



NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA
91, Cadastral Zone, University Village Jabi, Abuja
FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

Course Code: PAD 784

Course Title: Comparative Public Administration

Course Writers: Dr. Abubakar Faruk

Course Editor: Dr. (Mrs.) Nwamaka P. Ibeme
(National Open University of Nigeria)

Head of Department: Dr. (Mrs.) Nwamaka P. Ibeme
(National Open University of Nigeria)

Dean of Faculty: Prof. Wilfred I. Uwuyani
(National Open University of Nigeria)

Coordinator: Departmental
Course Material Review: Dr. Musa Zakari

Reviewers: Dr. Isah Ibrahim Salisu
(Nasarawa State University Keffi)

National Open University of Nigeria

Headquarters

University Village

Plot 91 Cadastral Zone

NamdiAzikiwe Expressway

Jabi, Abuja.

Lagos Office

14/16 Ahmadu Bello Way

Victoria Island, Lagos

E-mail: centralinfo@noun.edu.ng URL:

www.nou.edu.ng

Published by NOUN Press

©2022

ISBN:

All Rights Reserved

CONTENTS PAGE

| | |
|--|--|
| Introduction | |
| Learning Outcome | |
| Main Content..... | |
| Title of the sub-sections)..... | |
| Self-assessment Exercise | |
| Summary | |
| References/Further Readings..... | |
| <u>Possible answer to self-assessment exercise (s) within the content.....</u> | |

Introduction

The course Comparative Public Administration is specifically developed for students offering Post Graduate Diploma (PGD) in Public Administration in the National Open University of Nigeria (NOUN), Distance learning, though it can be utilized by other students at both undergraduate and master's level. The course is designed in a way as to provide students, especially those that are new in the field (Public Administration) with the opportunity to acquire the basic knowledge and understanding of the evolution, concepts and use of models and approaches in Comparative Public Administration, as related to both developed and developing countries, Anglophone and Francophone systems of administration and specifically the nature of bureaucratic organizations within the context of Nigeria as related to other countries (Senegal) of the world. It will assist students with the basic skills of applying these concepts and approaches in making comparative studies by determining why one system or the other is successful in a particular setting but not the other (due to different in ecology), hence, this will pave way vis-a-vis the roles that you perform as an administrator to identifying a particular approach or system that can be adopted or adapted in the public sector settings, especially Nigeria, that is, after weighing the extent for the suitability of same.

Furthermore, this course guide will provide you (students) with the necessary information about the course contents and the referencing materials you will need to further and enrich your study. It is designed in a way that it will assist you (students) to get the best of the course by enabling you (students) to think systematically and broadly about the principles underlying the issues of bureaucratic organizations. However, the guide also provides some

guidance on the way to approach your tutor-marked assignments (TMAs). Finally but not the least, the course guide is informative about what the course is all about and how you can work your way through these materials. It suggests some general guidelines for the amount of time you are likely to spend on each unit of the course in order to complete your study without any hitches.

Main Content

The main aim of the course is to give you a vivid understanding of the origin of Comparative Public Administration, Definitions and meaning of comparative public administration, approaches and how they can be applied in everyday administrative activities. It also aims to help you (students) to further your skills and competences in the public sector management that is, after studying the systems of administration in different settings in the world, especially developed and developing countries. You can also apply the principles to your job as policy makers, top management of public organizations in both the private and public enterprises respectively.

Learning Outcome

This course entitled —Comparative Public Administration (PAD 784) introduces you to the brief evolutionary trends with consideration of the factors that contributed to its development as a field of study under the broader field of Public Administration, it also features the conceptual clarifications, nature, approaches etc. as related to public administration (Bureaucracy) as it is practised elsewhere, that is, in both developed and developing systems, Anglophone and Francophone etc.

To achieve the aims highlighted above, the course sets specific objectives. These are designed in a way that each unit has specific objectives. The unit objectives are always

included at the beginning of each unit; advisably, you should read them before you start working through the unit in order to have insight or an idea of what the unit set to achieve. The objectives will serve as the benchmark or referral baseline to determine or measure your understanding of the sub-topics of the respective units.

Therefore, you should always refer back to the unit objectives after completing a study of every unit. In doing so, make sure that you follow the provided instructions in the respective unit.

However, below are the broken down objectives of the course as a whole. By meeting these objectives, you should have achieved the aims of the course as a whole. Thus, on successful completion of the course, you should be able to:

1. Explore and explain the evolutionary trends and meaning of comparative public Administration;
2. Identify and appreciate the contributions of Riggs to Comparative Public Administration Studies;
3. Outline the rationales or significance of Comparative Public Administration;
4. Describe the scope and forms of Comparative Public Administration;
5. Understand and argue for the uses of models and approaches in comparative public Administration study;
6. Describe the cross-cultural, bureaucratic, case study, institutional, structuralfunctional and Prismatic Sala Models in Comparative Studies;
7. Understand and examine the concept of Bureaucracy and civil service;
8. Highlight in general perspective the nature of administration in developed and developing countries;

9. Compare the system of Administration in developed and developing Anglophone and Francophone with specific reference to Britain and France, Nigeria and Senegal;
10. Finally, identify and examine the role of bureaucracy in nation-building and the problems and prospects of bureaucracy especially in developing countries.

WORKING THROUGH THIS COURSE

To complete this course, you are required to read the study units, read recommended text books and read other materials provided by the National Open University of Nigeria (NOUN). Each unit contains self-assessment exercises, and at a point in the course, you are required to submit assignments for assessment purposes. At the end of the course, there is a final examination. However, the course should take you about 16 - 17 weeks in total to complete.

Below you will find the constituent components of the course that includes what you have to do, and how you should allocate your time to each unit in order to successfully complete your study of the course.

Course Material

The course material package is composed of: _____

- The Course Guide
- The Study Units
- Self-Assessment Exercises
- References/Further Readings
- Possible answers to self-assessment exercise (s) within the content _____

The Study Units

The course material which is divided into three (3) modules is constituted by study units that make up a module. These modules and units are as follows:

MODULE 1

Unit 1: Brief Historical Development of Comparative Public Administration

Unit 2: Concept of Comparative Public Administration

Unit 3: Riggs' Contribution to Comparative Public Administration studies

Unit 4: Rationales for Comparative Public Administration Studies

Unit 5: Scopes and forms of Comparative Public Administration Studies

MODULE 2

Unit 1: Comparison between Public Administration and Comparative Public Administration

Unit 2: Uses of Models and Approaches in Comparative Public Administration Studies

Unit 3: Cross-cultural Approach to Comparative public administration Studies

Unit 4: Bureaucratic Approach to Comparative public administration Studies

Unit 5: Case studies Approach to Comparative public administration Studies

MODULE 3

Unit 1: Institutional Approach to Comparative public administration Studies

Unit 2: Structural-functional Approach to Comparative public administration Studies

Unit 3: Prismatic Model and Comparative Public Administration

Unit 4: Concept of Bureaucracy

Unit 5: Nature of Administration/Bureaucracy in Developed Countries

From the foregoing modules, it should be noted that the first module dwells into the discussion by first tracing the emergence or origin of Comparative Public Administration

as a sub-field of Public Administration, subsequent discussions feature the conceptual clarification of the concept and the nature of Comparative Public Administration.

The second Module focuses on the use of Models and Approaches in Comparative Public Administration studies with emphasis in explaining the cross-cultural approach, bureaucratic, case study, institutional, systems/structural-functional and discussion on Prismatic cum Prismatic Sala model.

The last module attempts analysis on the nature or systems of administration in developed and developing countries with further focus on the developed Anglophone and Francophone and developing Anglophone and Francophone countries respectively. Finally, attempt will be made in looking at bureaucracy and nation building as well as the prospects of bureaucracy especially in developing societies.

Assignments

Each unit of the course has a self-assessment exercise. You will be expected to attempt them as this will enable you understand the content of the unit.

Final Examination and Grading

The final examination for PAD 784 will be of three hours' duration and have a value of 70% of the total course grade. The examination will consist of questions, which reflect the types of self-testing, practice exercise etc. you have previously encountered. All areas of the course will be assessed. The work you submit to your tutor for assessment will count as the other 30% of your total course mark.

Spend the time between finishing the last unit and sitting for the examination to revise the entire course work. You might find it useful to review the self-assessment tests, tutor-

marked assignments and comments on them before the examination. The final examination covers information from all parts of the course

MODULE 1

Unit 1: Brief Historical Development of Comparative Public Administration

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main Content
 - 1.3.1 Trends in the emergence of Comparative Public Administration
- 1.4 Factors that influenced the development of Comparative Public Administration
- 1.5 Summary
- 1.6 References/Further Readings/Web Resources
- 1.7 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content



1.1 Introduction

The emphasis on the shift from the traditional Public administration to comparative Public Administration was heralded after the Second World War because hitherto to that period, literatures on Comparative Public Administration were sketchy. However, in the early writings on the subject, scholars such as L.D White and F.W. Taylor or the human relations movement adopted a —management approach and their main concern was building a science of administration through the articulation of certain —Universal principles of administration. It was the turn of events during and after World War II that influenced or changed the state of literature on Comparative Public Administration. Therefore, this unit focuses on the trends in the emergence of Comparative Public Administration and the factors that influenced the development of Comparative Public Administration as a sub-field of public administration.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit, student should be able to:

- a. Trace the origin and evolutionary trends of comparative public administration
- b. Identify the factors that influenced the development or evolution of comparative public administration



1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 Trends in the Emergence of Comparative Public Administration

Demand for Relevance Comparative studies have been conducted for centuries, producing broad comparative surveys leading to broad generalizations. Most of these cross-state comparisons have been cross-disciplinary (Deutsch 1987: 7). Perhaps the most prominent early user of such comparisons is Aristotle, who combined the Platonic methods of abstraction with the study of concrete cases. Aristotle sent his assistants around the Mediterranean to collect the constitutions of 128 city-states. The result was Aristotle's Politics, a valuable piece of theory which has endured over the centuries, and generating many important cross-disciplinary generalizations (Deutsch 1987: 7).

Although students of comparative administration may consider their subject a product of the post WW II era, actually a strong call for a comparative orientation of public administration goes back to much earlier time. Woodrow Wilson's famous article often referred to as the first articulation of public administration as a field of

study, repeatedly emphasized the comparative approach as the foundation of developing administrative principles. Wilson believed that it is possible, indeed desirable, that we find the regularities and the principles of public administration through comparisons.

In 1887, Wilson wrote that —nowhere else in the whole field of politics, it would seem, can we make use of the historical, comparative method more safely than in this province of administration (Wilson in Shafritz and Hyde 1997: 25). Profusion of systematic comparative public administration is a fairly recent activity, imprecisely linked to the downfall of colonialism. Scholars who bridged the interests of administration and politics took the lead in the early phase.

In 1953, the American Political Science Association had a committee on comparative administration, before the American Society for Public Administration created the Comparative Administration Group (CAG). During the 1960s, the CAG expanded its activities and attracted over 500 members that included academicians, students, management consultants, and operatives of technical assistance programs to developing countries. Subsequently, the CAG was merged to become the first section of ASPA that subsequently was named Section on International and Comparative Administration (SICA). Fred W. Riggs provided intellectual and organizational leadership to the CAG during its early days. He managed the group, attracted more members, and contributed significant writings that set new directions in comparative studies.

Other names that have been prominently involved during the early years of the comparative enterprise include Dwight Waldo, Milton Esman, Ferrel Heady, Frank Sherwood, Ralph Braibanti, John Montgomery, William Siffin, and others. In a report to the annual meeting of ASPA, April 1961, Fred Riggs specified three emerging trends in the comparative study of public administration: (a) a trend from normative toward more empirical approaches, (b) a shift from idiographic (distinct cases) toward nomothetic approaches (studies that seek explicitly to formulate and test propositions), and (c) a shift from predominantly non-ecological to an ecological basis of comparative study (Heady 1962: 2).

1.4 Factors that influenced the development of Comparative Public Administration

From the foregoing analysis on the trends in the emergence of Comparative Public Administration, the specific factors that contributed to the rise and development of comparative public administration were inter alia:

1. The revisionist movement in comparative politics due to dissatisfaction with the traditional approaches.
2. The dissatisfaction with traditional public administration which was culture-bound.
3. Intellectually oriented catalysts, that is, to develop universally relevant theoretical models.
4. Exposure of American scholars and administrators to the new features of the administrative systems of developing countries during the World War II period.

5. The emergence of newly independent Third World countries which attempted to achieve rapid socio-economic development, creating opportunities for scientific investigation.
6. Policy oriented catalysts, that is, to develop the practical knowledge to make policy formulation and policy-execution more effective.
7. The scientific, technological and theoretical development which have influenced the forms of administrative structures.
8. The extension of American foreign aid programme (both political and economic) to newly emerged developing countries.
9. The rise of behavioural approach in public administration as a reaction to the classical structural approach. However, the behaviour movement in Social Sciences led the students of Public Administration to move away from the traditional legal formal approach and to concentrate on the facts of actual behaviour of human beings in an administrative organization (Bhagwan and Bhushan, 2006:58)
10. The Comparative studies in sociology, anthropology and other areas.
11. New scientific, theoretical and technological development that affect the nature of administration

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Briefly trace the evolution of Comparative Public Administration and identify any five factors that influenced its growth |
|--|



1.5 Summary

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

In this unit, we have highlighted the trends in the emergence of Comparative Public Administration as an area of interest under the broader field of Public Administration as well as the factors that influenced the emergence of the subject matter which were related to the events that took place during and after the Second World War II. Some of the factors include: the revisionist movement in Political Science that saw the need for Comparative study in bureaucracy or administration, the exposure of some Americans on the system of administration in developing countries, the emergence of free or independent states etc.



1.6 References/Further Reading

- Eneanya, A.N. (2010). Comparative Public Administration and Public Policy: Theories And Applications. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd.
- Heady, F., and S. L. Stokes, eds. (1962). Papers in Comparative Public Administration. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan.
- Heady, F. (1979). Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, 2nd edition. New York: Mariel Dekker.
- Heady, F. (2001). Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, 6th ed. New York: Marcel Dekker



1.7 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Briefly trace the evolution of Comparative Public Administration and identify any five factors that influenced its growth

Answer

Demand for Relevance Comparative studies have been conducted for centuries, producing broad comparative surveys leading to broad generalizations. Most of these cross-state comparisons have been cross-disciplinary (Deutsch 1987: 7). Perhaps the most prominent early user of such comparisons is Aristotle, who combined the Platonic methods of abstraction with the study of concrete cases. Aristotle sent his assistants around the Mediterranean to collect the constitutions of 128 city-states. The result was Aristotle's Politics, a valuable piece of theory which has endured over the centuries, and generating many important cross-disciplinary generalizations (Deutsch 1987: 7).

Although students of comparative administration may consider their subject a product of the post WW II era, actually a strong call for a comparative orientation of public administration goes back to much earlier time.

Five factors that influenced its growth

From the foregoing analysis on the trends in the emergence of Comparative Public Administration, the specific factors that contributed to the raise and development of comparative public administration were inter alia:

1. The revisionist movement in comparative politics due to dissatisfaction with the traditional approaches.
2. The dissatisfaction with traditional public administration which was culture-bound.
3. Intellectually oriented catalysts, that is, to develop universally relevant theoretical models.
4. Exposure of American scholars and administrators to the new features of the administrative systems of developing countries during the World War II period.
5. The emergence of newly independent Third World countries which attempted to achieve rapid socio-economic development, creating opportunities for scientific investigation.

Unit 2: Concept of Comparative Public Administration

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main Content
 - 1.3.1 Definition and Meaning of Comparative Public Administration

- 1.4 Summary
- 1.5 References/Further Readings/Web Resources
- 1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content



1.1 Introduction

Good day everyone. I hope you have appreciated our discussion in unit one above which took us to the history of the subject matter of —Comparative Public Administration and the factors responsible for the emergence or growth of the area as a specialized sub-field of Public Administration. Having done that, I will now take you through the definitions and meaning of Comparative Public Administration as defined by different scholars and groups.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit, student should be able to:

- (a) Understand the conceptual and operational meaning of Comparative Public Administration



1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 Definition and Meaning of Comparative Public Administration

The concept of Comparative public administration has been defined in various ways. It is regarded as a sub-field of Public Administration. According to Comparative Administrative Group (CAG), "Comparative public administration is a theory of public administration applied to the diverse cultures and national settings

and the body of factual data by which it can be examined and tested. "In his own view, Jong S. Jun stated that "Comparative public administration has been predominantly cross-cultural or cross national in orientation."

Nimrod Raphaeli defined "Comparative public administrative as a study of public administration on a comparative basis." He traced the origin of comparative public administration to the 1952 Conference on Administration held at Princeton University in USA. He said, "Comparative public administration is a new corner to the community of academic instruction and research.

Riggs (1973) noted in his definition, that the term —Comparative should be used only for empirical, nomothetic and ecological studies. However, Marume (1976) is of the opinion that comparative public administration is that method of the study of public administration which is concerned with making rigorous systematic cross-cultural comparisons of the structures, institutions actions and processes involved in the activity of running the public affairs

According to Woodrow Wilson (1887), of ourselves, so long as we know only ourselves, we know nothing. Thus, Comparative public administration (CPA) is the study of administrative institutions, processes, and behaviors across organizational, national, and cultural boundaries. The CPA is a method of investigation and analysis that compares attributes and performance of administrative systems and subsystems as well as individuals or groups in positions of decision making to generate knowledge and enhance understanding of public management. Comparison recognizes similarities and differences and underscores successful practices, thus,

expanding options and alternative strategies for improving the performance of public institutions.

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

This comparison can be cross-national, namely —the comparison of municipal administration in Ceylon and India. Intra-national like the comparison of Rajasthan and U.P. Secretariat, it can be cross-cultural such as the comparison of budget administration of Nepal and Russia and cross-temporal, such as the comparison of administration of Chandra Gupta Maurya and Akbar or comparison of pre-colonial and post-colonial era/period in Nigeria or Africa in general.

The context (environment) of public administration consists of various external factors that exert significant influences on management action and behavior through different means and channels. External factors include societal values, legal norms, politics, international-global accords, culture, and the state of the economy. Together, these diverse external factors have considerable impact on public management, stimulating or stifling systemic traits and performance.

Consistently, the CPA seeks discovery of patterns and regularities of administrative action and behavior to produce new knowledge and insights and to affirm and refine existing information. The outcome, whether comparative research discovers new

knowledge or validates existing information, is that public administration scholars and practitioners are better able to sort out and to adopt most worthy practices. —Comparison is so central to good analysis that the scientific method is unavoidably comparative (Collier 1991: 7).

Similarly, social scientists regard the comparative approach as —the methodological core of the humanistic and scientific methods (Almond et al. 2000: 33). As a requirement of the scientific investigative process, the comparative approach has frequently been noted and emphasized in public administration literature since Woodrow Wilson's famous article in 1887. After many decades, Dahl's (1947: 8) widely quoted declaration remains true.

Namely, as long as the study of public administration is not comparative, —claims of a science of public administration sound rather hollow.

Dahl concluded that the development of an American, British, or French science of public administration is feasible. But he also inquired: can there be —a science of public administration in the sense of a body of generalized principles, independent of their peculiar national setting? Comparative studies of organizations and institutions also reinforce understanding of global influences while expanding the domain of intellectual inquiry beyond traditional, parochial tendencies.

Therefore, comparative public administration can be regarded as the study of public administration on comparative basis, in order to trace any regularities or otherwise in administrative patterns. It is mainly cross-cultural or cross-national, that is, it is not culture bound.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What do you understand by Comparative Public Administration?



1.4 Summary

In conclusion, it is believed that generalizations relating to administrative structures and behaviour, emerging out of comparative studies in different nations and cultures can help to formulate theoretical constructs, which can provide a scientific basis to the study of public administration which according to Dahl is the only basis of regarding public administration as a science. Therefore, comparative public administration is a major shift from the traditional public administration which is culture-bound.

The unit attempted a conceptual clarification of the subject matter of Comparative public Administration which is defined by different scholars and groups like Comparative Administration Group (CAG) etc. However, Comparative Public administration is the study of public administration across border that paves way for the universal application of a theory in different settings or cultures, it is cross-cultural study of the administration of various countries in the world, it is the shift towards empiricism, nomothetic and ecological studies.



1.5 References/Further Reading

Almond, G. A., et al. (2000). Comparative Politics Today. 7th ed. New York: Longman.

Collier, D. (1991). The comparative method: Two decades of change. In Comparative Political Dynamics. D. A. Rustow and K. P. Erickson, eds. New York: Harper Collins.

Dahl, R. A. (1947). The science of public administration: Three problems. Public Administration Review 7 (1): 1–11.

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

Heady, F. (1979). Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, 2nd edition. New York: Marjell Dekker.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

What do you understand by Comparative Public Administration?

Answer

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

UNIT 3: RIGGS' CONTRIBUTION TO COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION STUDIES

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Title of the main
 - 1.3.1 Trends in the study of Comparative Public Administration by Riggs
 - 1.3.2 Ecology and Comparative Public Administration by Riggs
- 1.3 Summary
- 1.4 References/Further Readings/Web Resources
- 1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content



1.1 Introduction

Riggs is one of the foremost model-builder in comparative public administration. Ferrel Heady says that Riggs' book Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society (1964) continues to be probably the most notable single contribution in comparative public administration. Professor Riggs employed three analytical tools to explain his administrative theories. These are ecological approach (ecological perspectives); structural-functional approach; and idea models (model-building). Also Riggs is well known for his contribution in highlighting the trend in the study of comparative public administration.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit, student should be able to:

- (a) Identify and describe the trends in the study of Comparative Public Administration
- (b) Understand the nexus between ecology and Comparative Public Administration



1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 Trends in the Study of Comparative Public Administration by Riggs

The trends in the study of Comparative Public Administration are related to the handy work of Fred Riggs. Riggs (1973) who was the chairman of Comparative

Administration group (CAG) noted in his definition, that the term comparative should be used only for empirical, nomothetic and ecological studies.

Riggs outlines three trends in the comparative study of Public Administration studies thus:

- a) Shift from normative approach towards more empirical approaches;
- b) Shift from ideographic (individualistic) toward nomothetic (universals); and
- c) Shift from a predominantly non-ecological to an ecological basis for the study of Public Administration.

(a) Normative to Empirical

Traditional studies of Public Administration were very much influenced by the classical approach. These studies emphasized upon 'good administration' which was based on following certain ideal principles (What ought to be). Efficiency and economy were considered to be the primary goals of all administrative systems and there were certain principles of formal organization which helped-in the achievement of these goals, therefore, a few models of administration, primarily of the western democratic world, were considered to be useful for all other administrative systems. As a number of developing countries emerged on the scene and with the success of the communist systems in various form of the world, it became clear that a limited culture-bound normative approach to the study of Public Administration was not adequate.

The behavioural approach highlighted the value of studying the facts and reality in significant manner and therefore the comparative studies of Public Administration

after the Second World War started assigning greater importance to the study of administrative "reality" existing in differences countries and cultures. These studies were more interested in finding out facts about some patterns and behaviorism of administrative systems rather than in describing as to what was good for each system. In this context, it may be mentioned that two important trends have influenced the character of some administrative studies in the past two decades or so. First, the concept' of Development Administration" which focuses on the goal-orientation of administrative system. Though considers reality as the basis of such goal orientation, the emergence of Development Administration focus inquiry since the early sixties.

Comparative Public Administration (encompassing the field of Comparative Development Administration) has evolved a synthesis between the normative and the elements of analysis. The second movement that best influenced the nature of Comparative administrative studies against Public Administration which stressed the idealistic goal and to be achieved and system and thus tried to bridge the gap between the "is" and "should" aspects of Public Administration. In the late sixties, the New Public administration marked the "post-behavioural" trend and its impact on most administrative analysis has been propounded.

(b) Ideographic to Nomothetic

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

Nomothetic approach, on the other hand seeks to develop generalizations and theories which are based on analysis of regularities of behavior of administrative systems. Thus earlier studies of Comparative Public Administration which were ideographic in character focused on the study of individual nations or institutions and their approach was primarily descriptive. No serious attempt was made to compare various nations and systems.

Generally, within a volume on comparative governmental administration, there were separate chapters on different nations, without any attempt to look at the similarities or differences among such nations in terms of their administrative systems. These studies, therefore, were 'comparative' only in name and did not help in the process of theory building or in developing generalizations concerning the functioning of administrative system in different settings.

Nomothetic studies analyze various administrative systems in comparative context in a manner that will help in the generation of hypothesis and theories. The objective of such studies is to look at the similarities and differences of various administrative systems existing in different nations and cultures and then draw certain generalizations relating to administrative systems functioning at various levels and in different settings. It may be noted that the emphasis on nomothetic comparative studies is more noticeable in the United States of America than in Europe or Asia. Presently, a large number of comparative administrative studies are ideographic in character. Even these studies, it must be admitted, contributed to knowledge in Comparative Public Administration. Analysis or theory-building has to be based on

facts and description. And therefore, in the present state of comparative administrative studies, a co-existence of ideographic and nomothetic studies may have to be accepted.

(c) Non-ecological to Ecological

The traditional studies of Comparative Public Administration were mainly non-ecological. These studies mentioned about the environment of administrative system only in a casual manner, there was no serious attempt to examine the relationship between the administrative system and its environment, thus, it had become very difficult to identify the sources of differences among various administrative systems.

However, studies undertaken after the Second World War have been specifically looking at similarities and differences among environmental settings prevailing in different nations and cultures and have been attempting to examine the impact of environment on the administrative system on the other hand the influence of the administrative system on the environment. The well-known ecological approach relates to the study of interrelationship between the system and its environment. This approach, popularized by Fred Riggs, has been regarded as an important development in the study of Public Administration. It may be noted that most of the comparative studies of Public administration after the " Second World War have been referring to the environment of the administrative systems, but the emphasis is still on analyzing the impact of the environment on Public Administrator. The analysis relating to the influences of the administrative system on the 'environment

is still inadequate. Nevertheless, a change in emphasis is noticeable and the ecological orientation is gaining stronger footing in the contemporary comparative administrative analysis.

1.3.2 Ecology and Comparative Public Administration by Riggs

Another contribution of Riggs was in determining the link between ecology and administration especially the emphasis of same in the study of administration, and development of universal principles. F.W Riggs in his book entitled *The Ecology of Public Administration* (1961) explored the dynamics of interaction between public administration and its external environment. He adopted the structural -functional approach in explaining the administrative systems from ecological perspective. The adoption of this approach in the field of public administration was first suggested in 1955 by Dwight Waldo.

Ecological approach studies the dynamics of interaction between administrative system and its environment consisting of political, social, cultural and economic dimensions. It assumes that administrative system is one of the various sub-systems of society and is influenced and in turn, also influences them. The ecological approach in the study of public administration though initiated by J.M. Gaus (1947), Robert A. Dahl (1947), Roscoe Martin (1952), and Riggs remains the foremost exponent of the ecological approach in public administration.

In terms of definition, ecology in simple words relates to 'Environment'. And this environment includes physical, social and cultural aspects. So, basically we are going to talk about the relationship between administration and the environment it

is set in (internal as well as external) and how they affect each other. Environment is the largest system, the rest and others like political systems, administrative systems, etc. are all sub systems who work under it. It influences its sub systems and vice versa. They both have to adjust to each other and also reform and change each other from time to time to stay up to date where the people's wishes drive the policies and the policies bring in development that uplifts the socio-economic status and level of the environment for progress. So they are interdependent and not mutually exclusive of each other.

Administration is seen as one of the most significant aspect of any societal arrangement as it makes possible the achievement of governmental function fulfillment. It has been observed that administration of any state happens to be an expression of various unique factors existing in society and is inter dependent over other arrangements in the society that provides the stability of all structure in a society. Various scholars like George Orwell in their writings like 'Shooting an Elephant' books have given case studies of how they have seen practically that the administrative systems in different parts of the world perform differently in order to suit the environment or ecology they are set in.

The ecological approach to Public Administration as propagated popularly by Fred W. Riggs who studied administrative systems in different countries (emphasis on developing countries) and why there was a vast amount of disconnect among them while applying the Americanized theories of Public Administration and how they coped up. He found that the main reason for this uniqueness of administrative

systems in the world is the environment that they are set in. Each country had a different environment setting and that played a major role in the shaping of the administrative system because without the help and approval of its people an administrative system cannot survive and thus it acts according to its environment and in turn it also influences the society with its work and procedures.

In *The Ecology of Public Administration* (1961), Riggs relied on his field experiences in Southeast Asia and the United States in formulating his perspective on public administration in developing countries. The newly independent countries, he recognized, have been faced with the problem of reorganizing and adapting their administrative systems to face the challenges of development. The problem is that administrative concepts and techniques evolved in the context of social, economic, and political conditions of Western countries are not fully valid or applicable in the new contexts.

Thus, Riggs concluded that differences in social, cultural, historical, or architectural environments affect the way in which administration is conducted. He refers to all these issues of the contexts as the ecology of administration. Governmental setting is one of the fundamental determinants of administrative behavior, Riggs pointed out (1961: 4). In his analysis, Riggs consistently emphasized that the comparative approach is indispensable. By comparing societies, we begin to discover whether any particular environmental feature is regularly accompanied by some administrative trait (1961: 3).

Through comparisons, he contended, we can sort out from numerous Administration of Developing Countries environmental factors those few that have important consequences for the administrative system. Thus, to explain differences between two administrative systems, we must look for ecological differences. Overall, the impact of Riggs's work is greater in generating debate, even excitement, in the literature and among students of public administration interested in cross-cultural studies. Riggs has been an involved scholar who provided organizational leadership and direction to the early comparative and development administration movement. But, his work largely remained at the macro level and too concerned with comprehensive and grand models, a task proved to be elusive or less relevant to the immediate needs of societies and practitioners of management. Despite criticisms of his work such as being too abstract, less relevant to the practitioner, and lacks convincing empirical evidence, Riggs publications are among the most upheld scholarship in comparative and development administration so far. Nevertheless, the focus on administration of developing countries was a departure from the ethnocentric traditional public administration and comparative politics of the post-World War II era. Although the end of colonialism magnified interest in developing countries in general, comparative and development administration had a singular focus that sought to explore the emerging world with far greater enthusiasm than any time before.

Stimulated by generous grants from U.S. foundations and government agencies and motivated by financial and other advantages that were available as a result of the

feverish competition of the Cold War, scholarship in comparative public administration flourished. Cross-cultural studies were significantly expanded, often in association with other field research activities covering most newly independent countries. The few references listed above are illustration of the intellectual productivity of this period. A particularly significant aspect of this trend is the integration and the institutionalization of comparative and development administration in the educational systems of the United States and the rest of the world. Courses on comparative and development administration became central parts in many graduate programs in public administration and in training activities. Apart from Riggs, the Structural-Functional Approach which was used in respect of explaining the link between ecology and administration was however adopted by Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton, Marion Levy, Gabriel Almond, David Apter, and others.

According to the Structural-Functional Approach, every society has various structures which perform specific functions. Riggs identified five functions which are performed in each society. They are political, economic, social, symbolic and communicational functions. He stated that, same set of functional requisite apply to an administrative subsystem.

Based on the structural-functional approach, F.W. Riggs has constructed two 'ideal models' (theoretical models) to explain the administrative system in a comparative context. These are (i) agraria-industria model; and (ii) fused-prismatic-diffracted model. They are explained in module 2 of this guide.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Outline the trends in the study of Comparative Public Administration by Riggs



1.4 Summary

In conclusion, Riggs has contributed immensely in Comparative Public Administration studies by consistently emphasizing that the comparative approach is indispensable. By comparing societies, —we begin to discover whether any particular environmental feature is regularly accompanied by some administrative trait Riggs (1961: 3). However, comparative public administration has to be empirically inclined, nomothetically inclined and based on consideration of the varied environmental factors.

In Summary

The unit highlighted the trends in the study of Comparative Public Administration by and the contribution of Riggs in developing the ecological approach to the study of public administration. As earlier stated, the ecological approach to the study of Public Administration was popularly propagated by Fred W. Riggs who studied administrative systems in different countries (with emphasis on developing countries) and why there was a vast amount of disconnect among them.



1.5 References/Further Reading

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

Heady, F. (1979). Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, 2nd edition. New

York: Mariel Dekker.

Marume, S. B. M., Jubenkanda, R. R. and Namusi, C. W. (2016). Comparative Public Administration in International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR) ISSN (Online): 2319-706.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Outline the trends in the study of Comparative Public Administration by Riggs

Answer

The trends in the study of Comparative Public Administration are related to the handy work of Fred Riggs. Riggs (1973) who was the chairman of Comparative Administration group (CAG) noted in his definition, that the term —comparative should be used only for empirical, nomothetic and ecological studies.

Riggs outlines three trends in the comparative study of Public Administration studies thus:

- a) Shift from normative approach towards more empirical approaches;
- b) Shift from ideographic (individualistic) toward nomothetic (universals); and
- c) Shift from a predominantly non-ecological to an ecological basis for the study of Public Administration.

(a) Normative to Empirical

Traditional studies of Public Administration were very much influenced by the classical approach. These studies emphasized upon 'good administration' which was based on following certain ideal principles (What ought to be). Efficiency and economy were considered to be the primary goals of all administrative systems and

there were certain principles of formal organization which helped-in the achievement of these goals, therefore, a few models of administration, primarily of the western democratic world, were considered to be useful for all other administrative systems. As a number of developing countries emerged on the scene and with the success of the communist systems in various form of the world, it became clear that a limited culture-bound normative approach to the study of Public Administration was not adequate.

The behavioural approach highlighted the value of studying the facts and reality in significant manner and therefore the comparative studies of Public Administration after the Second World War started assigning greater importance to the study of administrative "reality" existing in differences countries and cultures. These studies were more interested in finding out facts about some patterns and behaviorism of administrative systems rather than in describing as to what was good for each system. In this context, it may be mentioned that two important trends have influenced the character of some administrative studies in the past two decades or so. First, the concept' of Development Administration" which focuses on the goal-orientation of administrative system. Though considers reality as the basis of such goal orientation, the emergence of Development Administration focus inquiry since the early sixties.

Comparative Public Administration (encompassing the field of Comparative Development Administration) has evolved a synthesis between the normative and the elements of analysis. The second movement that best influenced the nature of

Comparative administrative studies against Public Administration which stressed the idealistic goal and to be achieved and system and thus tried to bridge the gap between the "is" and "should" aspects of Public Administration. In the late sixties, the New Public administration marked the "post-behavioural" trend and its impact on most administrative analysis has been propounded.

(d) Ideographic to Nomothetic

The words "ideographic" and "nomothetic" have been used by Riggs in specific contexts. An ideographic approach concentrates on unique cases, e.g. a historical event, study of single agency, single country or even a single cultural area. Nomothetic approach, on the other hand seeks to develop generalizations and theories which are based on analysis of regularities of behavior of administrative systems. Thus earlier studies of Comparative Public Administration which were ideographic in character focused on the study of individual nations or institutions and their approach was primarily descriptive. No serious attempt was made to compare various nations and systems.

Generally, within a volume on comparative governmental administration, there were separate chapters on different nations, without any attempt to look at the similarities or differences among such nations in terms of their administrative systems. These studies, therefore, were 'comparative' only in name and did not help in the process of theory building or in developing generalizations concerning the functioning of administrative system in different settings.

Nomothetic studies analyze various administrative systems in comparative context in a manner that will help in the generation of hypothesis and theories. The objective of such studies is to look at the similarities and differences of various administrative systems existing in different nations and cultures and then draw certain generalizations relating to administrative systems functioning at various levels and in different settings. It may be noted that the emphasis on nomothetic comparative studies is more noticeable in the United States of America than in Europe or Asia. Presently, a large number of comparative administrative studies are ideographic in character. Even these studies, it must be admitted, contributed to knowledge in Comparative Public Administration. Analysis or theory-building has to be based on facts and description. And therefore, in the present state of comparative administrative studies, a co-existence of ideographic and nomothetic studies may have to be accepted.

(e) Non-ecological to Ecological

The traditional studies of Comparative Public Administration were mainly non-ecological. These studies mentioned about the environment of administrative system only in a casual manner, there was no serious attempt to examine the relationship between the administrative system and its environment, thus, it had become very difficult to identify the sources of differences among various administrative systems.

However, studies undertaken after the Second World War have been specifically looking at similarities and differences among environmental settings prevailing-in

different nation and cultures and have been attempting to examine the impact of environment on the administrative system on the other hand the influence of the administrative system on the environment. The well-known ecological approach relates to the study of interrelationship between the system and its environment. This approach, popularized by Fred Riggs, has been regarded as an important development in the study of Public Administration. It may be noted that most of the comparative studies of Public administration after the" Second World War have been referring to the environment of the administrative systems, but the emphasis is still on analyzing the impact of the environment on Public Administrator. The analysis relating to the influences of the administrative system on the 'environment is still inadequate. Nevertheless, a change in emphasis is noticeable and the ecological orientation is gaining stronger footing in the contemporary comparative administrative analysis.

UNIT 4: RATIONALE FOR COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION STUDIES

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Title of the main
- 1.3.1 Significance of Comparative Public Administration
- 1.4 Summary
- 1.5 References/Further Readings/Web Resources
- 1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content



1.1 Introduction

Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen Good day, you will agree with me that comparison is essential to our understanding of public administration especially as it is practice in different settings. It has been claimed that one important dimension of science is to compare. In the process of theory building and in the process of interchange of ideas among human beings, comparison is quite imminent. Through comparison a scientific development of knowledge is quite essential or possible. Therefore, in this unit attempt will be made in discussing the rationale or significance of Comparative Public Administration.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit, student should be able to:

- (a) Understand and appreciate the significance of Comparative Public Administration studies to the students of Comparative Public Administration



1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 Significance of Comparative Public Administration

The comparative approach (comparative public administration) has been an important thrust within the field of public administration, committed to human learning and to discovery through comparison. The CPA seeks to advance administrative knowledge by focusing on administrative structures, functions, behaviors, and performance across organizational and cultural boundaries to improve reliability and applicability of administrative concepts and practices. As

Bannister (2007: 171) notes, the human urge to compare one's performance with that of others seems to be an intrinsic part of our psychological make-up. Comparison is more prevalent in our expressions and formal judgments than commonly acknowledged. We often compare performance to previous years, to other people, to other organizations, to cost, to benchmarks, and to similar functions and activities across jurisdictions and across national boundaries.

The examination of administrative practices of other societies permits us to see a wider range of administrative actions and choices, beyond the horizon of our own experiences. Rephrasing Woodrow Wilson, if we study only ourselves we know only about ourselves and remain isolated in an interconnected world. The CPA scholarship, at various phases of its evolution, devoted much attention to learning about unfamiliar, non-Western countries and their aspirations to transform and to modernize their administrative systems.

Comparative research broadens knowledge of conditions conducive to strong or weak administrative performance by focusing on a range of patterns of administrative activities and characteristics of the systems performing them.

Much learning is achieved from practices that worked well and from those that did not. Not surprising, therefore, that administrative reform and capacity building are major concerns in the comparative literature. To learn from the best practices is to encourage the recognition and the utilization of the most appropriate organizational structures and processes. In many countries, irrespective of the results of reform plans for improving performance of public organizations, the contents of such plans

have largely been based on lessons learned through cross-cultural comparative investigations (Manning and Parison 2004). While explanatory research is essential for the advancement of scholarship, it also benefits practitioners by expanding their horizons of choice and their capacity to observe, learn, and improve performance. However, Ramesh. K. Arora identified the four elements of the contribution of Comparative Public Administration as follows:

- (1) It has widened the horizons of public administration.
- (2) It has opened the doors of the discipline to all kinds of social scientists.
- (3) It has made the scope of the field more systematic by studying different administrative systems in their ecological settings.
- (4) It has stimulated interest on the part of its members in the problems of developing administration.

On the other hand, according to T. N Chaturvedi, the various contributions of comparative study in public administration are:

- i. It has helped to eliminate the narrowness of —provincialism and —regionalism.
- ii. It has broadened the field of social science research, which was earlier confined to cultural limitations.
- iii. It has led to a greater scientific outlook in theory construction.
- iv. It has encouraged the process of broadening the field of social analysis.
- v. It has played an important role in making the subject of public administration broader, deeper, and useful.

- vi. It has brought politics and public administration closer to each other.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

As a student of Comparative Public Administration, state four significance of Comparative Public Administration studies



1.4 Summary

In conclusion, through comparison, a scientific development of knowledge is quite essential or possible. According to the political scientist W.A. Welsh "comparison is the basis of concept formation." People assign some characters (term or concept) to things that seem similar to one another. Comparative studies in public administration afford us as students, scholars, analysis and practitioner's greater understanding of public administration across national boundaries as bureaucrats or administrators of each country have their peculiar characters and behavior different from others in another country. Therefore, among the tasks of comparative public administration is to establish propositions about administrative behaviour which cover different political settings. Generally knowledge of comparative public administration saves scholars and practitioners some embarrassment and surprise when having the advantage to operate beyond their immediate political and cultural environment.

In Summary, Comparative public administration is imperative in understanding the patterns and regularities of administration across border which will pave way for determining the similarities and dissimilarities of administrative system in different

settings. Therefore, we have outlined the significance of comparative public administration which on general note has widened our horizon in understanding how bureaucracy and government in general operate in different cultural setting and countries.



1.5 References/Further Reading

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

Heady, F. (1979). Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, 2nd edition. New York: Mariel Dekker.

Manning, N., and Parison, N. (2004). International Public Administration Reform: Implications for the Russian Federation. Washington, D.C: The World Bank.

Naidu, S.P. (2006). Public Administration, Concepts and Theories. New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

As a student of Comparative Public Administration, state four significance of Comparative Public Administration studies.

Answer

The comparative approach (comparative public administration) has been an important thrust within the field of public administration, committed to human learning and to discovery through comparison. However, Ramesh. K. Arora state four significance of Comparative Public Administration studies as follows:

(1) It has widened the horizons of public administration.

- (2) It has opened the doors of the discipline to all kinds of social scientists.
- (3) It has made the scope of the field more systematic by studying different administrative systems in their ecological settings.
- (4) It has stimulated interest on the part of its members in the problems of developing administration.

UNIT 5: SCOPE AND FORMS OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION STUDIES

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcome
- 1.3 Main content
 - 1.3.1 Scope and level of analysis of Comparative Public Administration
 - 1.3.2 Forms/types of Comparative Public Administration studies
- 1.4 Summary
- 1.5 References/Further Reading
- 1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content



1.1 Introduction

Good day students of Comparative public administration class. In this unit we are going to focus on the scope and level of analysis of comparative public administration and the different forms or dimensions of comparative public administration studies.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit, student should be able to:

- (a) Describe the scope and level of analysis of Comparative Public Administration
- (b) Understand the different forms or dimensions of Comparative studies



1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 Scope and level of Analysis of Comparative Public Administration

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

- (i) Environment of the administrative system.
- (ii) The whole administrative system.
- (iii) The formal structure of the administrative system with a focus on the pattern of hierarchy, division of work, specialization, authority-responsibility network, decentralization, delegation, control mechanisms, procedures, etc.

- (iv) The informal organizational patterns existing in an administrative set-up, including the nature of human groups, the relationships among individuals, motivational system, the status of morale, patterns of informal communication and the nature of leadership.
- (v) The roles of the individuals.
- (vi) The interaction between the personality of individuals and the organizational system.
- (vii) The policy and decisional systems of the organization that link its various parts.
- (viii) The communicational system, which also involves the feedback mechanism.
- (ix) The performance of an administrative system. You would notice from the foregoing discussion that an administrative system is not as simple entity. There are intricacies of its functioning which will be highlighted in any comparative analysis.

However, Comparative administrative studies can be conducted at three analytical levels: macro, middle-range and micro.

(a) Macro studies: These focus on the comparisons of whole administrative systems in their proper ecological contexts. For instance, a macro study would involve a comparison of the administrative systems of India and Great Britain or Nigeria and Senegal. It will comprise detailed analysis of all important aspects and parts of the administrative system of the two nations. It will be comprehensive in its scope. Though the studies of macro level are rare, they are not impossible to be

taken up. Generally, the relationship between an administrative system and its external environment is highlighted in the macro level studies.

(b) The Middle-range studies: These are on certain important parts of an administrative system that are sufficiently large in size and scope of functioning. For instance, a comparison of the structure of higher bureaucracy of two or more nations, comparison of agricultural administration in two or more countries or a comparison of local government in different, countries will form part of middle range studies. For instance, the Nigerian local government system can compare to that of Britain.

(c) Micro studies: These relate to comparisons of an individual organization with its counterparts in other settings. A micro study might relate to an analysis of a small part of an administrative system, such as the recruitment or training system in two or more administrative organizations: Micro studies are more feasible to be undertaken and a large number of such studies have been conducted by scholars of Public administration In the contemporary Comparative public Administration, all the three types of studies may exist.

1.3.2 Forms/Types of Comparative Public Administration Studies

The types of comparative administrative studies are broadly classified into five. They are:

(a) Inter-institutional Analysis

Inter-institutional analysis involves a comparison of two or more administrative systems within an organization. For instance, a comparison of the structure and

working of the department of human resource and department accounting such comparisons could involve the whole of an administrative organization or its various parts.

(b) Intra national Analysis

When an analysis in a comparative perspective is taken up among various administrative systems functioning within a country, it would be an intra-national analysis. For instance comparison of district administration in Northern (Unguja) and South district (Pemba) would be an example of such an analysis.

(c) Cross-national Analysis

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

(d) Cross-cultural Analysis

A cross-national analysis of administrative system involves countries forming part of different "cultures", this would be called a cross-cultural analysis. For instance, comparing the administrative system of the USSR (a socialist state) with the U.S. (a capitalist system) could be termed a cross-cultural analysis. Even a comparison between a developed country (e.g. Britain or France) with a developing country (e.g. Tanzania or Nigeria) or between a developing democratic country (e.g. Philippines) and a developing Communist regime (e.g. Vietnam) will be covered in a cross-

cultural comparison. Thus, the word "cultural" in the category "cross-cultural" has a broad connotation and involves an aggregation of distinctive political, economic and socio-cultural traits of a particular system and its environment.

(e) Cross Temporal Analysis

Such a comparison involves different time-frames for analysis. For instance, a comparison between the administrative system prevailing during ancient Rome and modern Italy or between the administrative practices prevailing during the period of late Abeid Amani Karume and Dr. Sheinor rather pre-colonial and post-colonial era of Africa or specifically Nigeria would fall under the rubric of cross-temporal analysis. A cross-temporal analysis may be inter-institutional, intra-national, and cross-national or cross cultural. For instance, a comparison of the administrative control mechanisms prevailing during the times of late Gaddafi, Alexander, Mkapa and Nasser will be cross national as well as cross-cultural.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Outline any three forms of Comparative Public Administration studies



1.4 Summary

From the foregoing, comparative public administration studies could be conducted in different analytical bases. It could be macro, middle range or micro analysis. Also, the comparative studies could be in the form of cross-national, cross-cultural etc. Sometimes, researchers are puzzle on the most suitable level analysis to use or on the form of analysis to engage in. Selecting the most fruitful approach for

conducting comparative public administration research is inescapably an eclectic process. Students of the field have to be able and willing to choose from several options, but with full knowledge of the objectives as well as the potential and the limitations of each option. No one method will suit all occasions. Case studies, middle-range models, focus on structure and function, or a behavioral orientation—each provides valid techniques and perspectives. What is the appropriate approach depends on the nature of the type of questions and the objective of the study. Therefore, students have to clearly define the level of analysis before engaging of any study.

In summary, the unit highlighted the scope and level of analysis in comparative public administration studies and the different forms or types of comparative studies which are chosen and applied relative to the objective one intends to achieve.



1.5 References/Further Reading

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

Heady, F. (1979). Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, 2nd edition. New York: Mariel Dekker.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Outline any three forms of Comparative Public Administration studies

Answer

Three forms of comparative administrative studies are as follows:

1. Inter-institutional Analysis

Inter-institutional analysis involves a comparison of two or more administrative systems within an organization. For instance, a comparison of the structure and working of the department of human resource and department accounting such comparisons could involve the whole of an administrative organization or its various parts.

2. Intra national Analysis

When an analysis in a comparative perspective is taken up among various administrative systems functioning within a country, it would be an intra-national analysis. For instance comparison of district administration in Northern (Unguja) and South district (Pemba) would be an example of such an analysis.

3. Cross-national Analysis

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

MODULE 2

UNIT 1: COMPARISON BETWEEN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main content
 - 1.3.1 Traditional Public Administration
 - 1.3.2 Comparative Public Administration
- 1.4 Public Administration and Comparative Public Administration compared
- 1.5 Summary
- 1.6 References/Further Reading
- 1.7 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content



1.1 Introduction

After the attempt in looking at the different level of analysis and forms of comparative public administration, here, we are going to proceed by comparing the traditional (conventional) public administration with comparative public

administration so that we identify the bottom line of differences between the latter and the former. Comparative public administration has been the first visible major development in the post world-war evolution of public administration. It aims at the development of a more systematic and scientific public administration by constructing and enhancing theory in public administration.



1.2 Learning Outcome

At the end of this unit, student should be able to:

- (a) Describe the Traditional Public Administration
- (b) Briefly describe Comparative Public Administration
- (c) Make comparison between Traditional and Comparative Public Administration



1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 Traditional Public Administration

In the literal sense of the term administration, it has a Latin origin from ‘ad’ and ‘ministrare’- administrare, meaning to serve. Pfiffner and Presthus define administration as the systematic ordering of affairs and calculated use of resources aimed at making those things which we want to happen and at the same time preventing the occurrence of those events that fail to meet our objectives. Frederick Lane defines administration as organizing and maintaining human and fiscal resources to attain a group’s goals Pfiffner and Presthus (1960:3) defined Public administration as the getting the work of government done by coordinating the

efforts of the people. Public Administration is a broad-ranging and amorphous combination of theory and practice; its purpose is to promote a superior understanding of government and its relationship with the society, it governs, as well as to encourage public policies more responsive to social needs and to institute managerial practices attuned to effectiveness, efficiency and the deeper human requisites of the citizenry.

However, in more comprehensive way, Nigro and Nigro summarize the meaning of Public Administration thus: (i) A cooperative group effort in a public setting (ii) Covers all three branches of government, that is, executive legislative and judiciary and their interrelationships, (iii) Has important role in the formulation of public policy and thus a part of the political process, (iv) More important than, and also different in significant ways from private administration, and (vi) Closely associated with numerous private group and individuals in providing services to the community. From all the foregoing definitions, it can be deduced that, Public Administration is a cooperative or group activities aimed at achieving predetermined aims and objectives of the government in order to achieve the objectives of public policies. It comprises the interrelationships among the three branches of government, i.e. executive, judiciary and the legislature.

In sum, public administration:

- (i) is the non-political public bureaucracy operating in a political system;
- (ii) deals with the ends of the State, the sovereign will, the public interests and laws;

- (iii) is the business side of government and as such concerned with policy execution, but it is also concerned with policy-making;
- (iv) covers all three branches of government, although it tends to be concentrated in the executive branch;
- (v) provides regulatory and service functions to the people in order to attain good life;
- (vi) Differs significantly from private administration, especially in its emphasis on the public; and
- (vii) is interdisciplinary in nature as it draws upon other social sciences like political science, economics and sociology.

1.3.2 Comparative Public Administration

As earlier stated, in our previous discussions, Comparative Public Administration, in simple terms, refers to a comparative study of government administrative systems functioning in different countries of the world. The nature of Comparative Administration has vast ramifications and ranges from the narrowest of studies to the broadest of analysis. To understand the meaning of Comparative Public Administration, it would be desirable to look at the types of comparative public administration studies undertaken by scholars in the field.

Nimrod Raphaeli has defined Comparative Public Administration as a study of Public administration on a comparative basis. The Comparative Administration Group referred to Comparative Public Administration as —the theory of Public Administration applied to diverse cultures and national setting and the body of

factual data, by which it can be examined and tested.¶ Robert Jackson has defined it as the phase of study which is –concerned with making rigorous 'cross-cultural comparisons of the structures and processes involved in the activity of administering public affairs.

1.4 Public Administration and Comparative Public Administration Compared

Comparative public administration is different from traditional public administration in two respects:

(a) Public administration is 'culture-bound' (ethnocentric) while comparative public administration is 'cross-cultural' in its orientation and thrust. In 1936, L.D. White observed that a principle of administration is as useful a guide to action in the public administration of Russia as of Great Britain, of Iraq as of United States. But later Robert Dahl (in 1947) and Dwight Waldo (in 1948) pointed out that cultural factors could make public administration on one part of the globe quite a different animal from public administration on the other part.

(b) Public administration is “practitioner-oriented” and involves the “real world”, whereas comparative public administration attempts to the “theory-building” and “seeks knowledge for the sake of knowledge”. In brief, the comparative public administration has a purely scholarly thrust, as opposed to professional.

According to Professor Ferrel Heady, the comparative public administration addresses five —motivating concerns¶ as an intellectual enterprise.

These are:

(a) The search for theory;

- (b) The urge for practical application;
- (c) The incidental contribution of the broader field of comparative politics;
- (d) The interest of researchers trained in the tradition of administrative law; and
- (e) The comparative analysis of ongoing problems of public administration.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Briefly distinguish between Traditional public administration and comparative public administration



1.5 Summary

The primary goal of the discipline (comparative public administration) is in line with the scientific demand which is to build and test propositions about administration, an assumption that is universally shared within the public administration fraternity (Sigelman, 1976). It is committed to verifiable generalized statements about public administration across political systems and different environments. It is believed by scholar of comparative public administrative studies that public officials, political advisers, public administrators and the entire political process will perform better if public administration and its practice can be rooted in developed theoretical and empirical foundation.

In this unit, we have looked at the traditional public administration and comparative public administration. The former can be seen as the one that emphasizes on normative (what ought to be) rather than empiricism (what is). It deals with the study of the cooperative effort of two or more people in order to achieve certain ends. On the other hand, comparative public administration is emphasizing in developing a

theory of public administration after taking into cognizance the variation in culture, environment etc.



1.6 References/Further Reading

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

Heady, F. (1979). Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, 2nd edition. New York: Marjell Dekker.

Marume, S. B. M. ,Jubenkanda, R. R. and Namusi, C. W. (2016). Comparative Public Administration in International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR) ISSN (Online): 2319-7064

Naidu, S.P. (2006). Public Administration, Concepts and Theories. New Delhi: New Age

International Publishers. Sapru, R.K. (2013). Administrative Theories and Management Thought (3rd edition) Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited



1.7 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Briefly distinguish between Traditional public administration and comparative public administration

Answer

Comparative public administration is different from traditional public administration in two respects:

1. Public administration is 'culture-bound' (ethnocentric) while comparative public administration is 'cross-cultural' in its orientation and thrust. In 1936, L.D. White observed that a principle of administration is as useful a guide to action in the

public administration of Russia as of Great Britain, of Iraq as of United States. But later Robert Dahl (in 1947) and Dwight Waldo (in 1948) pointed out that cultural factors could make public administration on one part of the globe quite a different animal from public administration on the other part.

2. Public administration is “practitioner-oriented” and involves the “real world”, whereas comparative public administration attempts to the “theory-building” and “seeks knowledge for the sake of knowledge”. In brief, the comparative public administration has a purely scholarly thrust, as opposed to professional. More so, According to Professor Ferrel Heady, the comparative public administration addresses five — motivating concerns as an intellectual enterprise.

These are:

- (a) The search for theory;
- (b) The urge for practical application;
- (c) The incidental contribution of the broader field of comparative politics;
- (d) The interest of researchers trained in the tradition of administrative law; and
- (e) The comparative analysis of ongoing problems of public administration.

Unit 2: Uses of Models and Approaches in Comparative Public Administration Studies

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main content
 - 1.3.1 Uses of Models and Approaches in Comparative Studies
 - 1.3.2 Models and Approaches Compared
- 1.4 Summary
- 1.5 References/Further Reading
- 1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content



1.1 Introduction

Our discussion in this unit will Centre on the concept of model and approaches.

Models are to use to organize information and facts that constitute the entire study.

Certainly unorganized facts are not going to serve any purpose of research. Research findings are useful only when it fits into our established framework or into our established knowledge. In fact, models are replacing our framework of the study.

To some degree models are universal framework of analysis of similar problems under study. Therefore, our attention in this unit is to identify and justify the use of

models and approaches in comparative public administration studies and to compare the two.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit, student should be able to:

- (a) Identify and justify the uses of models and approaches in Comparative studies and identify the common tendencies shared by different models
- (b) Briefly compare between Models and Approaches



1.3 Main content

1.3.1 Uses of Models and Approaches in Comparative Studies

The word model is treated in this unit as treated by Waldo, to mean simply the conscious effort or attempt to develop and define concepts or cluster of related concepts. It is useful in classifying data, describing reality and hypothesizing about it. We must also distinguish between the term 'model' and 'theory'. In fact, both 'model' and 'theory' are used interchangeably. Generally speaking, 'theory' is more sophisticated tool than 'model'.

The various models include the Max Weber's bureaucratic model which has the most popular use in comparative study of bureaucracies. Also, the model advanced by Down emphasized the importance of career interests as determinants of administrative process. Riggs's 'prismatic-sala' model is an intellectual creativity

of the model building clan in comparative public administration, particularly with reference to third world governments. Dorsey's information-energy model, the developmental model and Mathur's, model do represent distinctly different and yet in broad sense intellectually compatible models, each of which has proved to be useful in studying comparative administration.

Generally, we may point out that models used in studying public administration share the following tendencies:

1. To study the social, cultural, political and economic factors that influence comparative studies (Ecological Model).
2. To use concepts that characterize public administration as a series of actions or behaviours, involved in meeting changing environmental demands.
3. To conceptualize administrative activity in a system way with particular attention to the goal of political system.
4. To deal implicitly or explicitly with the requisites for effective operation of administrative system.
5. To be presented in such a way as to imply their general relevance for the study of public administration. As noted earlier, the very use of models is to organize information and facts that constitute the entire study. Certainly unorganized facts are not going to serve any purpose of research. Research findings are useful only when it fits into our established framework or into our established knowledge. In fact, models are replacing our framework of the study.

6. To some degree models are universal framework of analysis of similar problems under study.

1.3.2 Models and Approaches Compared

There are significant differences between models and approaches. An approach is based primarily on one central concept that is thought to be especially useful in studying basic features of public administration. Models can be thought of as refined and more specific versions of approaches. Within one approach different models can be developed. Models are very specific towards a particular study. On the other side, approaches are general in nature.

The word model is treated in this guide as treated by Waldo, to mean simply the conscious effort or attempt to develop and define concepts or cluster of related concepts. It is useful in classifying data, describing reality and hypothesising about it. We must also distinguish between the term 'model' and 'theory'. In fact, both 'model' and 'theory' are used interchangeably. Generally speaking, 'theory' is more sophisticated tool than 'model'. However, Herbert Simon, Allen Newell, Waldo and Nimrod Raphaeli used 'model' and 'theory' interchangeably in practice.

Models in public administration were first introduced impressively by Herbert Simon. His work like *Administrative Behaviour* (1947), *Public Administration* (1950), and *Organizations* (1958) are important contributions to 'model' building in public administration. Herbert Simon's 'bounded relational model' explained the rational way of arriving at decisions. Decision-makers are more contented with

'satisfying' rather than 'optimising model' in decision-making which is a major contribution to model building in public administration.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Identify four uses of model in comparative public administration



1.4 Summary

In conclusion, it is by analyzing each model separately and its proper use in comparative study of public administration that we can discover the requirement of empirical investigation for some comparative research. We can also narrow down the collection of data, ordering data -and postulate relationship among variables. The existing 'models for comparison are of limited use because they fail to explain the causes of bureaucratic change. And even if they do, they may be in accurate. Most of the conclusions of comparative studies are very abstract.

However, without models or framework by which we can accumulate and relate information, there is a difficulty of comparison. This proves the importance of familiarizing ourselves with appropriate models to make a reasonable comparison. The choice of models thus is intimately related to the choice of a research strategy and to the most effective employment of limited resources.

In this unit, we have attempted a comparison between a model and approach as well as the uses of models in comparative public administration studies. None of the models may present a perfect analysis of contemporary administrative scenes in

diverse cultural settings. But if carefully used models do serve as a framework for analysing different aspects of administrative phenomena in a comparative perspective.



1.5 References/Further Reading

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

Heady, F. (1979). Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, 2nd edition. New York: Mariel Dekker.

Rathod, P.B. (2007). Models of Comparative Public Administration in Comparative Public Administration, Jaipur, India: ABD Publishers.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Identify four uses of model in comparative public administration

Answer

The word model is treated in this unit as treated by Waldo, to mean simply the conscious effort or attempt to develop and define concepts or cluster of related concepts. It is useful in classifying data, describing reality and hypothesizing about it. We must also distinguish between the term 'model' and 'theory'. In fact, both 'model' and 'theory' are used interchangeably. Generally speaking, 'theory' is more sophisticated tool than 'model'.

The various models include the Max Weber's bureaucratic model which has the most popular use in comparative study of bureaucracies. Also, the model advanced by Down emphasized the importance of career interests as determinants of administrative process. Riggs's 'prismatic-sala' model is an intellectual creativity of the model building clan in comparative public administration, particularly with reference to third world governments. Dorsey's information-energy model, the developmental model and Mathur's, model do represent distinctly different and yet in broad sense intellectually compatible models, each of which has proved to be useful in studying comparative administration.

Generally, we may point out that models used in studying public administration share the following tendencies:

1. To study the social, cultural, political and economic factors that influence comparative studies (Ecological Model).
2. To use concepts that characterize public administration as a series of actions or behaviours, involved in meeting changing environmental demands.
3. To conceptualize administrative activity in a system way with particular attention to the goal of political system.
4. To deal implicitly or explicitly with the requisites for effective operation of administrative system.

Unit 3: Cross-cultural Approach to Comparative public administration Studies

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main content
- 1.3.1 Cross-Cultural Approach
- 1.4 Summary
- 1.5 References/Further Reading
- 1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content



1.1 Introduction

Realizing the massive influence of unfolding globalism, comparative public administration opens the door for effective adjustment and transition from traditional, ethnocentric perspectives to a wider scope that integrates knowledge from various places and cultures. There is no one way to get to the place where public administration ought to be. Therefore, this unit focuses on the cross-cultural approach to comparative public administration studies.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit, student should be able to:

Understand how to apply Cross-cultural approach in Comparative Public Administration studies.



1.3 Main content

1.3.1 Cross-Cultural Approach

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

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Briefly describe the cross-cultural approach

1.4 Summary

In conclusion, cross-cultural analysis is a commitment to human learning and discovery, unencumbered by geographical or political borders. It is compelling for many reasons: First, comparative public administration is a quest for patterns and regularities of administrative action and behavior. Through comparative analysis, we are able to show not only the diversity of human experience, but also the amazing uniformity within and among states. Comparison extends our knowledge of how to explore, reflect, and better understand universal administrative attributes, instead of being confined to ethnocentric views. Thus, comparative information and analysis have a balancing effect that reduces internalized biases and prejudices. The cross-cultural analysis of administrative system involves countries forming part or different "cultures", which would be called a cross-cultural analysis.



1.5 References/Further Reading

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

Heady, F. (1979). *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, 2nd edition. New York: Marjell Dekker.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Briefly describe the cross-cultural approach

Answer

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

Unit 4: Bureaucratic Approach to Comparative public administration Studies

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main content
- 1.3.1 Bureaucratic Approach
- 1.4 Summary
- 1.5 References/Further Reading
- 1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content



1.1 Introduction

Max Weber (1864-1920) a classical theorist presents an 'ideal type' of bureaucracy, which is capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency and the most rational form of administration. Weber's idea about bureaucracy first published in 1921 based on legal-rational authority and was destined to dominate all other forms of bureaucracy because of its technical superiority over others. Therefore, in this unit three, we are going to look at the bureaucratic approach to comparative public administration.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit, student should be able to:

Describe and understand how to apply Bureaucratic approach in Comparative Public Administration study.



1.3 Main content

1.3.1 Bureaucratic Approach

Weber's (1864-1920) model of bureaucracy was based on the political questions that dominated the nineteenth century scholars. He had integrated bureaucracy into the larger scheme of the three ideal types of authority. It is legal in the sense that it is based on a style of authority that is legitimated through legal processes. It is rational in the sense that it controlled on the basis of knowledge. It is learnt that Weber was firmly committed to Models of Comparative Public Administration parliamentary democracy. He supported strong leadership and expected the leaders to protect the mass against its own irrationality, and the individual against mob psychology. The identifying characteristics of bureaucracies were:

1. Fixed and official jurisdictions areas, controlled and ordered by written rules and regulations,
2. Clear division of labour with authority and responsibility equally clearly designated, maximizing specialization and expertise,
3. The arrangements of all positions into a hierarchy of authority,
4. All officials appointed on the basis of qualifications,
5. Work viewed as a vocation, a full time occupation, and

6. Uniformity and impersonality "without regard to persons." This kind of 'ideal bureaucracy' became the dominant form of civil service subsystem in the industrial world.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Outline four features of bureaucracy by weber



1.4 Summary

Bureaucratic approach conceives organisation as having structural prerequisites. No discussion on the conception of a bureaucratic organisation can proceed without reference to the Weberian model of bureaucracy.

In summary, evidently, the Weberian and socialist conceptions of bureaucracy differ regarding its specific functions and role. Weber views bureaucratic organisation in a value neutral context; it stands for rationality and machine-like efficiency. In Marxist-Leninist conception, it is an organ of political coercion in a class society. Weber underlines the continuity and permanence of bureaucracy and considers it indispensable machinery for managing a complex industrial society.



1.5 References/Further Reading

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

Heady, F. (1979). Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, 2nd edition. New York: Marjell Dekker.

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



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Outline four features of bureaucracy by weber

Answer

Four features of bureaucracies identified by weber were:

1. Fixed and official jurisdictions areas, controlled and ordered by written rules and regulations,
2. Clear division of labour with authority and responsibility equally clearly designated, maximizing specialization and expertise,
3. The arrangements of all positions into a hierarchy of authority,
4. All officials appointed on the basis of qualifications,

Unit 5: Case studies Approach to Comparative public administration Studies

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main content
- 1.3.1 Case Studies Approach
- 1.4 Summary
- 1.5 References/Further Reading
- 1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content



1.1 Introduction

In the previous unit, we have looked at the cross-cultural approach to the comparative public administration studies and the Weber's bureaucratic approach. However, a methodology of comparative administration, extended to the examination of a small number of cases instead of single-case analysis, produces more dependable results, better evaluation of hypotheses, and better verification of conclusions. By comparing a manageable number of administrative variables, researchers are able to have greater focus and provide an improved description and sharper definition of elements to be investigated. Information generated through case studies offers students and practitioners' better evidence and more credible analysis of the causes and effects of administrative actions and behaviors. We are

going to discuss about case study approach in comparative public administration studies.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit, student should be able to:

Understand and know how to apply Case Studies approach in Comparative Public Administration study.



1.3 Main content

1.3.1 Case Studies Approach

The case study method is a systematic research tool concerned with the context as well as the variables. Primarily, it seeks to discover rather than confirm or test hypotheses. The methodological characteristics of the case study method are particularistic, descriptive, heuristic, interpretive, and inductive (Merriam, 1988).

Also, the case study method varies in content and approach. The most relevant case study is the one developed from observation and experience, but not all cases are based on such observation. —The facts in the case may be focused toward specific theories, but seemingly irrelevant material will also be included (Buller and Schuler 2000,).

Ordinarily, cases are developed as synthesis of a variety of experiences. Others may be developed as hypothetical or abstract constructs, and may not represent concrete reality. Case studies that are based on participant observations benefit comparative

administration by enhancing its relevance. Close analysis of a manageable number of these observations within few real cases, is a preferable venue for improving reliability and utility of results. Moreover, case studies provide comprehensive-ness (unless the focus is on a case component) that is hard to reach through other methods of research without sacrificing specificity and relevance. Well-written case studies serve as vehicles for organizing data and materials that allow establishing regularities and identifying recurrent themes. Properly executed and fairly specified case studies of administrative reform, for example, are valuable sources of information about a variety of related elements. They inform us about processes, practices, and behaviors as well as environmental influences (cultural, political, and historical).

The patterns and regularities that may be found in comparing case materials are transformed into descriptive categories and characteristics that summarize experiences, integrate data, and synthesize conclusions. Abstractions often are unavoidable in the analysis of data collected by case study researchers. When such action takes place, however, most likely it is motivated by the need to connect and make sense of information gathered. From a practitioner's perspective, cases are enormously beneficial by providing rich details, for developing problem-solving skills, and for improving the ability to relate administrative practices to their conceptual foundations.

During the 1970s, under Dwight Waldo's leadership, the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) received a grant from the

U.S. Office of Education for developing case materials for classroom use in graduate programs in public administration. The project resulted in a bibliography of over 250 —Cases in Public Policy and Management. The cases were classified in categories corresponding to major curricular areas in schools and departments that offer courses on public policy and management. They include topics such as political and institutional analysis, economic and public finance, quantitative methods, ethical and moral issues, budgeting and financial management, organizational behavior and interpersonal relations, personnel, and general management (Waldo 1978). Waldo's project mainly consisted of single case studies that may be used for different purposes. Although comparison is not the central concern in compiling such cases, they presumably still may serve as useful material in comparative exercises. However, because the cases are based on observations mostly in the American context, they have limited utility for crosscultural analysis. Early contributions were largely single-case studies, such as Braibanti (1966) on Pakistan, Riggs (1966) on Thailand, Daland (1967) on Brazil, Esman (1972) on Malaysia, and so forth. Many foundational concepts and practical insights have been derived from such international experiences. Invariably, these scholars agreed that contextual or environmental constraints do influence organizational capacity to act effectively.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

| |
|---|
| Briefly explain the case study approach |
|---|



1.4 Summary

Certainly, the significance of the early case studies is compelling. But at this time, comparing a few cases instead of a single case is necessary to proceed to the next phase of knowledge consolidation and to achieve a true reflection of current societal and global conditions.

A case is a narration of what has actually taken place in administration, keeping in fact the context and all relevant dimensions. Aply, handled, the case method approach is a sensitive one, seeking as it does to reconstruct the administrative realities and gives to students a flavour of the administrative Process. The case approach has been motivated by a commitment to the objectives and methods of social sciences. It has been shaped also by a considerable sensitivity to traditional concerns of humanities and by practical interest in pedagogy as against research.



1.5 References/Further Reading

Almond, Gabriel A., and Sidney Verba, eds. (1965). *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations, An Analytic Study*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Almond, G., et al. (2000). *Comparative Politics Today*. 7th Ed. New York: Longman.

Braibanti, Ralph. (1966). *Research on the Bureaucracy of Pakistan: A Critique of Sources, Conditions, and Issues*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

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

Esman, Milton J. (1966). The Politics of Development Administration. In Approaches to Development: Politics, Administration, and Change, edited by John D. Montgomery and William J. Siffin, 59– 112. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Heady, F. (1979). Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, 2nd edition. New York: Marjell Dekker.

Riggs, Fred. (1961). The Ecology of Public Administration. New York: Asia Publishing.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Briefly explain the case study approach

Answer

The case study method is a systematic research tool concerned with the context as well as the variables. Primarily, it seeks to discover rather than confirm or test hypotheses. The methodological characteristics of the case study method are particularistic, descriptive, heuristic, interpretive, and inductive (Merriam, 1988).

Also, the case study method varies in content and approach. The most relevant case study is the one developed from observation and experience, but not all cases are based on such observation. —The facts in the case may be focused toward specific theories, but seemingly irrelevant material will also be included (Buller and Schuler 2000,).

Ordinarily, cases are developed as synthesis of a variety of experiences. Others may be developed as hypothetical or abstract constructs, and may not represent concrete

reality. Case studies that are based on participant observations benefit comparative administration by enhancing its relevance. Close analysis of a manageable number of these observations within few real cases, is a preferable venue for improving reliability and utility of results. Moreover, case studies provide comprehensive-ness (unless the focus is on a case component) that is hard to reach through other methods of research without sacrificing specificity and relevance. Well-written case studies serve as vehicles for organizing data and materials that allow establishing regularities and identifying recurrent themes. Properly executed and fairly specified case studies of administrative reform, for example, are valuable sources of information about a variety of related elements. They inform us about processes, practices, and behaviors as well as environmental influences (cultural, political, and historical).

The patterns and regularities that may be found in comparing case materials are transformed into descriptive categories and characteristics that summarize experiences, integrate data, and synthesize conclusions. Abstractions often are unavoidable in the analysis of data collected by case study researchers. When such action takes place, however, most likely it is motivated by the need to connect and make sense of information gathered. From a practitioner's perspective, cases are enormously beneficial by providing rich details, for developing problem-solving skills, and for improving the ability to relate administrative practices to their conceptual foundations.

During the 1970s, under Dwight Waldo's leadership, the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) received a grant from the U.S. Office of Education for developing case materials for classroom use in graduate programs in public administration. The project resulted in a bibliography of over 250 —Cases in Public Policy and Management. The cases were classified in categories corresponding to major curricular areas in schools and departments that offer courses on public policy and management. They include topics such as political and institutional analysis, economic and public finance, quantitative methods, ethical and moral issues, budgeting and financial management, organizational behavior and interpersonal relations, personnel, and general management (Waldo 1978). Waldo's project mainly consisted of single case studies that may be used for different purposes. Although comparison is not the central concern in compiling such cases, they presumably still may serve as useful material in comparative exercises. However, because the cases are based on observations mostly in the American context, they have limited utility for crosscultural analysis. Early contributions were largely single-case studies, such as Braibanti (1966) on Pakistan, Riggs (1966) on Thailand, Daland (1967) on Brazil, Esman (1972) on Malaysia, and so forth. Many foundational concepts and practical insights have been derived from such international experiences. Invariably, these scholars agreed that contextual or environmental constraints do influence organizational capacity to act effectively.

MODULE 3

Unit 1: Institutional Approach to Comparative public administration Studies

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main content
- 1.3.1 Institutional Approach
- 1.4 Summary
- 1.5 References/Further Reading
- 1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content



1.1 Introduction

Hello everyone. It should be noted that institutional approach to the study of comparative public administration is one of the oldest and in point of number, it has the largest followers. But it is least homogenous of all schools of public administration as it includes among its protagonists, teachers and research workers with varied training, ranging from political scientist to specialists in scientific management techniques. Therefore, we shall look at the institutional approach in comparative public administration study.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit, student should be able to:

Understand and know how to apply Institutional approach in Comparative Public Administration study



1.3 Main content

1.3.1 Institutional Approach

The common features of this school which distinguishes it from other schools of administrative thought are as follows:

1. The followers of this school took policy administration dichotomy quite seriously. They defined the task of administration as nonpolitical or technical which lay merely in carrying out the will of political authority by either neutral means. They directed all their efforts to discover principles of public administration.
2. The early work of this school is characterized by an empirical and pragmatic approach. Their sole aim was to describe a set of facts and not to build any theories. This view prevails particularly in United States during the period between the two world wars and its greatest exponents were Leonard. D. White and Luther Gulick.

Since the fifties of the last century, there has been a shift in this approach. Although the study has retained its institutional character, yet the policy administration dichotomy has been qualified after being found too hasty. More attention is being given to the normative aspects of public administration and administration is being viewed as an element in political theory and the accepted political Values. Scholars

like John. M. Gaus and Paul Appleby of this school have frankly given up the technical view of public administration and they approach public administration from the broad political standpoint.

However, institutional approach to the study of comparative public administration concerns itself with the institutions and organizations of the State. The core area of this method lies in detailed study of the structure, the functioning, rules, and regulations of the executives, legislatures and the departments of the Government. The scholars who practice this approach consider administration to be an apolitical and technical function which lies only in the aspect of policy implementation.

Now, there were many authors like L D White and Luther Gulick who concentrated their effort in describing what an institutional structure was and did little to build any theory actually. The reader may be intrigued as to why this special attention was paid to define institutions. The present day definition of institution encompassing all kinds of rules, regulations and organizations is argued as inaccurate by many authors like B Guy Peters and Jon Pierre. Institutionalization of an organization takes time.

An organization keeps getting complex by adding informal norms and practices which happens through its interaction with the external environment and they are in a sense independent of the individuals who make an organization at a given point of time. However, according to Selznick (1957), any organization which is complex needs to be infused with value which is beyond the technical requirement of the tasks that are performed by that organization. This means that an organization has a

distinctive sense of self and identity and its way and its beliefs become important for the society as well. It also starts representing the aspiration of the community and in turn influences the community with their own values and beliefs. A real institution becomes a symbol for the community in many ways, like the very building in which it is housed. It can be interestingly explained and seen all through the History that the revolting group often occupy the presidential palace or offices or the parliamentary buildings or pose a threat to the powerful and symbolic structures like the terrorist threat on the Pentagon during 9/11 and the 26/11 Taj Hotel attack in India.

The above discussion becomes relevant with respect to the study of public administration and comparative public administration because Government organizations are institutional in many ways and represent the needs and aspirations of the community. Therefore, studying and understanding their administration becomes important to make them more efficient and result oriented.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Briefly describe the institutional approach



1.4 Summary

This institutional approach focuses on the organizational structure, goals and principles as primary. So, a lot of attention was given to the problems related to the

functioning of an organization like delegation, coordination and control and bureaucratic structure.

The main drawback to this approach was that little or no attention was given to the external sociological and psychological factors. These factors affect the organization in ways which are not always subtle, but have strong ramifications on the health and well-being of an organization.

The unit discusses the institutional approach to the comparative public administration studies which is regarded as one of the oldest approach used to compare the composition, structure and the nature of the administrative system.



1.5 References/Further Reading

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

Heady, F. (1979).Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, 2nd edition. New York: Mariel Dekker.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXCERCISE

Briefly describe the institutional approach

Answer

The common features of this school which distinguishes it from other schools of administrative thought are as follows:

3. The followers of this school took policy administration dichotomy quite seriously. They defined the task of administration as nonpolitical or technical which lay merely in carrying out the will of political authority by either neutral means. They directed all their efforts to discover ‘principles’ of public administration.
4. The early work of this school is characterized by an empirical and pragmatic approach. Their sole aim was to describe a set of facts and not to build any theories. This view prevails particularly in United States during the period between the two world wars and its greatest exponents were Leonard. D. White and Luther Gulick.

Since the fifties of the last century, there has been a shift in this approach. Although the study has retained its institutional character, yet the policy administration dichotomy has been qualified after being found too hasty. More attention is being given to the normative aspects of public administration and administration is being viewed as an element in political theory and the accepted political Values. Scholars like John. M. Gaus and Paul Appleby of this school have frankly given up the technical view of public administration and they approach public administration from the broad political standpoint.

However, institutional approach to the study of comparative public administration concerns itself with the institutions and organizations of the State. The core area of this method lies in detailed study of the structure, the functioning, rules, and regulations of the executives, legislatures and the departments of the Government.

The scholars who practice this approach consider administration to be an apolitical and technical function which lies only in the aspect of policy implementation.

Now, there were many authors like L D White and Luther Gulick who concentrated their effort in describing what an institutional structure was and did little to build any theory actually. The reader may be intrigued as to why this special attention was paid to define institutions. The present day definition of institution encompassing all kinds of rules, regulations and organizations is argued as inaccurate by many authors like B Guy Peters and Jon Pierre. Institutionalization of an organization takes time.

An organization keeps getting complex by adding informal norms and practices which happens through its interaction with the external environment and they are in a sense independent of the individuals who make an organization at a given point of time. However, according to Selznick (1957), any organization which is complex needs to be infused with value which is beyond the technical requirement of the tasks that are performed by that organization. This means that an organization has a distinctive sense of self and identity and its way and its beliefs become important for the society as well. It also starts representing the aspiration of the community and in turn influences the community with their own values and beliefs. A real institution becomes a symbol for the community in many ways, like the very building in which it is housed. It can be interestingly explained and seen all through the History that the revolting group often occupy the presidential palace or offices or the parliamentary buildings or pose a threat to the powerful and symbolic

structures like the terrorist threat on the Pentagon during 9/11 and the 26/11 Taj Hotel attack in India.

The above discussion becomes relevant with respect to the study of public administration and comparative public administration because Government organizations are institutional in many ways and represent the needs and aspirations of the community. Therefore, studying and understanding their administration becomes important to make them more efficient and result oriented.

Unit 2: Structural-functional Approach to Comparative public administration Studies

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main content
- 1.3.1 Structural-Functional Approach
- 1.4 Summary
- 1.5 References/Further Reading
- 1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content



1.1 Introduction

The adoption of structural-functional approach in the field of public administration was first suggested in 1955 by Dwight Waldo. Apart from Riggs, the StructuralFunctional Approach was adopted by Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton, Marion Levy, Gabriel Almond, David Apter, and others. According to the StructuralFunctional Approach, every society has various structures which perform specificfunctions. Riggs identified five functions which are performed in each society. They are political, economic, social, symbolic and communicational functions. He stated that, same set of functional requisite apply to an administrative sub-system.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit, student should be able to:

Understand and apply the Systems/Structural-functional approach in Comparative Public Administration study.



1.3 Main content

1.3.1 Structural-Functional Approach

In structural-functional approach, for Structural-Functional Models to meet its obligations, government needs specialized institutions—agencies, and departments—to formulate and implement its policies. These administrative structures are often referred to as the bureaucracy. A government has other important structures such as the legislature, the judiciary, and political parties. Each of these structures performs specific functions. But one structure performing certain functions in a government does not mean that such structure will perform the same functions in all governments, nor will it perform with the same degree of competence and ethics across systems. Structure is defined as patterned activities and patterned behaviors that become standard feature of a social system (Riggs 1964). So, regularity and standardization are characteristics of structures. The processes of decision making in a bureaucracy, and how bureaucracy makes rules and regulations in an agency, are important parts of its structures—just as making laws by a parliament or a congress is indicative of the legislative institution's structural characteristics.

Significantly, structure does not include all actions carried out by members of an organization; it includes only those that relate to its goals and purposes. The structures of formal organizations, as Selznick pointed out, —represent rationally

ordered instruments for the achievement of stated goals (1948, 127). We know that structures vary in complexity, degree of formalization, functions served, and several other aspects. But in government, organizational structure has greater staying power than in a business corporation and, thus, exhibits different dynamism and distinct connection to performance. The point is that few public managers would really be —thriving on chaos or on management relativism in implementing public policy, and fewer still would risk possible violation of laws that decree such policies. While high-tech, speculative industries may benefit by proposed revolutionary managerial techniques (if they do not fade away in the process), public organizations, in comparison, apply different rules of conduct, abide by different ethics, and serve different expectations (Jreisat 1997a).

Function is the consequence of actions or behaviors by members of an agency, bureau, department, or any other organization. The functions of administrative units range from education to maintaining orderly traffic on highways. Although structure is easier to define and has been more often studied, satisfying the functions of the unit is what ultimately matters most. More than any time before, today's public administration has been refocused on performance and consequences of administrative actions and behaviors. Political and administrative leaders in many countries—developed and developing—have been demanding that units of government practice result-oriented management. Indeed, many have concluded that this concern is also becoming a global shift in concepts and application, ushering in a —new public management. To prevent misunderstanding, emphasis

should be on a balanced approach for comparative public administration that considers both structure and function simultaneously. As a minimum, researchers need to relate structures to their legitimate goals in any thorough cross-cultural analysis. Many structures appear impressive but actually harbor very low capabilities. Consider administrative units of education or public health in a developing country, or even a legislative house, with their impressive buildings and huge staffs. The picture is incomplete without assessing the functions of education, public health, and legislation and to what degree and at what cost they meet society's needs. Appraising both of structure and function remains a very challenging task few comparative studies have adequately satisfied (Almond and Coleman 1960).

F.W Riggs in his book entitled *The Ecology of Public Administration* (1961) explored the dynamics of interaction between public administration and its external environment. He adopted the structural -functional approach in explaining the administrative systems from ecological perspective. According to the StructuralFunctional Approach, every society has various structures which perform specific functions. Riggs identified five functions which are performed in each society. They are political, economic, social, symbolic and communicational functions. He stated that, same set of functional requisite apply to an administrative sub-system.

As earlier stated, based on the structural-functional approach, F.W. Riggs has constructed two 'ideal models' (theoretical models) to explain the administrative system in a comparative context. These are (i) agraria-industria model; and

(ii) fused-prismatic-diffracted model. Riggs developed the agraria-industria topology in 1956. In this model, he distinguished between two types of societies- societies dominated by agricultural institutions and societies dominated by industrial institutions. These two polar types represented the Imperial China and contemporary USA. According to him, all societies move from agraria stage to industrial stage. This is a unidirectional movement. He identifies the structural features of the agrarian and industrial societies.

A major criticism of structural functional analysis is that it is conservative in its methodology. It focuses on the status quo, since it describes institutions as they are in a certain time; it provides a snapshot of the existing state. One will agree with Almond and his associates, however, in their response to this criticism: to describe political institutions precisely and comprehensively at some particular time is not to praise or defend them but to try to comprehend them (Almond et al. 2000: 36). In public administration, studies of institutions, almost always, are geared toward finding ways and means to change them, to improve their performance, and to make them more responsive to citizens' needs. To a large extent, all frameworks applied in comparative public administration are judged in terms of their advancement of such objectives.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

| |
|--|
| Describe the major focus of structural-functional approach |
|--|



1.4 Summary

In conclusion, according to the Structural-Functional Approach, every society has various structures which perform specific functions. Riggs identified five functions which are performed in each society. They are political, economic, social, symbolic and communicational functions. He stated that, same set of functional requisite apply to an administrative sub-system.

The structural-functional approach was used by Riggs to describe the degree of formalization, the functions served, and several other aspects of the organizational complexities.



1.5 References/Further Reading

Almond, G., and J. Coleman, eds. (1960). Politics in Developing Areas. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Almond, G., et al. (2000). Comparative Politics Today. 7th ed. New York: Longman

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

Heady, F. (1979). Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, 2nd edition. New York: Marjell Dekker.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Describe the major focus of structural-functional approach

Answer

A major criticism of structural functional analysis is that it is conservative in its methodology. It focuses on the status quo, since it describes institutions as they are in a certain time; it provides a snapshot of the existing state. One will agree with Almond and his associates, however, in their response to this criticism: to describe political institutions precisely and comprehensively at some particular time is not to praise or defend them but to try to comprehend them (Almond et al. 2000: 36). In public administration, studies of institutions, almost always, are geared toward finding ways and means to change them, to improve their performance, and to make them more responsive to citizens' needs. To a large extent, all frameworks applied in comparative public administration are judged in terms of their advancement of such objectives.

Unit 3: Prismatic Model and Comparative Public Administration

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main content
- 1.3.2 Riggs' Prismatic Model
- 1.3.2 Features/components of Riggs' Prismatic Model
- 1.4. Prismatic Sala Model
- 1.5 Summary
- 1.6 References/Further Reading
- 1.7 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content



1.1 Introduction

Riggs offered his prismatic model (as an attempt to conceptualise developing countries) based on the metaphor of a prism. When white light (that is, light made up of all visible wavelengths) passes (fused) through a prism, it is diffracted, broken into a variety of colors—a rainbow. Therefore, in this unit, we will take you through the prismatic model and the prismatic Sala model that was used specifically to explain the nature of administration in developing countries.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit, student should be able to:

1. Understand and examine the Riggs Prismatic Model in Comparative Public Administration study
2. Understand and know how to apply the Riggs' Prismatic Sala Model to explain the nature of administration especially in developing countries like Nigeria



1.3 Main content

1.3.1 Riggs' Prismatic Model

Riggs contended, societies in the process of development move from a fused mode, in which little or no differentiation exists, to a diffracted condition in which a high degree of functional specialization.

In administrative terms, this means a change from a situation in which a few structures performing a variety of functions, as in very under- developed conditions, to one in which many specific structures perform specific functions, as in highly developed societies like the industrial countries of the West. When the system begins to assign specific functions to specific structures, then it is evolving into a higher mode of differentiation. This phase is also referred to as transitional to the ultimate position of a complete differentiation.

Most developing societies, however, belong to this intermediate position called transitional, between the fused and the diffracted. Thus, during this transition, societies continually search to attain a higher level of differentiation and to acquire higher levels of specialization among their organizations and workforces.

Other related variables, according to Riggs (1964: 31), are universalism and achievement that rank high with the diffracted (differentiated) systems.

In contrast, a fused model would be high on particularism and ascription. The prismatic model covers those states in intermediate phase on the continuum.

Thailand: The Modernization of a Bureaucratic Polity (1966) is a case study of

political and administrative change in Thailand. In a comprehensive review of the society and its main characteristics, Riggs concluded that the country's weak political structures were unable to provide the necessary control over bureaucracy, which is incapable of modernization on its own.

1.3.2 Features/components of Riggs' Prismatic Model

On the basis of this approach he proceeded to study and listed three theoretical models to explain the administrative systems in the comparative context. Those models are:

1. **Agraria Model:** It is the Agricultural society and the characteristics are functional diffusion, particularistic norms, self-sufficiency, ascriptive (The attribution of something to a cause) values, stable local groups and limited or no mobility, differentiated stratification. Agraria is agriculture dominated society and Riggs takes China at the time for instance Imperial China. Occupational pattern is fixed that is Agriculture and carries on for many generations. Very few administrative structures and their functions/duties were not at all specified.
2. **Transitia Model:** It is the in between society. It is in between or let's use the term in transition between the Agraria and Industrial society and bears featuresresembling to both. It is on the path to become a developed society from an agricultural society. Examples are India, Thailand, etc.
3. **Industria Model:** It refers to a developed or Industry dominated society. Its characteristics are Universalistic norms, Achievement values, specific patterns, high degree of social and spatial mobility, well-developed occupational system,

egalitarian class system, prevalence of associations which are functionally specific and non ascriptive. USA is an example of this society.

It is the more improvised and specified version of his previous typology where the fused society can be compared to the agrarian model, the prismatic society can be compared to the Transition model and the Diffracted society can be compared to the Industrial model. This Model was designed to silence those critics who stated that Riggs had not effectively and in detail specified the 'Transitia' society which was very important as most of the world in that phase. This model effectively detailed all of the typologies. The new model is based on the principle of a prism and how it diffracts fused colours of white light back into the seven colours of the spectrum when passed through it. White light represents a society with very less degree of specialization and development and the diffracted spectrum reflects the highly specialised and developed society. The in between prismatic society is the transition society. He stated that neither of the extreme sides exist in totality or as it is but yes, it is certain that they do but in varying degrees as suitable to the environment/ecology. First we will discuss the Fused and Diffracted model and then proceed to explain the Prismatic model. A good understanding of the Fused and Diffracted Model will only be the tool to understand the Prismatic Model features.

Fused Model (ex- imperial China and Thailand):

1. Heavily dependent on agriculture.
2. Economic system based on barter system.

3. King and officials nominated by the king carry out all administrative, economic and other activities.
4. Royal family and special sects dominate.
5. Ascriptive values dominate.
6. Having many administrative structures that are part diffracted (perform special functions they are given charge of) and part fused (many structures performing many functions which are not prescribed to them thus overlapping with the diffracted ones and confusing the system).

Diffracted Model:

1. It is the polar opposite of the fused society. Each structure carries out its own functions.
2. Attainment value in society.
3. Economic system based on market mechanism (demand and supply)
4. Responsive government.
5. General consensus among all the people on all basic aspects of social life.

1.4 Prismatic Sala Model

This is an Administrative subsystem which is called the SALA MODEL (The Spanish word, 'Sala', has a variety of meanings like a government office, religious conference, a room, a pavilion, etc. The word, 'Sala', is also generally used in East Asian countries more or less with the same meaning.)

The salient features of prismatic sala model are as follows:

1. **Heterogeneity**- Simultaneous existence of different kinds of system and viewpoints. Example includes rural-urban, Indian gurukuls - western education, homoeopathic-allopathic. Various factors pulling the system apart, political and administrative officers enjoy enormous influence.
2. **Formalism**:(Excessive adherence to prescribed forms) - Discrepancy between formally prescribed and effectively practiced norms. Rules and regulations are prescribed but wide deviations are observed. Lack of pressure on govt. for programme objectives, weakness of social powers to influence bureaucratic performance, hypocrisy in social life, constitution formalism which means that there is a gap between stated principles and actual implementation are the major manifestations of formalism.
3. **Overlapping**: Differentiated structures coexist with undifferentiated structures of fused type. New or modern social structures are created, but traditional social structures continue to dominate. Example - Parliament, Government, Offices exist but behaviour is still largely governed by family, religion, caste, etc.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Briefly explain the Riggs' Prismatic model and Prismatic Sala model



1.5 Summary

In conclusion, Riggs prismatic-sala model has been criticized on certain grounds. For instance, certain new words coined and used by Riggs to explain his concepts may create confusion rather than clarifying them. The mere use of certain new words borrowed from physical sciences cannot make Public administration a science. Also, critics have said that the Riggsian prismatic-sala serves no purpose to find out the stages in the process of development. This model is not very useful when the objective of development administration is social change, because of its doubtful utility in analysing the process of social change in development. Nevertheless, the prismatic sala model has contributed in explaining the nature of administration in developing countries.

We have seen the prismatic model by Riggs which is used to describe the underdeveloped, developing and developed societies, i.e. the agraria, transitia and industria and the modified version of fused-prismatic and diffracted models. Also, we have discussed about the Prismatic Sala model which is used by Riggs specially to describe the systems of administration as manifested in developing countries Nigeria inclusive.



1.6 References/Further Reading

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

Heady, F. (1979). Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, 2nd edition. New York: Mariel Dekker.

Naidu, S.P. (2006). Public Administration: Concepts and Theories. New-Delhi: New Age International publishers.

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



1.7 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Briefly explain the Riggs 'Prismatic model and Prismatic Sala model

Answer

Riggs contended, societies in the process of development move from a fused mode, in which little or no differentiation exists, to a diffracted condition in which a high degree of functional specialization.

In administrative terms, this means a change from a situation in which a few structures performing a variety of functions, as in very under- developed conditions, to one in which many specific structures perform specific functions, as in highly developed societies like the industrial countries of the West. When the system begins to assign specific functions to specific structures, then it is evolving into a higher mode of differentiation. This phase is also referred to as transitional to the ultimate position of a complete differentiation.

On the other hand, *Prismatic Sala Model* is an Administrative subsystem which is called the SALA MODEL (The Spanish word, 'Sala', has a variety of meanings like a government office, religious conference, a room, a pavilion, etc.

Unit 4: Concept of Bureaucracy

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main content
 - 1.3.1 Max Weber's Bureaucracy
 - 1.3.2 Features of Bureaucracy
- 1.4 Civil Service
- 1.5 Summary
- 1.6 References/Further Reading
- 1.7 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content



1.1 Introduction

Classic Bureaucratic Model Bureaucracy is a specific institutional structure that has received its initial designation and its characterization from the German sociologist Max Weber (1864–1920) in the early part of the twentieth century. Classic bureaucratic theory is linked to Max Weber's name as Scientific Management is to Frederick Taylor's. Although Max Weber devoted his studies to areas other than bureaucracy, his brief discussion of bureaucracy—as the form of administration functioning in a legal-rational system of authority—became the most widely recognized statement on the subject. Therefore, in this unit, we will look at the concept of bureaucracy, its features and the concept of civil service.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit, student should be able to:

- (a) Understand the meaning of Bureaucracy as developed by Weber
- (b) Identify the features of Bureaucracy

(c) Understand and explain the meaning of Civil Service



1.3 Main content

1.3.1 Max Weber's Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy or the administrative system of a country or its national bureaucracy refers to agencies, bureaus, units, organizations, departments, ministries, or appointed committees of the public sector. In large governments, these units employ thousands and, collectively, millions of public employees. They initiate, influence, interpret, and implement the authoritative policies and laws of the state and its political subunits. Bureaucracy is regarded as a system because its parts and units are inter-related in serving the policies and goals of the state.

While agencies and similar units constitute subsystems of bureaucracy, each of these units and organizations by itself may also be considered a system. Viewing bureaucracy as a large system with many subsystems enables analysts to define and to measure its input of resources, goals, and public demands as well as its output of goods, services, and regulatory actions. Studying and analyzing bureaucracy as a system emphasizes functional and complex relationships among and between actors, offices, and their environment. Focusing on the national administrative system in comparative studies places the institution of bureaucracy at the center of analysis. At the outset, it is important to point out that the national administrative system is conceived flexibly to incorporate various subsequent theoretical and

practical modifications, extensions, and adaptations to the classic model of bureaucracy.

At this macro level, one is able to delineate overall administrative characteristics and their significance to the function of governance. A close examination of the national bureaucracy also helps to bring out and to define crucial relations with the political order. Interdependence of the administrative and the political systems largely shapes the structure and defines the formal functions of bureaucracy. It is not surprising, therefore, that studies of comparative national bureaucracy and comparative politics converge or overlap on various aspects. Early comparative studies were preoccupied with attributes and functions of political institutions in a handful of Western countries and a scattering of developing countries (Heady 2001). Generally, the term bureaucracy is used to denote national administration, as in the classic conceptions, and subsequent changes and adaptations that followed. A country's bureaucracy is its national administrative system in its present form and function. What a bureaucracy does in a particular country, and how it is doing it, are not assumptions to be made but empirical questions to be answered through empirical investigation and research.

1.3.2 Features of Bureaucracy

The core elements of the bureaucracy are:

1. specialization,
2. hierarchy of authority,
3. impersonality,

4. system of rules,
5. written records, and
6. Recruitment process based on merit (education, training, and skills).

Weber's emphasis on generalizable properties of bureaucracy tends to challenge the claim that Western civilization and systems are distinct, thus superior. By accentuating the similarities among bureaucratic systems in the West and between these and other earlier and contemporary cultures, Weber's drive to make his theory of bureaucratic universal dictated that he play down the cultural differences while emphasizing the process, its rationality, and the need for its institutionalization. The political context, however, is a different issue altogether. The authority system dictates fundamental properties of the administrative system.

Weber identified three types of authority systems: In the first, the legal-rational system of authority, bureaucracy operates within carefully prescribed rules and processes. A main feature of this system is that obedience is based on legal and impersonal order. Offices, rather than persons, are the basis of authority. These offices are organized in a hierarchy, occupied by staff paid on a scale tied to their positions in this hierarchy, and according to their levels of competence and expert knowledge. —The persons who exercise the power of command are typically superiors who are appointed or elected by legally sanctioned procedures and are on their own oriented toward the maintenance of the legal order.

1.4 Civil Service

The civil service is a typical bureaucratic organization made up of civil servants who are recruited on the basis of their skills, qualifications and expertise. The civil service has traditional values of unquestionable obedience and loyalty to authority, permanence and continuity of service, as well as consistency and secrecy of its role. The civil service according to the 1999 constitution, section 318 sub sections 1 is: Service of the Federation (state) in a civil capacity, staff of the office of the President, (Governor), the vice President, (Deputy Governor), a Ministry or Department of the federation (state), assigned with the responsibility for any business of the government of the federation (state), (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999).

The term civil service is normally used when referring to the body of men and women employed in a civil capacity and non-political career basis by the Federal and state Governments primarily to render and faithfully give effect to their decisions and implementation (Ipinlaiye, 2001).

The significant features of the civil service are inter alia:

1. Generally civil services are regarded as politically neutral,
2. The basic function of the civil service in all modern states is to assist the political executive to conduct the affairs of the government.
3. A general code of discipline and harmony exists in the work place,
4. Permanency of the post held by the civil servants,
5. The work of the civil government is mostly governed by written procedures and rules,

6. They are trained for general and specialised tasks set by the government,
7. They enjoy certain privileges compared to the ordinary citizens.
8. They are holders of administrative powers but subservient to their political masters.
9. There are certain professional ethics which should be followed by the civil servants.

It is only from these major paradigms that a meaningful comparison can be made. The variance in the civil service system arises because they evolved from various historical political settings. For, they are continuously changing and the change agents are different in different countries. Thus, time is an important factor in analyzing the features of civil services. Administrative reforms and modern public demands further erode the static nature of civil service. Internally, the organizational aspects of civil service affect the performance of governments and the output they produce.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Define bureaucracy and list five features of bureaucracy



1.5 Summary

In conclusion, the —Ideal-Type‖ Concept Ideal or perfect bureaucracy is never achieved. Yet, ideal-type theoretical construct serves useful analytical purposes such as guiding research, specifying relationships, and clarifying basic

characteristics. The critics contend that idealizing a condition defies testing or verification in a systematic research and, therefore, cannot be elevated to the standing of a scientific knowledge. This is a major criticism of the classic bureaucratic model. Concurring with this notion should not mean accepting a derivative issue that a pure model is to be considered an idiosyncratic or a mere aberration. Actually, the real world of organization and management often is an approximation of ideal-type conceptions.

The unit attempted a discussion on the concept of bureaucracy, its features and the meaning and features of the civil service.



1.6 References/Further Reading

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

Heady, F. (1979).Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, 2ndedition. New York: Mariel Dekker.



1.7 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Define bureaucracy and list five features of bureaucracy

Answer

Bureaucracy or the administrative system of a country or its national bureaucracy refers to agencies, bureaus, units, organizations, departments, ministries, or appointed committees of the public sector. In large governments, these units employ thousands and, collectively, millions of public employees. They initiate, influence,

interpret, and implement the authoritative policies and laws of the state and its political subunits. Bureaucracy is regarded as a system because its parts and units are inter-related in serving the policies and goals of the state.

While agencies and similar units constitute subsystems of bureaucracy, each of these units and organizations by itself may also be considered a system. Viewing bureaucracy as a large system with many subsystems enables analysts to define and to measure its input of resources, goals, and public demands as well as its output of goods, services, and regulatory actions. Studying and analyzing bureaucracy as a system emphasizes functional and complex relationships among and between actors, offices, and their environment. Focusing on the national administrative system in comparative studies places the institution of bureaucracy at the center of analysis. At the outset, it is important to point out that the national administrative system is conceived flexibly to incorporate various subsequent theoretical and practical modifications, extensions, and adaptations to the classic model of bureaucracy.

At this macro level, one is able to delineate overall administrative characteristics and their significance to the function of governance. A close examination of the national bureaucracy also helps to bring out and to define crucial relations with the political order. Interdependence of the administrative and the political systems largely shapes the structure and defines the formal functions of bureaucracy. It is not surprising, therefore, that studies of comparative national bureaucracy and comparative politics converge or overlap on various aspects. Early comparative

studies were preoccupied with attributes and functions of political institutions in a handful of Western countries and a scattering of developing countries (Heady 2001). Generally, the term bureaucracy is used to denote national administration, as in the classic conceptions, and subsequent changes and adaptations that followed. A country's bureaucracy is its national administrative system in its present form and function. What a bureaucracy does in a particular country, and how it is doing it, are not assumptions to be made but empirical questions to be answered through empirical investigation and research.

The core elements of the bureaucracy are:

1. specialization,
2. hierarchy of authority,
3. impersonality,
4. system of rules,
5. Written records and Recruitment process based on merit (education, training, and skills).

Unit 5: Nature of Administration/Bureaucracy in Developed Countries

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main content
- 1.3.1 Nature of Administration in Developed Countries
- 1.4 Summary
- 1.5 References/Further Reading
- 1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content



1.1 Introduction

We are in a new era. —Today we have to deal with those problems we inherited from that time: the boom-and-bust economies, the social division, the chronic under-investment in our public service, British Prime Minister Tony Blair, marking the tenth anniversary of Margaret Thatcher's departure from office. Checking Central Powers, Building Institutions Advanced, developed, or industrial democracies are common designations denoting a group of countries that include Canada, Europe, Japan, and the United States. Among other attributes, each of these countries has a governance system that is relatively effective in making and implementing public policies. Generally, these countries also have a high consonance between adopted public policies and society's needs and demands. Citizens actively participate in governance, usually through constitutionally established and maintained privileges. Therefore, the unit will look at the nature of administration in developed societies.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit, student should be able to:

Understand and describe the nature of Administration in developed countries.



1.3 Main content

1.3.1 Nature of Administration in Developed Countries

In developed societies, the enforcement of public policy is assigned to institutions that are legally entitled to make decisions and that have the ability to act on them. For a variety of reasons, developed countries enjoy higher overall standards of living than most others. Their citizens generally have higher levels of income, better health care, higher literacy rate, and equal protection under the law. Benefitting from the use of sophisticated and regularly refined technologies for production and for the delivery of services, these countries manage to consistently increase the outputs of their organizations and to augment their managerial efficiencies.

What administrative concepts and practices are commonly employed in industrial countries and how they evolved are subjects of universal relevance, irrespective of levels of development. To understand how administrative systems of developed countries have been instrumental in reaching fairly high levels of performance, one has to examine, broadly and retrospectively, institutions as well as the prevalent systems of governance. Generally, public administration literature passes over the tasks of creating a sense of tradition and of viewing institutions and societies as constantly evolving. Although this discussion is not intended to be an exhaustive analysis of this aspect of industrial systems, it is an attempt to highlight critical events that left indelible marks on their institutions and processes of governance.

Contemporary literature extends a measured recognition that the European practices of the seventeenth century were the precursors to the emergence of modern bureaucracies. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were a foundational phase and are excellent sources of information on administrative structures and the influences that shaped them. Early in the seventeenth century, power drew away from the provinces and localities of Europe and became concentrated in the central government, requiring the active aid and development of administration and finance (Gladden 1972). During this time, Germany led the West in —professionalizing the public service. Government activities and services expanded, creating a need for appointees with particular knowledge and skills. Russia had the distinction of being the first modern state to introduce and develop a system of entrance examinations for the public service (Gladden 1972: 158).

Between 1650 and 1850, the West experienced significant political and economic upheaval that resulted in reexamination and restructuring of its administrative systems. Historically, the West experienced revolutions against the status quo; but soon the consequences became far-reaching and universal. The English Revolution of 1688, the American Revolution of 1776, and the French Revolution of 1789 preceded the industrial revolution, which produced far-reaching consequences by the early twentieth century. The single and the collective impacts of these historical events have been profound political, economic, and administrative changes, reaching far beyond any one country (Jreisat 1997). A revolution is the subversion and the abandonment of the status quo for the promise of a better alternative. Thus,

these British, French, and American political revolutions did more than usher in dazzling political alternatives. They also laid the foundations of the —organizational society‖ as we know it and advanced modern values such as reason, liberalism, and egalitarianism.

By official design as well as a consequence of new socioeconomic realities, formal organizations and professional management became indispensable for the new states. Organizations, as newly invigorated social structures, and professional management, which had gained more autonomy in practicing their specialized craft, both became the trusted enforcers of public decisions. These public decisions have already become bound to the public will rather than to the ruler's personal authoritarian commands. Thus, the representation of societal interests rather than individual wants in public decisions finally was inescapable. The American Revolution, on the other hand, was managed differently by men of different outlooks and experiences. As the common wisdom had it, these men sought to reflect the Anglo-Saxon tradition, particularly the political and economic ideas of John Locke, David Hume, and Adam Smith. However, contemporary historians and researchers are finding evidence that ideas borrowed from native peoples and their influence on European immigrants to America goes much deeper than has been acknowledged. In all of this, the American experience made the autonomy and will of the individual paramount no matter what final political and economic designs were to be forged. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the feudalistic economic order dissolved and commercialism emerged, followed by the Industrial Revolution.

As commercialism expanded, new urban centers took shape. Power struggles intensified for seaways, colonization of other peoples and territories, and domination of world trade. Western imperialistic expansions affected almost every area of the known world, particularly Asia and Africa. Comparative analysis of this early period indicates that many important philosophical and practical changes were in the making. In England, the birth of constitutionalism inhibited the arbitrary rule of the Crown and instituted the supremacy of the Parliament.

In France, the attack on the excessive central authority set the stage for new centralized structures, such as those governing local authorities initiated during the Napoleonic period. In both France and England, the orientation as well as the structures of public institutions was dramatically altered. Managing the affairs of the state in the context of the new political and economic realities required different levels of skill, commitment, and values.

Therefore, in developed countries:

1. There is high degree of task specialization. There are a large number of specific administrative structures each specialized for particular purpose agricultural, transport, regulatory, defense, budgetary, personnel, public relations, planning etc. Moreover, a set of political structure - parties, elections, parliaments, chief executives and cabinets are designed to formulate the rules and lay down the targets which the administrative structures then implement. In Rigg's view this is highly differentiated political system.

2. The roles are assigned according to the personal achievements of individuals rather than according to family status or social class. This system ranks high in terms of universalism and achievement orientation.
3. Developed political system consists of formal political structures in which control is exercised in conformity with a formula or a pattern which is laid down. The making of political decision becomes the duty of politicians, administrative decisions of administrators. Political decisions and legal judgments are made according to secular standards of rationality. Traditionalelites (tribal or religious) have lost any real power to affect major governmental decisions.
4. Government activity extends over a wide range of public and personal affairs.
5. Popular interest and involvement in public affairs is widespread. A high degree of politicization has taken place, so the population is mobilized for intensive participation in decision making and executing processes.
6. The occupants of political or governmental leadership positions are widely viewed as legitimate holders of those positions, and change of leadership occurs according to prescribed and orderly procedures.

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXCERCISE

Outline five features of the administration system of developed countries



1.5 Summary

In conclusion, to understand how administrative systems of developed countries have been instrumental in reaching fairly high levels of performance, one has to examine, broadly and retrospectively, institutions as well as the prevalent systems of governance. Generally, public administration literature passes over the tasks of creating a sense of tradition and of viewing institutions and societies as constantly evolving.

As stated, the administrative system of developed countries is characterized by high degree of task specialization; the roles are assigned according to the personal achievements of individuals rather than according to family status or social class. Developed political system consists of formal political structures in which control is exercised in conformity with a formula or a pattern which is laid down, government activity extends over a wide range of public and personal affairs etc.



1.6 References/Further Reading

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

Heady, F. (1979). Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, 2nd edition. New York: Marjell Dekker.



1.7 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content

SELF-ASSESSMENT EXERCISE

Outline five features of the administration system of developed countries

Answer

In developed societies, the enforcement of public policy is assigned to institutions that are legally entitled to make decisions and that have the ability to act on them. For a variety of reasons, developed countries enjoy higher overall standards of living than most others. Their citizens generally have higher levels of income, better health care, higher literacy rate, and equal protection under the law. Benefitting from the use of sophisticated and regularly refined technologies for production and for the delivery of services, these countries manage to consistently increase the outputs of their organizations and to augment their managerial efficiencies.

Therefore, in developed countries:

1. There is high degree of task specialization. There are a large number of specific administrative structures each specialized for particular purpose agricultural, transport, regulatory, defense, budgetary, personnel, public relations, planning etc. Moreover, a set of political structure - parties, elections, parliaments, chief executives and cabinets are designed to formulate the rules and lay down the targets which the administrative structures then implement. In Rigg's view this is highly differentiated political system.
2. The roles are assigned according to the personal achievements of individuals rather than according to family status or social class. This system ranks high in terms of universalism and achievement orientation.

3. Developed political system consists of formal political structures in which control is exercised in conformity with a formula or a pattern which is laid down. The making of political decision becomes the duty of politicians, administrative decisions of administrators. Political decisions and legal judgments are made according to secular standards of rationality. Traditional elites (tribal or religious) have lost any real power to affect major governmental decisions.
4. Government activity extends over a wide range of public and personal affairs.
5. Popular interest and involvement in public affairs is widespread. A high degree of politicization has taken place, so the population is mobilized for intensive participation in decision making and executing processes.