definition of Public Administration
- To decipher the nature of the discipline
- To delineate the scope of the discipline

1.2 Introduction

Public Administration is both a discipline as well as a vocation. There is no denying that Public Administration matters. It virtually envelops our life and indisputably justifies the euphemism that from 'womb to tomb' Public Administration is there to bail us out. The present unit intends to introduce Public Administration as a discipline. Written in a lucid manner the present unit covers the following issues: first, Public Administration as an academic discipline has been suffering from a definitional distress as there is hardly any all-agreed definition crafted till date. Secondly, the definitional distress also contributing to the identity crisis of the discipline. Thirdly, in case of nature and the scope of the discipline a clear-cut division is visible among the scholars and the practitioners of the discipline. If we take up the term 'Public Administration' for analytical

purpose, we can see that it is composed of two expressions: 'public' and 'administration'. For analytical convenience, let us set aside the prefix 'public' for the time being and concentrate on the suffix 'administration'. Though the term 'administration' is conceptualized in various ways, the proper understanding of the meaning of Public Administration requires etymological knowledge. Etymologically speaking, the word 'administration' has a Latin root, which means 'to manage'. Therefore, administration is at the heart of every organization, no matter whether it is privately owned or public in nature. The prefix 'public' on the other hand, has a special connotation, which relates anything directly or indirectly with state. Further, public interest is considered to be the distinguishing feature of the word 'public'. Hence, Public Administration essentially represents the state administration.

1.3 Definition of Public Administration

There is no denying that the self-sufficiency of any budding discipline demands a comprehensive definition. Public Administration is no exception either. In fact, the identity distress of Public Administration as a self-sufficient discipline is often attributed to its lack of sound definition. Despite omnipresence of Public Administration in our day-to-day life, there is barely any mutually agreed definition till date. Several attempts have been made to craft an all-encompassing definition of the discipline. However, the discipline is still in search of an agreeable definition. Any attempt in this regard fails to provide any direction to the discipline. To paraphrase Dwight Waldo, it would end up in mental paralysis. A cursory glance at any standard textbook of the subject, no matter whether it is in the past or in the present, would corroborate the fact (Nigro: *ibid*; Caiden: 1971; Stillman: 2005). Some textbooks often put together a number of definitions to avoid the definitional dilemma of the discipline. However, the search for an agreeable definition is seemingly endless. If we look at the latest round of meeting of scholars and practitioners of Public Administration at Minnowbrook (2008) or what is popularly known as Minnowbrook III conference, we can identify such attempt on the part of the scholars to define Public Administration in the context of 21st century. The definition surfaced at the Minnowbrook III conference (2008), deserves some space here, which reflects changing nature of the discipline especially the phenomenon like socio-cultural diversity, which has so long been neglected by the scholars of the discipline. Scholars assembled at the Minnowbrook III conference had defined Public Administration as "a socially-embedded process of collective relationships, dialogue, and action to promote human flourishing for all". Beginning with a quest for the science of administration, the meaning of the discipline has been changing over the

years in tandem with the socio-political transformations. Born out of the sheer concern of making impartial administrative policies, Public Administration initially was known as the executive branch of administration and any intercourse with politics was strictly shunned for the sake of smooth administrative deliberations. However, the initial definition of the discipline based on clear-cut demarcation between politics and administration had eventually turned out to be a principle of public management under the aegis of administrative state. Until recently, the state was considered as the sheet-anchor in defining Public Administration. However, of late, the macroeconomic transformation in the form of globalization has put the entire definitional discourse of Public Administration under scrutiny as under globalization the state is supposed to have shared turf with a host of NGOs and civil society organizations. Hence, the discipline of Public Administration seems to have no escape from the definitional dilemma. Keeping the above problem in mind, this subunit will dwell upon a few important definitional attempts emerged out in course of its development in addition to an effort of making sense of public administration.

If we take a look at the existing literature of Public Administration, we can see that definitional attempts of the discipline have been centering around two different perspectives of Public Administration viz. managerial perspective and integral perspective. Picking a couple of definition here would elucidate the above argument. For example, when Luther Gullick defines 'Public Administration is that part of the science of administration which has to do with government, and thus concerns itself primarily with the executive branch where the work of the government is done, though there are obviously problems also in connection with the legislative and judicial branches', he was basically drawing on the managerial perspective of Public Administration. Almost in the similar vein, Herbert Simon had endorsed the managerial perspective in his attempt of defining Public Administration. By Public Administration, wrote Simon, is meant, in common usage, the activities of the executive branches of the national, state and local governments'. Marshall E. Dimock on the other hand, took much broader (i.e. integral) perspective in defining Public Administration. To him Administration is concerned with 'what' and the 'how' of government. The 'what' is the subject matter, technical knowledge of a field which enables the administrator to perform his tasks, the 'how' is the technique of management, the principles according to which cooperative programmes are carried to success, each is indispensable, together they form the synthesis called administration'. Nigro and Nigro have discarded any one liner and come out with a checklist or sort to capture the essence of Public Administration. He has tried to confine meaning of Public Administration in the following points.

- Public administration is a cooperative group effort in a public setting;
- It covers all three branches—executive, legislative, and judicial—and their interrelationships;
- It has an important role in the formulation of public policy and thus a part of the political process;
- It is different in significant ways from private administration; and
- It is closely associated with numerous private groups and individuals in providing services to the community.

On reviewing the above definitions, the basic concern of Public Administration as a field of study should incorporate the followings: first, structures of public organization, especially the executive branch of organization; secondly, administrative processes involving communication, decision making and control; thirdly, bureaucratic behaviour; fourthly, organizations and structures and networks of various departments and organizations.

1.4 Nature of Public Administration

As an independent discipline Public Administration can be approached from two different perspectives namely the managerial perspective and the integral perspective. The managerial perspective views the administration from the above and takes up the standpoint of those who are at the helm of affairs only. Hence, this perspective is rather narrow in nature. Under these perspectives, barring the managerial functions, rest of the functions of organization like the manual, clerical, and technical activities have been excluded from the purview of Public Administration. Luther Gulick had encapsulated the managerial perspective in an acronym, popularly known as POSDCORB view of administration. The POSDCORB sums up the carnal of public administration in the seven functions of the manager viz. P-Planning, O-Organizing, S-Staffing, D-Directing, CO-Coordinating, R-Reporting, and B-Budgeting. The major proponents of this particular perspective were Luther Gulick, Henry Fayol, Herbert Simon, Donald W. Smithburg, and Victor Thomson. The integral perspective on the contrary, takes up a holistic view of administration and considers it as totality, comprising of all the activities viz. manual, clerical, or managerial that are envisaged in order to fulfill the objective of an organization. Hence, integral perspective conceptualizes administration as the sum total of all those who are involved in various capacities in the act of governing. Hence, viewed from this perspective, the entire workforce

irrespective of their position is the part and parcel of administration. Therefore, from the peon to the secretary -all the government officials are the equal stakeholders of public administration. According to this perspective, success of any organization is contingent upon the contribution all the employees concerned. The major exponents of this school were Woodrow Wilson, L.D. White, Marshall E. Dimock, and John M. Pfiffner et al.

1.5 Scope of the Discipline

Like the nature and the definition of the Public Administration, the scope of it is also contested as scholars are divided on the issue. In common parlance by scope we generally mean the range of issues to be discussed under it. In Public Administration the scope involves the range of concerns and areas to be discussed under the rubric of Public Administration. Before we move on to explore the scope of Public Administration, it is worth noting that Public Administration has been conceptualized both as an activity as well as a discipline. Hence, one, who exposes to the discipline for the first time should be mindful of the said conceptualization when discussing the scope of Public Administration. Hence, exploring the scope of Public Administration as an activity is equivalent to map all the activities of the government. Viewing from this perspective, Public Administration can be defined as the government in action. With the rising expectations of the people on government, the Public Administration has grown manifold over the years and entrusted with multifarious activities, ranging from welfare services to security. Consequently, the ambit of public administration as governmental activity gets widened to incorporate the whole gamut of public policy under its fold.

Tracing the scope of Public Administration as a discipline, one would stumble into two divergent views of Public Administration viz. the POSDCORB view or the narrow view of administration and the subject matter view of administration. The POSDCORB view of administration, a brainchild of Luther Gullick presents a rather narrow perspective of Public Administration, confining it only to the executive branches of government at all the three levels. Under this perspective, all those procedures and methods, pertaining to organization have been taken up for consideration. Luther Gullick had encapsulated the crux of the administration in an acronym entitled POSDCORB, denoting the key components of administration viz. Planning, Organization, Staffing, Directing, Co-ordinating, Reporting and Budgeting. Planning represents the chalking out of the detail outline of the objectives to be achieved and

the methodologies to accomplish the same. Organization stands for setting up of the formal structure of authority through which the work is defined, sub-divided, arranged, and coordinated. Staffing signifies the personnel policy involving recruitment and training of the personnel and the conditions of their work. Directing denotes the making of decisions and the issuance of orders and instructions. Coordinating indicates integration of various divisions, sections and other parts of the organization. Reporting means updating the superiors within the agency to whom the executive is responsible about what is going on.

Budgeting sums up fiscal planning, control and accounting. For Gullick, the POSDCORB activities constitute the essence of all organizations, regardless of the nature of the work they do. Hence, POSDCORB view provides certainty, and definiteness in handling organizational problems. However, the POSDCORB view of administration is not free from criticism. The approach has been subjected to severe criticism for its homogenous approach to organization especially for its apparent neglect of contextuality in addressing organizational problems. Critics argue that despite the tallest claim of encapsulating the essence of organization, the POSDCORB approach has rarely represented the totality of organizational reality. In fact, in pursuit of designing a common toolkit for organization, Gullick seems to have missed the centrality of socio-cultural milieu in constructing organizational realities. Moreover, the POSDCORB view of administration has also ignored the study of the 'subject matter' with which the agency is associated. Another major drawback of the POSDCORB view, identified by the critics, is the absence of any reference to the formulation and implementation of the policy. Hence, its instrumental value to top management notwithstanding, the scope of administration defined in the POSDCORB perspective is too narrow to look after the overall administrative problems.

The subject matter view of Public Administration on the other hand has presented a much boarder and holistic perspective of Public Administration. Unlike the typical POSDCORB perspective of equating administration with a few processes' instrumental for the top management, the subject matter view of administration takes up the substantive matters of administration, like defense, law and order, education, public health, agriculture, public works, social security, justice, welfare, and so on. This perspective believes that for realizing the organizational goals dependence on mere techniques as enunciated in the POSDCORB perspective of administration is not enough. For, proper functioning of an organization calls for both the technique of POSDCORB as well as the specialized techniques of the specific administration concerned. In other words, specialized form of administration requires specialized expertise in addition to the

general administrative knowhow encapsulated in the POSDCORB view of administration. For example, if you take instances of police administration, we can see that it has its own rationality and techniques of crime detection, control and maintenance of law and order, which cannot be performed by mere application of the general administrative principles like personnel management, coordination, finance and so on. It is true in case of other branches of administration as well.

Hence, in sum it can be said that none of the aforementioned perspectives represents the entire administrative reality. In fact, individually no matter how rational it might be in its own way, presents only a truncated view of administrative reality. Therefore, the study of Public Administration should adopt both the perspectives (viz. POSDCORB view and the subject matter view representing the substantive concerns) in its deliberations. In this context the statement made by Lewis Meriam deserves some space here. With an objective of elucidating the scope of Public Administration Merriam wrote "Public Administration is an instrument with two blades like a pair of scissors. One blade may be knowledge of the field covered by POSDCORB, the other blade is knowledge of the subject matter in which these techniques are applied. Both blades must be good to make an effective tool". Hence, following Herbert Simon the present discussion may be concluded with the observation that Public Administration comprises of two important components, namely deciding and doing things. Deciding constitutes the foundation of doing things as one can hardly conceive of a discipline without thinking or deciding. So in sum Public Administration is a combination of both the broad-ranging and an amorphous combination of theory and practice.

1.6 Conclusion

In the forgoing analysis an attempt has been made to introduce the discipline of Public Administration in a user-friendly manner. However, it is by no means an easy task as the discipline is beset with several confusions which often question its very claim as an independent and autonomous discipline. First, if we begin with the definition, i.e. the first convincing sign of any autonomous discipline, Public Administration fails to stake any credible claim in this regard. In fact, the discipline is still to settle for an all-agreed definition. The search for same can be discernible in the latest round of meeting of scholars at the Minnowbrook III conference. Secondly, the discipline, especially the scholars and the practitioners of the discipline, are divided on the nature of the discipline as to whether the discipline constitutes only the functioning of the executive branch of the administration or is it a sum total of all the activities and

personnel involved in the act of governing. Thirdly, a similar kind of confusion is centering round the scope of the discipline as the scholars are bifurcated into two camps viz. POSDCORB view and the subject matter view. Fourthly, as a corollary of the above points it can be said that the above confusions together put a serious challenge to the identity formulation of Public Administration.

1.7 Summary

- In this unit we have discussed the definition, scope and nature of Public Administration as a discipline.
- We have also discussed the managerial perspective and the integrative perspective of Public Administration, and also the various controversies beset with the discipline.

1.8 Glossary

- Identity formation: Also called identity development or identity construction, is a complex process in which humans develop a clear and unique view of themselves and of their identity. Self-concept, personality development, and values are all closely related to identity formation.
- Self-sufficiency: the ability to maintain once upon itself without outside aid.

1.9 Model Questions

Long Questions

- Define Public Administration.
- Discuss the scope of Public Administration
- Explain the nature of Public Administration
- Distinguish between the managerial perspective and the integrative perspective of Public Administration.
- Write a note on the "subject matter" view of Public Administration.

Short Questions

- According to Nigro and Nigro, what is the essence of Public Administration?
- What are the confusions beset with the discipline of Public Administration? discuss.
- How did Lewis Meriam and Herbert Simon explain the scope of Public Administration?
- What do you understand by the term POSDCORB view of Administration

1.10 References

- White, Leonard Dupee, 1891-1958.
Introduction to the Study of Public Administration.
New York, Macmillan Co., 1926
- Nigro, F. A., & Nigro, L. G.. Modern Public Administration. New York: Harper & Row, 1984.
- Public Administration by Urmila Sharma (Author), S.K. Sharma (Author) Atlantic Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi, 2002
- Hughes, O.E. Public Management and Administration An Introduction London Macmillan, 1994.
- Public Administration: A Reader by Chakrabarty Bidyut (Author), Mohit Bhattacharya (Author) Oxford University Press; New Delhi '2005.

Unit-2 : Public Administration and Private Administration

Structure

- 2.1 Learning Objectives**
- 2.2 Introduction**
- 2.3 Differences between public and Private Administration**
- 2.4 Commonalities between Public and Private Administration**
- 2.5 Conclusion**
- 2.6 Summary**
- 2.7 Glossary**
- 2.8 Model Questions**
- 2.9 References**

2.1 Learning Objectives

- To embark upon the fundamental differences between the Public Administration and Private Administration
- To figure out similarities between them
- To understand the closeness between the two types of administration in the light of global economic meltdown and public sector reforms

2.2 Introduction

The present unit intends to lay out one of the protracted debates in the text book of Public Administration i.e. the relationship between the public and the private administration. The unit has illustrated both sides of the debate: whereas on the one hand, it dwells on the fundamental difference between the public and private administration; and on the other hand, it figures out the similarities between them. Finally, drawing on the recent developments of public sector reforms and New Public Management in the time of global economic meltdown, the unit shows that the two types of administration come closer than ever before. The debate between public versus private administration seems to have plagued the discipline of Public Administration since its inception and contributing greatly to its identity distress. If one revisits the major arguments mooted at the Minnowbrook I conference, the above debate would have been evident. Interestingly, the debate refused to die down even

after 147 years of its existence as an academic discipline. Though a few attempts have been made after Minnowbrook I conference to distinguish Public Administration from its private or non-public counterparts, the distinction gets blurred once again with the onset of globalization. Interestingly, the nomenclature of Public Administration was a later addition. If we consider Public Administration both as a vocation as well as an applied principle of management it is as old as civilization. Public Administration then was primarily the principle of organization designed to cater the private business. Publicness of public administration was conspicuous by its absence. It was a later addition. In the early part of 20th century when the growth of capital was hit by roadblocks in the form of severe social backlashes, publicness of Public Administration was brought into being to salvage private business. Hence, public and private administration has an interesting relationship, which includes both the similarities as well as differences. Any cursory glance at the literature of Public Administration would have substantiated the said statement. Whereas a few scholars like Herbert A. Simon, Paul H. Appleby, Peter Drucker et al have underlined the marked differences in the nature of two types of administration, others like Henry Fayol, Urwick, Pfiffner and Presthus have simply ignored the difference by underlining subtle commonalities between the two types of administration. The central arguments of those who have identified the marked difference between private and public administration are namely the scope of administration, motive of the administration, nature of operation, and so on. The other group of scholars, who have underlined the similarities between two types of administration, based their arguments on the following commonalities like similar hierarchical bureaucratic organization, similar working condition, similar set of rules, and so on. However, it would be grossly misleading to put them into two water tight compartments. In fact, it is better to consider them as 'two species of the same genus', with their respective differences. In the following sections an attempt will be made to elucidate the above debate.

2.3 Differences between Public and Private Administration

The present section draws on the differences between Public and Private Administration. John Gaus, Ludvig Von Mises, Paul H. Appleby, Sir Josia Stamp, Herbert A. Simon, Peter Drucker, etc., in their writings, have made distinction between Public and Private Administration. According to Simon, the distinction between Public and Private Administration relates mainly to three points: first, Public Administration is bureaucratic whereas Private Administration is business like; Secondly, Public Administration is political whereas Private Administration is non-political; and, thirdly, Public Administration is characterized by red-tape whereas Private Administration is

free from it. Almost in a similar vein Paul H. Appleby has made a distinction between Public Administration and Private Administration. According to him, "in broad terms the governmental function and attitude have at least three complementary aspects that go to differentiate government from all other institutions: areas of activities and breadth of scope, impact and consideration; public accountability and political character. Public administration works in close proximity with politics and enjoys the benefit of political responsibility for administrative activities. Private Administration can remain away from politics and is directly and solely responsible for its own activities"

Scholars those who believed in distinction between Public and Private Administration have underscored the following issues :

First, the first and the foremost issue that distinguishes Public Administration from its private counterpart is public Administration's commitment towards public interest. Public Administration is known for its commitment towards public welfare. Whereas, the private / business administration is generally guided by the profit motive, Public Administration is driven by altruistic motive.

Secondly, public administration also differs from Private Administration on ground of its scope or magnitude. In terms of scope or magnitude, Public Administration is far wider and diversified than its private counterpart. Public administration is very comprehensive in nature and covers all the activities of the government. The private/ business administration on the contrary is much more limited in its scope. Thirdly, public accountability is considered to be another redeeming feature of Public Administration. In Public Administration administrators or executives have to work under the strict public vigil. They remain answerable to the public for all their acts of commission and omission. The scope of public scrutiny gets widened these days with the promulgation of several path-breaking legislations like RTIs, in addition to existing mechanisms of public scrutiny like legislature, executives, judiciary, and press. However, private / business administration does not have to work under such stringent public vigil. There is no denying that there is a mechanism of internal audit and control in private administration, but its operation is not open to public scrutiny. In this context a comment made by Paul H. Appleby deserves some space here. To Appleby "government administration differs from all other administrative work to a degree not even faintly realised outside, by virtue of its public nature, the way in which it is subject to public scrutiny and outcry. This interest often runs to details of administrative action that in private business would never be of concern other than inside the organization".

Fourthly, transparency is another important component of Public Administration that differentiates it from Private Administration. The operation of Public Administration

is by and large open and transparent. On other hand, private/business administration is known for its secrecy of transaction. General employees do not have any access to such information.

Fifthly, unlike the control of investors on financial affairs in private administration, in public administration, there is public control over the finance. Hence, no financial autonomy is provided in case of public administration as state acts as a supreme repository of public finance. The state via legislative mechanism, budget and auditing keeps a tab on public administration. However, private administration is gifted with much financial freedom.

Sixthly, Public Administration is also committed to treat clientele uniformly irrespective of their socio-economic and political background. Backed up by the principle of the rule of law enshrined in the constitution, Public Administration is assigned to deliver all the goods and services to the citizen. Private Administration, no matter whether it is associated with the delivery of any service, does not have any such obligation. Driven by the profit motive, private administration only pays heed to those consumers who have adequate purchasing power.

Seventhly, political character is another important hallmark of Public Administration. Owing to its engagement in democratic process and its ever responsiveness to public interest, Public Administration has been a subject of relentless political direction and control. Private administration on the other hand, is relatively free from politics as it functions largely in tune with the market forces. In order to foreground the political character of Public Administration vis-à-vis Private Administration Paul H. Appleby has nicely captured the essence of Public Administration in the following words: "administration is politics since it must be responsive to the public interest. It is necessary to emphasize the fact that popular political processes, which are the essence of democracy, can only work through governmental organization, and that all governmental organizations are not merely administrative entities, they are and must be political organisms."

Eighthly, Public Administration unlike its private counterpart has to work under a maze of rules and regulations. In Public Administration an administrator has to work under the paraphernalia of rules and regulations. The rationale behind designing such control mechanisms is to ensure that the administrative (public) activities are carried out in accordance with legislative and executive policies and any abuses of political power and public fund & may be curbed. However, Private Administrations do not have to work under such complex layers of rules and regulations.

Ninthly, in Public Administration administrators generally remain anonymous. Drawing on Weberian characterization of ideal type bureaucracy, public administrator seem to have imbibed the spirit of anonymity in discharging his/her assigned duties. Though designed to infuse impartiality in administration, this anonymous character of public administrator has its serious drawback as it may shield any wrongdoer with impunity due to lack of his/her identity. Private administration on the contrary, does things on its behalf.

Tenthly, in terms of efficiency and effectiveness private administration always fares better than public administration. Though, of late there is an increasing sensitivity among the public administrators regarding efficiency and effectiveness, efficiency has never been a strong point in public administration. In fact, it is only in the wake of NPM movement across the globe that efficiency becomes a major issue in public administration. Private administration on the other hand is hailed for its supposed efficiency and effectiveness.

Eleventh, public administration has an inherent tendency to monopolize. Though, of late with the onset of globalization public administration has parted with several duties monopolized by it so long, conceptually it does not allow competition in the provision of goods and services to the people. Private administration on the other hand, is essentially competitive in nature.

2.4 Commonalities between Public and Private Administration

Despite having differences between public and Private Administration, mentioned above, it would be completely misleading to consider them as diametrically opposite entities. In fact, a great deal of commonality exists between the two types of administration as both of these administration subscribe to some common principles of organization. A group of scholars like Henry Fayol, Urwick et al have denied the line of demarcation between private and public administration. To them administration is the unified entity, which has two different variants viz. Private and Public Administration. Urwick for example has shunned any such attempt. To him "the attempt to subdivide the study of management or administration in accordance with the purposes or particular forms of undertaking seems to many authorities equally misdirected. They have much in common. POSDCORB techniques are common to both". Hence, as Fayol had cautioned us,

"we are no longer confronted with several administrative sciences but one which can be applied equally well to public and private affairs".

Hence, the following commonalities can be identified between Public and Private Administration :

The first and the foremost commonality between Public and Private Administration one could identify is that both types of administration are equally committed to provide efficient , effective and prompt services to the people. Secondly, both types of administration have to work under the similar working conditions. In a democratic set up both Private and Public Administration have to deal with popular demands and to abide by similar legal constraints. Therefore, both types of administration have to relentlessly adjust to the changing socio-economic and political environment. Thirdly, both types of administration have to cater their own clientele. Hence, both types of administration want to keep the clientele in good humour by developing a continuous, cordial relationship. Fourthly, both types of administration are amenable to similar set of rules and regulations. Fifthly, the managerial technique applied for managing administration is common for both the Private and Public Administrations. Sixthly, both types of administration have to wrestle with hierarchical set up in administrative deliberations. Though there is a difference of degree of hierarchy between Private and Public Administration, both have to muddle through it in handling personnel policy. Seventhly, the line of demarcation is often getting blurred in management as several types of partnership between Public and Private Administration in the name of PPP models or leasing out of services are coming up to handle new Administrative realities. Eighthly, both Public and Private Administration have been relentlessly striving for the improvement of the goods and services being provided by them. This is more so in the era of globalization, when citizen centricity becomes the heart of any administrative deliberation be it private or public in nature.

2.5 Conclusion

To sum up, it can be argued that the neither the difference nor the similarities between Public and Private Administration is absolute. In fact, in reality there are lots of intersections, overlapping and grey areas between them. For operational convenience, these two types of administrations do often interact. Therefore, it is not judicious to

bank on either of the extremes. This is more so if we take a look at the world wide neoliberal agenda like public sector reforms, New Public Management etc. in the globalized world designed to salvage neoliberalism from a series of market debacles. On the face of successive market meltdowns across the globe, a realization sets in among the neoliberals that too much reliance on market and that too at the cost of public sector (state/government) is at best be avoided. Hence, there has been a renewal of interest in public sector among the neoliberals. With no visible respite in sight, the neoliberals have decided to take refuge in the strong arm of the state by reforming public sector with infusion of several market principles of efficiency and economy. Thus, for all practical reasons, the line of distinction between Public and Private Administration gets blurred. In today's world of heightened citizen-centricity several innovations like PPP model, contracting out of services, single window services etc, which have been made to provide efficient services to the citizen, have brought both the administration closer than ever before. Hence, there is no point in hammering at the differences between Private and Public Administration.

2.6 Summary

- In this unit we have understood one of the protracted debates in the textbook of Public Administration that is the relationship between the Public and Private administration.
- We have also explained the differences and similarities between the two types.
- Finally, this unit show us how the two types of administration come closer than ever before.

2.7 Glossary

- **Altruistic** : Behaviour is normally described as altruistic when it is motivated by a desire to benefit from one other than oneself. The term is used as the antonym of self interested.
- **Public accountability** : the underlying principle of public accountability is that the power and discretion held by the administrative authorities is subjected to public trust and scrutiny.

2.8 Model Questions

Long Questions

- What is Private Administration?
- Highlight the differences between Public and Private Administration.

Short Questions

- What are the commonalities between public and Private Administration?
- What is the role of PPP in Public and Private Administration.

2.9 References

- Chaturvedi T.N. (ed) Towards Good Governance; New Delhi: IIPA 1999.
- Gupta, M.C. and Tiwari R.K. Restructuring Government. New Delhi IIPA, 1998.

Unit-3 : Evolution of Public Administration

Structure

- 3.1 Learning Objectives
- 3.2 Introduction
- 3.3 The Conceptual Mapping of the Discipline
- 3.4 European Origin
- 3.5 American Origin
- 3.6 Paradigm of Public Administration
- 3.7 Evolution of Public Administration
- 3.8 Conclusion
- 3.9 Summary
- 3.10 Glossary
- 3.11 Model Questions
- 3.12 References

3.1 Learning Objectives

- To understand the evolution of Public Administration
- To provide with the historical background of both traditions of Public Administration– European and American
- To be acquainted with the paradigm of public administration

3.2 Introduction

This unit intends to map the evolution of Public Administration. However, it is a daunting task as there is no unified version of the discipline. In fact, Public Administration is a contextually grown discipline. The present unit has the following arguments :

First, the discipline has no authentic history to date.

Secondly, there is no unified mass of Public Administration, no authoritative version of the discipline, associated with a particular geographical location, no authoritative commentator of the discipline and obviously no authoritative texts.

Thirdly, since Public Administration is primarily a contextually grown discipline, there should be multiple versions of Public Administration with their respective histories, instead of one.

Fourthly, there has been a typical America-centricity or arguably parochialism in the epistemology of Public Administration. Several factors can be identified for such trends, which include among others the initial insularity of the American foreign policy, her apparent socio-economic and political stability during that phase, and the bailout package like Marshal Plan offered by the American government for the war ravaged Europe.

Fifthly, the chapter also argues that we come across a new homogenizing version of Public Administration informed by New Public Management, heightened citizen-orientation, governance and so on since 1990s with the onset of globalization. However, this apparent familiarity of Public Administration does not automatically bring in a unified version of Public Administration. In fact, it is to be noted that relentless process of localizing is equally operational. Hence, the apparent projection of homogenous version of Public Administration needs to be customized in accordance with the local specificity.

Sixthly, Public Administration, both as an academic discipline and a contemplative-cum-operational science of management has been wrestling with the intriguing question of identity ever since it came into being in 1887. Interestingly, more than hundred years down the line, the discipline is still in search of a stable identity.

Seventhly, the discipline also lacks a coherent theoretical development.

Eighthly, despite having an avowed applied directionality, the study of Public Administration mostly confines itself to several half-baked recipes of governance, constructs, approaches, concepts, models etc. for the want of an all-agreed homogeneous epistemology of Public Administration.

3.3 The Conceptual Mapping of the Discipline

Here in this unit an attempt has been made to make sense of the development of the discipline, not just as a mere enumeration of the phases of its development. To begin this section one would invariably encounter a host of problems: first, why do we need a conceptual mapping of the discipline at the first place? How do we map the discipline? Which version of Public Administration should we take as authentic? Is there any authentic history of the discipline? Or there are histories of the discipline? And so on. Answering these questions would invariably draw us closer to the historical

developments of the discipline, and its persistent identity distress. The discipline has no authentic history to date. In fact, the development of the discipline is largely context specific. Hence, instead of tracing the history of the discipline, we should look for histories of the discipline, spreading across the borders. Until recently, the discipline of Public Administration has been dominated by the American texts, leading to the resultant marginalization of the contextual development of Public Administration. It is quite interesting but true that despite adequate background for the flourishing and dissemination, the British tradition of Public Administration could not develop its independent status. In fact, the American tradition had overshadowed the European tradition during the post-cold war period. Why this is so? Why most of the text books in the discipline are of American in nature? Is Public Administration developed and practiced in US alone? Is it practicable to draw on an American version of Public Administration as authentic? These are but few puzzles that bound to haunt the students of Public Administration. Thanks to the Marshal plan and other ways of establishing American hegemony, the US tradition had been popularized throughout the globe. It is true that as an academic discipline Public Administration is relatively younger compared to her mother discipline of Political Science. It is little more than hundred years old. But Public Administration as a systematic contemplation and execution of collective efforts of management is as old as human civilization. The roots of the discipline especially the practical operational part of it can be traced back to the era of hunter-gatherers. As an academic discipline, though its origin and development is often associated with US, the European contribution to it is no less important, especially if we consider the importance of bureaucratic theory of management or administrative law etc. Before we continue, a caveat needs to be sounded that Public Administration does not have any authentic account of its development. More than hundred years down the line, the discipline is still in search of a stable identity.² The different spatial location of its development has further added to the confusion. There is a clear distinction between Anglo-American and European (French and German) variants of Public Administration with their respective priorities. Actually, the discipline has had a long gestation period and that predates even 1887 and spans across both sides of the Atlantic. Most of the texts chronicle the evolution of Public Administration in the overall background of America. Even the handbooks of the discipline from reputed publications are not also free from the American bias. Consequently, the contextual documentation of Public Administration has suffered from serious setback. The Anglo-American version of Public Administration seemed to have overshadowed the other versions of highly rich variants of Public Administration. Thanks to colonial expansion

and the resultant dissemination of enlightened rationality across the globe, Anglo-American versions of Public Administration took up the centre stage.

If one starts revisiting the very article which is often claimed to have given birth to the discipline of Public Administration (at least the American version of it) authored by Woodrow Wilson, he or she will find that Wilson was too modest to claim any credit of fathering the discipline. On the contrary, he had rather candidly acknowledged the French and German professors for it and called for a similar kind of 'science of administration' for the Americans. In fact, much before the Wilsonian advocacy of the science of administration, there was a well-established tradition of Public Administration in Europe.⁴ A few commentators even have tried to locate the crisis of identity within the very article of Wilson, which was apparently ambivalent and had no precise outline of the nascent discipline.⁵ Even some of them refused to acknowledge Wilson as the intellectual founder of Public Administration. Notable among them was Van Riper⁶ who wanted to give the credit of fathering of Public Administration to Dorman Eaton. In fact, the term 'Public Administration' began to figure prominently in European discourse as early as 17th century to 'distinguish between absolutist monarch's administration of public affairs and his management of his private household', however, the official recognition did not come until World War-I, when the professional chairs were introduced and the instructional textbooks on the discipline were published. Even in the context of America, there is hardly any consensus on the exact date of birth of the discipline, as a few scholars have traced the beginning of Public Administration in the publication of the famous '*Federalist Papers*' by James Madison, Alexander Hamilton and John Jay.⁸ Stillman II has shown that American version of Public Administration, unlike its European counterpart, has "bubbled up quietly and haphazardly from grassroots reform, imbued with protestant moral uplift and democratic idealism".⁹ In fact, it preceded the state formation. European Public Administration was, however, a natural outgrowth of nation-state formation and had a strong state tradition.¹⁰ Stillman II has nicely put such dichotomy in the following words: 'continental Europeans deduce Public Administration from *reason of state*, whereas *America's missing sense of state* forces us to induce state from Public Administration. This fundamental difference, a deductive vs. an inductive way of thinking about the field, stands as a great divide separating the two sides of the Atlantic.'¹¹ Hence, two distinctive strands in the evolution of Public Administration can be identified viz. the European and the American. European Public Administration was, however, a natural outgrowth of nation-state formation. But the American tradition of Public Administration is bubbling up from the grassroots. The distinctiveness of the said two strands of administration is also discernable in their

respective approaches to organization. The American Public Administration has a purportedly 'human processual approach', whereas the European counterpart relied on a typical 'techno-structural' approach. Whereas the human processual approach 'focuses on people and their collective goals', the techno-structural approach 'focuses on the structure, technology and environment of organization'.

3.4 European Origin

The systematic study of the discipline began in Europe, much before the Wilsonian advocacy of science of administration. In fact, Wilson had categorically mentioned the contribution of European scholars in the following words: 'No, American writers have hitherto taken no very important part in the advancement of this science. It has found its doctors in Europe. It is not of our making; it is a foreign science, speaking very little of the language of English or American principle. It employs only foreign tongues; it utters none but what are to our minds alien ideas. Its aims, its examples, its conditions, are almost exclusively grounded in the histories of foreign races, in the precedents of foreign systems, in the lessons of foreign revolution'. European origin of the discipline can be attributed to the 'bureaucratization of nation-state'. Initially, it was dedicated to the grooming of the upcoming public officials for public service in Prussia. Hence, it was confined to a kind of code of conduct which includes a few do's and don'ts, necessary to guide a public servant in running a public office. Hence the study of administration in European context was largely a part of vocational training programme for the budding public servants. The Prussian example was adopted in rest of the Europe as well, though it was mainly confined to the civil service aspirants among the intelligentsia.

3.5 American Origin

Though Public Administration as an academic discipline is a late comer in the US, it reached its apogee in terms of academic sophistication within a few decades of its existence. Before we discuss evolution of American Public Administration, the distinctive features of American society and polity need to be discussed, that could possibly give us clues of the uniqueness of American Public Administration. First, unlike its European counterpart, the US had enjoyed a relative insularity of sort, which had its impact on the development of American Public Administration. Several factors were held responsible for such insularity in its first century of existence. They include among others- geographic isolation, agrarian self-sufficiency, absence of threat to national

security and limited demand for public services. But the situation began to change from late 19th century as a host of new developments like technological innovations, growing involvement in the international affairs, and increasing participation in a democratic coupled with a vicious environment of governance at the local level seemed to have challenged the US government, forcing her to end the seclusion and to work for a separate discipline. A select perusal of Woodrow Wilson's celebrated essay would validate the point. Wilson wrote: "the poisonous atmosphere of city government, crooked secrets of the state administration, the confusion, sinecurism, and corruption ever and again discovered in the bureaus at Washington forbid us to believe that any clear conception what constitutes good administration are as yet widely current in United States". As a young scholar, Woodrow Wilson rose up to the occasion with a forceful plea for a new discipline. Second, The US had a typical anti-statist political tradition, which had led to a stunted and cautious growth of Public Administration. This radical anti-statist tradition in the political culture of the US was evident in the constitution, which remained conspicuously silent about anything that even remotely smacked of state power and authority. Consequently the important issues like civil service, budgets, executive departments, planning and so on did not find any mention in the Constitution. Moreover, the framing document of American state, had stipulated additional measures like federalism, separation of powers, periodic elections, a bill of rights and the like in order to ensure the goal of 'life, liberty and pursuit of happiness' as enshrined in the Declaration of Independence. The following factors are held responsible for such anti-statist tradition in the American political culture (a) Philosophically, the anti-statist tradition had drawn its inspiration from the Lockean philosophy of individual liberty, and the 16th century Calvinist religion. (b) The immigration was also held responsible for anti-statism in America. "America's belief in anti-statism" as Stillman views, "was further soundly reinforced over more than three centuries by waves of immigrants fleeing all sorts of oppressive regimes, from the Puritans in 1600 to the twentieth-century's escapees from fascism, communism, and numerous other varieties of 'isms', all carrying a peculiarly virulent hostility towards statism". Owing to above reasons and specificities, the development of Public Administration in US had registered a delayed and hesitant start. In fact, the growth of Public Administration research and training in the true sense of the term began in 1930s.¹⁹ The interlude between the Wilsonian advocacy and the publication of the first text on the subject by L.D. White was marked by a discourse, popularly known as 'Political-administration dichotomy'. Hence, tracing the evolution of Public Administration as a 'heuristic' discipline is a problematic proposition as the development of Public Administration is largely context-

specific and dependent upon the differential practices of administration. However, saving the American version no other contextual history of Public Administration is available. The puzzle of the overwhelming presence of the American ideas in the epistemology of Public Administration despite Wilson's acknowledgement to the contrary, can be solved if we consider the international political and social contexts of 1930s and 1940s along with Second World War. The initial insularity of the American foreign policy and her apparent socio-economic and political stability during that phase had enticed the war-ravaged Europe to fall back on America for the bailing out package in the form of international aid. The America-centricity is quite revealing in the epistemology of Public Administration.

3.6 Paradigm of Public Administration

American-centricity in Public Administration is evident in a famous article where Nicholas Henry has equated American Public Administration with the discipline of Public Administration per se. In this celebrated article he had encapsulated the evolution of American Public Administration in form of five overlapping paradigms. A brief overview of these paradigms deserves some space here. Drawing on Robert T. Golembiewski's perceptive essay, which has understood intellectual development of Public Administration in terms of locus and focus, Nicholas Henry has identified five paradigms: paradigm-I (The Politics-Administration Dichotomy), paradigm-II (The Principal of Administration), paradigm-III (Public Administration as Political Science), paradigm-IV (Public Administration as Administrative Sciences), and paradigm-V (Public Administration as Public Administration).

Paradigm I : The Politics/Administration Dichotomy (1900-1926)

This paradigm marks the distinction between politics and administration. Though initiated by Woodrow Wilson in his path breaking article entitled 'The Study of Administration' in 1887, Henry had earmarked the publication years of two important publications by Frank J. Goodnow and L.D. White to identify this paradigm. Frank J. Goodnow was the first to theoretically substantiate the Wilsonian advocacy for separation between politics and administration in 1900 in *Politics and Administration*. For Goodnow politics should be concerned with the policies and the expression of state will; and administration with the execution of policies. The major thrust of this paradigm was the locus—where Public Administration should be. This dichotomous relationship had another strong advocacy in the first text book of the discipline— 'An Introduction to

the Study of Public Administration' authored by L.D. White. White had categorically mentioned that there should not be any intrusion of politics in administration.

Paradigm II : The Principles of Administration (1927-1937)

The second paradigm is associated with the publication of F. W. Willoughby's book "Principles of Public Administration" in 1927, where he had called for the development of scientific principles of administration. To him mastering of these scientific principles would give administrators managerial edge over others. The birth of this paradigm had definite contextual underpinnings. Owing to their superior knowledge of management, Public Administrationists during 1930s and 1940s were the most sought after experts, both in industry and government. Consequently, the Public Administrationists started 'manufacturing' the scientific principles of organization with universal applicability, which had culminated to 'the high noon of orthodoxy' with the publication by Luther H. Gullick and Lyndall Urwick, entitled *Papers on the Science of Administration* in 1937. A select perusal from one of the papers from the said publication by Urwick is indicative of the universal pretention and orthodoxy :

"It is the general thesis of this paper that there are principles which can be arrived at inductively from the study of human organization which should govern arrangements for human association of any kind. These principles can be studied as a technical question, irrespective of the purpose of the enterprise, the personnel comprising it, or any constitutional, political or social theory underlying its creation."²¹

However, the heyday of the scientific principles of organization had come to an abrupt end during 1938 to 1950. The traditional ideas of Public Administration like politic/administration dichotomy along with the scientific principles of organization had faced serious rebuttals from the scholars like Robert A. Dahl, Herbert Simon, Waldo et al. However, the most damaging of these was the 'formidable dissection' (to paraphrase Henry) by Herbert Simon. Simon in his *Administrative Behaviour* in 1947 had questioned the feasibility of the scientific principle of organization. By the mid-century 'the two defining pillars of public administration.'²² namely the politics/administration dichotomy and the principles of administration had been discarded by the scholars of the discipline. The loss of this two defining pillars of public administration had relegated the discipline from a distinctive epistemological identity to the margin.

However, the traditional public administration had managed to withstand the assiduous attacks on its basic foundation. Interestingly enough for resurrection it had to rely upon Herbert Simon, who was actually instrumental in discrediting its very foundation. In fact, in a lesser known article, entitled "A comment on 'The Science of Public

Administration' Simon argued in favor of pure science of administration on a thorough grounding in social psychology. However, such proposal of Simon of maintaining pure science on the plain of social psychology had all the likelihood of logically drifting public administration from its mother discipline, Political Science, which has been a rich source of human values for it. But owing to the following factors the ties between political science and public administration had remained intact: firstly, the public policy making process kept the linkages between Political Science and Public Administration. Secondly, political scientists have been resisting the growing independence of Public Administration, because political wanted to keep a dominant position over Public Administration. Thirdly, the precarious conditions of political science during post-second world war era had kept the ties intact as Public Administration had been the greatest drawing card for student enrollments and government grants.

Paradigm-III : Public Administration as Political Science (1950-1970)

Consequently, Public Administration had managed to keep its place within the discipline of Political Science. The third phase marks a consolidation of the strenuous relationship between Political Science and Public Administration. The outcome of this exercise was the 'defining away' the field in terms of priorities, essential expertise, area of interest, and so on. But the apparent bonhomie, as it were, between the disciplines in the early 1950s had evaporated with the end of the decade and deep-seated superiority complex of Political Science began to surface. Public Administration has been systemically dropped from different disciplinary committees of the American Political Science Association. Waldo had nicely encapsulated this big brotherly attitude of Political Science in the following words: "the truth is that the attitude of political scientists...is at best one of indifference and is often one of undisguised contempt or hostility. We are now hardly welcome in the house of our youth".²³

Paradigm-IV : Public Administration as Administrative Sciences (1956-1970)

Under this paradigm a desperate effort was evident among the scholars to get out of shadow of Political Science and to stake its claim as an independent discipline. Driven by the 'the undisguised contempt' expressed in the attitude of the political scientists vis -a vis Public Administration, Public Administrators began to search for an alternative in administrative science option. This paradigm almost coincided with paradigm III. Major concern of this paradigm was the loss of identity within the confines of an overarching concept. As a paradigm administrative science has a focus but the locus was not clearly defined. A number of developments have been registered in this phase as the business schools have offered alternative paradigm. A new journal

called '*Administrative Science Quarterly*' began its journey during this phase to underscore the premise that administration is a universal construct, therefore making the distinction among public, business and institutional administration is wrong. This paradigm has also witnessed a rapid development of organizations. However, the major shortcoming with this paradigm was that though it fell short of claiming universal credential, believed that all organizations and managerial methodologies have certain characteristics, patterns and pathologies in common.

3.7 Evolution of Public Administration

On the basis of the above rationale, Stillman II has traced the evolution of American Public Administration under the following heads :

POSDCORB Orthodoxy (1926-1946)-Stillman II took the publication of L.D. White's *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration* in 1926 as the effective beginning of the discipline, though the foundation stone was laid almost four decades earlier by Wilson. The POSDCORB is an acronym, which encapsulates the kernel of good administration viz. planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting. It was popularized by Luther Gullick in his famous book entitled 'The Papers on the Science of Administration'(1937). It arrived at a time when the US was reeling under the twin crises—the Great Depression and World War II and claimed to have bailed out the US from the said crises. However, the POSDCORB orthodoxy failed to impress the post war scholars. To them POSDCORB view was full of contradictions.

Social Science Heterodoxy (1947-1967)— This phase had witnessed the waning of POSDCORB orthodoxy and the birth of social science heterodoxy. Contextually speaking, with the successful campaign against the twin challenges mentioned above, the US had emerged as a new leader in the post war world order. Soon the US had repudiated her century-old policy of seclusion and got embroiled in a protracted cold war with the communists. The POSDCORB perspective of administration found inadequate to meet the new realities as Robert Dahl and Herbert Simon had shown in their respective publications. Under the circumstance, the American had engaged into a 'self-protectionist's frenzy of administrative state-building'. And subsequently in the process it had encouraged a cross-fertilization of knowledge of social sciences. The social science heterodoxy was the outcome of such context. As a result American Public Administration becomes much broader and less parochial.

The Reassertion of Democratic Idealism (1968-1988)— From the late 1960s to late 1980s the American society had witnessed a tremendous upsurge of democratic idealism in the form of anti-statism, which was culminated in two separate events viz. Minnowbrook Conference and the publication of Vincent Ostrom's 'The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration'. Stillman called them as the manifestation of 'democratic temper of the times'.

The Refounding Movement (1989-to the Present Day)— The year 1989 had dawned a new era of US hegemony with the collapse of Communism. However, the dramatic event had also opened up floodgates of problems and challenges before the US government, which needed to be addressed at war footing. Public Administration, both as a contemplative and operational science of management, had geared up to the challenges and started refounding its basics. A few fundamental questions were re-excavated and the issues like public interest, accountability, responsibility, public welfare and so on had resurfaced in the discourse of Public Administration. Stillman has identified seven distinctive strand of thoughts engaged in this refounding exercise or movement viz. the reinventors, the communitarians, the VPI refounders, the interpretivists, the tools makers, new bureaucratic analysts, from management to governance. *The Re-inventors*— This group of thinkers had drawn their inspiration from a path-breaking publication by David Osborne and Ted Gaebler, entitled *Reinventing Government* (1992). Written in the backdrop of receding credibility of bureaucratic governance, Osborne and Gaebler, in their book did not repose their faith on the alternative market option. Quite alive to the weaknesses of both the alternatives, they came out with a third way'. Combining the best of government and the best of market, they suggested a hybridization of sort, what they called "the Entrepreneurial Government". The prescription put forward in the book was adopted by the Clinton administration to reform the federal government. However, from the late 1990s for various reasons, the re-inventing government had experienced marked decline.

The Communitarians : Banking on the philosophy of communitarianism, a group of intellectuals like Etzioni, Selznick, Galston, Chrislip et al have actively campaigned for retrieving the value of community or communal living in order to counter the breakdown of society and social dislocation.

The VPI Refounders : Unlike the above two schools, the Virginia Polytechnic Institute(VPI) refounders were mostly the insiders. They were mostly senior scholars of the discipline. With an objective of figuring out the future of the discipline they met at the French town of Charlott. The upshot of the meet, subsequently known as the

Blacksburg Manifesto, came out in two successive publications under the following titles: "Refounding Public Administration"(1990) and 'Refounding Democratic Public Administration"(1996).

The Interpretivists : Drawing on the philosophical principles of phenomenology and ontology, the interpretivist administrative thinkers sought to probe into some of the profound questions confronting the discipline.

The Tools Makers : This school of refounders advanced new 'analytical methods' for 'weighing the costs and benefits of various delivery alternatives', without bothering about the ethical question of right and wrong.

New Bureaucratic Analysis : This school contributes a rich literature of Public Administration, which relocates the fundamental issues pertaining to public bureaucracy viz. public accountability, oversight, control, power, institutional performance, responsiveness to democracy, to interest groups.

From Management to Governance : This school has argued that the traditional top-down management practices have given way to new model governance.

3.8 Conclusion

In the foregoing analysis an attempt has been made to trace the evolution of public administration as a discipline. However, as evident from the above discussion, it is out and out a problematic proposition as there is no uniform version of Public Administration as practice is in place. In fact, owing to contextual variations Public Administration as a practice develops several variations. Hence, as a discipline Public Administration encounters difficulty of generalization in terms of its conceptual mass as well as its stages of growth. Hence, the need of the hour is to get out of typical Anglo-American periodization of the stages of growth of Public Administration and to customize it in accordance with the socio-cultural context.

3.9 Summary

An attempt has been made to trace the evolution of public administration as a discipline.

A comprehensive analysis has been presented in terms of the European - American version of the stages of growth of Public Administration.

3.10 Glossary

Paradigm : A very clear or typical example used as a model or example. A set of theories that explain the way a particular subject is understood at a particular time.

Evolution : A process of change in all forms

3.11 Model Questions

Long Questions

- Trace the evolution of Public Administration as an independent discipline.
- Do you think that Public Administration as a discipline has a typical American bias? Argue in favour of your answer.
- Examine the major paradigms of Public Administration as enunciated by Nicholas Henry.
- What do you mean by the politic-administration dichotomy?
- What is the refounding movement in Public Administration?

Short Questions

- What do you understand by the 'European origin' of Public Administration?
 - What do you understand by the Reassertion of Democratic Idealism?
 - Write a short note on social science heterodoxy.
 - What is meant by homogenizing version of Public Administration?
-

3.12 References

- Public Administration Evolving: From foundations to the Future; Ed. Mary E Guy and Marilyn M Robin
- Public Administration and Public Policy; Lohit Matani Oakbridge: New Delhi 2019
- New Horizons Of Public Administration; Mohit Bhattacharya Jawahar Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi : 2018.

Unit-4 : Impact of Globalization on Public Administration

Structure

- 4.1 Learning Objectives**
- 4.2 Introduction**
- 4.3 Making sense of Globalization**
- 4.4 Impact of globalization on Public Administration**
- 4.5 Conclusion**
- 4.6 Summary**
- 4.7 Glossary**
- 4.8 Model Questions**
- 4.9 References**

4.1 Learning Objectives

- To take stock of the discipline especially in the era of globalisation.
- To study in brief the various dimensions of globalisation.
- To examine the impact of globalisation on Public Administration both as a discipline and practice.

4.2 Introduction

As a sweeping socio-economic process globalization has brought literally a tectonic shift in the very contour of the discipline. Indeed in the shift from the 'government in operation' to 'government in collaboration' Public Administration has traversed a long distance ever since it came into being. The present unit intends to take stock of the discipline especially in the era of globalization. There is no denying that globalization has brought a paradigm shift in the epistemic world, Public Administration as a discipline is no exception either. As a multifaceted phenomenon, globalization has literally challenged the very foundation of the discipline i.e. the sheet anchoring role of state in Public Administration. Conceptualized in different ways, globalization is essentially a neoliberal design of expanding the model of free market economy across the globe. For operational purpose, globalization calls for a radical restructuring of public affairs with the progressive downsizing of the state and the corresponding enlargement of the market.

Such tectonic shift in the very conceptualization of public sector has a serious repercussion for public administration both as a discipline and as a practice as the scholars and practitioners had rightly cautioned us about the uncertain future of the discipline. But proving those apprehensions false, public administration has survived the onslaught of globalization and reinvented itself to cope up with the changes. It has freed the discipline from the stifling regimen of structure and paved the way for more accommodative, less hierarchical type of a discipline based on networking and collaboration. The present unit will try to assess the impact of globalization on public administration.

4.3 Making sense of Globalization

Before moving on to the next section for analyzing the impact of globalization on public administration both as a discipline and practice, this section attempts to make sense of globalization. As mentioned earlier, globalization has taken the globe by storm. As a multifaceted phenomenon, globalization has touched upon almost all the aspects of our life. Though the word globalization came into vogue in 1990s, the term was coined for the first time in 1959 by *The Economist*. Even the word global had a history of 400 years. (Water:ibid). Despite the centrality of the concept in our daily life there is hardly any all- agreed definition of it. The *Handbook of Globalization, Governance, and Public Administration* (2007) has rightly captured the essence of conceptual dilemma associated with the concept of globalization in the following words: "Globalization has meant many things to many people. The ideas are diverse, interchangeable, and broad, so much so that it is easy to fall into a definitional trap. For example-economists consider globalization as an advance step toward a fully integrated world market. Political Scientists view it as a march away from the conventionally defined concept of state with territorial sovereignty and the emergence of supranational and global governing bodies under a new world order. Business school scholars and consultants see globalization as unlimited opportunities in a borderless world'. Others view globalization as a phenomenon driven only by private sector corporations, not governments. These viewpoints reflect different lenses of seeing the world, and they promote the interests they are supposed to serve"(Farazmand and Pinkowski: 2007). The associated conceptual confusion notwithstanding, globalization is out and out an epoch making phenomenon that forces us to revamp our conventional worldviews on polity, economy and society. Moreover, the concept of globalization is projected with such a conviction that it may appear inevitable and the possibility of any alternative to it is literally nonexistent. However, critics have refused to buy the

inevitability thesis by associating it with capitalist development. To them, globalization has been brought into being as an ideological smokescreen to clothe the real expansionist design of the capitalism. Drawing on the analysis by David Held and McGrew globalization can be conceptualized by a "tripartite cluster of forces viz. increasing global economic interconnectedness, repositioning of political space and national sovereignty, and last but not least the growing and deepening enmeshment of global and local cultures" (David Held and McGrew:2000). Hence, the concept of globalization comprises of three important dimensions, viz. economic, political and social/ cultural. Here an attempt will be made to discuss each dimension in a user-friendly manner.

Economic Dimension

Economic dimension of globalization stands for integration of national economics into international economic order marked by free trade, free flow of labour and capital, and free flow of technology. Essentially economic in nature it is associated with the modalities like Liberalization, Privatization and Globalization or what is popularly known as LPG. Though not necessarily happened in a sequential manner, success of globalization calls for proper implementation of the aforementioned modalities. Liberalization, one of the most important components of globalization points to the unlocking of the domestic market to open competition. Unlike the typical protectionist approach usually adopted by the national governments to salvage the domestic market from being exposed to the harsh external competition, liberalization process encourages bringing down of the tariff barrier between sovereign states. Jiblerito and Mommen have identified the following components of liberalization: "first, privatization of state and parastatal enterprises in order to reduce inefficiencies and government protection monopolies; second, high interest rates and credit squeeze in order to reduce inflationary tendencies; third, trade liberalization in order to open up the internal market and expose local industry to world market competition and boost foreign trade exchange; fourth, domestic demand management, leading to a lowering of state budgets and decreasing expenditure in the social sector; fifth, currency adjustment in order to improve the balance of payment by raising import prices and making exports more competitive; and sixth, free market prices in order to remove distortions resulting from import taxes on luxury items" (Jiblerito and Mommen: as cited by K.N. Kabra:1996). Another important component of the economic dimension of globalization is privatization. It calls for gradual relieving of the state from its duty of provisioning goods and services to the people with the corresponding enlargement of the role of private sector. However, privatization is not always a self propelled

proposition. In fact, the demand for privatization is raised due to several pressures, as Savas has mentioned four such forces viz. pragmatic pressure, ideological pressure, commercial pressure and populist pressure. Further, Savas has identified four 'interrelated and mutually reinforcing strategies' to put privatization in practice viz. load-shedding, devolution, user charges, and competition. And the final component of economic dimension is globalization itself. It signifies the unification of global markets. Three different kinds of infrastructures are believed to have been instrumental in implementing globalization, which include among others the physical infrastructure comprising of communication, transport and banking systems, normative infrastructure like trade laws and symbolic infrastructure like English as lingua franca (Held & McGrew: *ibid*).

Political Dimension

Though globalization indicates an economic project of unification of global markets, the success of the said project is contingent upon political dimension to a great extent. In other words, successful globalization called for a thorough 'reconfiguration of political space' so long dominated by Westphalian state-centric geopolitics. It is also said that globalization has dawned a post-Westphalian world order. The Westphalian 'constitution of world-order' was the product of the treaty of Westphalia signed at the end of thirty years' war in 1648. The treaty was famous for heralding a new era of sovereign nation-state system based on the three principles of territoriality, sovereignty, and autonomy. Globalization has not only brought a paradigm shift by ushering in an era of 'geo-centric global politics', but also infused a reasonable amount of apprehension and fear among the disciples of sovereign nation states. But proving those apprehensions baseless, nation states survive the so-called neoliberal onslaught of globalization, albeit in a new form. In fact, the onset of globalization has led to a re-positioning of the state vis-à-vis non-governmental sectors including market, NGOs, civil society organization, people's initiatives in the garb of governance.

Social/Cultural Dimension

The third and the most important components of globalization is the cultural or social dimension. Cultural elements play significant roles in sustaining the process of globalization. There is no denying that for successful globalization, economic integration of global markets and its political precondition of repositioning of political space should be backed up by cultural homogenization. However, it is very difficult to pin down the actual nature of cultural element, as it simultaneously represents the component and variant of globalization. Moreover, it would be prudent to understand the nature of cultural or social element of globalization as it represents two contradictory pulls

viz, cultural homogenization vis-à-vis cultural specificities in terms of localization. Hence, the successful completion of globalization is contingent upon relentless contestations between the two processes. Theoretically speaking, it is believed that the homogenization of global cultural space would bolster the unification of global capital, but in reality the cultural specificities in the form of innumerable cultural identities or what is popularly known as localization poses a serious challenge to the unification of markets across the globe. Consequently, there has been considerable convergence in global cultural practices, where global meets local, making a hybridization called 'glocalization'.

4.4 Impact of globalization on Public Administration

It would not be an overstatement to say that globalization has brought a paradigm shift in Public Administration. This section tries to assess the impact of globalization on public administration. Globalization has not only unchained the discipline of Public Administration from structural reification, manifested in the form of the discipline's proclivity to rules, rigid hierarchy, centralization, unity of command and so on , but also given birth to an altogether new genre of Public Administration informed by flexibility, accommodativeness and entrepreneurship. Initially there was a lot of uncertainty relating to the future of Public Administration in the wake of globalization as a host of scholars and self styled experts sounds alarm for the future of the discipline. Some of the experts were of the opinion that Public Administration both as a discipline as well as practice was going to face an existential crisis, as state, the very fountainhead of Public Administration would come under serious threat. But proving those doomsday predictions wrong Public Administrations survived, casting aside the so-called apprehension of the neoliberal onslaught of globalization. However, Public Administration has experienced a metamorphosis of sort where the traditional version of Public Administration with a 'sheltered bureaucracy' has given way to a more flexible, less hierarchical, proactive and more entrepreneurial post-bureaucratic form of administration based on networking and partnership. However, the said transformation in Public Administration was not confined to structural level alone. From the functional point of view also Public Administration had experienced substantial changes especially in the area of delivery of public goods and services to the clientele. Unlike the typical public provisioning of goods and services in traditional Public Administration, Public Administration in the era of globalization has donned a new role of collaboration with numerous agencies and associations operational at the societal level, including the third sector for delivering public goods and services.

Despite the perceptible shift in its role from the sole provider of goods and services to a mere facilitator of the entire process, Public Administration did not sustain the level of damage it was initially feared. In fact, Public Administration in the era of globalization had enjoyed almost the same kind of confidence as it used to enjoy during the era of traditional Public Administration. In fact, of late unlike its earlier version based on market fundamentalism, neoliberals had also appreciated Public Administration for its sufficiently legitimizing capacity to provide a humane face of market operations. Hence, Public Administration has retained its centrality in the era of globalization, albeit certain changes. In the following section an attempt will be made to illustrate the changes that had transpired in the discipline of Public Administration in the wake of globalization. Putting it broadly the impact of globalization on Public Administration can be categorized into three groups: structural impact, procedural impact and attitudinal impact.

Structural Impact

If one ventures out to assess the impact of globalization on Public Administration, it is the structural impact that would draw his attention first. The structural impact of globalization on Public Administration can be summarized in the following points: **First**, structurally speaking, globalization has brought a fundamental transformation in the very nature of Public Administration as the centrality of state in the discourse of Public Administration has undergone a sea change. The state-controlled and bureaucratically-managed paradigm of administration had given way to a more flexible, market-based administration. In other words, structural changes entailed 'reconfiguration of political power' in the form of re-positioning the state vis-à-vis the third sector including market, NGOs, civil society organization, and people's initiatives. **Secondly**, the structural alteration of Public Administration was also felt in the traditional bureaucratic notion of organization. The onset of globalization had brought a paradigm shift in organization with respect to boundary, and mode of operation, leading to the rise of post-bureaucratic organization. **Thirdly**, globalization had brought a complete structural shift in the process of governing through the introduction of a new governance discourse. **Fourthly**, the impetus of globalization has stimulated the demand for public sector reform movement across the globe in the form of 'reinventing the government' movement and New Public Management(NPM) movement; **Fifthly**, the demand for public sector reform movement has also mooted the long pending issue of civil service reform; **Sixthly**, globalization has blurred the line of demarcation between private and

public administration by giving more elbowroom to the non-governmental and civil society organizations and the private sector.

Procedural Impact

Impact of globalization on public administration was not confined to structural level alone. In fact, much of the structural changes that had transpired in Public Administration were based on some procedural changes as well. The procedural changes that entailed in the wake of globalization may include among others contracting out of public services, introduction of the quality consciousness among the citizens in the form of quality cycles, Total Quality Management, performance measurement techniques, and empowerment of the citizenry via citizen's charter. Needless to say that the aforementioned procedural changes, which were largely remained unheard of till the onset of globalization, had changed the very contour of public administration.

Attitudinal Impact

Assessing the impact of globalization on Public Administration would have been grossly underestimated had we not mentioned the attitudinal transformation within its fold. First, the onset of globalization has engendered a new level of global consciousness for transparency, accountability and global justice, in administrative deliberations. Secondly, globalization had led to a virtual metamorphosis of sort in the strenuous relationship between citizen and administration, where both rediscovered their real worth in relation to each other. Thirdly, as a corollary of the previous point, another important impact of globalization on Public Administration is the empowerment of citizens.

4.5 Conclusion

In the foregoing analysis an attempt has been made to understand the complex correlation between globalization and Public Administration. Needless to say that it is a daunting task as the phenomenon of globalization is still in a state of unfolding. It had literally unlocked a floodgate of possibilities and problems for Public Administration ever since it came into being in 1990s. Despite apprehensions in the beginning, globalization did not sound death knell for Public Administration. Rather, globalization had increased the urgency of having a more proactive Public Administration informed by efficiency and effectiveness.

4.6 Summary

- An attempt was made to understand the essence of conceptual dilemmas of Public Administration associated with the concept of globalisation.
- This section has also tried to portray how globalisation has brought a Paradigm shift in public administration.

4.7 Glossary

- **Globalisation** : it is the process of interaction and integration among people, companies and governments worldwide. Globalization has accelerated due to advances in transportation and Communication And Science and Technology. It is primarily an economic process of interaction and integration that is associated with social and cultural aspects too.
- **Paradigm shift** : it is a fundamental change in the basic concepts and experimental practices of a scientific discipline.

4.8 Model Questions

Long Questions

- Write a critical note on the impact of globalization on public administration.
- 'Globalization is essentially an economic concept'— Elucidate the statement
- Do you think reconfiguration of political space is a necessary precondition of globalization? Argue your case
- Write a short note on the cultural or social dimension of globalization.
- Identify the major structural impact of globalization on Public Administration.

Short Questions

- Discuss the political dimensions of globalisation.
- Write a short note on the attitudinal impact of globalization on Public Administration.
- Analyse the procedural impact of globalisation on Public Administration.
- Define globalisation.

4.9 References

- Globalization and its Critics: Perspectives from Political Economy Ed. Randall Germain Palgrave Macmillan; 2000th edition (March 2000)
- Globalization and Development Studies Challenges for the 21st Century Ed. Frans J Schuurman Vistaar Publications, New Delhi 2000
- Chakrabarty, Bidyut, Public administration in a globalizing world. Thousand Oaks, Calif. : Sage Publications, 2012

Unit-5 : Comparative Public Administration, Development Administration, New Public Administration, New Public Management

Structure

- 5.1 Learning Objectives**
- 5.2 Introduction**
- 5.3 Comparative Public Administration**
- 5.4 Development Administration**
- 5.5 New Public Administration**
- 5.6 New Public Management**
- 5.7 Conclusion**
- 5.8 Summary**
- 5.9 Glossary**
- 5.10 Model Questions**
- 5.11 References**

5.1 Learning Objectives

- To present a broader view of several variants of Public Administration
- To discuss the topics and themes that include the past and current concerns and interests of the discipline

5.2 Introduction

This unit intends to present a snapshot view of several variants of administration, representing different temporal and locational positions. Not necessarily ordered in a sequential manner, the above concepts of administration point to the dynamic nature of the discipline which keeps changing with the evolving time. The unit has the following 4 sections. These sections introduce the above concepts. Public administration scholars and practitioners are increasingly concerned with the need to broaden the field's scope beyond particularistic accounts of administration in given countries. The

fields of comparative public administration, development public administration and new public administration are thriving. Equally exciting is contemporary new public management scholarship. These sections would provide readers and opportunity to contextualize the fields 'growth and evolution. This chapter is organized around broad array of topics and themes that include the past and current concerns and interests of the discipline.

5.3 Comparative Public Administration

Comparison is said to be a normal human instinct, which an individual resorts to make sense of his/her relative position vis-a-vis a person or situation. It is as old as human civilization. Aristotle had widely used the comparative methods and came out with his famous taxonomy of governments. Max Weber made use of this comparative research during 1895 to 1920. However, as a scholarly pursuit, it could not claim to have a long history as it draws academic attention only after Second World War. With an objective of developing administrative experiences in different contexts the concept of comparative Public Administration had been brought into being via the birth of the Comparative Administration Group (CAG) under the aegis of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA). Though, the real impetus for comparative Public Administration came with the birth of CAG, it had its precursor in the form of a committee on comparative administration as early as 1953. The major intention of engaging into cross-cultural studies of administration was to find out any underlining patterns and regularities to be employed for making generalizations. It was argued that the comparative approach had imparted us the way of exploring, reflecting, and understanding the entire human experience without getting trapped into an ethnocentric perspective. It enjoyed huge financial support from the Ford Foundation until the disbanding of CAG in the post-Vietnam period (1971). From 1990s there has been a renewal of interest in the comparative studies in the garb of New Public Management (NPM) as the neoliberal dream of integrating markets across the globe required pool of comparative knowledge of administrations.

5.3.1 Distinguishing features

The distinguishing features of comparative Public Administration can be summarized as follows :

First, Its centrality in understanding the contextual administrative deliberations notwithstanding, as a future subfield of public administration, the comparative public administrative cannot boast to have a long history as it received due academic attention only after the second world war. Secondly, the said subfield was also marked by diverse and contesting approaches. Partly because of the keen interests the scholars share with the discipline and partly because of the fact that scholars of different disciplinary persuasions have forayed into the field, the discipline has registered a diversity of approaches. Thirdly, the subfield especially under the stewardship of Fred Riggs had also experienced a definite tilt towards scientific analysis especially the form of *nomothetic* and ecological approaches. Fourthly, another characteristic feature of this subfield was the predominance of the American scholars. In fact, the cross-cultural orientation of the subfield was primarily driven by the American interest. The liberal endowment by the Ford Foundation had further cemented the American presence in the comparative public administration. Fifthly, the attention of the subfield had been veering round a couple of objectives viz, theory building and administrative problem solving.

5.3.2 Major Proponents :

There is no denying that comparative public administration had attained its distinct visibility under the tutelage of Fred Riggs. In fact, under his chairmanship the Comparative Administrative Group (CAG) became highly productive and engaged into comprehensive programme of research for attaining reliable generalizations about administrative theory and practice. Though popularized as an important subfield of Public Administration in the post Second World War, the roots of it can be traced back to Aristotle. However, Woodrow Wilson in recent past had underscored the importance of comparative method for developing scientific study of administration. Wilson in the seminal article, (which is said to have given birth to the discipline of Public Administration) entitled 'The Science of Administration' in *Administrative Quarterly* in 1887, had reposed his faith on comparative method. During the early part of 20th century Max Weber had also resorted to comparative method in differentiating three types of authority systems. However, the real boost in comparative studies was registered in 1962 with the birth of Comparative Administration Group(CAG), wherein a dedicated group of scholars decided to develop the comparative method as an important tool of measuring administrative development. This phase was primarily dominated by

Fred Riggs and Ferrel Heady. Riggs had forcefully argued in favour of comparative method to make administration a truly scientific enterprise. Riggs believed that "Actually, all systems of government require comparative analysis if we are to understand cause/effect relationships and achieve predictability. This applies as much to the study of American government as any other. Whenever we want to focus our attention on any country, we can easily use geographic terms to specify the context-e.g. Public Administration in Asia, Africa, Latin America, Europe, or the U.S." (2002).

Ferrel Heady had identified five key concerns of comparative Public Administration, which included among others, the relentless search for theory, advocacy for practical applicability, occasional contribution of comparative politics, interests of scholars pertaining to administrative law; and last but not the least comparative assessment of the persisting problems of Public Administration.

5.4 Development Administration

Born at the critical juncture of decolonization, the concept of development administration was brought into being with an objective of bringing about rapid socio-economic development in the newly independent states of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Designed with an objective of catapulting the erstwhile colonies into the steady growth trajectory, the concept of development administration put lot of emphasis on development per se. It is essentially a government induced endeavor intends to bring about rapid socioeconomic transformation. The term of 'development administration' was coined by an Indian civil servant, U.L. Goswami in his article entitled 'The Structure of Development Administration in India' in 1955, in the context of community Development Programme. However, it was the Western especially American scholars like George Gant, Donald C. Stone, F.W. Riggs and Edward Weidner et al have developed it into vibrant subfield of Public Administration. The state led development initiatives in the West had begun in the decade of 1950s. The intellectual roots of it in the West can be traced back to Robert Dahl's seminal article entitled 'The science of Public Administration: Three problems' (1947), where he had identified the inability of developing a comparative perspective as the major shortcoming of Public Administration.

Conceptually speaking, the concept of development administration comprises of two distinct yet interrelated components viz. the administration of development and

the development of administration. The administration of development stands for a particular type of administration which is dedicated to development alone. However, this definition is conceptually flawed as no administration can be designated as totally developmental in nature. In fact, in reality administration per se comprises of both the developmental as well as routine activities. Hence administration of development can be defined as the administration which lays special emphasis on developmental tasks in addition to routine tasks normally associated with any administration. The development of administration on the other hand is a boon in disguise as the prolong engagement of administration with developmental activities has led to development of administration in terms of acquiring new skills, techniques to deal with the realities of the newly independent states. Following George F. Gant, development administration can be defined as a complex of agencies, management systems and processes that a government establishes to achieve its goals'. According to him Several factors can be held responsible for the birth of development administration, which include among others first, the exponential rise of newly independent states in Asia, Africa and Latin America during the decolonization phase; Secondly, the compulsions of the Western especially US scholars to explore the reasons behind the failure of the assistance programme to the developing countries have engendered an urge among them to understand the nature of governance in these countries; and thirdly, the formation of the Comparative Administrative Group had brought a huge fillip in the field of development administration as the scholars of Comparative Administrative Group took an active interest in the study of administrative systems in developing countries.

At least two major contributions of development administration can be recognized viz first, it had identified the incommensurability of Western model of development and public administration to the needs of the developing countries. Secondly, the scholars of development administration had called for changes in the administrative systems and practices in order to manage the technical assistance programme.

5.4.1 Features of Development Administration

Hence, it would not be an exaggeration to say the development administration is a qualitatively different genre of administration informed by change orientation, result orientation, citizen centricity, commitment to work and so on. The distinguishing features of development administration can be enumerated as follows:

The first and perhaps the most important feature of development administration is the philosophy of change. In fact, change especially the socio-economic and political dimension of change constitutes heart of development administration. Here change orientation in administrative deliberations intends to bring about structural reorganization of administration including removal of unemployment, alleviation of poverty, introduction of innovative programme to augment production, and so on. Secondly, development administration is also known for its goal orientation. Unlike the routine administration, development administration is committed to the objectives of the organization.

Thirdly, the client orientation is also held as one of the redeeming features of development administration. Though administration by nature is dependent upon clientele satisfaction, development administration has foregrounded the issue so that citizens may be roped in the developmental activities. Fourthly, the temporal dimension or the time orientation is another important feature of development administration. Completion of development projects within the stipulated time frame has always been concern for administration. Development administration puts lot of emphasis on timely completion of development projects. Hence, under development administration development goals are laid out in a categorical manner with tentative time frame, so that all development projects attained its indented goals. Fifthly, another redeeming feature of development administration is the ecological orientation. Being an open system development administration is known for constant interaction between the administrative system and its environment, where change in one system has a corresponding repercussions and the vice versa. Sixthly, development administration by nature is an innovative administration which has been incessantly experimenting with the identification and application of new structures and methods, techniques, policies and programmes.

5.5 New Public Administration

The New Public Administration (NPA) has dawned a new qualitatively different phase in the development of Public Administration by engendering a new genre of Public Administration infused by the political values like equity, social justice, change and professional commitments. This new phase is inextricably associated with the 'crisis of identity' of Public Administration as a separate discipline. In fact, the very

urge for a new public administration was generated out of the obvious insecurity among the scholars and practitioners regarding the sorry state of the discipline. In fact, the discipline has been grappling with this crisis since its inception. It was a conference in 1968 at the Minnow brook conference site of Syracuse University which had acted as a triggering factor for the birth of a new public administration. The said conference had given a proper outlet to the simmering discontent of the scholars and practitioner alike. The scholars assembled for the conference expressed their dissatisfaction with the state of affairs of Public Administration as the discipline had been increasingly getting disassociated from society and engaged into meaningless theoretical exercises. Hence, new Public Administration was a wakeup call for the discipline that had been locked into a typical 'disciplinary orthodoxy'. The NPA had reiterated the societal commitment of the discipline by identifying some core issues like relevance, change, equity, justice and so on. Originated in the backdrop of an academic conference, the NPA had represented a counterculture of sort against the disciplinary orthodoxy. Any cursory glance at the presentation of papers, made at the conference (Minnowbrook I) would indicate four distinctive features of New Public Administration, which include among others relevance, values, equity and change. In the following section an attempt will be made to explore the distinctive features of New Public Administration.

5.5.1 Features of New Public Administration

Unlike the quintessential version of Public Administration obsessed with efficiency and economy, New Public administration intended to remind the discipline of its societal commitments. Dissatisfied with the sorry state of the discipline of Public Administration, especially with its disciplinary orthodoxies, a group of young scholars and practitioners had assembled at Minnowbrook conference centre of the Syracuse University at New York in 1968 to officially register their discontent and anguish. Citing the example of the contemporary social upheavals in the form of ethnic skirmishes across the American cities, campus clashes, Vietnam war and its repercussions in American society and the like the scholars have argued that the discipline had lost its social relevance and confined to the respective departments. The New Public Administration wanted to bring back social relevance of Public Administration by giving primacy of politics in it. The major features of new Public Administration can be identified as follows:

Relevance

Making public administration more relevant is perhaps the most important feature of new Public Administration. It had demonstrated that in pursuit of disciplinary sophistication or what is often argued as disciplinary orthodoxy, public administration had lost its social mooring. Consequently, several political issues which required intervention on the part of the Public Administration remained outside the purview of Public Administration. The new Public Administration in a way had reminded Public Administration of its duty toward the society.

Values

Unlike the behavioural persuasion of political science and management oriented public administration, the New Public Administration lays emphasis on the centrality value in administrative deliberations. According to the scholars of New Public Administration, value neutrality in administrative deliberations is an impossibility. In fact, discarding the pretense of neutrality, New Public Administration wanted administration to be sided with the marginal and disadvantage sections of the society.

Equity

The advocacy for social equity is said to be another important hallmark of new public administration. The protagonists of the New Public Administration argued in favour of distributive justice in the governmental institutions in order to ensure social equity.

Change

Change orientation is an equally important feature of New Public Administration which intended to make an inroad into statusquoist and the dominant interest group entrenched in the society.

5.6 New Public Management

New Public Management (here after NPM) was born at a time when the public sector across the globe was reeling under series of crises. Putting it simply, NPM signifies a new kind of experimentations of introducing market principles of efficiency, economy and effectiveness in the public sector management to bail out the ailing

public sector and make it more effective. It emerged in the realm of public sector management in late 1990s with an objective of rediscovering public sector in the changed perspective. It was an outgrowth of the initiatives of public sector reform sweeping across the Western part of the world since late 1980s. The re-inventing movement in 1992 with the landmark publication by David 'Osborne and Ted Gaebler had further intensified the NPM movements. It has brought a paradigm shift in the public sector management by removing overreliance of the discipline on the traditional Weberian and Wilsonian paradigm of Public Administration.

Despite its centrality in the public sector reforms across the globe, there is hardly any all agreed definition of it as there are multiple even contradictory interpretations available on the subject. Whereas some of the scholars have hailed the NPM as a new found mantra of resurrecting public sector, others have rejected it as mere exaggeration. Christopher Hood, a leading expert, has succinctly captured the predicament that one would encounter in dealing with the subject : "Although ill-defined, NPM aroused strong and varied emotions among bureaucrats. At one extreme were those who held that NPM was the only way to correct for the irretrievable failures and even moral bankruptcy in the 'old' public management (cf. Keating 1989). At the other were those who dismissed much of the thrust of NPM as gratuitous and philistine destruction of more than a century's work in developing a distinctive public service ethic and culture (cf. Martin 1998; Northcote 1989b)". The NPM has proposed to take on 'sheltered 'bureaucracy' by replacing it with flexible market based Public Administration. In sum, NPM foregrounds a qualitatively different variant of Public Administration informed by minimum government, debureaucratization, decentralization, market orientation of public services, contracting out, privatization, performance measurement and so on.

5.6.1 ORIGIN

The origin of NPM can be traced back to a host of factors which include among others credibility deficit of state or public sector, the surfacing of New Right Approach; emergence of Post-Weberian / Post-Wilsonian bureaucracy; and several administrative experimentations in advanced Western countries.

Credibility deficit of the state : Among the several factors responsible for the birth of public administration, receding reliability of the state is perhaps the most important one. State as the major provider of social justice has come under serious challenges

since late 1970s. A popular sentiment was that the state was no longer in a position to provide them services. Consequently, an alternative to the state had come into the scene to supplement state, if not totally replacing it.

Emergence of New Right Philosophy : The birth of New Right philosophy is supposed to be another important impetus for the recent spurt of public sector reform across the globe. The New Right as a monthly group of ideas representing individual liberty and free market economy, intends to challenge Keynesian demand management and the egalitarian welfare package provided by the state. It came into being in late 1960s and early 1970s in the form of libertarianism, supply-side economics, monetarism, Thatcherism, and Reaganomics. However, it hogs the limelight under the tutelage of Ronald Regan and Margaret Thatcher. Despite the variations among the different strands of New Right, there is an overarching commonality regarding the role of the state in society. To them state has an inherent tendency, of monopolizing over economy, society, individual liberty and entrepreneurial spirit. Moreover, they believe that the overstretching role of the state in the social sector leads to oversupply, and wastage of public money.

Emergence of Post-Weberian/Post-Wilsonian conception of Public Administration–

The birth of post-Weberian/Post-Wilsonian variant of Public Administration especially in the wake of the pragmatic repudiation of Wilsonian politics-administration dichotomy has ushered in a paradigm shift in public sector management in the form NPM

New administrative experimentations in advanced Western countries

Recent administrative experimentations in advanced Western countries have also contributed to the development of NPM. According to Mohit Bhattacharya those administrative experimentation can be encapsulated as follows: First, structurally speaking there has been a clear shift from a rigid, hierarchical and bureaucratic form of Public Administration to one of flexible market-based form of Public management; Secondly, the role of government in society has also undergone a sea change. From a sole provider of goods and services the role of the state has reduced to a mere facilitator. And Thirdly, the citizen-government relationship has also witnessed a substantial transformation. Citizens in those advanced Western countries have been re-conceptualized from a passive recipient of goods and services to an active customer.

5.6.2 Five Fundamentals

Another expert of the field Nicholas Henry has identified 'five fundamentals' or 5As of NPM :

- **Alertness**– Government should improvise the problem and act before it actually hit the system, not the other way round.
- **Agility**– Government should be agile in the sense that it should be 'entrepreneurial, open, and communicative'.
- **Adaptability**– Government should be continuously engaged in improving quality of its programmes and services and thereby adjusting with demands.
- **Alignment**– Government should collaborate with other government, non-governmental and civil society organizations to achieve social goals.
- **Accountability**– 'Government should have a clear and compelling mission that focuses on the needs of the people (Henry: 2007)

Another leading exponent Patrick Dunleavy has enumerated three key components of NPM viz. *disaggregation*, *competition* and *incentivization*. For the sake of operationalization Dunleavy has further fine grained the constituting elements of above components: *Disaggregation* means splitting up public bureaucracy into smaller components with underlying emphasis on flattening of hierarchies and 'flexibilization' in personnel, IT, procurement etc. Under this component a host of elements have been identified viz. purchaser-provider separation, agencification, decoupling of policy system, growth of quasi-government agencies, separation out of micro-level agencies, chunking up privatized industries, corporatization and strong single, organization management, deprofessionalization, improved performance measurement etc. *Competition*- NPM seeks to infuse competition among the potential providers. It includes among others quasi-market, voucher scheme, outsourcing, compulsory market testing, intra-government contracting, public/private liberalization, deregulation, consumer-tagged financing, user-control etc. *Incentivization*–favours providing pecuniary-based specific performance incentives for augmenting productivity in organization. This component has also several constituting elements as well viz. respecifying property rights, light touch regulation, capital market involvement in projects, privatizing asset ownership, anti-rent seeking measure, de privileging professions, performance related pay, private finance initiative, private-public partnership, united rate of return and discounting, valuing public sector equity, mandatory efficiency dividends etc. (Dunleavy: 2005).

5.6.3 Salient Features

(i) Overhauling of organizational structure

With an objective of facilitating organizational leadership, NPM calls for a thorough overhauling of the organizational structure. The organizational restructuring under NPM includes among others simplifying organizational procedures, flattening of hierarchies, etc.

(ii) Empowerment of citizens

The empowerment of citizens constitutes the heart of NPM. NPM unlike its traditional counterpart reconceptualizes citizens as 'active customers'. It signifies an enormous perceptual change of the public bureaucracy vis-a-vis citizens. Traditionally citizens were conceptualized as 'passive recipients' of the public goods and services, to be delivered by the state. The birth of NPM has expanded the freedom of choice of citizens to a great extent. Drawing on Albert Hirschman's conceptualization the expansion of freedom of choice under NPM can be crystallized under three specific freedoms viz. 'exit', 'voice', and 'loyalty'. Whereas the freedom of 'exit' signifies the liberty of the customer to withdraw from any market transaction; the freedom of 'voice' describes the liberty of the consumer to raise his/her point of view either in terms of objection or complain so that he is able to complain in a way that may lead to some changes in services or products offered and the 'loyalty' explains consumer's allegiance to a given supplier, regardless of the standard of services it provided.

(iii) Greater autonomy for public sector manager

NPM calls for more autonomy to the public sector managers. Unlike private sector, public sector managers have to work within a strict regime of laws and by-laws. Hence, they have no room for innovation and contemplation. NPM is in favour of greater elbowroom for managerial leadership by providing public managers with greater flexibility in personnel policy like contractual appointment, work place bargaining etc (Bhattacharya: 1998).

(iv) Application of Rigorous Performance Measurement Technique

Application of rigorous performance measurement technique is another hallmark of NPM. The root of performance measurement as a technique of quality assurance has its first forceful advocacy in the Scientific Management Theory of Fredrick Taylor.

Though it has become a household name in private sector enterprises for quite some time, its acceptance in the public sector management is only a recent phenomenon. Thanks to the 're-inventing government' movement in the US in early 1990s, a host of performance measurement techniques like Total Quality Management, counter services, citizen's charter etc have increasingly become the part of bureaucratic parlance. However, a caveat needs to be sounded regarding performance measurement technique. For, applications of performance measurement techniques like benchmarking, report card etc do not necessarily guarantee unadulterated success in terms of productivity in every situation. Sometimes, they are mechanically introduced without proper appreciation of the ground reality or problem (Campo-Sundaram: 2001)

(v) Disaggregation of Public Bureaucracy

Public bureaucracy has an uncanny knack of expansion and extravagance. The public choice theorist have shown how bureaucracy has blown out of proportion and eaten out the vitals of a given society. Parkinson has unpacked the intricacies of bureaucratic expansion by his famous Parkinson Law (Parkinson:). NPM suggests disaggregation of public bureaucracies into agencies, which will deal with each other in a user-pay basis (Hood:1991).

(vi) Cost-cutting

NPM is strongly advocating economy in public sector. Inspired by New Right philosophy NPM is in favour of cost-cutting in public sector.

(vii) Goal-orientation

Another important feature of NPM is its goal-orientation. NPM is exclusively committed to goal.

(viii) Use of quasi-markets and contracting out technique

NPM encourages use of quasi markets and contracting out techniques to ensure better management of ailing cash-strapped public sector.

(ix) Emphasis on managerial support service

NPM asks for managerial support service to facilitate public sector managers reaching the pre-set target. Under managerial support service, an array of policies has been undertaken collectively known as human resource management. The basic objective is to draw best talents from the market in the public sector by offering attractive salary, perks, incentives and other benefits. Moreover, NPM is also suggesting regular periodic

skill -improving training programming to hone up the competitive edge of the man power (Bhattacharaya: ibid).

(x) Organizational and spatial decentralization

NPM believes in decentralized form of governance. It encourages all kinds of organizational and spatial decentralization.

5.6.4 Implications

NPM has engendered an administrative reform spree of sort across the globe. Ghuman has identified five broad categories of administrative reforms:

- (a) reforms aiming reorganization and downsizing of the government;
- (b) reforms aiming setting up of performance based organization;
- (c) reforms aiming to create Senior Civil Services(SCSs);
- (d) reforms emphasizing adoption of private sector styles of management practices; and
- (e) reforms aiming promotion of customer orientation of administration.

(a) **Reorganization and downsizing of government**– Though NPM does not directly suggest down sizing of government, however, the elaborate reorganization and restructuring measures it prescribes, often lead to slimming of government. There are number of instances

(b) **Performance based organization**- One of the direct implications of NPM for public sector management is to adopt performance as the basis of organization.

(c) **Creation of Senior Civil Services (SCS)**- Under NPM the idea of unified civil service is repudiated by separating policy from administration. For effective implementation of policies, NPM proposed to contract out service delivery functions to non-governmental or quasi-governmental agencies and private service providers, saving the major policy making functions for core departments to be manned by seasoned public servants. Hence, it recommends forming a cadre of Senior Civil Servants (SCSs) based on written employment contracts and partly performance based pay for effective formulation of public policies.

(d) Adoption of Private sector styles of management practices

Another major implication of NPM is the adoption of private sector managerial practices in pubic sector management. NPM moved from bureaucratic model of Kanter's model of flatter (non-hierarchical) and more focused structure of organizations to an

entrepreneurial form of governance as Osborne and Gaebler (1992) seemed to have suggested. Hence, NPM calls for greater synergy between public and private sector management.

(e) Customer-Driven Administration-

If there is any seemingly positive implication of NPM on overall governance, it must be the customer -orientedness of administration. NPM, unlike the traditional bureaucratically managed public sector management, elevates citizen to centre of discourse. Customer's satisfaction index is considered to be 'the' criteria of public service. Several procedural innovations like Citizen's Charter, citizen's report card etc are manufactured to reflect citizen's choice.

5.6.5 NPM—An All Purpose Garment

NPM, especially the way it has been packaged and marketed, comes under serious challenge. The criticism against NPM is ranging from questioning its claim of universality (Hood: 1991) to the proclamation of its death (Dunleavy: 2005). In this section we will mainly concentrate on the major criticism labeled against it. The professed claim of universal applicability of NPM as a trusted antidote of any kind of 'management ills' irrespective of culture and contexts, is no longer found tenable. Christopher .Hood has enumerated some major objections:

First, despite the initial hypes and hooplas, NPM seems to have worked only in superficial level, leaving most of the old problems and weaknesses intact. The only substantial change that has occurred is in the language that the public managers speak in public.

Second, NPM 's claim of economy or cost cutting also sounds hollow as it failed to bring down the cost per unit of service. Critics argue that the net result of NPM is an 'aggrandizement of management' and 'rapid middle level bureaucratization of new reporting system', which in effect hampered public service.

Third, NPM on the pretext of promoting public good actually serves the 'career interest of an elite group of new managerialists (viz the top managers, officials, management consultants, business schools).

Fourth, NPM's claim of universal applicability is also not tenable as different administrative values call for different administrative design. (Hood : 1991)

To the other extreme, critics like Patrick Dunleavy et al have written the obituary of NPM and proclaimed a post-NPM regime of digital era governance (Dunleavy :

2005). A few commentators, who are not willing to go that far, have identified 'one important shift in the thinking of NPM'. In its earlier Entrepreneurial Government version, the emphasis was on de-governmentalization and privatization. The government was supposed to be slim, smart and responsive. But considering the centrality of government in development discourse and nation building, the contemporary version of NPM emphasizes on better government, not on less government (Arora: 2007).

5.7 Conclusion

The fields of comparative administration, development administration, New Public Administration and new public management point to the dynamic nature of the discipline which keep changing with the evolving time. they also represent different temporal and locational positions. Public administration Scholars and practitioners are increasingly concerned with the need to broaden the field scope beyond particularistic accounts of administration in given countries In the foregoing analysis an attempt has been made to map the seemingly revolutionary idea of public sector reform. This unit also casts some light on the distinctive feature NPM, especially its major components, salient features, its overall implications over public management per se. Moreover, at the end of the unit a question is raised against NPM's apparent claim of universality under the sub-unit called 'NPM-an all purpose garment?'.

5.8 Summary

An attempt has been made to introduce several branches of public administration, with special reference to their Origins distinguishing features and major proponents.

Significant discussion has taken place on comparative public administration, development administration, New Public Administration and new public management and tracing the interactions between these with the discipline of public administration as a whole.

5.9 Glossary

- **New Public Administration :** Anti-positivist, anti-technical, and anti-hierarchical reaction against traditional public administration
- **New Public Management :** New Public Management or NPM is an approach that seeks to build an administration by implementing flexibility, transparency,

minimum government, de-bureaucratization, decentralization, the market orientation of public services, and privatization.

5.10 Model Questions

Long Questions

- What do you understand by Comparative Public Administration? Discuss its distinguishing features.
- How would you describe Development Administration? What are its important features?
- How do you explain the origins of New Public Management? What are the salient features of NPM? Discuss.
- Who are the major proponents of Comparative Public Administration?

Short Questions

- What are the major features of New Public Administration?
- What are the five fundamentals of NPM as identified by Nicholas Henry?
- Write a note on the administrative experimentation in advanced Western countries.
- According to Patrick, what are the key components of new public management?
- How would you explain the origin of NPM?

5.11 References

- Comparative Public Administration; Second Edition Ramesh K. Arora, Associated Publishing House, New Delhi 2021
- Title, Development Administration; R. K. Sapru ; Publisher, Sterling Publishers (P) Limited, 1994
- Handbook on New Public Governance; Parth J Shah and Makarand Bakore Centre for Civil Society, New Delhi 2015.

MODULE – II

**Relationship between Public Administration and other Social
Sciences**

Unit-6 : Political Science

Structure

- 6.1 Learning Objectives**
- 6.2 Introduction**
- 6.3 Social Phenomena : Their Integrated nature**
- 6.4 What is Political Science and Public Administration?**
 - 6.4.1 Importance of Public Administration and Political Science**
- 6.5 Closeness and Commonality**
- 6.6 Relationship between Public Administration and Political Science**
- 6.7 Distinction between Public Administration and Political Science**
- 6.8 Conclusion**
- 6.9 Summary**
- 6.10 Glossary**
- 6.11 Model Questions**
- 6.12 References**

6.1 Learning Objectives

- To understand the disciplines of Political Science and Public Administration.
- To explore the interrelationship between Public Administration and Political Science
- To know the distinction between public Administration and Political Science

6.2 Introduction

Public Administration is essentially interdisciplinary in nature as the discipline has taken its clue from a host of subjects in its formative stage. In fact, too much reliance on others' input has led to a serious crisis of identity for the discipline. The discipline has been grappling with a debilitating crisis of identity since its inception as it fails to devise its own tools and conceptual parameters. Too much reliance on Political Science and Management science for organizational principles in the initial stage of its growth has left the discipline with a stunted growth. Even the latest round of Minnowbrook conference (Minnowbrook III) fails to settle the issue of identity distress as the renewed attempt of defining Public Administration as "a socially-embedded process of collective

relationships, dialogue, and action to promote human flourishing for all" is indicative of it. Hence, the random borrowings of principles, ideas, constructs from other sister fields of studies without proper planning and design have confused the discipline.

6.3 Social Phenomena: Their Integrated nature

No social phenomenon can be properly examined in isolation without reference to other related ones, for example, the problem of the backward classes in contemporary Indian society. A proper understanding of the problem of backward classes requires us to view it from several perspectives, notably those of the social sciences and of legal studies as we are at every step confronted by the divergence between what exists as social reality and what ought to exist according to the laws and ethical standards we have created for ourselves. We are aware of the provisions of equality in the constitution of India. These provisions are both wide-ranging and varied. We cannot understand either their scope or their complexities in terms of purely formal principles. We can appreciate their nature and significance only by relating them to the historical background from which they have emerged and the social context to which they were designed to be applied.

6.4 What is Political Science and what is Public Administration

Political Science and Public Administration are two closely related fields which deal with the scientific study of political and administrative aspects. The discipline of Political Science analyses the processes by which resources are allocated and values are developed and distributed within a political system. The discipline explores on one hand, concepts like power, authority, legitimacy, social class, gender, ethnicity, political participation and the like, and institutions like state, government, political parties, pressure groups and international organizations on the other. The discipline also deals with political ideas and ideologies relating to issues like justice, liberty, democracy, morality, equality and so on. The discipline of Public Administration *analysis* the processes by which public decisions and policies are formulated and implemented within administrative systems, particularly within the state. The discipline also deals with the practical side of government through the *analysis* of the institutions, management and implementation of public policies and public organizations at national and local levels of governments,

which involves program management (that is planning, decision making, organizing, leading, implementing and evaluating) and resource management (human resource management, financial management and budgeting).

6.4.1 Importance of Public Administration and Political Science

Political Science and Public Administration are major social science disciplines which help us understand the political, social and economic processes and their transformation at local, national and international levels. The two disciplines expand our horizons by providing insight from scientific and enlightened perspectives and address several problems of everyday life. They prepare us to become more conscious, rational and effective citizens and more constructive participants in public affairs. These disciplines empower individuals by providing the knowledge and necessary skills to be professionals in the public domain. Since the study of politics and administration combines both theory and practice, studying Political Science and Public Administration is challenging but also rewarding and caters to the interest and capabilities of a large number of the people.

6.5 Closeness and Commonality

Political Science and Public Administration both focus on the public arena of human society and by virtue of commonality of the subject matters are intricately related to one another. Public administrators and bureaucrats cannot ignore the political environment and context of public policies, as they are decided by various dynamics and interplay of political forces. Politicians cannot ignore the role of public administration and policy makers as public policies are implemented through the bureaucrats and administrators as an interplay within the political system. Political Science is the study of the state and system of government. It is concerned with power, authority and their influence. It ensures authoritative allocation of values to the various sections in society; Public Administration is very closely, if not indistinguishably connected with political science. Whereas Political science is connected with government, Public Administration is government in action.

Dwight Waldo, an eminent thinker had pointedly observed the relationship between the two disciplines in the following words "The interface between the two (Political

Science and Public Administration) becomes clear and vivid if we concur that both deal with political system or substantially the state but from different positions: Political Science activate and energizes the state it deals with the input path while public administration deals with the output." Inequality and injustice have aggravated the distressful situation of poverty in these countries.

Being the study of state and government, political science provides the fundamental framework within which public administration functions. Public Administration is government in action and as such concerned with the use of power given to it in order to achieve the policy goals of the government. There are many more common areas of study which makes Public Administration and Political Science more of sister disciplines. Public policy studies constitutional law, administrative law, delegated legislation, government budgeting, local government and the like.

There are such common areas which are studied in both Political Science and Public Administration; there exists another point of close connection between the two disciplines; the political environment of a nation largely shapes the nature of the political system and activities of its administrative system. The volume of administrative activities and the nature of its functioning is determined by the scope of government functions which is decided politically. Public administrators work with and under the direction of politicians. Since public administration functions in the context of a given political situation and governmental system, its study calls for a good deal of preliminary knowledge of political institutions and ideologies and governmental activities. Hence, Dimock rightly points out that "understanding of politics is the key to an understanding of public administration."

Administration is regarded as a powerful agent of change in most of the developing countries. The nature of the state is that such countries are the root cause of poverty, inequality and injustice. In such cases we have to examine the prevailing political system before we can analyse the role of the administrative system in the concerned country. According to some critical observers, the separation of Public Administration from Political Science denies us the requisite 'political approach' necessary to the study of Public Administration. For instance, the study of the Indian political system, the historical evolution of the Indian administrative system, the debates in the Constituent Assembly and the basic constitutional law which are all 'subjects of political science' would alone provide an insight into the process and the working of the administrative

system of the country. In fact, there are certain areas of study common to Political Science and Public Administration such as public policy, comparative constitutions, local government. Again, government is regarded as a continuous integrated process comprising different functions-legislative, executive and judicial as well as administrative. The scope of Public Administration, in this light, is not a routine process, but a dynamic process involving considerable practical discretion. Studies in administration, therefore, focus only on policy formulations, but also on political parties, pressure groups, public opinion, and the like. The methods and techniques of Political Science have been borrowed extensively by researchers of Public Administration which includes public policy, public welfare and public interest. The relationship between politics and administration is so close and interlinked that they may be regarded as two sides of the same coin.

6.6 Relationship between Political Science and Public Administration

Public Administration as separate discipline with a distinct disciplinary boundary, has been struggling hard to get out of demanding parental control of Political Science since its inception. Indeed, as a mother discipline Political Science had nurtured Public Administration a lot with maternal care in its adolescent days despite the Wilsonian advocacy of politics administration dichotomy, but the formal separation became inevitable as the later started demanding more space when it reached its adolescence. Actually, the relationship between the two has always been problematic as Waldo (1990) has categorized them as 'troublesome cleft'. Indeed, a kind of ego-centrism, (sometimes bordering on disdain of the practitioners of Political Science was implicit in the above tenuous relationship; for example, the president of American Political Science Association in late 1970 had purportedly relegated Public Administration as an intellectual wasteland' [i] (Henry: *ibid*). The uneasiness in the said relationship is 'as old as the discipline of Public Administration itself (Whicker, Strickland, Olshfski: 1993; Chakraborty & Bhattacharaya: 2003). Had anybody referred to the evolution of Public Administration as a discipline, he would have appreciated the above fact. However, severing of umbilical cord as it were, does not mean that Public Administration has lost its ties altogether with the mother discipline. Rather, reunion was in sight as a host of theorists started questioning the very feasibility of complete separation between politics and administration at early stage of its

development, which was later forcefully argued by a motley group of scholars, assembled at the Minnowbrook I conference. Indeed, history took a full circle when the contemporary experts of policy science started asking for a close interaction and cooperation between the two. Riggs has cautioned against compartmentalization between Public Administration and Political Science as any such attempt would end up in frustration and futility. In fact, the core concerns of Political Science like democracy, plurality, equality before law, political participation and so on have been co-opted as cardinal features of Public Administration. The birth of public policy and policy sciences has further cemented the relationship between Political Science and Public Administration. 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 individual. It provides answers to questions concerning the origin and the nature of the State and also considers the institutions through which the members of society exercise power. For a long time Public Administration has been regarded as a part of 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 also. 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 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 administer/implement the policy-decisions, the senior administrators are also involved in policy-formulations by way of providing data/information/advice to the minister.

6.7 Distinction between Public Administration and Political Science

The founding father of Public Administration, Woodrow Wilson propounded politics— administration dichotomy which made a sharp distinction between politics

and administration. According to this theory the domain of politics is policy making and that of administration is policy implementation. In other words, politics is concerned with laying down policies, whereas the administration is concerned with the execution of those policies with a view to cost effective measures. Woodrow Wilson further point that "Administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics, administrative questions are not political questions. All politics sets the task for administration, it should not be used to manipulate its officers. The field of Administration is a field of business, it is removed from the hurry and strife of politics and at the most common stands apart even from the debatable grounds of constitutional study."

In brief, the various points of distinction between the two disciplines can be summarised as follows :

- The scope of Political Science is wider than the scope of Public Administration because the latter is a branch of Political Science.
- Public Administration is practical cover while Political Science is largely theoretical. In other words, Public Administration is the real world of governance, while Political Science is the analysis of government.
- Public Administration is concrete, while Political Science is abstract.
- Political Science deals with the struggle for securing and retaining power, whereas Public Administration concerns itself with the utilisation of power in realising the goals of state policy.
- Political Science is ethical and hence value loaded. On the other hand, Public Administration is factual and technical.
- In the words of John M. Gaus, "There is no denying the fact that there is a difference between the duties of political offices and those of Administrative offices, but the difference is more of a degree rather than of a kind."
- Political Science is macro in nature because it deals with the state and systems of government as well as bureaucracy and administrative processes while Public Administration is micro in nature because it deals with the bureaucrats and institutions which serve as the machinery of the state.

6.8 Conclusion

The relationship between Public Administration and Political Science can be characterized as close, competitive based on a division of labour, and hierarchical,

with the former subordinate to the latter. It is closed not only because research questions are related with the role of state institutions and the effects of state interventions are the focus but also in the sense that the respective scholarly communities do interact within permeable structures, often using the same when used for the presentation and publication of their research. Close ties are also founded at the individual level - at the same time scholars subsequently engaged in Public Administration as well as Political Science projects have to focus on domains of the two disciplines at the same time. It is self-evident that the borders are more apparent than real among those Political Science scholars and Public Administration scholars working on policy making, on national political system. The relationship is competitive with respect to establishing and entertaining various academic programs, demonstrating relevance to society, attracting new scholars and students and struggling for resource from private actors and public authorities. The relationship is however, also based on a division of labour. Public administration focuses on intra organisational and procedural issues and its vantage point remains the authority and capacity of the state in a normative and empirical sense. Political science, in contrast, takes a broader perspective where a broad range of societal inputs and policy outputs are given much greater attention and it puts much more emphasis on the generalizability of knowledge and on theoretical advancement. Finally, if one accepts certain criteria for assessing the coherence and consistency of scientific disciplines, one is led to interpret the relative greater fragmentation, the missing methodological consensus, and absence of an overarching paradigm as indicators of Public Administration relative epistemological inferiority. Acknowledging this state, one cannot ignore that Political Science has difficulties and deficits of its own but the point is that Public Administration in perhaps best seen as a profession that is primarily interested in instrumental knowledge, more akin to Engineering or other technical disciplines. If we were to reframe it, the aim of Public Administration would shift to optimising administration in the widest sense that is making the state work as legitimate, fair, as effective and efficient as possible. If one accepts these objectives for Public Administration as a whole other than engaging in multi-disciplinarity, it would appear to be the right strategy. In the absence of a unifying paradigm and a methodological consensus, chances for theoretical advancement in Public Administration will remain limited and more likely confined to discourses that originate in the respective parent disciplines and then get imported to

Public Administration. In this sense, the various corners of Public Administration reflect a hybrid character. They are parts off Public Administration but are closely linked to the parent disciplines of Political Science Law, Management Studies and other Social Science disciplines.

6.9 Summary

- In this unit we have discussed the nature, scope and importance of the disciplines of Political Science and Public Administration
- We also understood the closeness and commonality between Political Science and Public Administration and also the differences.

6.10 Glossary

Commonality : the state of sharing features or attributes

Integrated nature : various parts or aspects linked or coordinated

6.11 Model Questions

Long Questions

- Write a critical note on the interdisciplinary nature of the discipline of Public Administration.
- Discuss the nature and scope of Political Science.
- Examine the interrelationship between Public Administration and Political Science.
- Write a note on the closeness and commonality between Political Science and Public Administration.
- What are the distinctions between Political Science and Public Administration? Discuss.

Short Questions

- "Public Administration and Political Science are separate disciplines, but interdependent"– Do you agree with the statement? Give reasons for your answer.

- What do you understand by the integrated nature of social phenomena?
- Indicate the importance of Public Administration and Political Science as social science disciplines.
- What is meant by the *prices* of identity of Public Administration as a discipline? Discuss briefly.

6.12 References

- Public administration by Marshall Edward Dimock [and] Gladys Ogden Dimock, 1975. Oxford & IBH Publishing Co New Delhi
- Handbook of Public Administration Edited By W. Bartley Hildreth, Gerald Miller, Evert L Lindquist, 2021. Routledge (Public Administration: From Government to Governance by Bidyut Chakrabarty and Prakash Chand, 2017. The Orien Blackswan; New Delhi
- Jos C. N. Raadschelders. (2019) The State of Theory in the Study of Public Administration in the United States Balancing Evidence-Based, Usable Knowledge, and Conceptual Understanding. *Administrative Theory & Praxis* 41:1, pages 79-98
- Spicer, Michael W. "Public Administration Enquiry and Social Science in the Postmodern Condition: Some Implications of Value Pluralism." *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, vol. 27, no. 4, Taylor & Francis, Ltd., 2005, pp 669-88, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25610769>.

Unit-7 : Sociology

Structure

- 7.1 Learning Objectives**
- 7.2 Introduction**
- 7.3 Understanding sociology**
- 7.4 Relationship between sociology and public administration**
- 7.5 Sociology and social work in public administration**
- 7.6 Conclusion**
- 7.7 Summary**
- 7.8 Glossary**
- 7.9 Model Questions**
- 7.10 References**

7.1 Learning Objectives

- In this unit we will familiarize with Public Administration and its interconnectedness with/Sociology, the interdisciplinary dimension it shares.
- To provide a better understanding of Sociology and Public Administration and the dichotomy that they have in general.
- To familiarize the readers with the agencies of society and administration and how they coordinate to maintain balance in a harmonious way.

7.2 Introduction

At the very onset one must familiarise with the conceptual understanding of Sociology and its interconnectedness to Public Administration. It is the state, the public sector and the public realm that unifies the subject of Public Administration and not its methods, theories and aims as Christopher Pollitt puts it. If we go by organisational terms then schools of Public Affairs or Public Policy, Schools of Public Administration or "John F. Kennedy School of Government" are affiliated to Public Administration.

In the words of Yang, Sociology as a subject of Social Science primarily deals with social structure and its function, social process and its implications and societal laws

as a whole which is derived from social relations and action. Sociology was introduced long back into two stages i.e., stage of subject capital construction and systematic research later transcending into a comprehensive and specific social science. 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, whereas administration as we are aware, operates in the context of the society of which it is a part. Hence, just as the society is concerned with goals, values, belief systems, so also should be the administration. There is a however a debate across national contexts whether Public Administration is an academic discipline or not. Thus, we notice a two-way relationship; administration exists in a social setting and the pattern of administration theoretically is decided by society. In order to understand its interdisciplinary relationship, we will further look into the relationship it shares.

7.3 Understanding Sociology

Sociology is a comprehensive and specific Social Science discipline concerned with the scientific study of social structure. Sociology is concerned with people's interactions and behavior towards one another, as well as group conformity, development, foundation and purpose. We must also consider society's fundamental institutions. The family is the most basic form of social institution, followed by religion as the foundation for morals, beliefs and even ideologies, education as a source of knowledge and intellectual development for society's citizens, the economy as a means of allocating scarce resources and government as the body that legislates, executes and interprets the law, and extends its sovereignty throughout its territory. As a result, the government is an element of society that through the laws it enacts, impacts how individuals interact and behave with one another. Sociology can describe, analyze and predict social phenomenon that can alter in future. With the help of description, explanation and prediction, Sociology carries out social criticism, education and social norms. Sociology's subject cognition is practically divided into four types as Kapucu puts it. The first one focusses on representative characters such as August Comte, Emile Durkheim and Herbert Spencer whose objective lies in creating sociological tradition of positivism in Sociology and visualize whole society as a research model. The second one deals with creation of sociological tradition of humanism, Max Weber is its representative figure and in this type individuals and their social behavior is the object of study. The next type is criticism-oriented which is about creating critical tradition of Sociology and its proponent is Karl Marx and the

fourth one covers that part which does not fall into the above three types that includes "the surplus said", "the investigation says", "the discipline says" and so on. Sociology is a broad discipline that has various branches comprising of :

- Sociology : theory and methods
- Social Psychology
- Medical Sociology
- Development Sociology
- Rural Sociology
- Urban Sociology
- Sociology of labor
- Sociology of Sports
- Sociology of Education
- Population Sociology
- Industrial Sociology
- Social Anthropology
- Family Sociology
- Social work
- Sociology of law
- Social investigation

Apart from the instrumental nature, the humanistic nature persuades Sociology to delve into basic problems of society, people, culture, history, groups in order to establish solid foundation of the discipline. Sociology is incorporative of both theoretical and methodological approaches. Sociology arrives at abstract, generalized concepts, paradigms by transcending social phenomena. There have been many controversies on sociological research approaches. Sociological knowledge comprises of theoretical perspectives of Sociology which observe, analyze, describe empirical facts as the procedure to obtain knowledge. Theory is usually considered as the harbinger of knowledge and method constructs and develops knowledge. Sociology is therefore combination of theory and method.

As described in 'Interdisciplinary relationship between Sociology, Politics and Public Administration : Perspective of theory and practice', Sociological research perspective can be classified into three levels, that is philosophy of science, comprehensive social science such as Law, History and the third one is single subject of Social Science for example Pedagogy, Politics, Psychology and Management. Moving onto sociological research approaches it includes macroscopic-microscopic

approach, holistic-individualism approach, positivism-humanism approach. These can be divided into three basic approaches that are social fact paradigm, social behaviour paradigm and social interpretation paradigm. Social fact paradigm focusses on large social structure and social system. Social interpretation pays attention towards action, interaction through observation, supplemented by theories like sociological action theory, phenomenological sociology, ethnology, methodology.

Positivism methodology, anti-positivism methodology and historical materialism methodology are three types of sociological research methods. Positivism methodology aligns with the idea that social phenomena is associated to social types and social environment and society must be defined in sociological perspective. Anti-positivism methodology stands in contrast to natural sciences, it advocates subjectivity, creativity and consciousness of social actors. It anchors value-related, value judgement theories to be dealt separately. Explaining social phenomena and relations from outcome of economic conditions but also keeping in knowledge not to take economic factor as the sole determinant is the methodology of historical materialism.

However, these approaches and research methods have considerable influence on the public administration domain. If we go by theoretical significance of Sociology, it aids Public Management to build up scientific social knowledge, sociological and anthropological analysis can channelize focus towards public property in Public Management. Further various research methods can be fruitful to pay heed towards public real life, social interaction and social mentality. The advantage Sociology adds up to Public Management is social facts rather than solely relying upon data analysis, provided that it can assist in improving existing social system. In a way, it keeps public administration stay grounded into realities of society, enhances its consciousness and consistency in accordance to regularity.

7.4 Relationship between Public Administration and Sociology

As Prof. Dimock puts it, society is determined by patterns of administration and administration exists in a social setup. But sensitive administrative leadership only leads to change in society itself. The administrator is not only an executive, he must act as social engineer in order to help society fulfil, particularly in the developing countries of Asia and Africa. Public Administration is a medium to initiate social change. F.W. Riggs states that understanding of social environment gives impression about public administration in developing nations. Traditional social control exercised by agency of family, marriage and caste has started to be taken over by administrative controls. For example, marriage and family are affected by welfare, social security and taxation. The field of administration has drawn heavily from Sociology. The significance

attributed to informal groups, initiating influence of group norms in the functioning of an organisation and to understand organisational behaviour the behaviouralists applied methods and findings of Sociology. Because social science research may be utilised to convey information to legislators, policy can hopefully be guided by evidence and information rather than anecdotes or hollow rhetoric that is why Sociology is relevant to Public Administration. It is reasonable for legislators to conduct study into their constituents' interest, if they intend to serve those interests. A sociologist, for example, might undertake a poll on criminal justice, reproductive health, or gun control attitudes. It is the responsibility of the social scientist to conduct evaluative research after public and institutional policies have been passed. Is the law accomplishing what we wanted to do? Do we still agree with the law's underlying principle? Does the law have any unintended consequences? (Think of the war on drugs and the resulting overrepresentation of African American men in prison populations as one example). Another use of Sociology in Public Administration is to highlight societal problems and demographic trends that are not always "on track" but has the possibility to intrude into people's realities. Legislators, journalists and the general public do not always have the time or resources to do scientifically rigorous study on problems they care about. Scientists, economists, criminologists and sociologists are tasked with researching these challenges, synthesising their findings and presenting their conclusions.

Public Administration as a discipline developed in the middle and late 20th century. It is entrusted with the responsibility to effectively distribute public goods and public services, to ensure public interests are fairly distributed and overall development is targeted through proper effective methods and public power. It is through administrative leadership the society may be influenced. Public administration is not infected by Pan-European identity crisis, across Europe it has been moulded differently by various traditional academic disciplines. For example—Public Administration has economics and management flavour in Central and Eastern European countries. In Denmark and Norway, it plays a role in Political Science departments and associated to Economics department in Czech and Slovak Republics. In particular it is linked to reform trend that took place in 1980s- 1990s that is New Public Management System (NPM). Comparative studies indicate that these reforms were implemented in different manners across different countries. New Public Management system was a dominant paradigm for quite some time. In the United States, Public Administration emerged in a period when state was considered critical and Public Administration had to have strong hold on individuals, interest groups and state-society interaction. In contrary to this, Public Administration is highly influenced by law in France and Germany, where the state of social and political development of both the countries act as the initiation for

reflection on Public Administration as Hustedt, Randma-Liiv and Savi describes. In Central and Eastern Europe, public administration attempted to generate, sustain and handle newly democratic institutions after emerging out of post-socialist transformation. Sociology is concerned with the human behaviour in a group, the various types of groups and the ways in which they influence human instincts and activity. In a Pan-European survey that was conducted as part of the COCOPS Project, Political Science was ranked as the most important discipline by Public Administration scholars, next rank was assigned to Political Sociology and Business Management and in equivalence, Economics and Law.

The study of human social relationship in totality is broadly under the banner of sociology. A man's social life has political, economic, familial, religious and other relationships. Sociology takes 'social man' as a unit to assess social structure, to explore the complexities of different behaviours in social activities which can help understand the impact of public management on the subject and the object of society. As a discipline with an avowed practical operational dimension, Public Administration is out and out embedded in society. In fact, the fate of three important functions of Public Administration viz. revenue collection, law and order and development are contingent upon societal responses. In other words, society's response to a given administrative measure determines the very fate of it. Hence, Public Administration has developed a close tie with Sociology, which was brought into being to study the underlying social structures and cultural patterns of the society. Sociology as a master science of society provides constant societal feedback to the practitioners of Public Administration regarding the feasibility of any given public policy. Hence, Sociology facilitates Public Administration to implement public policies by customizing them in accordance with socio-cultural context. Sociology offers to Public Administration information about groups, their behaviour, and the way they affect social life. It is, therefore, not surprising that eminent in Public Administration primarily owe 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.

Sociologist Max Weber is attributed by many as the founding father of modern Public Administration presentive notion of ideal-type bureaucracy. The links established between Sociology and Public Administration has recently developed -at least outside France. This new institutional theory is referred to as "sociological institutionalism". The arrival of this new institutionalism serves as a theoretical framework to shape institutions, regulate organizations, culture and processes and their structure. The gap between institutional environment and organizations is bridged by new institutionalism

making it attractive to Public Administration scholarship as it connects political environment with administrative-organizational analysis. These connectedness between Sociology and Public Administration has potential for shared research interests and role of public organizations in society. With the various global challenges contemporary societies are confronted with such as migration, climate change, digitalization that are not only pressing problems in public policy domain, but these are pushing inevitable changes in social norms, changing social scenario and change in behaviour and expectations from government in problem-solving capacities and distribution of public service. Social changes also generate social conflict and fissures which pave the way for substantial intersections between these two disciplines.

7.5 Sociology and Social Work in public administration

Public welfare administration cannot act detached from realities of day-to-day problems. The expansion of federal, state and local old agencies and other new agencies have been rapidly occupying the space in public welfare association. Beneficiaries in thousands have multiplied into millions which reflects the manifold growth in services of public agencies in a more specialized format. This specialization has induced coordination in the field of public welfare agencies. Public welfare administration is slowly evolving as a national function in states, localities and the federal government. Though its volume has increased and services has become varied but the nature has become professional which is evident from the numbers of social workers hired and the standard of guidance imparted. The Work Projects Administration is an example of an agency which has maintained its record in hiring trained personnel in supervisory and administrative positions.

One can assert confidently that professional social workers are well suited for public welfare service. However, there is popular discussion as Anderson has described regarding popular opposition to hiring professional social workers which exist in the bigger picture. There are certain qualities and factors in addition to attitude and personality that agencies take into account before hiring trained workers. While these qualities are characteristics of professional worker there is still ambiguity if training at all is adding up value. There is dearth of information regarding the previous jobs, its nature and the experience these social workers have in the field. The ambiguity and the necessity to train these workers stems from the concern that public officials are held responsible by voters and unwillingness to pay unprofessional. This opposition towards social workers also emanates from uncertainty if they have failed to provide proper service due to lack of training. Criticism of these kinds has pushed towards the possible questions if the job responsibility is too big for many social workers as compared to their previous

work experience.

There occurs a disparity which social workers feel when they get hired into public welfare after leaving their private welfare work background. Nonetheless the picture for social workers is not dark, the need is of adaptability. Public welfare work has ample opportunities to offer and social work has a role to offer. Infact social work has more to provide than any other profession. With the adaptation to dynamical changes in public welfare, social work has a hope but Nels Anderson heavily criticizes and argues that at present sociologists must question themselves about the direction they are moving forward in. He adds that a lot of sociologists have zero personal knowledge and lacks zeal to even know. They have little botheration towards people despite writing several books about social problems. He urges that sociologists must be able to contribute instead of standing detached from pressing problems of society. There is however plenty of space to assess this later.

7.6 Conclusion

Sociology and social work are trying to keep up the pace with Public Administration. Despite the closeness, Sociology and Public Administration shares a dichotomy that exists in matters pertaining to family, tribe, society which doesnot seen to be a concern for Public Administration. Strategic planning, the distribution and management of resources (land, labor and capital), the zoning of industries and residences, the assessment of environmental effect, performance evaluation and issue mitigation are all duties that fall under the umbrella of public administration. Also, public administration is somewhat dissimilar to corporate administration; however, it has a broader scope, therefore it includes planning, organizing, staffing, directing and controlling. Sociology incorporates both organized and unorganized forms of social association whereas public administration is limited to organized political life. Sociology is general social science unlike Public Administration which is a specialized social science which makes it narrower in approach. The research of the theory and practice of Public Administration is oriented towards public interest whereas in Sociology the society is believed to be closely related area, no isolation between interaction of people and all forms of network relations. In this period the country is going through social transformation period with advancing reform measures initiated by government. Public management has been under considerable focus provided its demand has grown. However Public Administration has been strictly scrutinized because of its inability to guide the practice effectively.

7.7 Summary

- We have so far discussed what Sociology is and its relevance to Public Administration, its various methodologies and approaches that shape up the discipline.
- Public Administration shares a compatible bond with Sociology that keeps it grounded to social reality.
- We also discussed in brief how professional social workers are appropriate to fit in the role of public welfare agencies least to say questions have been raised about their efficiency in professional setup. It is however evident that both the field need a harmonious balance to operate, devoid of which will only limit its approach.

7.8 Glossary

- **Sociological institutionalism:** Also known as sociological neo institutionalism, cultural institutionalism, concerned with how institutions create meaning for people.
- **New public management system:** It is a method of managing public service organizations that is applied in both subnational and national government and public service institutions and agencies.

7.9 Model Questions

Long Questions

- Discuss the nature and scope of Sociology.
- Analyse the interrelationship between Public Administration and Sociology.
- Examine the role of Sociology and Social Work in the arena of Public Administration.
- Indicate the similarities between Public Administration and Sociology.
- What are the distinctions between Political Science and Public Administration? Discuss.

Short Questions

- Write a note on sociological research approaches and methods.

- What are the different branches of Sociology?
- According to Prof. Naim Kapucu, what are the various traditions of Sociology?
- Is Public Administration exclusive? Discuss.

7.10 References

- Anderson, Nels. "Sociology and Social Work in Public Welfare Administration". *American Sociological Review* 5, no.2 (1940): 177-184.
- Hustedt, Thurid, Tiina Randma-Liiv, and Riin Savi. "Public administration and disciplines." *EUROPEAN PERSPEC* (2020): 129.
- Dimock, Marshall Edward and Dimock, Gladys Ogden, 1975. *Public Administration*; Oxford & IBH Publishing Co.: New Delhi
- Sharma, M.P. 1960, *Public Administration Theory and Practice*; *Kitab Mahal*: Allahabad.
- Chanthamith, B., M. Wu, S. Yusufzada, and M. Rasel. "Interdisciplinary relationship between sociology, politics and public administration: Perspective of theory and practice." *Sociology International Journal* 3, no. 4 (2019): 353-357.
- Farazmand, Ali. "The future of public administration: challenges and opportunities- A critical perspective". *Administration & society* 44, no. 4 (2012): 487-517
- Bozeman, Barry, and Mary K. Feeney. *Rules and red tape: A prism for public administration theory and research: A prism for public administration theory and research*. Routledge, 2014.

Unit-8 : History

Structure

- 8.1 Learning Objectives**
- 8.2 Introduction**
- 8.3 Relationship between Public Administration and History**
 - 8.3.1 Historical Approach**
- 8.4 The Cultural Context and the common themes, then and now.**
- 8.5 Conclusion**
- 8.6 Summary**
- 8.7 Glossary**
- 8.8 Model questions**
- 8.9 References**

8.1 Learning Objectives

- To bring in the idea that among the various general approaches to the issue, the historical approach is the most promising, even when limited to specific countries.
- To educate learners that relationship of Public Administration with History is vital to understand present and predicting how future can be.

8.2 Introduction

The lack of a universal coordinating mechanism or factor makes Public Administration a difficult subject to teach and study. There are numerous good historical books on Public Administration in individual countries or periods as well as from certain perspectives, but there are few universal assessments. Students are occasionally unsure of chronology of historical events such as whether Social Security was established during the New Deal or the Great society. Other times, the substance of key eras in government history, such as the Great Society's environmental impact is unclear. Most importantly, as Gladden puts it, students must often accept the existing relationship of the public sector to society- its size, functions and political standpoint- as a given, as "what is", since they have not investigated how it evolved over time.

8.3 Relationship between Public Administration and history

Administration is just one of the many things that the government does. The term "government" encompasses a wide range of activities, including policy-making, law making, enforcing, maintaining, peace, adjudicating and numerous acts of communal engagement. Although, despite the widely accepted doctrine of separation of powers, it is not possible to assign exclusively each to its equivalent branch of government, these various activities are traditionally distributed among the three broad powers of the political - executive, legislative and judicial- as separate spheres. Furthermore, the tripartite classification does not account for acts of communal engagement that occur outside the government realm but have an impact on it, which are becoming increasingly important, particularly in democracies. While the legislative and judicial branches have relatively simple and well-understood functions-though even these tend to generate supplemental services-the executive branch has numerous features, ill-defined and if far from uniform. Policy-making, commanding, executing and maintaining peace are all basically executive duties. In actuality, the executive (to which the term government is frequently applied to distinguish it from legislature and judiciary) exercises legislative and judicial powers, while both the legislature and judiciary may perform responsibilities that would normally be allocated to one of the others. This broad functional range does not however exhaust the pattern of government complexity because government operates at several levels which are divided into both central and local levels, which are defined by population density, geographic distribution and other unique variables. Public administration at each of these levels, while adhering to the same broad principles has its own distinct characteristics. There are issues to resolve. To these regions of influence public administration must be added to the mix. International and supranational cooperations have always been crucial and are becoming so today. Students of public affair are aware of public administration being widely operative. Drawing a barrier between government and private activities based on some principle is no longer possible if it ever was despite political philosophers having suggestive answers.

In the past, historians did not pay much attention to the social, political and economic development of the states. Administrative history is now being developed as a distinct discipline of history; hence this approach has altered. In the United States of America, the first attempt to compile a complete history of administration was

made. Prof. Leonard D. White gives a detailed history of American administration in the first 48 years in his two volumes : The Federalists (1948) and the Jeffersonians (1951). History instructs and advises administrators by highlighting the errors made by previous administrators that led to their downfall. Every country's public sector has its own distinct history, one that characterizes, explains and defines how government can and does operate in the present. Understanding this history may help us better adapt management techniques to changing political and economic conditions. It can bring a sense of satisfaction in knowing how do we fit into a greater cultural tale of public sector, in addition to practical benefits.

The discipline of History has a close relationship with Public Administration. Though American Public Administration has had a tendency to downplay the importance of history, the European version of Public Administration has been inextricably associated with history. Indeed, any study of Public Administration would become meaningless until and unless it is studied in the context of history. For, history can only explain as to how administrative institutions in a country are evolved over the years. Further, administrative precedence which is considered to be an important element of policy making, is indicative of the importance of history in administrative decision making. The past administrative practices along with memoirs of administrators are considered to be the most important component of administration deliberations. 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. For instance, L. D. White in his books on the early history of American administration, 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.

As a result, even if we agree that history is the ideal frame for bringing coherence to public administration studies, we are still faced with the challenge of designing a cohesive pattern for such a wide range of activities and approaches.

Above all, two elements stemming from the nature of public administration must be considered : (1) its status as an integral part of government and (2) its necessary subordination in that framework.

1) While universal histories of government are rare, owing to the subject's vast diversity, general histories are invariably concerned with government, and wherever the context permits, these include a significant amount of information about public administration and its practitioners, particularly when they are important enough. This is clearly the case with the Oxford History of England, which devotes considerable, if variable, attention to such things in each of its sixteen volumes, but, of course, the administrative picture generated is inherently fragmented if not disjointed, being auxiliary to the main theme. Even a broad image of the administrative world can be gleaned only after thorough probing in such histories, as detailed as they may be. There's no need for it to be any other way, because putting too much focus on the administrative components would inevitably throw the primary plot out of whack. There are a number of specialized histories dealing with certain administrative issues or sectors that, when considered as a whole - if that is possible - cover a significant portion of the broader ground. One aspect of the difficulty is coordinating these specialty accounts and filling in the gaps where possible.

(2) Because of administration's intrinsic subordination and the fact that it does not exist on its own - administration for the sake of administration, as it were - its history should not be twisted in such a way as to give the idea that it is a fundamental or key subject. The history of Public Administration must be connected to governance in all of its forms. Because it is a specialist subject, this form of history will usually only interest experts, but given the enormous impact of public administration today on practically every sphere of human endeavour, it is becoming increasingly important that it be widely understood.

In the contemporary setting, a current American business is particularly significant. The requirement for a more comprehensive and realistic approach to administrative history is highlighted in G.D.. Nash's *Perspectives on Administration: The Vistas of History*, published by the University of California, Berkeley's Institute of Governmental Studies, where the subject is being researched extensively. It is clear that there is no simple formula for selecting acceptable points of view from which a broad history of public administration can be successfully shaped. Nash presents a variety of different lines of approach in his thought-provoking study of the primary choices. These perspectives include institutional functional, Civil Service, biographical, psychological, anthropological, historical, entrepreneurial, ecological and intellectual approaches, all

of which have been used by writers dealing with specialist administrative topics and none of which can be clearly distinguished from the others.

Public Administration histories, whether confined to specific specialist fields or forming important elements in works of a more general nature, already exist in such universal activities as Public Finance and Diplomacy, and universal histories could certainly specialise in Central Government Administration, Local Government Administration, or the administration of such public activities as Police, Constructional Works, Defense, Taxation, Communications, Education, and Coordination. Nash's final summing up has two key points that can be usefully quoted:

Historians can offer theorists with resources which are more varied in origin, more deeply anchored in human experience, and gathered from a wider historical span than those provided by academic evidence today.

At this point, Guy Thuillier and Jean Tulard's recent article on *Problèmes de l'histoire de l'Administration*, makes an important contribution to the problem, as it covers a colloquium held in Paris on the subject of French administrative history since 1800. Their statement of six principles for the historian of administration to follow in approaching the subject is worth studying in depth, but at least one of them must be disputed right away. This is the idea that this kind of history is based on a regressive process, in which present-day experience is used to explain the past. As a result, the administrative historian is unable to be objective. Such a mindset is an insidious flaw that historians must combat in all domains. In reality, it's tough for us to put ourselves in the other person's shoes, especially when he's been dead for a long time and the available information is incomplete, if it exists at all. However, the historian must always put forth an effort, acting as an artist when science has little to say. Otherwise, identifying the underlying tendencies that can provide important future signposts while also justifying our looking back will be very impossible. Regressive history, as stated, can do little more than reinforce our errors rather than help us figure out why we keep making the same mistakes. Initially, it appeared that a universal history of Public Administration would have to be set in the context of the principal activity - government - as well as against a broad historical backdrop that would account for time and space. It would have to be shaped on three levels to account for (i) the administration's essence, (ii) its governmental environment, and (iii) a minimal number of historical indicator points or map references, to put it another way.

Covering the entire span of universal history - from cave man to computer - on these, or any other, lines would obviously necessitate the dedication and perseverance of a large team of experts, with plenty of time and plenty of financial and resource support, and the results could only be adequately deployed in a long series of volumes. It was much too big a mission for one under-resourced researcher.

8.3.1 Historical Approach

The historical approach is essentially based on the belief that knowledge of History is absolutely essential for an in-depth study of any subject. For a proper understanding of the public administration of a country, it is necessary to link it up with a spatio-temporal frame. For example, in order to study the background and the growth of the administrative system in modern India, a historical perspective is essential. To understand the evolution of the administrative system in India, the characteristics of Indian administration during the British period and also the pre-British period have to be studied. Thus, the historical approach studies organization in a chronological order and comparative context.

People who work in or study public organisations may not consider history to be very important. Public Administration is an applied professional subject that deals with real time issues like money, organizational structure and programme management. We know that recent events can influence today's decisions, yet events from the past may appear to be entirely irrelevant when it comes to developing and implementing public policy in the present. Below we will discuss how history is still relevant to daily work of public sector professionals. By focusing on times of substantial change in the function of government in society, *Essential history for Public Administration* explores the culture that surrounds and shapes the American public sector. The book's concept is that understanding the cultural context can help students of public affairs better grasp the topics they're learning about in class and it can also help practicing public officials plan and manage successful initiatives. Each narrative describes how cultural understanding evolved in public sector.

8.4 The Cultural Context and the Common themes, then and now

People who work in the public sector are not just machine-like tools used to implement policies, as the case for the importance of history begins. Instead, their

actions are influenced by the surrounding society's political, social, environmental and economic factors; they provide input to elected officials and interested citizens that might lead to policy change; and they use professional judgement in everyday decision making. Political leaders use it to generate public support, legislators sense it while considering changes in public policies and programmes and individuals may have it in mind while voting, the strength of the cultural view of government can have important effects. The public sector's cultural perspective did not emerge out-of nowhere in the last few decades. It originated in the years leading up to during the nation's formation, when individuals fled Europe to avoid tyranny of monarchical governments and religious constraints. It influenced the formation of government institutions and continues to affect how Americans think about government, public policy and the proper role of unelected career public servants in American society. As a result, the term "cultural" is particularly well suited to describe a viewpoint on the public sector's position in the United States. It is not a result of recent events or generational perspective but rather a continuing characteristic of the national political landscape. While the cultural perspective continues to shape public opinion and policy, it adapts to new circumstances brought about by political movements, economic situations and technological advancements. This is especially true during periods of rapid social change such as economic crisis, war, wealth and power disparities, social injustices and environmental degradation, all of which ignite public desire to act collectively. This means that public sector's connection with the rest of the society isn't set in stone and will change as people act to tackle current challenges. People who advocate for change face pushback from those who use their power to hinder or weaken new policy measures, therefore bringing about change in these areas sometimes takes years. Successful adjustments in the role of the public sector become culturally embedded and largely stable elements of governments operation over time.

There is of course difference in present-day issues and challenges in the public sector from the days of past. Despite differences in social conditions in earlier period, today's issues and problems are parallel which is striking. As Box describes, in American society, these includes themes like public versus private interest, concentrated wealth and power, relationship between "insiders" and "outsiders", the size and the cost of the government.

There are six approaches as Gladden has described about general history associated to public administration. These are:

- **Direction and Top Management-** Most administrative history is found at this level and this is where the majority of historians and other researchers set their interests. It is here that rulers and governors communicate their decisions to their administrative assistants in the form of instructions and it is here that the latter arrange their activities for moulding and operating the administrative machine to achieve the desired results. Naturally, the distinction between the two sorts of actions is seldom evident. In smaller systems, kings are usually actively involved in administration, even to a great extent, although in bigger realms, rulers may choose to engage, as in the case of King John of England and Philip II.
- **Function and Organization-** an approach which is extension of the previous approach. In this true administrative realm where administrative function (i) develops as a factor of government from its original undifferentiated form, (ii) divides into specific activities through the division of labour, which has been a fundamental component of all social change and (iii) evolves the appropriate structure to shape and activate the emerging services. The functional foundation will be determined by the ruler's policy decisions, which will be based on their perception of the situation's demands and the availability of resources, while the actual organisation will vary greatly depending on the social context and government style.
- **Personnel matters-** when the ruler has to choose helpers, personal issues become more important, and they grow more complicated when he has to delegate some of his obligations to deputies. The authentic world of the officials has arisen where such deputies are involved mostly or entirely in administration and it would be quite fair to focus administrative history on the responsibilities, power and conditions of service of these officials.
- Techniques used by public officials must be kept in mind under each of the three preceding sections as well as being considered separately. These activities include not only basic administrative practices in their especially public form, but also actions related to the provision of the large variety of services that governments and their auxiliary agencies are responsible for. Before expanding the scope of their operations, governments must ensure that there are people available who can operate the essential procedures, if not among current officials and servants, then in the general public, as embalmers in Ancient Egypt and clerks in Medieval Europe did.

Public Administration like many other Social Sciences, has recently rekindled its interest in its own history, not just in the history of administration but in the history of the discipline's evolution as a whole. The distinction between the history of long associated practices with the government process and the history of modern professionalism of those practices is tough and nuanced but is a significant if not necessary, distinction to make.

8.5 Conclusion

History gives us a glimpse into the past. The study of a country's historical background allows us to comprehend its administrative structures. Historians have noted this, not only political events such as battles and rulers' action but details of public administration too. More importantly, the professionalization of administration engendered national interests among administrative professionals, detaching them from the local ties that their forefathers had so well understood. Professionalization has created a challenge for American society as a whole because specialization did not give an alternative value system.

8.6 Summary

- So far we have learned that, the history of wars and dynasties is of the utmost importance to public administration, on the other hand, it is concerned with country's social, Economic, and political existence.
- We understood that history is mainly concerned with the past. It is unrelated to the present or the future. Public Administration is more concerned with the present and the future and only uses the past as a lesson for the present.
- Lastly, History is broader when compared to Public Administration because the former encompasses considerably more larger domain of human existence.

8.7 Glossary

- **Organization-** In narrower sense of the term it refers to an entity, association or company consisting of numerous people for a specific purpose.
- **History-** It is a broader term to refer to study of past events, particularly in human affairs.

8.8 Model questions

Long Questions

- Discuss the relationship between Public Administration and History.
- Discuss the approaches described by Gladden in regard to general history associated with public administration.
- Give an account of the nature and scope of History in relation to operative part of government.
- What are the two elements stemming from the nature of Public Administration? Discuss.
- Examine the significance of the 'cultural context in Public Administration'?
- Write a note on administrative history as a distinct branch of History.

Short Questions

- what do you understand by universal history of Public Administration?
- Write a short note on the historical approach.
- What is History, as conceived by E.H. Carr and L.D. White.

8.9 References

- Gladden, Edgar Norman. "Public administration and history." *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 38, no. 4 (1972): 379-384.
- Karl, Barry D. "Public administration and American history: A century of professionalism." *Public Administration Review* 36, no. 5 (1976): 489-503.
- Box, Richard C. *Essential history for public administration*. Melvin & Leigh, Publishers, 2018.
- Adams, Guy B. "Enthralled with modernity: The historical context of knowledge and theory development in public administration." *Public administration review* (1992): 363-373.

Unit-9 : Economics

Structure

- 9.1 Learning Objectives**
- 9.2 Introduction**
- 9.3 Understanding Economics**
- 9.4 Relationship between Economics and Public Administration**
- 9.5 Impact of Economics on Administration and Policies with examples**
- 9.6 Conclusion**
- 9.7 Summary**
- 9.8 Glossary**
- 9.9 Model Questions**
- 9.10 References**

9.1 Learning Objectives

- To understand how the concepts and issues of Economics are applicable in the analysis of Public Administration.
- To explain the interrelatedness between Public Administration and Economics.
- To know the impact of Economics on Administration and Policies.

9.2 Introduction

What is the role of the state in economic development? This question has puzzled thinkers since Adam Smith and other economists even to these days, who continue to ponder on this question. We will learn about the contemporary discourse over the state's capacity in development and other activities or resource allocations. We can begin by exploring these questions, by conversing along Adam Smith's claim for the need of a "tolerable administration of justice"

9.3 Understanding Economics

Economics permeates each and every sector of human activity and interaction. It is about how limited resources are used to create wealth. In the contemporary world, public administration plays a critical role of providing direction in terms of how that wealth

should be distributed, although its involvement in the economy differs from one country to another depending on a particular economic system at play. The public administrators are therefore faced with the challenges of taking decisions within the context of economic realities of their communities. They often make decisions in the face of limited resources. This is a fundamental economic challenge. A sound knowledge of the fundamentals of Economics is, therefore, essential for all public administrators and policy makers in the business of government. The fundamentals of Economics include, among others, inflation, unemployment, poverty, national and international trades, fiscal and monetary policies, and the economic behavior of households and organizations in the private and public sectors. Knowledge of Economics is important in understanding various phenomena that impact on the survival of human beings. Its teaching, particularly at the institutions of higher learning, is fundamentally important and should form an integral part of the curriculum of even those specialized instructional offerings that fall outside its formal purview as an academic discipline.

Engineers, lawyers, medical doctors, nurses, social workers and physicists, just to mention but few, also invariably need some degree of understanding of Economics to efficiently carry out their specialized functions. Including Economics as an "anchor subject" in all set of courses that are being pursued for various professional and academic qualifications in the social and natural sciences is a sound approach to curriculum development as it would ensure that institutions of higher learning produces the caliber of graduates that are well-rounded and could easily understand the economic dynamics that underpin human actions. This is, however, often disregarded in various curriculum development endeavours. In this article curriculum development in the field of Public Administration at the universities of technology in South Africa is critically analyzed to determine the extent of the recognition of economics as a twin-science that should go together with the science of public sector governance. For, as pointed out above, public administration plays a critical role of providing direction in terms of how wealth should be distributed.

9.4 Relationship between Economics and Public Administration

There is also a great deal of complementarity between Economics and Public Administration as Economic science facilitates Public Administration especially in the implementation of public policies with the sophisticated techniques of Pareto

optimality. Preoccupied primarily with public interest, Public Administration has drawn its sustenance from Economics, which is solely concerned with the problem of allocation of limited resources. In fact, the root of the complementarity between Economics and Public Administration can be traced back much before the formal birth of the said disciplines. In fact, there has been a long tradition of economists advising governments on macro-economic management of the country. For example, Adam Smith in his magnum opus *The Wealth of Nations* had underscored the close relationship between political economy and state/government. Similarly, J.M. Keynes, another important economist had made a strong advocacy for collaboration between Public Administration and Economics. In fact, Keynes in a correspondence to the then Prime Minister of the United Kingdom Ramsay Macdonald, had advised to form a standing advisory committee of economists to guide the policy makers. As an arch rival of the orthodox laissez faire doctrine, Keynes intended to salvage the traditional theory of money from the clutches of long-term equilibrium situation and to ground it on a more realistic problems of economic management. Keynes in his landmark book *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, had categorically suggested that government should engender demand by deploying mechanism of fiscal and monetary policy. Further, public finance is another domain where economic and public administration collaborate. Public policy makers constantly are required to make choices and should be properly equipped to do so. Basic training in economics is therefore essential because every choice has costs and benefits associated with it. By making a choice, the decision maker has decided to employ scarce resources in a certain way, forcing other opportunities. Without a foundation in fundamental economics, less than optimal policies often result in under development.

"Economics is a science concerned with those aspects of social behaviour and network of institutions which are involved in the use of scarce resources to produce and distribute' goods and services in the satisfaction of human wants. This understanding 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 use:' These definitions suggest that Economics is as much concerned with human behaviour as any other Social Science.' The major objectives of administration during 18th and a good part of 19th century were maintenance of law and order and 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 extended an 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 a 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 realise the goal of Socialist society, Since 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, insurance companies and tackling ' issues concerning agriculture, banking, etc. They, therefore, have got to have an understanding of the economic problems of the country. The ancient classic Arthashastra is not only a treatise on the art of administration but also a reference book on Economics. In several other respects Arthashastra points out the close relationship between Public Administration and Economics.

9.5 Impact of Economics on Administration and Policies with examples

The knowledge of both Public Administration and Economics is important in assisting government official to improve and reform their governance system and administrative institution, strength their policy making capacity and improve overall efficiency of the government machinery.

In the context of the current developmental challenges that South Africa faces, dropping Economics in the Public Administration curriculum does not make any sense. What informed this curriculum direction in the field of public administration is misinformed about the development trajectory that South Africa is pursuing. The strategic focus of government at this epoch that dawns the second decade of democracy in South Africa is on building and consolidating a developmental state. Maserumule & Mathole point out that the imperatives of a developmental state necessitate that the

quality of life of the citizens must be enhanced through an improved service delivery of public services and the creation of appropriate environment to maximize the participation of the citizens in the mainstream economy particularly those that were previously marginalized by the apartheid system. Improving service delivery and creating a befitting climate for equitable citizen participation in the mainstream of economy are two-pronged challenges confronting the government. These challenges necessitate the calibre of government officials who do not only master the art and science of governance, but also of Economics. Given the emergence of public expenditure concept as an integral component in the economic studies between the period 1960s and 1970s, the foregoing is even more important. The concept of public expenditure focuses on the demand for and supply of government goods and services as well as resource allocation in the public sector (see Economics and Public Administration, undated). The knowledge of both Public Administration and Economics is important in assisting government officials to improve, strengthen and reform their governance systems and administrative institutions; strengthen their policy making capacity; and improve overall efficiency of the government machinery. The societal problems are solved by Public Administration and Economics explain choices. This means that Public Administration identifies normative rules that would lead decision-makers to make optimal decisions whereas economics identifies rules that decision makers are likely to follow. Of more importance in this "public administration-economics nexus" is the ability of government officials to identify and effectively respond to emerging global trends and challenges. The current global financial crisis threatens the economies of the countries of the world and impacts negatively on the efforts to realize the Millennium Development Goals. This necessitates high calibre of government officials with sound economic knowledge to make informed decisions, particularly in dealing with the challenges as brought about by the global economic meltdown. Since the inception of the democratic dispensation in 1994, South Africa has committed itself to correcting structural injustices and improving the living standards of the people and recognises socio-economic rights (access to basic services such as housing, health and education) enshrined in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa as an integral component of developing the country. The government, therefore, embarked on a variety of development initiatives clearly expressed in the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), developed back in 1993, Growth, Employment

and Redistribution Strategy (GEAR), in 1996, and Accelerated and Shared Growth Initiative (ASGISA), in 2006. All these development initiatives, with huge economic implications on the country, are aimed at addressing the socio-economic challenges such as poverty, unemployment, and unequal distribution of resources that face the country and public administration is expected to play a leading role in ensuring their successful implementation. In the context of South Africa, the knowledge of economics is even more essential for Public Administrators as it would provide a theoretical framework to understand these contemporary development initiatives. RDP is an integrated policy framework for socio-economic renewal, transformation and empowerment to establish a systematic approach to the democratization and development of the South African society. Its central thrust is to reduce the poverty of the majority of South Africans and make services of an economic nature accessible to all. To give rise to ample employment opportunities and a redistribution of resources, GEAR was developed as a strategic intervention aimed at accelerating the pace of realizing the objective of RDP. As a result of an increase in unemployment (from 26 % in 1994 to 30.5 % in 2002), the government committed to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) set in 2000 (Development Report 2005), which is to halve poverty and unemployment by 2014. The government introduced ASGISA as another intervention to accelerate the pace of development. ASGISA focuses, in particular, on fast job creating growth, ensure availability of the needed skills, create opportunities for those marginalised, and maintain policies that brought macroeconomic stability. The theoretical antecedents of these development initiatives are embedded in the science of economics. Therefore, the "brightest and best servants" that the imperatives of a development state needs should not only be schooled in the science of governance but of economics as well. This would ensure that various programs of government, largely those that are aimed at eradicating poverty and unemployment, are properly managed by people with rounded-knowledge. Economics is extremely important for governments and policy makers as it provides comprehensive and in-depth knowledge to analyze the economy in terms of these development initiatives which are very significant in the provision of quality public services. Economic decisions and actions are taken every day by economic agents such as individuals, governments and firms and economics is the study of these decisions and actions and of the way economic processes work. Economics therefore provides knowledge of

regional and municipal development, Public Administration and Economics, and prepares graduates for careers in local, municipal and central authorities of government administration, as well as various institutions. In a developmental state, government establishes social and economic goals. Factors of production are privately owned but the government must always intervene and influence the direction and pace of economic and social development rather than leaving them to the dictates of the markets to ensure that the national interests are always realized. This needs a "strong state capacity", which is achieved through the creation of inexpensive, efficient and effective public service staffed by the nation's brightest and best servants functioning without constraints and capable of being innovative in addressing the social and economic needs of the citizens. It is in this context that public administration and economics [should] go together as twin-sciences for rounded-knowledge. An omission of Economics in the Public Administration curriculum at the universities of technology following the re-curriculation exercise of 2000 is therefore a gross mistake, which its effect is mass production of graduates whose knowledge profile do not adequately befit the orientation of a developmental state. Much of knowledge that the universities of technology create through the current Public Administration curriculum is skewed towards the science of governance and economic science is underplayed. In one of the modules called Public Resource Management in Public Administration curriculum, consideration of economics in Public Administration is only limited to normative values of efficiency, effectiveness and productivity in governance. The theories of economics, which constitute its scientific essence, are not covered. A concern is always being raised in government circles about the quality of graduates that the institutions of higher learning produce. This is an indictment on the quality of knowledge that the Public Administration educational programs produce through their curricula that are narrowly focused. Economics has recently emerged as public administration's preeminent paradigm and is much more directly relevant to the concerns of public administration and to solve real life economic problems.

9.6 Conclusion

Public Administration is a very new discipline. It got separated from Political Science a few decades ago. It has very close relationship with all other social sciences. Public

Administration cannot be appreciated without an understanding of social reality around it. Works of sociologists like Max Weber influenced the theory and practice of Public Administration. The fact that the modern administrator is known as a social engineer, confirms the close relationship between economics and Public Administration. With the advent of planning the relationship between Public Administration with Economics has grown stronger, and the present-day administrators ought to know the economic aspects of the polity for effective implementation of policies.

9.7 Summary

- So, in this unit we have learned how Public Administration is related to Economics just like any other social science.
- Public Administration along with Economics plays an important role in the implementation of financial development and social infrastructure of the state.

9.8 Glossary

- **Economics-** The branch knowledge concerned with the production, consumption and transfer of wealth and resources.
- **Development-** A multitude of meanings is attached to the idea of development; the term is complex, contested, ambiguous, and elusive. However, in the simplest terms, development can be defined as bringing about social change that allows people to achieve their human potential.
- **Arthashastra-** Arthashastra is an ancient Indian Sanskrit treatise on statecraft, economic policy and military strategy, written by Kautilya.

9.9 Model Questions

Long Questions

- Discuss the nature and scope of Economics.
- Analyze the relationship between economics and public administration.
- 'Economics has recently emerged as public administration's preeminent paradigm'. Do you agree with the statement? justify your answer.

- Why is sound knowledge of the fundamentals of Economics essential for a public administrator? Discuss

Short Questions

- Write a note on reconstruction and development programme (RDP)
- Why did J.M. Keynes make a strong advocacy for collaboration between Public Administration and economics?
- What is the significance of the Arthashastra?
- What do you understand by public expenditure?
- What is meant by Public Resource Management?

9.10 References

- Dimock. Marshall Edward and Dimock, Gladys Ogden, 1975. Public Administration; Oxford & IBH Publishing Co. New Delhi.
- Boettke. Petter, Economics and Public Administration, Southern Economic Journal, April 2018, Vol. 84, No. 4 (April 2018), pp. 938-959.
- Grodzins. Morton, Public Administration and the Science of Human Relations, Public Administration Review, spring, 1951, Vol. 11, No. 2 (spring, 1951), pp.88-102.
- Lyden. Fremont James, Psychological Research for Public Policy Formation, Public Administration Review, May - Jun., 1976, Vol. 36, No. 3 (May - Jun., 1976), pp. 316-318.
- Anderson. Nels. Sociology and Social Work in Public Welfare Administration, American Sociological Review, Apr., 1940, Vol. 5, No. 2 (Apr., 1940), pp. 177-184.
- Dunn.D Delmer. The impact of Administrative behavior on Public Administration. Public Administration Quarterly, FALL 1988, Vol. 12, No. 3 (FALL 1988), pp. 369-384.
- Balla, S., Lodge, M., & Page, E. (eds). (2015). The Oxford Handbook of Classics in Public Policy and Administration. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Unit 10 : Psychology

Structure

- 10.1 Learning Objectives**
- 10.2 Introduction**
- 10.3 Relationship between Psychology and Public Administration**
- 10.4 Recent Developments and the Application of Psychology in Public Administration**
- 10.5 Two-Way Street between Psychology and Public Administration**
- 10.6 Conclusion**
- 10.7 Summary**
- 10.8 Glossary**
- 10.9 Model Questions**
- 10.10 References**

10.1 Learning Objectives

- To understand how the psychology of administrators affects the management of Public Administration.
- To understand the relationship between Psychology and Public Administration.

10.2 Introduction

Before outlining how Public Administration research may benefit from Psychology, it is worth showing how this idea is rooted in the scholarship of early Public Administration. We do not have to search long or in obscure corners of our field: discussions about the cross-fertilization of the two disciplines were central to many seminal figures in Public Administration scholarship. The most obvious early attempt can be found in Herbert Simon's seminal work *Administrative Behaviour* (Simon 1947a). Today, Simon's scholarship is mostly credited with introducing the concepts of bounded rationality and satisficing into the study of Public Administration (e.g., Meier 2015). While these concepts clearly draw on insights from cognitive and social psychology, they are just examples of how Simon envisioned a much more general and tight integration between the two fields. In his Nobel Prize speech of 1978, he

cited how his 1947 book grew out of the conviction "that decision making is the heart of administration, and that the vocabulary of administrative theory must be derived from the logic and psychology of human choice" (Simon 1978, 353). Simon reiterated this view in an exchange with Robert Dahl (1947) in *Public Administration Review* over the fundamentals of Public Administration as a science (Simon 1947b). While Simon and Dahl disagreed on a range of issues, they both acknowledged the importance of understanding human behaviour in public administration. For instance, Dahl noted that a science of Public Administration must be based on an "understanding of man's behavior in the area marked off by the boundaries of Public Administration". He therefore argued that Public Administration must work together closely with fields that focus on human behaviour in other areas, including Psychology and Sociology. Simon's sentiment reflects the idea that Public Administration is subordinate to Psychology, as administrative decision making must be studied as a special case of the many forms of decision making studied by psychologists. Thus, one of the founding fathers of contemporary Public Administration saw the field as, ideally, an applied subfield within Social Psychology. However, Simon also noted that Public Administration cannot merely be a passive user of Psychology but must aim to also contribute to it. A decade later, Simon still saw a great distance between Public Administration and Psychology, and he recognized that Psychology also could learn something from Public Administration and thus "a marking stone placed halfway between might help travelers from both directions to keep to their courses". In other words, Simon envisioned a two-way street between the two fields. Simon and Dahl were not the only prominent Public Administration scholars interested in Psychology. In *The Administrative State*, published in 1948, Dwight Waldo, who in the 1960s spearheaded the "behavioral revolution" in political science, discussed the connection between Public Administration and Psychology. He noted how psychologists see "that man is in small part rational" but rather is motivated by emotional drives and urges. Despite this, he also notes that Public Administration has been little touched by ideas from Psychology. Waldo subsequently evaluated the extent to which psychological insights had penetrated Public Administration and came to a similar conclusion. Calls for integrating insights from Psychology into public for adopting Psychological public opinion research in Public Administration. Frederick Mosher, for instance, discussed the role of Public Administration in relation to other social sciences and pointed out that there should be more interaction between them, in particular public administration and the field of Psychology. Along the same lines, scholars in the 1950s and 1960s argued for a tighter integration of the fields (e.g., Honey 1957; Verba 1961). Yet, until recently, these calls have been largely unheard.

10.3 Relationship between Psychology and Public Administration

Public Administration as a discipline is concerned with human behaviour in the institutional setting. It is indebted to Psychology for availing inputs of organizational management. As a science of human behaviour, Psychology helps us to uncover nuances of individual cognitive processes like attitudinal changes, cognitive dissonance and so on. Though the classical theorists of administrative management like Fayol, Taylor, Gulick were busy with the mechanical aspects of the process and structuring of organization. It was late 1920s and early 1930s organizational management had undergone a sea change as human psychology came into the Centre of the discourse via the Hawthorne studies. Consequently, the human factor became the centre stage of organization. Moreover, several contemporary individually oriented psychologists like Maslow, Herzberg have contributed to organizational management. Hence psychology has a close interrelationship with Public Administration.

Modern behaviourism which developed in the late 1930's is mainly concerned with the scientific study of human behaviour in diverse social environment. In Public Administration behaviourism as a distinct line of study started in 1930's with the Human Relations movement and was later developed by Chester Bernard, Herbert Simon, Herbert Dahl and others. They observed that administrative behaviour is a part of the behavioural sciences and study of Public Administration should involve the study of individual and collective human behaviour in administrative situations.

The behaviourists sought to adopt an integrated and interdisciplinary approach for according to them all human actions are motivated by social, economic, political and psychological environment from which they emanate. This approach aims at substituting empirical and realistic judgements for the purely value oriented one. It also emphasizes a scientific approach to the study of administrative problems and their solution. The scholars in the field of Public Administration have made cross-structural, cross-cultural studies of administrative behaviour. This has helped in the development of knowledge of Public Administration in the comparative context. But the behavioral approach has been criticized for having limited utility in the analysis of all types of administrative phenomena. Therefore this approach appears to be of limited relevance in dealing with all types of administrative problems and their solutions, since their complexity and variability of human nature, motivations and behaviour are far from attaining precision as is possible in physical science. Value oriented or normative problems and issues of

organization cannot really be explained or interpreted in terms of the behavioural approach.

10.4 Recent Developments and the Application of Psychology in Public Administration

The aforementioned calls illustrate how ideas about the connection between Public Administration and Psychology were part of early discussions about the foundations of Public Administration. In order to systematically assess the extent of recent Psychology informed Public Administration research, some researchers conducted a systematic analysis of all articles published in three top-tier journals in the field of Public Administration Public Administration Review, Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, and Public Administration—from 1996 to 2015. They chose to analyze 20 years given that this is a substantial time frame that is sufficient to identify potential trends in Public Administration research. Furthermore, there was also a more pragmatic reason, as the Scopus database only allows word searching within the body text and references from 1996 and onward. Furthermore, even for some years after 1996, the Scopus database seems incomplete, and therefore the total number of articles reported here may not completely reflect the total number of articles published in each journal. However, the data are suitable to provide an overview of the development in Psychology informed Public Administration research over time. A total of 1,807 articles were published in PAR. Among these articles, identified 216 articles containing the word "psychology" in either the title, abstract, body text, or references. This amounts to about 12 percent of all articles. Based on their reading of the articles, they identified which ones made substantial use of psychology (e.g., by using various psychological theories). The coding identified 63 psychology-informed articles, which amounts to 3.5 percent of the full body of articles in the 20-year period. The mean share of articles for the last six years has more than quadrupled compared with the mean in the period from 1996 to 2009 ($p < .01$). The manual coding also included the area of research in Public Administration. They categorized the articles based on the Public Administration categories developed by Groeneveld et al. (2015). Most of the articles focused on the broad category of public management, for instance, articles on public service motivation and leadership. A smaller share analysed topics related to policy and politics or looked at networks.

10.5 Two-Way Street between Psychology and Public Administration

They argued that Public Administration scholars could benefit from integrating Psychology informed theories into their projects. What does this imply for research practice? First of all, it implies an open attitude toward theories and methods that are not initially developed for studying research questions that arise in an administrative setting. Specifically, this entails that a research project in behavioural public administration not only draws on the best available knowledge within Public administration, but also from state-of-the-art knowledge from psychology. By studying concepts derived from Psychology in Public Administration settings, behavioural public administration will also be better positioned to provide constructive and critical contributions to Psychology. Yet "it takes two to tango," and therefore behavioural public administration should be a two-way street for scientific discovery. Theories in Psychology are often backed by experiments conducted with a student sample in a highly controlled environment such as the laboratory. A political administrative setting provides a real-life laboratory to study human judgment and decision making in which the ecological validity of practical implications of psychological theories can be tested. Certain concepts from Public Administration, such as public service motivation and red tape, can further inform thinking in Psychology. Public Administration can actively contribute to Psychology by highlighting the interplay between psychological processes among citizens and political actors. For instance, psychologists have identified a "left-most digit bias" in humans' processing of numbers, which posits that humans are overly influenced by the digits they first encounter when relying on a multidigit number. Public Administration research has also shown that politicians can actively draw on citizens' left-most digit bias in order to provide a more favourable view of performance to the public. That is, Public Administration provides psychology with novel ways of linking micro-level processes to macro-level variation in how politicians, managers, or organizations behave.

10.6 Conclusion

One of the reasons why Whitehead's approach to moral psychology is so appropriate for Public Administration (and other professions, as well) is that it recognizes that the concern of morality is all of reality, not just humanity; that is, human beings have moral relations with all in the environment and not merely among themselves. The authentic moral psyche is morally related to the environment, as well as to other individuals in the community. Formalists and utilitarians have only problematically

attempted to bring moral obligations to non-human life under the rubric of their systems. Even in John Rawls' theory of justice, for example, there is no indication that plants and animals hold any higher status than merely serving the interests of human beings. Do all moral relations with nature reduce to human utility? According to Tribe's argument, this approach is a distortion from a more fundamental feeling of empathy and obligation toward non-human life around us. If he is right, there is more to be served by public servants than the "public interest" - more than a process philosophy might capture.

10.7 Summary

- We have learned how Public Administration is influenced by Psychology as much as other social science disciplines.
- Psychology plays an important role on the Administrators' mindset regarding the decision-making as well as implementation of various administrative, management and developmental programmes.

10.8 Glossary

Psychology- The scientific study of the human mind and its function, especially those affecting behaviour in given context.

Behaviourism- Also known as behavioural psychology, is a theory of learning which states all behaviours are learned through interaction with the environment through a process called conditioning. Thus, behaviour is simply a response to environmental stimuli.

10.9 Model Questions

Long Questions

- Examine the impact of behavioural Psychology on Functional aspect of Public Administration.
- Examine the relationship between Psychology and Public Administration.
- “Behavioural Public Administration should be a two-way street for scientific discovery”. Do you agree with the statement? Justify your answer.
- Analyse Simon's Contribution to the study of Administrative behaviour.

Short Questions

- Write a note on the behavioural approach to Public Administration.
- Examine the relationship between psychology and Public Administration.

10.10 References

- Evidence from an Online Experiment. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 24 (1): 137 - 57.
- Groeneveld, Sandra, Lars Tummers, Babette Bronkhorst, Tanachia Ashikali, and Sandra van Thiel. 2015. Quantitative Methods in Public Administration: Their Use and Development through Time. *International Public Management Journal* 18(1): 61 - 86
- Haverland, Marcus , and Dvora Yanow. 2012. A Hitchhiker' s Guide to the Public Administration Research Universe: Surviving Conversations on Methodologies and Methods. *Public Administration Review* 72(3): 401 - 8.
- Honey, John C. 1957. Research in Public Administration: A Further Note. *Public Administration Review* 17(4): 238 - 43.
- Christopher, Hood, and David Heald, eds. 2006. *Transparency: The Key to Better Government?* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hinrichs, James V., Janis L. Berie, and Molaan K. Mosel. 1982. Place Information in Multidigit Number Comparison. *Memory and Cognition* 10 (5): 487 - 95.
- Huddy, Leonie, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy. 2013. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, 2nd ed. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hvidman, Ulrik, and Simon C. Andersen. 2016. Perceptions of Public and Private Performance: Evidence from a Survey Experiment. *Public Administration Review* 76 (1): 111 - 20.
- James, Oliver. 2011. Performance Measures and Democracy: Information Effects on Citizens in Field and Laboratory Experiments. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 21 (3): 399 - 418.
- Janis, Irving L. 1972. *Victims of Groupthink: A Psychological Study of Foreign-Policy Decisions and Fiascos*. Boston : Houghton Mifflin.
- Jilke, Sebastian. 2015. *Essays on the Microfoundation of Competiton and Choice in Public Service Delivery*. PhD diss.: Erasmus University Rotterdam.

MODULE – III

Society, Politics and Administration

Unit-11 : Politics and Administration

Structure

- 11.1 Learning Objectives**
- 11.2 Introduction**
- 11.3 Understanding Politics**
- 11.4 Understanding Administration**
- 11.5 Politics and Administration**
- 11.6 Conclusion**
- 11.7 Summary**
- 11.8 Glossary**
- 11.9 Model Questions**
- 11.10 References**

11.1 Learning Objectives

- The learners will develop an understanding of what is politics and what is considered to be administration, its institutions and processes.
- The learners will be acquainted with the relationship between politics and administration.
- The learners will be capable to find a nuanced balance between the dichotomy as well as find a harmony between politics and administration.

11.2 Introduction

At the very beginning, before understanding the complex multi-dimensional relationship between politics and administration, we must develop a conception of what is politics and what administration is all about. So, this module begins with the question what is politics and the answer is not a simple one. Politics encompasses a number of concepts, issues, institutions and processes, thus to understand what is politics also requires the coverage of a broader spectrum of issues. Logically, this module would next address the conception of administration, particularly from the

point of view of management of government and public institutions and the administrative processes. Although administration encompasses all organizations, both public and private, including religious, political and other undertakings, for our purpose we shall consider administration from the perspective of carrying out or executing or implementing policy decisions, or to coordinate activity in order to accomplish some common purpose or simply to achieve cooperation in the pursuit of a shared goal, particularly from the point of view of the state. Finally, after developing ideas about politics and administration individually, we will examine the relationship between the two and address the issues of politics-administration dichotomy, harmony and symbiotic interrelations between them, and understand their present nature of complex correlations.

11.3 Understanding Politics

The term 'Politics' emerges from the Greek word 'Polis' which meant 'city states'. Thus, politics was essentially concerned with the affairs of the states. However, in the modern day, we know that 'Politics' has a much broader application from the realm of public affairs and matters of states and governments to the individuals' private life and may even be applied in their day to day personal affairs.

There is no single answer to 'what is politics', because politics is a loaded term. Understanding politics requires the grasping of its conceptions along a spectrum from narrower to broader conceptions of what constitutes politics. It includes

- politics as that which concerns the state
- politics as a (non-violent) method of conflict resolution
- politics as an arena for conflict
- politics as the exercise of power
- politics as a social activity
- politics as a public activity
- politics as dependent on context and interpretation
- politics as struggle over the meaning of political concepts.

The definition of politics varies from time to time and from place to place. For instance, in the nineteenth century the arena of business and commercial affairs was not considered the legitimate sphere of politics as it is today. According to Heywood,

‘Politics’ is defined in such different ways: as the exercise of power, exercise of authority, the making of collective decisions, the allocation of scarce resources, the practice of deception and manipulation, and so on. US political scientist David Easton (1979), defined politics as the 'authoritative allocation of values'. Thus, for Easton, politics encompasses the various processes through which government responds to pressures from the larger society, in particular by allocating benefits, rewards or penalties. 'Authoritative values' are therefore those that are widely accepted in society, and are considered binding by the mass of citizens. However, if we move to a broader understanding, politics expands beyond the realms of government into public affairs and public life. In Politics, Aristotle declared that 'man is by nature a political animal', by which he meant that it is only within a political community that human beings can live the 'good life'. From this viewpoint, then, politics is an ethical activity concerned with creating a 'just society'; it is what Aristotle called the 'master science'. On the other hand, politics can be broadly understood as the means to, and the manifestation and contestation of, power. It transgresses beyond any particular sphere (the government, the state or the 'public' realm). In this broader view politics is at play in all social activities and in every corner of human existence. As Adrian Leftwich proclaimed in *What is Politics? The Activity and Its Study* (2004), 'politics is at the heart of all collective social activity, formal and informal, public and private, in all human groups, institutions and societies'. Politics is thus, in essence, power: the ability to achieve a desired outcome, through whatever means. This notion was neatly summed up in the title of Harold Lasswell's book *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How?* (1936).

11.4 Understanding Administration

The term administration comes from the latin word 'administrationem' (nominative administratio) and noun of action from past-participle stem of `administrare' which means "to help, assist; manage, control, guide, superintend; rule, direct". From the latter half of the 17th century, it came to signify "management of public affairs" which broadly get translated into the executive powers of the government.

For Hamilton, The administration of government, in its largest sense, comprehends all the operations of the body politic, whether legislative, executive, or judiciary; but in its most usual, and perhaps in its most precise, signification, it is limited to executive details, and falls peculiarly within the province of the executive department.

For the learners of public administration, the word administration would be appropriately connected to the sphere of government activity or public affairs, however one must keep in mind that the degree and extent of jurisdiction of various administrative institutions and authorities varies with location, time and space. For example, the executive powers of a government, as exercised through its administrative branch, is far greater in case of states which are either autocratic or dictatorial in nature, or maintain a façade of democracy like in the case of North Korea or China. On the other hand, nations like the United States, United Kingdom, India and many others where prevalent democratic ethos and values, dominate the society and such regimes are in control of the government, the outreach of the administration is limited and is reasonably restricted by law. Let us look at a few different understandings of 'Administration' -

- According to Simon, "Administration can be defined as the activities of groups cooperating to accomplish common goals" (Simon, Smithburg, Thompson, 1950).
- In another definition, administration is defined as "an activity or process mainly concerned with the means for carrying out prescribed ends." (Pfiffner and Presthus, 1967).
- According to Waldo "administration is a type of cooperative human effort that has a high degree of rationality." (Waldo, 1955).

Sometimes, the term "administration" is used in the meaning of "organization" or the "management" of an organization. These are actually the institutions that carry on the task and processes of administration. So let us try and understand what an organization is perceived to be-

- For Scott, Organizations may be defined as "collectivities that have been established for the pursuit of relatively specific objectives on a more or less continuous basis." (Scott, 1964)
- According to Pfiffner and Presthus "organization is the structuring of individuals and functions into productive relationship" (Pfiffner and Presthus, 1967)

The terms "administration" and "management", are generally used synonymously, and meaning the same thing. But the term "management" is generally identified with private sector organizations and used with reference to such organizations. The term, "administration" on the other hand, is used with reference to public organizations.

Such a usage should not give one the impression that managing a private organization is completely different from administering a public organization. Public or private organizations are social units established for accomplishing pre-determined objectives, and in accomplishing their objectives, they both employ the very same techniques and processes. In this sense, administration is a universal phenomenon. But this does not necessarily mean that there are no differences between public and private organizations with regard to their administration. So, to sum up if we consider administration to be an 'activity or process mainly concerned with the means for carrying out prescribed ends' as stated earlier, we can identify organizations to be those institutions and agencies and domains where the activities and processes of administration takes place in order to meet the desired ends.

11.5 Politics and Administration

Woodrow Wilson outlined what later happened to be called the politics-administration dichotomy, a theoretical model that emphasizes distinct features of public administration vis-a-vis politics. In Wilson's words, public administration "lies outside the proper sphere of politics". The politics-administration dichotomy rests on a functional-structural view of government, dividing governmental authority between elected and administrative officials along functional lines. As such, Demir points out that the government is conceptualized as though it has two discrete domains as politics and administration, with each one occupied separately by elected and administrative officials.

To better understand the relationship between politics and administration, we can discuss their correlation from various perspectives:

Separation of Politics and Administration- This school of thought treats public administration as a world in its own with values, rules, and methods divorced from those of politics. As understood by the separation school proponents, primary values that guide public administration include neutrality, hierarchy, and expertise, which altogether refer to a defining feature of public administration: neutral competence. The overarching goal of public administrators is to provide neutral and competent policy advice to elected officials. In Kaufman's (1956) words, neutral competence is "the ability to do the work of government expertly, and to do it according to explicit, objective standards rather than to personal or party or other obligations and loyalties".

Three constitutive components of neutral competence, neutrality, expertise, and hierarchy, help public administrators maintain distance from politics while ensuring their contributions to policymaking process.

The proponents of the separation school express support for a clear structural division of authority between elected and administrative officials to eliminate or minimize undue political influences on public administration as well as potential conflicts. For example, Svara emphasizes the strength of a structural division (best exemplified in council-manager form of 3 government), "in council-manager cities, friction is reduced when responsibilities are divided in a way that limits interference by one set of officials in the activities of others. In such a system of divided authority, Montjoy and Watson (1995) state, "neither individual members nor the whole council bypass the manager in giving directions to the staff".

Hierarchical nature of the administrative organization helps minimize undue political influences over public administrators, while policymaking prerogative of elected officials proves to be highly effective in resolving conflicts on disputable policy issues (e.g., Abney and Lauth 1982; Koehler 1973; Svara 1990; Miller 2000). Political influences on public administrators are considered to be leading to corruption, that is, making of administrative decisions on the basis of partisan political considerations. Martin posits that the leading assumption that inspires the proponents of this school is that "politics and administration work best as independent variables, capable of being improved in isolation without endangering or interfering with the other side". The school draws attention to the potential negative consequences of free interaction between politics and administration. Svara notes that "there are cases of cities controlled by an appointed manager who cannot be challenged because of longevity or community support." In his words, "the manager has become the master to whom the board defers out of respect and dependency".

On the other end of the spectrum, we have another school of thought which rejects the separation of politics from administration but emphasizes and supports a broad policy role for public administration. Tansu Demir calls them the scholars of the political school, those who acknowledge and second the role of politics in administration. The political school proponents consider public administration as an inseparable part of the political process. The political school takes administrative discretion as a point

of departure to rationalize the policy role of public administrators. Of many reasons, vague and ambiguous legislations, lack of technical knowledge and resources available to elected officials, and difficulties in monitoring and controlling bureaucratic behaviour are a few used to signify the critical role of public administrators in the policy process. Consequently, for political school proponents, there are strong grounds to view public administrators as policy makers (e.g., Lipsky, 1980). Some public administration scholars, representing the political school, rest their arguments on pragmatic grounds. In their view, political power in the U.S. governmental structure is widely diffused, and this fact makes it essential for public administrators to engage in politics, and build and maintain coalitions (e.g., Long, 1954). Abney and Lauth, among others, even argue in favour of interest group-public administration interaction on the belief that interest groups complement the electoral process, which has certain deficiencies.

Finally, we must consider another school of thought that proposes a limited yet meaningful interaction and positive relationship between politics and administration. This school's viewpoint is best reflected in the opinion of Van Riper who believed- As we all should know by now, politics and administration are inextricably intermixed. Both are central to effective action. One problem is to bring them together in a symbiotic association yet keep each in its proper place. The other is to understand that the "proper place" of each will vary through time. There is no permanent solution, no fixed paradigm, to this or any other ends means continuum. The interaction school allows a broader policy role for public administrators for mostly pragmatic reasons. Our attention, by this school, is drawn to the increasing complexity and dynamism in the political, social, and economic environment of policymaking, a fact that makes intense interaction between elected and administrative officials an essential requirement for success. In the ideal world of political-administrative world, as envisioned by the interaction school, public administrators maintain a productive partnership with elected officials, partnering with, informing and helping them in the policy process, yet remain accountable and responsive to their elected officials. Cognizant of the risk that intense interaction between elected and administrative officials may fuel negative dynamics that might eventually lead to political corruption or administrative tyranny, the interaction school finds the assurance in the interaction process itself, that is, in the interplay of different roles creating a restraining effect of reciprocating values. As such, in the end,

one should expect both administrative competence and political responsiveness to reach their fullest potential.

11.6 Conclusion

We have so far seen the broad spectrum of politics and various perspectives of what it entails, ranging from the broader realm of state and power to the narrower individual, personal level and we focused more on the 'public' nature and domain of politics. Likewise, we have seen that administration too is a complex process which often goes hand in hand with management and governance of organizations, and the focus of this module has been on public administration and public organizations. Finally, we have dealt with three schools of thought related to the relationship between politics and administration, and perhaps finding that a healthy, positive, progressive interplay between them, is necessary for the proper development of the system and delivery of welfare services.

11.7 Summary

- In this unit, we understood that politics requires the grasping of its conceptions along a spectrum from narrower to broader conceptions of what constitutes politics.
- Along with the conceptions of politics, we also understood the various notions of "administration" and the meaning of "organization" or the "management" of an organization.
- We analysed the relationship between politics and administration and examined how politics-administration dichotomy and politics-administration support for a broad policy role, both play an important role.
- Finally, we considered a meaningful interaction and positive relationship between politics and administration.

11.8 Glossary

- Management — is the administration of organisations, whether business, nonprofit organizations or a government bodies.
- Politics–Administration Dichotomy — is a theory that separates politics and public administration.

11.9 Model Questions

Long Questions

- What do you mean by administration? How is Organizational Management and Administration related to each other?
- How do you view the relationship between politics and administration? Should the two domains be separated or mixed together? Give reasons for your answer.

Short Questions

- What is your understanding of politics ?
- Administration can be defined as the activities of groups cooperating to accomplish common goals” — Who said this ?

11.10 References

- Demir, T. Politics and Administration Three Schools, Three Approaches, and Three Suggestions | Administrative Theory & Praxis Volume 31, 2009 - Issue 4. Published online: 07 Dec 2014.
- Demir, T. & Nyhan, R. C. (forthcoming). The politics-administration dichotomy: An empirical search for correspondence between theory and practice. Public Administration Review.
- Denhardt, R. B. & Denhardt J.V. (2000). The new public service: Serving rather than steering. Public Administration Review. 60 (6): 549-559.
- Hoffman, M. C. (2002). Paradigm lost: Public administration at Johns Hopkins University, 1884-96. Public Administration Review, 62 (1), 12-23.
- Karl, B. D. (1976). Public administration and American history: A century of professionalism. Public Administration Review, 36 (5), 489-503.
- Kaufman, H. (1956). Emerging conflicts in the doctrines of public administration. American Political Science Review, 50, 1057-1073.
- Moore, M. H. (1995). Creating public value: Strategic management in government. Harvard University Press

- Pfiffner, J. P. (1985). Political public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 45 (2), 352- 356.
- Svara, J. H. (1998). The politics-administration dichotomy model as aberration. *Public Administration Review*, 58 (1), 51-58.
- Svara, J. H. (1999). Complementarity of politics and administration as a legitimate alternative to the dichotomy model. *Administration & Society*, 30(6), 676-705.
- Svara, J. H. (2001). The myth of the dichotomy: Complementarity of politics and administration in the past and future of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 61 (2), 176-183.

Unit-12 : Politicians and Bureaucrats

Structure

- 12.1 Learning Objectives**
- 12.2 Introduction**
- 12.3 Who are politicians?**
- 12.4 Who are bureaucrats?**
- 12.5 Relation between the Politicians and the Bureaucrats**
- 12.6 Conclusion**
- 12.7 Summary**
- 12.8 Glossary**
- 12.9 Model Questions**
- 12.10 References**

12.1 Learning Objectives

- The learners will understand the type of relationship and professional connection and obligations that bureaucrats share with politicians.
- The learners will develop a better understanding of the responsibilities of the bureaucracy towards the political masters and the public.

12.2 Introduction

In any democratic nation, political parties and politicians play a vital role in the articulation of interests of the people, competing in the electoral process and fulfilling the demands of the people when they form the government. However the fulfilment of demands require extensive planning, careful implementation, monitoring and evaluation of various programmes, and requires technical and practical expertise which the politicians may not have. To help them in their efforts, the bureaucrats and the bureaucracy provide the essential backbone needed to manifest into reality the broad vision of the parties and politicians. However, this does not necessarily mean that bureaucrats are subservient to politicians in all circumstances. Ideally, they work hand in hand with the politicians who win elections, to help realize the demands of the

people. Politicians who do not form the government, also play a valuable role of maintaining vigil and balance in democracy. In this unit we will familiarize ourselves with the role of politicians, the role of bureaucrats and examine the essential relationship between the two.

12.3 Who are the politicians?

A politician is someone who may be involved in the governance of a country, or at the least, the politics of the nation. He or she is a member of a political party. In democracies, politicians are mostly elected or those who contest elections with the hope of coming to occupy state power. Their role as elected representatives makes them very important, since they provide a 'reality check' on policy and decision-making. Political leadership within government department represents the crucial element of democracy, which separates government departments from the mere function of administration. The role of ministers, as politicians, is therefore a critical and necessary element of governance. Politicians can bring a range of skills and attributes to public policy, including decisiveness, ideological cohesiveness, political understanding, leadership, partnership, communication, the ability to balance interests, accountability, legitimacy and insights from their experience as representatives.

First and foremost, politicians are meant to be the guardians of democracy. In practice, though, being responsible for everything is not an easy task. Various constitutional provisions or the lack thereof, may restrict the accountability of legislators and politicians.

Secondly, politicians are expected to apply their knowledge and political ideology to policy making. However, the bureaucrats do enjoy a near monopoly on policy advice, and ministerial engagement is generally confined to being presented with blue-print of plans at the last minute.

Thirdly, politicians are expected to use their vast experience and knowledge gained as constituency MPs to inform on public policy decisions. However, when taking office, their experiences may be restricted; their diaries may be filled by bureaucratic advice and engagement, and they may lack the time and resources to drive transformation in society.

Politicians bring a wide range of abilities, experience, and personality traits to solve a problem. Some of the characteristics that set politicians apart from other authorities

have little to do with their skills and abilities, but rather with the unique nature of their position.

Decision making ability or being decisive, is another crucial characteristic of politicians. The ability to bring insights from their political philosophy, a sense for what is politically necessary, practical, and acceptable, providing leadership, forming partnerships, political communication, the ability to balance interests, accountability legitimacy and insights from their role as an MP, such as case work and constituency encounters, all make them invaluable within the polity. It is unrealistic to expect a single minister to be proficient in all of these areas. However, because the successful delivery of public policy and services is dependent in part on the exercise of these skills, it is critical to consider not only how to improve politicians' skills, but also how to ensure that both the pool from which ministers are drawn and the methods of recruiting and promoting ministers meet this need.

Politicians who are not affiliated with the government also have a huge impact. They make up the opposition to the prevailing government and act as a political counterweight to it. The opposition's major role is to question the present administration and hold it accountable to the public. This also helps to correct the flaws of the ruling party. The political leaders of the opposition bear equal responsibility for safeguarding the best interests of the country's population. In the West, the concept of resistance is rarely questioned. It is supposed to facilitate representation and channel a variety of needs in favourable directions. The opposition plays a crucial role in representing individuals who have been marginalised by the ruling party. One of the hallmarks of democratic administration is that, while it serves all interests simultaneously, it does not favour one group over another for lengthy periods of time. A politician in the opposition aims to represent interests as the basis for the survival of the ideals to which they adhere, rather than opposing government on moral grounds. It can do so by advocating the rights of those who have been deprived and offering the government alternative policies. The opposition provides information about public opinion on a topic that would otherwise be unavailable to the administration. In many such ways, politicians of the opposition too plays an effective role on the adoption of official policies.

12.4 Who are the bureaucrats ?

A bureaucracy is a system for administering huge groups of individuals who must collaborate. Bureaucracies are essential to the functioning of both public and private

sector organisations, including colleges and governments. The term "bureaucracy" literally means "ruling by desks or offices," a meaning that emphasises bureaucrat's typically impersonal nature. Despite the fact bureaucrats can appear inefficient or wasteful at times, they help to ensure that thousands of people work together in a harmonious manner by outlining everyone's tasks within a hierarchy.

Government officials are responsible for a wide range of responsibilities. Bureaucrats aren't just paper pushers; they also battle fires, teach, and keep track of how federal politicians gather money, among other things. A bureaucrat's job is to put government policy into action, to put laws and decisions made by elected authorities into action.

Bureaucracy and its advantages

- Power division: Facilitates decentralised work and encourages functional specialisation.
- Productivity: Competence is developed, and work is carried out efficiently under the direction of direct supervisors in the hierarchy.
- Accountability and compliance: Ordinary citizens have the ability to hold government officials and bureaucrats accountable for their actions while performing their duties. Various instruments like RTI, institutions like Lokpal, have empowered the citizens to keep a vigil.
- Decision-making authority: Bureaucrats are typically delegated decision-making authority by their immediate superiors, while senior management officials are delegated decision-making authority by those higher up in the hierarchy.
- Rules and regulations: A collection of clearly defined rules and regulations makes adherence to them an obligation within the bureaucratic system, restricting the scope of noncompliance with the framework of rules and protocols.
- Ease of management: Makes administration easier by logically organising the organisation in a hierarchical structure. Because of the organization's size, maintaining control of management, making required changes as needed, and adopting new regulations as needed is made easier under a bureaucratic structure.

Lacunae or disadvantages of Bureaucracy

- Red tape: Bureaucracy, by definition, is governed by a set of rules and regulations. This leads to a lack of flexibility and, more often than not, inefficiency.

- Bureaucratic delays: The complex set of regulations that govern a bureaucratic system frequently results in lengthy delays.
- Corruption at the highest levels of government: Corruption at the highest levels of government can be tremendously damaging to the economy and society.
- Goals shift: Working in a bureaucratic system may be inefficient with the changing of targets, and maintaining rules and regulations frequently takes precedence over the end result.
- Documentation: Even for seemingly simple procedures, a significant amount of documentation may be required.
- Segmentation: Because jobs are divided into specific groups, collaboration and completion of work in other categories are restricted.
- Nepotism: Nepotism is a problem in many bureaucracies. Top executives may favour their own and help them advance more quickly than more deserving individuals.
- Decision-making: Decisions are made according to a set of rules and regulations in the bureaucracy. This rigidity frequently leads to the adoption of pre-programmed decisions rather than the exploration of other options and practical out of the box solutions.

12.5 Relation between the Politicians and Bureaucrats

The relationship between politicians and bureaucrats is crucial because they jointly make up the government's executive branch and also work for public good. The administration does not run well if there are issues in the relationship between the two. We take a deeper look at the connection between politicians and permanent officials ie. bureaucrats via three lenses: relationship during policy formulation, relationship during policy implementation, and overview of their relationship problems.

Previously, it was thought that policy was formulated by politicians, and that there was no separation of functions. Reportedly, projects are sanctioned faster in constituencies with strong party ties, this suggests that bureaucrats perform better in areas where politicians have a larger chance of winning. These findings are consistent with the dynamic contracts mechanism when combined with the results of the natural

experiment: legislators in low-competition constituencies have longer tenures and have access to dynamic contracts that provide stronger incentives to bureaucrats. As a result, bureaucratic performance improves. However, if the chances of winning become nil, the promise of future benefits becomes untrustworthy, and officials take longer to approve projects. This is true in case of most countries: politicians and bureaucrats work together on policy formulation and implementation. It has been well established that the bureaucracy plays a crucial role in policy formulation, particularly in developing countries.

Public policy emerges from interactions between individuals and groups, on the one hand, and politicians and bureaucrats, on the other. All of these actors try to influence each other and communicate for the achievement of their aims, during their interaction. Politicians maintain regular contact with the public, and citizens attempt to voice their specific interests through interest groups. Still, the truth remains that political parties and politicians play a crucial role in organising the people and giving voice to their demands and frustrations. As a result, sometimes politicians are perceived as being aligned with specific groups and interests. However, the bureaucracy is often regarded as neutral, although it too works for public interest, it does not have the incentive to work for particular interests groups at the cost of others.

Sometimes interest groups and municipal and panchayati raj institutions may be weak, in such cases the bureaucracy acts as the primary conduit for relaying the public's perceived requirements to the government. As a result, while both politicians and civil officials serve as links in the communication line between the public and the government, bureaucrats frequently regard politicians as their masters, due to their positions in various ministries. Politicians, on the other hand, have a tendency to feel that bureaucrats are unresponsive and indifferent to the people's issues and requirements and therefore they tend to give orders to the bureaucrats for effective implementation of policies.

The cultural and status gaps between the senior bureaucracy and the general public exacerbate this view. At the same time, political and bureaucratic communication channels do cross paths at various locations. As a result, despite their rather disparate duties and perspectives, politicians and bureaucrats must work together at all levels of the government and even at a broader societal arena.

Politicians and bureaucrats are both reservoirs of many forms of data and have a plethora of experience, and both are required in the creation of policy and such formulations. Civil officials typically have more experience and maintain their mastery of organisational memory in the form of files and other records. As a result, they can provide useful feedback on the outcomes of previous initiatives as well as ongoing programmes.

Based on these findings, policy can be developed: changes can be made to avoid previous errors or difficulties. Politicians, on the other hand, are more likely to accurately judge public sentiment; in particular, they are expected to know what the real demands are, and what the public would not tolerate. Following the assessment of the ruling politicians, bureaucrats can proceed to give policy suggestions concrete form in the form of new programmes or budget proposals. If politicians' assessments are incorrect, voters may punish them in the next election.

The successful functioning of local self-government authorities such as municipalities and Panchayati Raj bodies required cooperation between politicians and public officials. However, in developing nations like India, these committees are often so weak that makes them rely on civil workers who work for the state government. As a result, local politicians may have limited authority over the permanent bureaucrats who serve local governments. When various parties are in power at the state and local levels, state officials tend to use the bureaucracy in the field to further the party's political agenda.

However, it is beyond doubt that, the bureaucracy is primarily responsible for providing legal form to a policy. The various ministries prepare a draft of the law when the cabinet approves a policy. The idea is next assessed by bureaucrats and the ministers who made the proposal. While cooperation between politicians and government workers is essential, it is also critical to recognise the value of those who design the legislation. The legal terminology of the bill determines the specifications of the policy as it is implemented.

While politicians play a prominent role in policy making, the bureaucracy plays a larger role in execution and implementation of the same. Bureaucrats work at all levels, but politicians only head departments as ministers. Top-level bureaucrats advise ministers and administer ministries, middle-level bureaucrats supervise field officials and keep the top informed of developments of various programmes, and field officials such as cops, tax collectors, and factory inspectors implement the law at the grassroots. It

would be a mistake, however, to believe that politicians play no influence in implementation. The minister is the department's political leader, and he is responsible for the department's policies as well as their implementation. If something goes wrong, he is questioned before the legislature about the intricacies of implementation.

12.6 Conclusion

We can understand that politicians and bureaucrats both play a significant role in the determination, implementation, and performance of public policies. The politicians who are elected to the government must work hand in hand with the bureaucracy to effectively implement their vision and serve the demands of the public. On the other hand, the politicians who do not get elected, also serve as a check and balance by creating pressure on the government and bureaucracy to perform and serve the needs of the public. Thus, both politicians and bureaucrats serve the needs of the nation and need to work transparently with each other for the progress and success of various programmes and meeting the demands of the populace and the interests of the nation.

12.7 Summary

- In this unit, we understood who are the politicians, their role and functions,
- Along with the conceptions of politics, we also understood the role of the bureaucrats and the "administration".
- We understood some of the key advantages and disadvantages of the bureaucracy.
- We analysed the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats and examined how a mutual cooperative position is needed between the two, for a broad success in policy implementation and meeting needs of public.

12.8 Glossary / keywords

- Policy Formulation – the pro-active process of identifying problems, exploring potential solutions and making a set of policy alternatives ultimately leading to a final policy decision.
- Policy Implementation – the process of putting a policy into action for application in the real world.

12.9 Model Question

Long Questions

- Examine the role of the politicians in administrative context.
- What is the role of the bureaucrats? Explain
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of the bureaucracy? Discuss

Short Questions

- What is the relationship between the politicians and the bureaucrats? Discuss
- Can the aims of governance and needs of the public be met by either politicians or bureaucrats alone? Argue your case.

12.10 References

- Abney, G. & Lauth, T. P. (1985). Interest group influence in city policy-making: The views of administrators. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 38 (1), 148-161.
- Montjoy, R. S. & Watson, D. J. (1995). A case for reinterpreted dichotomy of politics and administration as a professional standard in council-manager government. *Public Administration Review*, 55 (3), 231-239.
- Svara, J. H. (2006). Introduction: Politicians and administrators in the political process - A review of themes and issues in the literature. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 29, 953-976.
- Van Riper, P. (1983). The American administrative state: Wilson and the founders- An unorthodox view. *Public Administration Review*, 44 (6), 477-490.
- Waldo, D. (1980). *The enterprise of public administration: A summary view*. Novato, CA: Chandler & Sharp Publishers.
- Watson, R. P. (1997). Politics and public administration: A political profile of local bureaucrats in Alabama. *Administration & Society*, 29 (2), 189-200.

Unit-13 : Ministers and Civil Servants– Relations : Case Studies

Structure

- 13.1 Learning Objectives**
- 13.2 Introduction**
- 13.3 Ministers and Civil servants**
- 13.4 Relationship between ministers and civil servants : Some cases**
- 13.5 Conclusion**
- 13.6 Summary**
- 13.7 Glossary**
- 13.8 Model Questions**
- 13.9 References**

13.1 Learning Objectives

After reading this unit, learners will be able to

- Analyse the relations between the political and administrative wings of government.
- Identify the causes of stress and sources of confrontation between them.
- Understand what role does politicians and civil servants collectively take up for smooth functioning of administration with reflection to the present scenario.

13.2 Introduction

In developing countries, we still live in a welfare state system. States are not keepers of the law and order. States nowadays not only protect and restrain but also promote and foster. Even in Western developed nations a policy battle has started since 2008, for which the function of ministers working for the states has grown critical. Ministers may or may not be the epitome of knowledge and competence. Anyone over the age of twenty five can be elected to Parliament and if luck favours then a minister afterwards. A person who is socially visible and skilled at canvassing or manoeuvring can sweep the polls. Administration necessitates knowledge that a minister may lack. As a result, he relies on his secretaries, who have undergone rigorous training after their recruitment and experienced the inside out of department. Secretaries and other high-ranking officials in

the department provide the ministers with sound advice. In fact, they set the policy, and the minister usually signs on the dotted line. Though the secretaries chalk out the details, he sets the broad strokes of policy. Political execution also takes tact, courage and talent, all of which the civil service possesses in spades. If they find a proposal unsustainable, they can point out shortcomings to the minister without hesitation and offer policy changes. The political and permanent executive pillars underpin the government's operation. The seamless operation of this system is dependent on both of them having a cordial working connection. In recent years, the administrative and political climate have altered, causing problems in the interaction between the two groups.

Issues are likely to arise as a result of their diverse functions. Politicians represent the people and watch out for their interests; permanent officials, on the other hand, provide expertise and experience. As a result, their recruitment techniques are different: politicians are elected, whereas bureaucrats are appointed. This helps to explain their differences in social background. While the majority of officials in emerging countries like India come from the paid or professional urban middle class, many politicians originate from the rural, agrarian class. Differences in their perceptions are caused by a variety of factors, including their roles and social backgrounds. As a result, it can be challenging to work with others at times.

Let us begin by looking at the connection between the political executive and civil officials, and lastly assess their relationship in the context of public administration.

13.3 Ministers and Civil Servants

In a parliamentary style of government, such as India's, there are two sorts of relationships that must be maintained in order for the government to work smoothly and efficiently. The ministers and the civil servants the two pillars of the parliamentary form of government, and any weakness in either of them will have a negative impact on the government's performance. In theory, political and permanent executives have different roles in government, but in fact, their responsibilities often overlap, making it difficult to distinguish between them.

As a result, while both politicians and civil officials serve as links in the communication chain between the public and the government, civil servants frequently regard politicians as little more than rabble rousers. Politicians, on the other hand, have

a tendency to assume that bureaucrats are unresponsive and insensitive to the public issues and demands. The cultural and status gaps between the upper bureaucracy and the general public exacerbate this view.

At the same time, political and bureaucratic communication channels must cross paths at various locations. As a result, despite their rather disparate duties and perspectives, politicians and civil workers must work together at all levels.

Politicians and civil officials must also work together on the ground. A Deputy Commissioner and a Member of Parliament, for example, are both concerned with the many policies relating to the development of a specific area. Despite the fact that district planning has yet to become a reality, district politicians and civil workers do make ideas that are considered by higher-level authorities. Politicians and government servants working together yield better results.

The successful functioning of local self-government authorities such as municipalities and Panchayati Raj bodies requires cooperation between politicians and public officials. However, in developing nations like India, these committees are frequently so weak that they must rely on civil workers who work for the state government. As a result, local politicians frequently have limited authority over the permanent bureaucrats who serve local governments. When various parties are in power at the state and local levels, state officials tend to use the bureaucracy in the field to further their own party's goals. The ultimate solution to such issues is the strengthening of local governance. This is a key part of the political growth that is required.

Politicians and civil servants are both reservoirs of many forms of data, and both are required in the creation of policy. Civil servants typically have more experience, and they also maintain track of their organizational memory in the form of files and other records. As a result, they can provide useful feedback on the outcomes of previous initiatives as well as ongoing programmes.

Now, based on these findings, policy can be developed: changes can be made to avoid previous errors or difficulties. Politicians, on the other hand, are more likely to accurately judge public sentiment; in particular, they are expected to know what the public would not tolerate. As a result, providing more or better social services, such as education and health care, would require money that would have to come from the people in the form of taxes. Following the assessment of the ruling politicians, civil employees can proceed to give policy suggestions in concrete form i.e., in the form of

new programmes or budget proposals. It is critical to recognize that the majority of the issues that arise in developing countries such as India are mostly due to underdevelopment. The several characteristics of underdevelopment are linked.

Underdevelopment in the economic, social, political, and administrative realms all impact and are interlinked as cause and consequence. As a result, the solution to administrative difficulties can rarely be treated in isolation.

13.4 Relationship between ministers and civil servants : Some cases

In practice, there is a lot of distrust, tension, unease, and unfaithfulness in the relationship between the minister and the civil servant. For a developing country like India, it is even more critical that all parties work together in harmony, with complete respect for one another, in order to reach a common goal. Interference by ministers and other politicians in administrative tasks on behalf of their party members, friends and relatives is a major source of low morale in the civil service. The civil worker's approach to lawmakers and political bosses for postings, transfers and promotion complicates the relationship between ministers and civil servants. Although the occurrence is not very common it does exist. However, it is at best a half-truth, as it simply presents one side of the story- that of the politician. In reality, it takes two to make a deal, and in some circumstances, the legislator contacts the other party first, while in other cases, the civil servant approaches first. However, it is often assumed that the legislator approaches the official for some favour, both being aware of the former's political clout. When a government official helps him, it's normal for him to expect something in return.

While politicians play a prominent role in policy making, the bureaucracy plays a larger role in execution. Civil employees work at all levels, but politicians only head departments as ministers. Top-level bureaucrats advise ministers, middle-level bureaucrats supervise field officials and keep the top informed of developments and field officials such as cops, tax collectors and factory inspectors implement the law. It would be a mistake, however to believe that politicians do not influence implementation. The minister is the department's political leader and he is responsible for the department's policies as well as implementation. The minister's job is to make sure that civil officials in their department follow the law and that no one, whether a client or a bureaucrat is treated unfairly. The minister must guarantee that policies are implemented legally,

effectively and efficiently. If the minister tries to impose his or her will on officials performing quasi-judicial functions, such as serving on a tribunal, if he/she withdraws assigned powers from officials in specific circumstances and if he or she acts in a partisan or selfish manner, the minister merits censure.

There are certain areas where politician and civil servants collectively carry out tasks of government such as—

i) **Rule implementation and making**— while the legislation grants the government the power to enact rules and regulations, this power is primarily exercised by civil servants. The rationale for this is because public officials have the specialized knowledge, experience and extensive information required to draught rules. The minister is unlikely to have either the specialized knowledge or the time to do this himself, he is preoccupied with his political responsibilities, such as dealing with delegations of the people, investigating complaints and so on.

ii) **Supervision and Evaluation**— In India's government, monitoring is often lax. The fundamental reason for this is because superior authorities have very little real influence over their subordinates in terms of rewarding or penalizing them. Promotion is primarily based on seniority, especially at lower levels and superiors cannot grant any other incentives. In terms of punishment, the process for instituting disciplinary action is lengthy, taking months, if not years before a final decision is reached. Another and perhaps more crucial cause for today's weak oversight is the protection that politicians frequently provide to government officials over the heads of their supervisors. Politicians frequently offer such assistance to civil officials in the hopes of gaining their support during election season.

Every programme should be assessed once it is completed to ensure that the objectives were met, that the job was completed efficiently and that no dishonesty occurred. Superior officials in the department are the ones who make the evaluations first and foremost. If the minister takes interest in the review, makes time to see the reports and requires an explanation for non-performance the evaluation will be more effective. The Planning Commission, for example, was an overhead (or staff) agency that used to evaluate policies and programmes. As a result, the Planning Commission was to review previous policies in the document containing the new plan at the start of each plan period. The Planning Commission was made up of politicians and specialists, with high-ranking bureaucrats assisting them. The Planning Commission has now been

replaced by Niti Aayog, a now State Resource Centre. Niti Aayog is now serving as the apex public policy think tank of the central government fostering the notion of cooperative federalism using a bottom-up approach to cater to demographic dividend and socio-economic requirements. This body is made up of political and non-political wings of government providing directional and policy inputs.

iii) **Administrative management**— The overall management of an organisation is referred to as the administrative management. The ministries or departments of finance, planning, personnel and administrative reform or reorganization (in the Union and state governments, respectively) are the primary agencies in India for this purpose. The Planning Commission as well as state planning boards and Public Service Commissions play a role in controlling the governmental organization as a whole. While line agencies such as the Ministries of Defense, Industry and Health are responsible for the management of programmes or projects that help the government achieve its substantive goals, administrative management is concerned with the organisation, financing, planning and staffing of ministries and departments in general. Effective administration management is required for effective policy and programme implementation. Administrative management is often overlooked because more essential concerns such as defence, employment and maintaining law and order are prioritized. Administrative management does not get the attention it deserves at the political level. As a result, many of the Administrative Reforms Commission's recommendations have yet to be implemented.

As we already discussed in spite of harmony that exists, there are distrust and areas of tension too. Take for example, the event that occurred in 1966, when Home Minister Gulzari Lal Nanda criticized the Home Secretary for non-cooperation and demanded that he be replaced by the then Prime Minister; however, the request was denied, and the Home Minister resigned from the cabinet. In 1971, a disagreement arose between Railway Minister K. Hanumanthaiya and Chairman of the Railway Board B.C. Ganguli over the railway's financial administration. The government terminated B.C. Ganguli's services in this case. Rajiv Gandhi, the then-Prime Minister, clashed with the Agriculture Department Secretary (C.S. Shastri), the Rural Development Secretary (D. Bandyopadhyay), and the Foreign Secretary in 1987. In 1993, there was also a disagreement between the Home Minister and the Home Secretary, which resulted in the latter's resignation. The following are the grounds for the relapse of this connection between ministers and public servants:

- a) **Interference complex-** Fred Riggs created the phrase 'interference complex' to describe politicians' complaints about 'bureaucratic intervention' and 'administrators' counter-complaints about 'political interference'. These politicians frequently allege that the bureaucracy sabotage progressive social change ideas and programmes. Civil servants on the other hand, frequently claim that legislators and ministers engage in patronage by interfering with the recruitment, selection, transfer, and advancement of government personnel in order to gain support during election season. Both of these complaints have some merit. The urban professional middle class ornaments the majority of the seats of our higher bureaucracy. As a result, the majority of the population which consist of farmers and labourers remains underrepresented on it. As a result, the bureaucracy's attitude may differ from the aspirations of the majority of the population. To some extent, the solution to this problem resides in the implementation of tests for assessing various intellectual physical and psychological aspects of the candidates' personalities at the time of initial selection. Strengthening interest groups and political parties can help to solve the problem of political patronage to some extent.
- b) **Bureaucratic power-** Authors like Riggs, Weidner and Heady observed that bureaucracies in underdeveloped countries tended to be more powerful than those in rich countries. The stronger the bureaucracy's influence, the more difficult it is for politicians to exert control over it. As a result, the civil and military bureaucracies in developing countries have a proclivity for dictatorship. The bureaucracy must be appropriately managed by elected representatives of the people in democratic administration.
- c) **Civil servants should be evaluated objectively** and this will only be possible if ministers have the will, as well as the talent and sense of direction, to steer the administrative horse in the right direction; only then will the system work smoothly, Members of the bureaucracy should be dedicated to human and constitutional principles as well as national goals, They're expected to be immuned from the influence of the political parties. However, in the recent past, there have been concerns that certain powerful politicians have demanded loyalty from the bureaucracy for their party and themselves. As a consequence of this, members of the bureaucracy hav complained that they were unable to freely express their opinions with the ruling politicians during the emergency. Some civil servants,

due to compromised accountability have failed to balance between the values of The Shah Commission in this regard noted that in some situations the administration and administrators ceased to be insulated from politics with fatal results. This is a reality in USA also, where public service is often a political creation.

- d) The power game in politics has increased in India since the 1980s, when the Era of Coalition Governments began. Money and criminals gained more clout in politics as a result. The 1993 Vohra Committee Report focused on the criminalization of politics. This committee has noticed that criminals got rich benefit from the ruling party's patronage because they helped them win elections. Ministers and civil servants also join forces to commit grand theft. Moreover, Ministers in a coalition government are preoccupied with maintaining their majority in the Lok Sabha. As a result, they offer their departments less attention. The legislative process is also unclear and full of varied viewpoints due to the involvement of a number of parties with opposing viewpoints. As a result, ambiguous language is frequently employed to keep the coalition together, and administrators must interpret the policy based on their own assumptions.

13.5 Conclusion

For effective and efficient administration, cooperation between politicians and bureaucrats is required. Both serve as conduits for information between the government and the general public. Civil employees receive crucial feedback while politicians gauge the public sentiment. Civil officials conduct a variety of technical reviews of proposed programmes. Politicians, primarily in the cabinet, and civil officials, through staff agencies, coordinate policies and programmes. Laws are mostly drafted by government workers, although they are passed by legislators.

Civil employees are in charge of implementation, while ministers have final say. Problems in their interaction can be resolved in the long run by increasing local self-government, interest groups, and political parties, or in other words, by developing these areas.

13.6 Summary

- So far we have understood that the relationship between ministers and civil servants is of mutual dependence. It has to work collectively to not only implement

policies but also evaluate and to monitor them. Administrative management is one key area which needs focus from both the parties.

- Though there are certain drawbacks in terms of interference, impartiality and power game in politics there is still scope for improvement in areas of governance.
- We also understood that none of the parties can act in isolation in matters pertaining to public because both the parties are at the service of public which needs proper guidance to meet the demands.

13.7 Glossary

- **Politician-** It refers to a person holding and elected office in government. Mostly involved in political affairs.
- **Civil servant-** It is a collective term that refers to sector of government that is mainly consisting of hired professionals based on merit.
- **Bureaucracy-** A system of government which has state officials to take decision instead of elected representatives.
- **Policy-making-** In simple terms it refers to creating laws or setting up standards to follow.

13.8 Model Questions

Long Questions

- What is the relationship between the politicians and the bureaucrats in the course of implementation of policies?
- Briefly discuss how politicians and civil servants collectively take up function, such as monitoring and evaluation. Does authority meddle with the fair process?
- What are the areas that need attention to bridge the gap between civil servants and public?
- Define administrative management. Which commissions can be classified it?
- How power game politics is reducing effectiveness of the relationship that politicians and civil servants share with each other.
- What are the problems of the relationship between politicians and bureaucrats?

Short Questions

- What role does the bureaucracy play in technical examination of a policy?
- How does a politician can interfere in the decisions taken by civil servants? Who, according to your opinion, play the pivotal role?
- Do you think in India civil servants are likepuppets in the hands of the politicians? Give reasons for your answer.

13.9 References

- Matheson, A. et.al (2007), ‘‘Study on the Political Involvement in Senior Staffing and on the Delineation of Responsibilities Between Ministers and civil servants’’, OECD Working papers on Public Governance. 2007/6 OECD. Publishing.
- Putnam, R. D. (1973). The political attitudes of senior civil servants in Western Europe: A preliminary report. *British Journal of Political Science*, 3(3), 257-290.
- Qian, L. (2013). What is Political Philosophy. *Journal of Jiangsu University (Social Science Edition)*, 6, 005
- Rose, R. (1981). *The political status of higher civil servants in Britain* (No. 92). University of Strathclyde, Centre for the Study of Public Policy.
- Rosenbloom, D. (2008). The politics-administration dichotomy in US historical context. *Public administration review*, 68(1), 57-60.
- Arora K. Satish, "Political Policy and the Future of Bureaucracy", in *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 18 (July-Sept. 1971). pp. 355-367.
- Gupta, V.P., 1983 ‘‘A Study of Conflict between Political Elite and Bureaucracy’’, in the *Indian Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 48, No. 1 January-March.
- Subramanian, V. April-June, 1971, "Role of Civil Service in the Indian Political System", in *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. VVII, No. 2, , p. 238.

Unit-14 : Bureaucracy and the Public

Structure

- 14.1 Learning Objectives**
- 14.2 Introduction**
- 14.3 Concept of Bureaucracy**
- 14.4 Notion of the Public**
- 14.5 Relation between the Bureaucracy and the Public**
- 14.6 Conclusion**
- 14.7 Summary**
- 14.8 Glossary**
- 14.9 Model Questions**
- 14.10 References**

14.1 Learning Objectives

- The learners will develop an understanding of the concept of bureaucracy and the notion of the public
- The learners will be able to find a nuanced constructive linkage between the functioning of the bureaucracy and meeting the needs of the public.
- This unit will also discuss bureaucracy in length and the responsibilities it is bestowed with.

14.2 Introduction

There has been an undergoing fundamental shift in relative powers of the institutions of government. In the wake of 'grey government' by bureaucrats where great days of legislature and executives seems to have passed, there has been a shift which various scholars and writers refer to as: technocracy, mandarin power, administrative state, bureaucratic government, managerial professional state, technocracy to name but a few. The common key idea is that there has been a dynamic change in domain of public and in bureaucracy which no longer adheres to traditional models of state and

party which has therefore called for need to formulate new policies congenial to modern state. Generally old models perish but few nor die nor fades away which is true in case of models of democratic government that associates significance to formal representative bodies in formulating policy which designate public bureaucrats to compliant roles as mere administrator. B. Guy Peters argues that European juridical tradition of public servant and American tradition of civil servant renounce active role of civil servant in policy-making. He further adds that this myth serves politician in justifying their role and to bureaucrats in averting responsibility for actions. Adequate conceptualization of this shift in power and institutional politics is yet to develop.

The rise of the bureaucratic organization in modern governments has paved the way for a cadre of government employees who work for the government full-time. The mere presence of such trained professional body is intended to have a rational influence on the entire policy-making process. This unit will attempt to demonstrate that the government is heavily reliant on bureaucracy in formulating policy for public. We'll talk about what bureaucracy means, its roles and importance. Further its relationship with the public will be discussed.

14.3 Concept of Bureaucracy

Vincent de Gournay (1712-1759), a French civil official and physiocrat, is credited with coining the term 'bureaucracy'. In 1745, he coined the term *bureau mania* to describe the French administration, which was plagued by red tape, formality, hierarchy, and laziness. Prior to Weber's development of the notion of bureaucracy in the 1920s, Georg Wilhelm, Friedrich Hegel and Karl Marx had proposed the term.

The theory of bureaucracy was developed by Hegel in his concept of the idealist state. He did not, however, propose a well-structured idea of bureaucracy; in fact, for some, it is as broad as Weber's. Hegel, like Marx, was not particularly interested in bureaucracy, but he developed it as part of a greater interest in investigating the essence of the state. According to Hegel, the state is the final evolution in a succession of logical social structures, with the family and civil society being the other two. Once the state is created, it is expected to offer the conditions for the unconscious and specifically oriented acts to become self-aware and public-spirited over time. The prince, the estates' deputies, and the bureaucrats are all political actors in Hegel's eyes.

He elevated the concept of bureaucracy to abstract heights in his *Philosophy of Right* (1921), describing it as a transcending entity, a mind above human brain. He defined it as civil society's 'state formalism' and state authority as a company. The Marxist Point of View : Karl Marx's writings do not provide an in-depth treatment of bureaucracy. Because of his concentration with political economics, he couldn't even attempt a systematic analysis of the state. However, his first substantial work after his doctoral dissertation, "Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law" (1843), is primarily concerned with the state. We can discover some brief remarks on bureaucracy in this book.

Marx looked at bureaucracy in the framework of the capitalist state and its bureaucracy. He derived the concept of bureaucracy from the connection between power-holding institutions, particularly the state, and the social groups that were subservient to it. The significance of Marx's critique of bureaucracy resides in his assertion that bureaucratic organisations do not automatically reflect, but rather corrupt and disfigure, the underlying social power relations. Thus, bureaucracy is the picture of a dominant social authority, distorted by its universality claim. The Weberian Bureaucratic Model : Max Weber, a German historian and sociologist, is credited with developing a theory of bureaucracy. His idea of bureaucracy laid the groundwork for a slew of future works on the subject.

Max Weber was the first to mention bureaucracy as a significant improvement over government. He gave a thorough analysis of the nature of bureaucracy, as well as the various forms of bureaucratic organisations and thought. Bureaucracy, he said, is one of the most sensible and efficient ways to organize power. Weber discussed bureaucracy as part of a larger discussion of power, authority, and legitimacy. It's worth mentioning that he distinguished between power and authority based on legitimacy. According to him, if the people who are subjected to the power (even if it is exerted against their choice) regard it as proper or appropriate, it becomes legitimate and becomes the shape of authority.

The distinguishing characteristics of bureaucracy according to Weber, set it apart from other sort of organisations based on nonlegal forms of authority. The advantage of bureaucracy, according to Weber is that it is most technologically proficient type of organisation, with specialized competence, certainty, continuity and unity. The rise of a money-based economy (which eventually led to the creation of capitalism) and the

concomitant necessity for impersonal, rational-legal transactions ushered in the rise of bureaucracy as a favoured form of organisation. Instrumental organisations (e.g., public-stock commercial corporations) emerged quickly as a result of their bureaucratic structure which allowed them to handle the different demands of capitalist production more efficiently than small scale producers. Nonetheless, the terms bureaucracy and bureaucrat are frequently associated with negative connotations. They evoke images of bureaucracy, numerous rules and regulations, a lack of creativity, a lack of individual discretion, central control and a lack of accountability. Far from being portrayed as competent, popular modern depictions frequently portray bureaucracies as inefficient and unadaptable. Because the features that constitute bureaucracy's organizational advantages also include the potential for organizational failure, both flattering and unpleasant portrayals of bureaucracy can be valid. As a result, the qualities that make bureaucracies effective may also cause organizational disorders.

14.4 Notion of the Public

The concept of the 'public' is the most basic of all political concepts, because it is only through the shared relationship it creates between rulers and ruled that government becomes more than just dominance. It's hardly surprising, then, that the subject of how to define the public sphere has occupied political intellectuals from Plato to more current philosophers like Hannah Arendt. Although the answers they have given have varied widely, what is relevant in the present context is simply the idea that there could be an answer, which has been held for well over two thousand years.

What is novel today, on the other hand, is the growing realisation that political theory cannot, in principle, provide philosophical guidance of any kind about how the public realm can be finally and definitively identified, in a way that clearly distinguishes it from the private realm and thus allows an unquestionable limit to the proper scope of politics and state action to be set.

Take a look at some of the most prevalent distinctions made between private and public codes. Access and visibility in both places are governed by laws. The public realm is often open to all members of the general public. Of course, who is to be classified as a member is a determining factor. It is objective, frequently incorporated in the constitution and protected by law, and it does not rely on arbitrary instantaneous

judgements. Access to the private realm, on the other hand, is determined by the owner's subjective discretion. One must knock before entering a private home.

Following this line of logic, one can look for comparable terminology in the public and private sectors, respectively. The public is impersonal and signifies separation, whereas the private implies closeness and solitude. Predetermined laws and bureaucracy define the public domain, whereas creativity defines the private sphere. The private market is a free-flowing "persons" exchange. It is a public activity in which individuals' representatives make decisions that influence collectives and individual groups (person).

True, state authority is frequently referred to as 'public' but it is this aspect of the public realm that gives it primary responsibility for the well-being of all residents. Only when the exercise of political control is properly subordinated to the democratic demand for public access to information does the political public sphere achieve institutionalized authority over the government through the instrument of law-making bodies. The duty of criticism and control that a public body of citizens undertakes informally and formally in periodic elections against the ruling structure established in the shape of a state is referred to as "public opinion."

14.5 Relationship between the Bureaucracy and the Public

As the concept was developed by Weber, bureaucracy was meant to be the highest level of development of rational-legal governance. He said, bureaucracy must impart greater equality and greater transparency as compared to traditional forms of governance which it has replaced rather than oppressing the public.

Bureaucracy is a link between the public and private sectors. It's critical for managing contracts and collaborations, as well as establishing link between social actors' networks and the public sector. Finally, it's helpful to envisage life without bureaucracy in order to appreciate its benefits. It would be a world without consistency, without continuity, and without competence. Although we loathe bureaucracy, we would despise a world without it even more. Bureaucrats undertake both 'output' functions, such as implementing policies and programmes, and 'input' functions, which include not only policy making but also shaping public perceptions of the government. The bureaucrats' main responsibilities are to: (i) carry out the government's policies and instructions, (ii) maintain and keep in order the general administrative apparatus under its official charge,

and (iii) provide advice to the political executives on norms of procedure, regulation, and so on. Most developing countries' administrative systems follow the colonial administration's model. Several countries, however, have recently made significant reforms to restructure their administrative organisations. This has been impacted by a variety of domestic causes, such as the desire to fulfill the government's responsibility in providing services to the people, as well as external forces, such as increasing regional and international interactions and the impact of globalization. Similarly, the requirements imposed on developing countries by donor countries and agencies have attempted to modify the administrative characteristics of these countries, particularly the relationship between public officials and politicians. Some of these initiatives, however, have yet to generate the expected results, owing to distrust generally associated with ideas and recommendations from external parties, particularly former colonial powers. Second, because most donor-driven reforms are based on incorporating private sector practices into public sectors, the limited success can also be attributed to a simplistic approach that ignores the private sector's understanding and practice, as well as its limitations in developing countries. As a result, efforts to limit the influence of politics and political elites in the bureaucracy have made little success in industrialized countries as well as in developing countries, one of the fundamental features of contemporary government is the growth of public sector or government. It is however impractical to scale up the growth of government. Economics in this case can get insights from the measure of public expenditures which is usually the most visible part of government activity. Bureaucracies usually have the experience and expertise needed for effective policy making. In the opinion of some Public Choice economists, the growth of public expenditure and government is directly proportional to public bureaucracy. Expansive set of bureaucracy is one of the stereotypes associated to public bureaucracy. Any simplistic model cannot be sufficient to depict role of public bureaucracy in policy making. William Niskanen's bureaucratic theory believes in the idea that public sector bureaucracy is non-profit body financed fully or partially by grant or periodic appropriation. He argues that in case of private sector, managers of these firms can retain profit which bureaucrats in their public sector cannot. Niskanen model of a bureaucratic behaviour is based upon several assumptions; self-interest primarily motivates bureaucrats, public sector receives its finances from sale of output and from other sources and it is a non-profit organization, lastly bureaucrats enjoy

monopoly over information related to real costs of supply. He therefore adds that one of the key differences between exchange relation of market and bureau rest on fact that bureau in exchange of budget offers total output, where as market organization offers price of output units. Patronage is a key characteristic of bureaucracy-politics connections in underdeveloped countries. While this is a trait that even rich countries have faced in the past, it is the scope and slow progress in dealing with the offenders of such crimes in developing countries that causes anxiety. Most emerging countries did not have a well-developed private sector capable of employing a large number of people when they gained independence. As governments strove to live up to the dreams and aspirations of their people during the war for independence, combined with the euphoria that came with independence, the public sector became the major employer. As a result, employment in the public sector has become a political instrument for elites to reward their supporters. Furthermore, the lack of significant reforms in the civil service to implement a merit-based recruitment and promotion system lies at the heart of the patronage problem. This blemished the public sector in emerging countries resulting in lower productivity and triggering a vicious cycle of poverty, underdevelopment, political favoritism and inefficiency. Contrary to this, developed countries continue to profit from civil service reforms that not only allow employment of some of the best and the most qualified persons in public service delivery, but also for the separation of politicians and bureaucrats. The strong ties that exist between political elites and bureaucrats have resulted in significant economic and administrative issues. One of them is that it allows unfettered corruption to flourish, which is still a problem in developing countries. Worse, people responsible for the misappropriation of public funds, whether through thefts or dubious initiatives with no economic value, do not accept responsibility and are frequently recycled across government offices. It's no surprise that the top 20 worst-performing countries on the corruption ranking are from emerging countries which lose more money than they borrow from donors for development purpose. Most administrative units in poor nations have become inefficient and characterized by impunity as a result of corruption.

The second aspect that determines the relationship between bureaucracy and politics is representation. Public workers are meant to represent the public views, goals, interests and aspirations while remaining neutral. However, representation may take on a distinct meaning in poor and rich countries alike. Identity-based representation, whether ethnic,

religious, racial or clan based is a typical trend in developing countries in this scenario. Job opportunities in the public sector have become a tool for promoting one's own support base and an important means of shaping attitudes and opinion of their support base as a result of weak institutions and polarizing political processes, while also strengthening control of the country's political and bureaucratic spheres. Not only has this resulted in horizontal inequality, but it has also served as a trigger for civil conflicts. The third factor is career advancement and civil service recruitment. Individuals must be recruited and promoted on the basis of merit as Weber's ideal bureaucracy believes in. In the absence of merit-based recruiting, the civil service is characterized by corrupt, inexperienced, and inept bureaucrats, who rely on the political elite's backup to stay in power. Therefore, there is presence of merit-based recruitment processes so as to maintain quality of public service personnel. Interests, values and drive are the fourth factor impacting ties between bureaucrats and politicians in developing countries. While politicians have been examined for their self-motivation and desire in improving public well-being, same traits can also be found among bureaucrats. Some relationships and values are also strengthened by networks formed at elite schools and universities, whose alumni appear to dominate top administrative and political posts. If the actors come from various backgrounds, some of them adopt similar ideologies and mentalities, which might either prevent cooperation or generate rivalry. Politics and bureaucracies in most developing nations are dominated by persons of a specific bloodline or class, which tends to define their relationships. Public bureaucracies have been mostly disregarded in most political communication research, although there has recently been an uptick in interest in their efforts.

14.6 Conclusion

The emphasis on procedural regularity, a hierarchical system of accountability and responsibility, specialization of function, continuity, a legal-rational basis and inherent conservatism are thus the most essential features of pure bureaucratic organization. The rise of capitalism and the preference for standard money transactions over barter systems necessitated the adoption of bureaucratic organizational structures in both the private and governmental (public) sectors. Management in the public sector is usually harder than the private sector because of certain major issues like transparency, absence of control over budget and personnel systems. The critical parts of bureaucratic type of

organization, on the other hand can conflict with one another and are frequently at the root of accusations of bureaucracies as dysfunctional. To summarize, the same factors that make bureaucracy function can also operate against it.

14.7 Summary

- We discussed the Weber's model of bureaucracy and the broad spectrum of public in general.
- So far we have understood that bureaucracy is an essential link between public sector and the public which bridges the gap between the two.
- Likewise, for managing contracts and partnership and to act as the linkage between networks of social actors and the public sector.
- We have also discussed in length the responsibilities of bureaucratic organisation and the relationship it shares with politics.

14.8 Glossary

- **Bureaucracy:** Refers to body of administration, social system or government that has a hierarchical structure regulated by rules and regulations
- **Bureaucratic Model:** refers to organizational structure that follows a pattern of organizing people in hierarchy which has division of labor and procedures to operate.
- **Weber's theory:** Bureaucracy, according to Max Weber, is a highly ordered, formalized and impersonal entity. He also came to believe that an organization must have a stable hierarchical structure as well as defined rules, laws and lines of authority to govern it.

14.9 Model Questions

Long Questionings

- What is your understanding of public? Describe in detail what does it mean in public administration.
- How public realm is different from private realm?

- Briefly discuss Hegel's idea of bureaucracy.
- Do you agree with Marx's idea of bureaucracy? Give reasons to substantiate your answer.

Short Questions

- What do you understand by the term 'bureaucracy'? Does bureaucracy and bureaucrats share the same meaning?
- Describe Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy in detail.
- What are the responsibilities of a bureaucratic organisation? What criticism does it usually receive from public.
- How does the relationship of bureaucracy with politics influence the qualities of public service delivery by the civil servants?
- Describe Niskanen model of bureaucracy in brief.

14.10 References

- Altay, Asuman, (1999) 'The efficiency of bureaucracy on the public sector. "Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi İktisadi İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi 14, no. 2."
- Avasthi A. and Maheshwari S.R. (1987). Public Administration. Laxmi Narain Agarwal, Agra.
- Jain R.B. (1976) Contemporary Issues in Public Administration, Vishal, New Delhi.
- Peters, B. Guy. (1979) "Bureaucracy, politics, and public policy." : 339-358.
- Nyadera, Israel Nyaburi, and Md Nazmul Islam (2020) "Link between administration, politics, and bureaucracy.'"
- Aberbach JD, Putnam RD, Bert AR (1981) Bureaucrats and Politicians in Western Democracies. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA
- Dasandi N, Esteve M (2017) The politics-bureaucracy interface in developing countries. Public Adm Dev 37(4):231-245
- Demir T, Nyhan RC (2008) The politics administration dichotomy: an empirical search for correspondence between theory and practice. Public Adm Rev 68:81-96

Unit-15 : Administration and Civil Society

Structure

- 15.1 Learning Objectives**
- 15.2 Introduction**
- 15.3 Concept of Civil Society**
- 15.4 Understanding Administration**
- 15.5 Relation between the Civil Society and Administration**
- 15.5 Conclusion**
- 15.7 Summary**
- 15.8 Glossary**
- 15.9 Model Questions**
- 15.10 References**

15.1 Learning Objectives

- To understand the nature of relationship between administration and Civil society.
- To decipher how civil society may impact the functioning of administration.
- To develop a notion of constructive relationship between civil society and administration.

15.2 Introduction

At the very beginning, before understanding the multi-dimensional relationship between administration and civil society, we must develop a conception of what is civil society and how it is pivotal in influencing the administration. So, this unit begins with the question what is civil society and the answer is not a simple one. Logically, this unit would next address the various conceptions on society-administration relationship. Although administration encompasses all organizations, both public and private, including religious, political and other undertakings, for our purpose we shall consider administration from the perspective of carrying out or executing or implementing policy decisions, or to coordinate activity in order to accomplish some common purpose, or

simply to achieve cooperation in the pursuit of a shared goal, particularly from the point of view of the state. Finally, after developing ideas about civil society and administration respectively, we will examine the relationship between the two and understand the complex nature of their relations which in turn affects the functioning of administrative organizations and meeting the needs of society and the public.

15.3 Concept of Civil Society

The term "civil society" can be traced back to the works of Aristotle and Cicero, two classical Greek and Roman thinkers. In fact, Aristotle is credited with coining the term "*koinōnia politikē*" for the first time, which denoted a form of 'political community'. In the modern discourse, the term, which was once considered identical with political institution, has taken a completely different shape and meaning, and is now referred to as an autonomous entity separate from the state and family. The late-eighteenth-century Scottish and Continental enlightenment age gave birth to the contemporary concept of civil society. Political thinkers from Thomas Paine to George Hegel created the concept of civil society as a parallel but distinct entity from the state. Civil society, according to them, is a sphere in which persons associate based on their shared interests, and desires. Changed economic realities, such as the growth of the bourgeois, private property, and market competition, reflect this new school of thought.

Charles Taylor defined civil society as "a web of autonomous associations independent of the state, which bind citizens together in matters of common concern, and by their existence or actions could have an effect on public policy".

As per Sussane Haber Rudolph "civil society... includes the idea of a non-state autonomous sphere; empowerment of citizens; trust building associational life; interaction with, rather than subordination to the State". Dipankar Gupta defines civil society, as "not a thing but a set of conditions within, which individuals interact collectively with the state." For Larry Diamond, it is the "realm of organized social life that is open, voluntary, self-generating, (largely) self-supporting, and autonomous from the state, bound by a legal order or a set of shared rules. It is distinct from the 'society' in general in that it involves citizens acting collectively in a public sphere to express their interests, passions, and ideas; exchange information, achieve mutual goals, make demands on the state, and hold the state officials accountable. Civil society is an intermediary entity standing between the private sphere and the state.

Civil society is concerned with public rather than private ends... civil society relate to the state in some way but do not aim to win formal power." According to Jeffery Alexander "civil society is an inclusive, umbrella-like concept referring to plethora of institutes outside the state." Niraja Gopal Jayal envisions civil society to cover "all forms of voluntary associations and social interactions not controlled by the state." To Michael Bratton civil society is a "social interaction between the household and the state characterized by community cooperation, structures of voluntary association, and networks of public communication." A definition of civil society produced by a number of renowned research centers has been endorsed by the World Bank, which is "the term civil society refers to a wide array of non-governmental and not-for-profit organizations that have a presence in public life, expressing the interests and values of their members or others, based on ethical, cultural, political, scientific, religious, or philanthropic considerations. Civil society organizations (CSOs) therefore refer to a wide of array of organizations: community groups, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), labor unions, indigenous groups, charitable organizations, faith-based organizations, professional associations, and foundations." The European Union (EU) considers CSOs to include "all non-State, not-for profit, non-partisan, and non-violent structures through, which people organize to pursue shared objectives and ideals, whether political, cultural, social or economic These CSOs are membership based, cause-based, and service oriented. Among them are the community-based organizations, NGOs, faith-based organizations, foundations, research institutions, gender based organizations, LGBT organizations, cooperatives, professional and business associations, media, and non-for-profit organizations. Trade unions and employers' organizations, the so-called social partners, constitute a specific category of CSOs."

15.4 Understanding Administration

In the earlier unit, there has been a brief discussion on what administration is. Administration is basically concerned with the formulation of the objectives, plans and policies. Administration lays down the fundamental framework of an organization, within which the management of the organization functions. The nature of administration is bureaucratic. It is a broader term as it involves forecasting, planning, organizing and decision-making functions at the highest level of the enterprise. Though often

management and administration are considered synonymous, there are differences between the two.

Management is a systematic way of managing people and things within the organization. The administration is defined as an act of administering the whole organization by a group of people. Management is an activity of business and functional level, whereas administration is a high-level activity. While management focuses on policy implementation, policy formulation is performed by the administration. Functions of administration include legislation and determination. Conversely, functions of management are executive and governing. Administration takes all the important decisions of the organization while management makes decisions under the boundaries set by the administration.

Theoretically, it can be said that both are different terms, but practically, the terms are often interchangeable. Often a manager performs both administrative and functional activities. Although the managers who are working on the top most level are said to be the part of administration whereas the managers working on the middle or lower level represents management. So administration represents the top layer of the management hierarchy of the organization.

15.5 Relationship between Civil Society and Administration

In the globalization context, 'governance' is not just confined to either only state or market. Instead, these two actors are collaborating with each other to provide goods and services. With the reappearance of a vibrant civil society, this process has now become multiple actor-centric with NGOs, CBOs, Self-help groups acting as responsible stakeholders with the State and market in the process of governance and development. The two ways of governance—Keynesian Welfare State and Neo-liberalism have not produced the desired results, Anthony Giddens observes "A fundamental theme of third way politics is rediscovering an activist role for government, restoring and refurbishing public institutions. Reforming the State is far from easy in practice, but the aim should be to make government and State agencies transparent, customer-oriented and quick on their feet".

Reform of government and the state is the first priority. The state should not dominate either markets or civil society, only regulate the both. The core role of the civil society

has to be realized. Without a developed civil society there cannot be an effective market system or well-functioning government. Let us now look at the various endeavours in the area of civil society and see how these can be tapped to facilitate development and governance.

There is an urgent need for the government, civil society and private sector to work as partners in crucial areas of participatory development. Without a civil society to nourish engaged citizens, it has been observed, politicians turn into 'professionals', out of touch with their constituencies; while citizens are reduced to mere antagonists or turn into ungrateful clients of government services that they readily consume without being willing to pay for.

Market-State endeavours have overwhelmed the economy in the recent past with many public sector enterprises divesting and opening up to private entrepreneurs. There have been successful ventures between the state and civil society, especially in the areas of Information Technology and resource management. It has to be seen how market can fruitfully associate with the State as well as civil society in the future. The convergence between NGOs and informal profit-oriented enterprises, as has been observed, offer some promise for building a different model of society. Since profits generated within this new 'non-profit-for profit' nexus are invested in public as well as private goods and services.

Recent decades, points out Scholte (2000), have brought a general retreat from centralized governance with trends toward devolution, regionalization and globalization. Governance has shifted from a unidirectionality of statism to a multidimensionality of local, national, regional and global layers of regulation and meeting the specific needs in each of these levels. Although large-scale globalization has not dissolved Nation States, this form of collective identity is slowly losing its previous position of primacy. In the late 20th century, world politics is also being deeply shaped by sub-state solidarities like ethno-nations and by non-territorial, trans border communities based on class, gender, race and religion.

There is a strong emphasis on community not as a social or geographical construct, but as a virtual space of shared cultural and moral affinities that express the ethics of self-governance. As per the Human Development Report (1999), the focus is on the fair, rights-based, practical shaping of daily institutional practices in each sphere of individual life. Informal community initiatives are now being organized all over South

Asia, with or without government help, and they have often succeeded in serving those vulnerable sections of society that governments find quite difficult to reach. By opening spaces for civic engagement, civil society organizations, households, businesses and the media can contribute to governance processes for human development in general and an improvement in the lives of local communities in particular. The emergence of the self-instituted civil society as an independent social partner alongside formal political and economic structures has a potential for thoroughly modifying governance systems.

In July 2002, the World Civil Society Forum met in Geneva to discuss issues that would help in strengthening international cooperation between civil society and international organizations. The implications of this type of global civil society are not so clear but encouraging nevertheless. Some ponderable could be: (i) Will huge networks and coalitions of citizen activists come to rival international governmental organizations (IGOs) in the next century as leading vehicles of transnational cooperation, (ii) Will new democratic processes arise at the worldwide level that can offset the clout of global capital, and (iii) Will national public policy debates increasingly be influenced by social and economic norms that hold sway globally.

NGO's and social movements must keep in mind that their influence on the process of global governance will remain quite limited unless they succeed in effectively channelling their national governments' action as well as influencing the allocation of resources mobilized by governments and multilateral institutions. The new trends in globalization cannot be a remedy for all ills. Socio-economic development has to be indigenous, contextual and innovative. Especially, in the developing countries, where community plays a pertinent role in production of goods and services; more so, at the micro-level, the solution lies in what has been called 'localization'. There is a need for more research in the areas of community building, democracy and citizenship, role of global civil society and collaborative networking among the NGOs. It has been pointed out that village councils in which women and Dalits have a central place will be a genuine indigenous institutional innovation. They can give a new lease of life to democracy in India.

An alternative paradigm that treats citizens as equal partners in development with due regard to goals of equity and social justice is therefore needed. The retention of high levels of autonomy and self-organization will be important if these agencies are not to be flooded by distorting State power. Established traditions of participative

planning and community development can be complemented by experience in direct democracy (Ferlie and Fitzgerald, 2002). With the recent formation of the Confederation of NGOs in rural India, several hundreds of NGOs working in the remote areas can now express their ideas, suggestions and grievances on institutionalized lines. The Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology (CAPART) is playing the role of facilitator in this regard with emphasis on transparency, expeditious disposal, flexible and innovative approach towards projects for the poor in rural areas through NGOs. These NGOs will have representation at the district, state and national levels. In a number of countries, we can witness strong political efforts to reaffirm the position of the citizen in relationship to public administration such as Citizens' Charters in Britain, Charter for Right and Freedom in Canada and new Chapter in Constitution on Human Rights in Sweden. We have discussed various civil society endeavours earlier and it is important to acknowledge them as important efforts in the areas of participatory governance.

In a sincere bid to open up a new democratic terrain, it has been rightly pointed out that the core justificatory principle is that major arenas of social, economic and political power (power over people's lives and power that shapes the life of society itself) should be harnessed to a doctrine of democratic responsibility. This is a responsibility that acknowledges a framework of obligations and accountability recognizes a range of legitimate stakeholders and seeks ways in which these stakeholders can have an effective voice. An approach of this kind will not be able to serve the purpose if attempts to construct iron walls between 'public' and 'private' centres of power are made. Instead, the doctrine of responsibility should be applied to both.

This new thinking should not be seen as a shift in power from the state to civil society, but rather as the natural evolution of the relationship between those who govern and those who are governed. Couched in positive terms, governments are learning to govern better through heeding the popular voice; and citizens are learning to be better citizens through exposure to the regular rules and disciplined practices of associations of civil society. The private sector has a large stake in the expansion of civil society because civil order fosters economic growth. The synergies arising out of the emerging relations between the State, private sector, and civil society must thus be put to practical use. This is a relevant but difficult goal to achieve. Civil society

organizations are necessary in the present context to ensure effective, responsive and efficient governance based on viable State-society and Society-market partnerships.

15.6 Conclusion

We have seen that administration too is a complex process which often goes hand in hand with management and governance of organizations, and the focus of this module has been on civil society and its impact on administration. The basic concepts of state, civil society, and the administration and administrators, as well as their interrelationships, have been brought out and examined. The interconnections between society and government, particularly between administration and civil society has been discussed with light on essential conceptualizations of society-administration linkages.

15.7 Summary

- Civil society acts through social capital and the capacity of people to act together willingly in their common long term interest. Social capital is strong in a homogeneous, egalitarian society.
- Civil society as a whole is, therefore, unable to play its full potential role in enforcing good governance except when extraordinary leadership overcomes narrow loyalties, or when an issue is of common, major concern to all sections. Smaller units of governance and decentralization of governance are, therefore, indispensable.
- Individual cannot take on the huge political bureaucratic machine that the government is, nor can the entire civil society act on behalf of every citizen. Civil society therefore has to operate through compact, focused organizations based on strong social capital.
- There is a close relationship between civil society and administration, with the former exerting considerable influence on the latter, and the administration too must take into confidence the various actors of civil society to successfully reach the targets of governance and effectively serve the people.

15.8 Glossary

- **Public Administration-** Planning, organizing, directing, coordinating and controlling of government operations.
- **Civil Society-** Society considered as a community of citizens linked by common interests and collective activity.
- **WB-** World Bank
- **NGO-** Non Governmental Organization
- **Capitalism-** An economic and political system in which a country's trade and industry are controlled by private owners for profit, rather than by state.
- **Bureaucracy-** A system of government in which most of the important decisions are taken by state officials rather than by elective representative.
- **EU-** European Union.
- **Ecology-** The branch of biology that deals with the relations of organisms to one another and to their physical surroundings.
- **Governance-** The action or manner of governing a state.

15.9 Model Questions

Long Questions

- What is your understanding of civil society? Describe some of the domains of its applications.
- What do you mean by administration? How is civil society and administration related to each other?
- What is the relationship between state, market and civil society?

Short Questions

- What are the role of civil society organizations in the globalization context of governance and development?
- What do you understand by open society? Write critical note on the relationship between state and civil society in the context of emerging socio-economic crisis in the global community.

15.10 References

- Edwards. Michel, (2011) The oxford handbook of Civil Society, (Page-185-195). Oxford University Press,
- Thurid Hustedt, Tiina Randma, Liiv and Riin Savi. (2012) Public Administration and Disciplines. Leuven University Press. 13 March,
- Balla, S., Lodge, M., & Page, E. (ed). (2015). the Oxford Handbook of Classics in Public Policy and Administration. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2017). Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis. 4th ed., Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Raadschelders, J.C.N. (2011). The study of public administration in the United States. Public Administration 89: 140-155.
- Ganapati, S., & Reddick, C.G. (2016). Information Technology in Public Administration Education. Journal of Public Affairs Education 22(2): 155-160.
- Roberts, A. (2014). Large Forces: What's Missing In Public Administration. Create Spaces.
- Sager, F., Rosser, C., Mavrot, C., & Hurni, P. (2018). A Transatlantic History of Public Administration.

[illegible]