



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

COURSE GUIDE

Course Code:	PAD 868
Course Title:	Comparative Public Administration
Course Writers:	Prof. Julius U Ezelama (Ambrose Alli University)
Course Editor:	Prof. E. E. Chukwuemeka (Nnamdi Azikiwe University)
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)
Departmental Coordinator: Course Material Review	Dr. Musa Zakari (National Open University of Nigeria)
Reviewers:	Dr. Mark Ochala, (National Open University of Nigeria) Dr Nelson Gabriel (Prince Abubakar Audu University)

Introduction

Comparative Public Administration (PAD 868) is a second semester course work of 3 credit units taken by post graduate students of the National Open University of Nigeria (NOUN) in the Faculty of Management Sciences. The social setting within which public administration operates in different countries especially with regards to developed and developing countries vary. This has huge implication on the context and system of public administration. As such, for public administration to be effective, it must be designed and operated based on prevalent social and cultural factors. This course therefore attempts to provide students with knowledge of comparative analysis of public administration in the context of developed and developing countries.

The Course Aim

The course is intended to equip students with knowledge of comparative analysis of administration across different social settings and assist them appreciate the various systems of administration in practice in both developed and developing countries. To achieve this objective, important information are outlined and discussed on the following:

Major concepts in comparative public administration

Differences between public and private administration

Influence of management on public administration

Concept, scope, usefulness and problems of comparative public administration Theoretical

perspectives and models of comparative public administration Context of Administrative Systems

A Comparative Study of the Pattern of Administration in Traditional and Colonial Africa Political and Policy Roles of Bureaucracies

Relationship between Interests and Public Agencies

Problems of Bureaucratic Accountability of Political Accessory

Measurable Learning Outcomes

Upon successful completion of these modules, you will be able to:

- i. Describe major concepts central to the understanding of comparative public administration
- ii. Trace the evolution of comparative public administration as a field of study
- iii. Explain the rationale as well as significance for the study of comparative public administration
- iv. Explain the theoretical perspectives and models of comparative public administration
- v. Identify and explain the roles and problems of bureaucracy in Third World development
- vi. Understand the meaning of bureaucratic accountability and highlight its problems
- vii. Discuss comparative practices of public administration in different social setting with particular reference to Nigeria and other developing countries vis a vis developed countries of the world

Course Guide

The course seeks to provide you with knowledge of comparative analysis of administration across different social settings and assists you to appreciate the various systems of administration in practice in both developed and developing countries. The course has 4 modules and 23 units. Contents of the modules dwell on fundamentals of comparative public administration; approaches to the study of comparative public administration; nature/system of administration in both developed and developing countries with particular reference to France, Britain, Nigeria, Uganda, Senegal and Benin Republic.

Self-Assessment-Exercise (SAEs)

Self-assessment Exercises are incorporated in the study material for each unit. Self-assessment Exercise helps students to be a realistic judge of their own performance and to improve their work. Promotes the skills of reflective practice and self-monitoring; Promotes academic integrity through student self-reporting of learning progress; Develops self-directed learning; Increases student motivation and Helps students develop a range of personal, transferrable skills.

Summary

Each Unit contained a summary of the entire unit. A summary is a brief statement or restatement of main points, especially as a conclusion to a work: a summary of a chapter. A brief is a detailed outline, by heads and subheads, of a discourse (usually legal) to be completed: a brief for an argument.

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

The materials contained Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content. The possible Self-assessments answers enable you to assess your level of assimilation or comprehension of the course contents. It is a way of analysing your work performance and any areas for growth. Reflecting on your strengths, weaknesses, values and accomplishments can help you determine what goals to work toward next.

Course Materials

The major components of this course are:

- i. Course Guide
- ii. Study Units
- iii. Further Readings
- iv. Activities and Tutor-Marked Assignments

Everything is contained in each unit except the textbooks, which you may have to acquire. You are expected to study the materials carefully and attempt the exercises. Practise the tutor- marked assignment questions as well. You are also expected to consult the textbooks under references/further readings for additional information. However, you may contact your tutor where you encounter any problem about recommended textbooks.

COURSE MATERIAL UNIT

This course material package comprises of following Modules and units structure:

MODULE 1

- Unit 1 Meaning and Nature of Comparative Public Administration
- Unit 2 Evolution of Comparative Public Administration
- Unit 3 Rationale for Comparative Public Administration
- Unit 4 Theoretical Perspectives
- Unit 5 Criticisms and Prospects of Comparative Public Administration

MODULE 2

- Unit 6: Comparison between Public Administration and Comparative Public Administration
- Unit 7: Uses of Models and Approaches in Comparative Public Administration Studies
- Unit 8: Cross-cultural Approach to Comparative Public Administration Studies
- Unit 9: Bureaucratic Approach to Comparative Public Administration Studies
- Unit 10: Case studies Approach to Comparative Public Administration Studies

MODULE 3

Unit 11: Institutional Approach to Comparative Public Administration Studies

Unit 12: Structural-functional Approach to Comparative Public Administration Studies

Unit 13: Prismatic Model and Comparative Public Administration

Unit 14: Concept of Bureaucracy

Unit 15: Nature of Administration/Bureaucracy in Developed Countries

MODULE 4

Unit 16: Systems of Administration in Developed Anglophone Country: Britain

Unit 17: Systems of Administration in Developed Francophone Country: France

Unit 18: Nature of Administration/Bureaucracy in Developing Countries

Unit 19: Systems of Administration in Developing Anglophone Countries: Nigeria

Unit 20: Systems of Administration in Developing Anglophone Countries: Uganda

MODULE 5

Unit 21: Systems of Administration in Developing Francophone Countries: Senegal

Unit 22: Systems of Administration in Developing Francophone Countries: Benin Republic

Unit 23: Problems and Prospects of Bureaucracy on Nation Building

UNIT 1 MEANING AND NATURE OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Unit Structure

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main Content
 - 1.3.1 Definition of Comparative Public Administration
 - 1.3.2 Nature and Scope of Comparative Public Administration
 - 1.3.3 Distinctions between Comparative Public Administration and Traditional Public Administration
- 1.4 Problems of Comparative Public Administration
- 1.5 Summary
- 1.5 References/Further Reading
- 1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s)



1.1 Introduction

This unit of the course material introduces you to the meaning as well as scope and areas of comparative public administration in order to provide you with the background knowledge for easy comprehension of the units that follow afterward.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

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

- ✓ Define comparative public administration
- ✓ Identify scope and areas of comparison of public administration
- ✓ Differentiate between comparative public administration and traditional public administration.



1.3 Comparative Public Administration

1.3.1 Definition of Comparative Public Administration

Comparative public administration has been variously defined. Some of the definitions of different scholars are presented hereunder:

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

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

Public Administration.

From this definition, it is apparent that the focus of comparative public administration was a major developmental issues faced in American public administration. According Riggs (1973), the first trend observed from the definition is fairly well established and the other two trends are perhaps only fast emerging.

Nimrod (2002) defines comparative public administrative as a study of public administration on a comparative basis which he traced to the 1952 Conference on Administration held at Princeton University in USA. He submitted that comparative public administration is a new corner to the community of academic instruction and research. According to Jackson (nd) Comparative public administration is that facet of the study of public administration which is concerned with making rigorous cross-cultural comparisons of the structures and processes involved in the activity of administering public affairs. **Jun (1998)** sees comparative public administration as predominantly cross-cultural or cross-national in orientation. Similarly **Marume (1976)** defines comparative public administration as 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. Comparative public administration basically concerns itself with a study of administrative systems to identify commonalties and contrasts in principles, concepts, structures, process, components and environment of administration. The idea of comparative public administration presupposes the feasibility of scientific approach to the study of public administration. In line with this argument, Jiffin (1977) argued that No science of public administration is possible unless..... there is a body of comparative studies from which it may be possible to discover principles and generalities that transcend national boundaries and peculiar historical experience Comparative public administration may be referred to in two major related senses. These are comparative public administration as an approach and as a field of study. As an approach, comparative public administration is a method in political science and public administration. As a method it is behavioural in nature and emphasizes extraction, collection and analysis of data on the various aspects of administrative systems in order to establish a pattern which can be adopted for generalization and identification of deviations.

Self-Assessment Exercise 1

Define comparative public administration?

1.3.2 Areas of Comparison of Public Administration

1. Inter-state comparison, which refers to a study of administration systems across states. State as used here refers to an independent political unit recognized internally as exercising sovereignty over a particular area of the earth surface. Adoption of this approach is based on the assumption that there is a uniform administrative system in a particular state at a particular time. This assumption is not a holistic truth. There are

situations where in a particular state, there are different administrative systems put in place. An example is local government administration in Nigeria before the 1976 reforms. The areas of difference which may exist notwithstanding, it is usually rewarding to carry out a comparative study of administrative systems across states. Adopted this method one can study the public administrative systems in states like Nigeria, Ghana, India, China, USA, France, Germany, etc.

2. Intra-state Comparison, by which public administrative system obtainable in the same state at a particular time can be studied comparatively. This kind of study becomes particularly relevant when there are differences in the administrative systems adopted. Even where there is a uniform administrative system adopted in the state the method still becomes relevant where there are major difference in the ecology or environment of administration within the political system. Such differences within the environment may lead to different results emanating from the same administrative system adopted.

3. Development stages as an area of comparison is another area. A comparative study of public administration can be done across political system or within a state. In adopting this method there can be study of public administration in the traditional system, the transnational system and the modern system. It may be noted that these three simple stages are perhaps the most commonly adopted by W.W. Restow's stages of economic development. These stages are the traditional stage, the pre-condition for take-off, the take-off, the drive towards maturity and the stage of high mass consumption. Almond and Powell in their work "the developmental approach to the political system"² identified the stage of state building, nation building or integration and the stage of the problem of high demand for participation. There are many other stages identified by different writers. In carry out a comparative study of public administration in the political system or systems the nature of the administrative system in one stage can be studied in comparison to that in another stage.

4. A comparative study of administrative system may be based on periods. So in a particular political system chosen particular periods can be identified. Then a comparative study of public administration in those periods is carried out. Usually in identification of period for study there are instruments adopted to identify considerable variables which would have dictated difference either in the nature of the administrative system or in the environment of the administration. So there can be short period with remarkable differences. There can also be long periods with negligible differences.

5. Ideological instrument has been adopted. A comparative study of political systems operating different ideologies or similar ideologies can be carried out. For instance, administrative systems in capitalist states, socialist states, communist states, etc, can be studied. There can also be a comparative study of different states adopting the same ideology at a particular time. For instance, the public administrative systems in communist China and former USSR within a particular period or across periods can be studied.

6. Theories can be the basis for comparative study: Different political systems where the same administrative theories have been adopted may be studied in relation to one

another. Also different administrative systems where similar administrative theories have been adopted may also be studied. The purpose is to identify the impact of such theories on the administrative systems.

7. Peculiar challenges are a basis for comparative study: Political systems which have experienced similar crises or challenges can be studied. The purpose is to analyze the nature of administrative system adopted in an attempt to provide solution to the problem. Such challenges may be war, economic recession, frequent internal insurrection, etc.

8. There can be a comparative study of the theories of public administration. Such a study is a natural consequence of the fact that even theories which are grouped together because they focus on the same aspect of administrative system may have differences. For example there are areas of difference between the classical theories. These are the Weberian bureaucracy, Frederick Taylor's scientific management and Henri Fayol principles of administration.

Also in theories of organizational behaviour there are basic differences. Such differences are identifiable in McGregor's theory X and theory Y, Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs, Herzberg's two factor theory, etc. Even when a particular theory is studied there are usually differences in the way it is adopted across administrative systems. There are other bases of comparison of administrative systems. They include democratic and non-democratic systems, religious and secular systems, military and non-military system, etc.

Self-Assessment Exercise 2

State five (5) areas of comparison for public administration?

1.3.3 Distinctions between Comparative Public Administration and Traditional Public Administration

As rightly observed by Nicholas Henry, comparative public administration is different from traditional or American 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 (1947) and Dwight Waldo (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. It addresses itself will require increasing communication between scholars and practitioners in all countries. The American dimension will be viewed as a subfield or a practical aspect of the broader subject." When

carrying out comparative study of public administration, one needs to know what constitute the units of analysis. In other words, what areas do you study? It may be observed that many new comers into the comparative study of public administration may be of opinion that such a study entails entirely a study of public administration across states or political systems. It becomes useful therefore to identify the various areas on which our focus can be directed in comparative study of public administration.

1.3.4 Usefulness of Comparative Public Administration

Some scholars, mainly of the normative persuasion, have argued that comparative administration effort does not worth the rigour associate with it. They emphasize that data derived from such an exercise do not always have a high analytical and empirical utility. This is because, they argue, it is difficult to understand the value and other factors which influence the establishment of a particular administrative process or structure. This argument notwithstanding there are benefits derivable from comparative public administration which cannot be ignored. We shall identify the major ones. Comparative administration is indispensable in scientific study of public administration. Scientific study of public administration cannot exist without theories. Theory building requires data on the phenomena studied to be empirical. Comparative public administration offers an opportunity for data to be collected on units of analysis of the administrative system of systems studied. Such data are required for establishment of principles generalization etc. required for theory building. Robert Dahl recognized the indispensability of the comparative approach to the study of public administration if it must be scientific. So he argued that:

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

2. Comparative public administration may lead to adoption of an administrative system or a part of it that has worked elsewhere. It has led to new states adopting administrative systems obtainable in the industrialized nations. There have also been situations where industrialized nations have borrowed a leaf from the third world countries in providing solutions to their problems of public administration. In relation to this argument Ferrel Heady argument that: The influence of western pattern of administration in the newly independent countries is well-known and easily understandable. Less obvious is the growing interest in larger countries concerning administrative machinery originated in the new nations.

3. A comparative approach to the study of public administration leads to an in-depth understanding of the administrative systems studied. When an entity is studied in relation to another there is a tendency of a rigorous analysis to be carried out. A vivid examination of various facets is done either in an attempt to identify similarities of establish dissimilarities. These aids added understanding of the phenomena.

4. As a result of comparative public administration data on administrative systems are produced. This leads to available information, check list or data which can be obtained and

utilized for various purposes. This same advantage is derived from comparative politics. So across the globe the information is made available in a processed form and presented in material people can easily have access to like diary etc.

5. A political system encountering particular problems especially relating to its public administrative system may study the administrative systems of other political systems that have had similar problems in the past. Such a study may lead to identification of how the particular problems can be provided solutions to through the instrumentality of public administration.

6. Comparative public administration may lead to improved efficiency in the administrative system of some states. This happens when a particular state identifies aspects of the administrative system of another which when adopted may lead to an improvement or increased efficiency. It has been argued for instance that in adopting the indirect rule system in the northern part of Nigeria Lord Lugard utilized the idea which he had seen working in Uganda. He adapted it for adoption in the Nigerian environment.

7. Comparative public administration offers an opportunity for theory testing. There can be a comparative study of the impact of administrative theories adopted either across political systems or at different periods in political systems. Such a study could lead to identification of the areas of imperfection of the theory. Where efforts are consequently geared towards a modification of the theory, it becomes further enriched and more relevant.

1.4 Problems of Comparative Public Administration

There are certain problems associated with comparative public administration both as an approach and as a field of specialization within political science or public administration. We are going to pay attention to the major ones.

One of the problems is that of resistance by scholars who continue to be skeptical about the feasibility of the scientific or behavioural approach to the study of social phenomena among which are public administration and political science. Such scholars mostly of the normative persuasion regard collection of data, analysis of data and consequent theory building in the area of comparative public administration as unrealistic. Their major area of criticism therefore is the doubt about the science of public administration. A second problem associated with a comparative study of public administration is the indispensability of sufficient knowledge of the political system studies for adequate knowledge of the administrative system.

In every political system the public administrative system is a subsystem of the whole. A claim of isolating the administrative system for study would amount to unrealistic oversimplification. So to carry out a meaningful study of an administrative system there is a need to understand the environment where the system grew. It may be observed that this need is not peculiar to comparative study of administration alone. Rather is required in the study of any component or sub-system of an entity in social and management sciences.

A third problem of the comparative study of public administration is that of the value of the investigator. It is difficult to completely prevent the value of a scholar from colouring his

perception of the administrative phenomena studied. This may lead to collection of data, the empirical utility of which is reduced by the bias of the researcher. It may be observed that this problem is also not restricted to comparative public administration. Rather it is associated with the study of every aspect of social science.

There is also the problem of conflicting data emanating from the study of the same administrative phenomenon are the same time by different social scientists. Such a problem does not necessarily suggest that the studies have presented comparative public administration as unrealistic. Rather such conflicts, where detected, are pointing at the need for further investigation into the administrative phenomena. Such further study would add to be body of knowledge available on the phenomena studied. There is a fifth problem detected. This relates to the tendency of over mathematicalization for the purpose of establishing a relationship between variables or demolishing an already established one between variables. A researcher may choose particular statistical methods and techniques which can help him to play on figures or to control information to arrive at a conclusion which supports his/her bias.

It has been observed that in some social science discipline, like economics, presentation of complex statistical calculations may wrongly be viewed as a value and evidence of rigorous work. It can therefore lead to an unrealistic work getting viewed as a great.



1.5 Summary

This unit outlined various definitions of comparative public administration which basically involves the study of public administration on a comparative basis. It distinguished between comparative public administration and traditional public administration as well as identifies areas of comparison. Comparative Public Administration is “the systematic study of political systems with the aim of developing scientific theories, which could be applied to diverse cultures and national settings and the body of factual data, by which it can be examined and tested”. It is that facet of the study of public administration which is concerned with making rigorous cross-cultural comparisons of the structures and processes involved in the activity of administering public affairs. The idea of comparative public administration presupposes the feasibility of scientific approach to the study of public administration.

Public administration is 'culture-bound' (ethnocentric) while comparative public administration is 'cross-cultural' in its orientation and thrust. 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.



1.6 References/Further Reading

Frinkle, J. and Gable, R.W, (1971). *Political development and social change*. New York: John Wiley and Sons

- Kast, F. and Rosenzweig, E. (1974): *Organization and management: A systems approach*. Washington: Graduate School of Business Administration, University of Washington
- Kootz, H., O'Donnell, C. and Weihrich, H.: (1984). *Management*, London: McGraw-Hill
- Mooney, J.D. (2006). *The principles of organisation*. New York: Harper and Brothers,
- Rodee, E.C., Anderson, T.J., Chistol, C.G. and Creene, T.H (1976). *Introduction to political science*. Tokyo: McGraw-Hill Kogakusha Ltd
- Siffen, W.J. (1977). *Toward the comparative study of administration*. USA: Greenwood Press Publishers
- Thomas, A. N. (2012). *Introduction to comparative politics and administration*. Lagos: Amfitop Books Ltd.



1.7 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S)

Answer To SAE 1

Define Comparative Public Administration?

Comparative Public Administration can be defined as “the systematic study of political systems with the aim of developing scientific theories, which could be applied to diverse cultures and national settings and the body of factual data, by which it can be examined and tested”. It can also be seen as a study of public administration on a comparative basis which has origin in the 1952 Conference on Administration held at Princeton University in USA. Comparative public administration is that facet of the study of public administration which is concerned with making rigorous cross-cultural comparisons of the structures and processes involved in the activity of administering public affairs. Comparative public administration basically concerns itself with a study of administrative systems to identify commonalties and contrasts in principles, concepts, structures, process, components and environment of administration. The idea of comparative public administration presupposes the feasibility of scientific approach to the study of public administration.

Answer to SAE 2

State five (5) areas of comparison for public administration?

1. Inter-state comparison, which refers to a study of administration systems across states. State as used here refers to an independent political unit recognized internally as exercising sovereignty over a particular area of the earth surface.
2. Development stages as an area of comparison is another area. A comparative study of public administration can be done across political system or within a state. In adopting this method there can be study of public administration in the traditional system, the transnational system and the modern system. It may be noted that these three simple stages are perhaps the most commonly adopted. W.W. Restow's stages of economic development. These stages are the traditional stage, the pre-condition for take-off, the take-off, the drive towards maturity and the stage of high mass

consumption.

3. A comparative study of administrative system may be based on periods. So in a particular political system chosen particular periods can be identified. Then a comparative study of public administration in those periods is carried out.
4. A comparative study of political systems operating different ideologies or similar ideologies can be carried out. For instance, administrative systems in capitalist states, socialist states, communist states, etc., can be studied. There can also be a comparative study of different states adopting the same ideology at a particular time.
5. Theories can be the basis for comparative study: Different political systems where the same administrative theories have been adopted may be studied in relation to one another. Also different administrative systems where similar administrative theories have been adopted may also be studied. The purpose is to identify the impact of such theories on the administrative systems.

UNIT 2: EVOLUTION OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Unit Structure

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main content
 - 1.3.1 Trends in the emergence of Comparative Public Administration
- 1.4 Development of Comparative Public Administration
- 1.5 Summary
- 1.6 References/Further Reading
- 1.7 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s)



1.1 Introduction

Having known what comparative public administration means as a discipline and practice, this unit will therefore take you through events, occurrences and factors that led to the emergence of comparative public administration across the globe, particularly in the United States of America. Emphasis will be laid on the origin and development as well as factors that contributed immensely to the discipline of comparative public administration.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

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

- i. Trace the origin and evolutionary trends of comparative public administration
- ii. Identify the factors that influenced the development of comparative public administration as a discipline



1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 Trends in the Emergence of Comparative Public Administration

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

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

During and after the World War II, the traditional school of public administration consisting of Woodrow Wilson, William Willoughby, L. D. White and F. W. Taylor came to be criticized for its failure to undertake a comparative study of the administrative systems. Robert Dahl considered the claim of public administration to be a “science” as hollow as long as study was not comparative. The World War II is often regarded as the dividing line between the old and new literature on the subject of public administration, as a new discipline under the name of new public administration came into being. In the field of comparative public administration, emphasis shifted from general managerial approach to contextual and situational approach. Beside the World War II, there were a number of factors which attracted the attention of American scholars to the comparative study of public administration:

- 1.** New scientific, theoretical and technological developments influenced the structures of administration stimulating interest in the comparative study of administrative;
- 2.** The emergence of free nations after the world war and efforts by these nations to achieve rapid socio-economic development, created new problems before public administration which led to scientific investigation and empirical studies in the field of public administration.
- 3.** The assistance programmes initiated by the United States to help the newly independent countries in the task of their national development insisted on the establishment of modern personnel, budgeting and planning agencies by the recipient states. But when these countries failed to respond, it led the academic critics to point out that the American patterns of improvements were “cultures bound” and could not be transported to the countries having different cultures soon it came to be recognized that “exogenous” technical change required a complete understanding of the culture context of the administrative institution and behaviour in foreign countries, “which developed ecological perspective among the students of public administration working developing countries.
- 4.** New intellectual developments in comparative Sociology, Anthropology, politics and other areas stimulated the students of Public Administration to develop theoretical constructs with a cross-cultural, cross-national and cross-temporal relevance in their field.
- 5.** The behaviour movement in Social Sciences led the students of Public Administration to move away from the traditional legal formal approach and to concentrate on the facts of actual behaviour of human beings in an administrative organization (Bhagwan & Bhushan, 2006:58); and

6. The concern of Public Administration scholars searching for “science of Public Administration”

Self-Assessment Exercise 1

Give highlights of the evolutionary trends of Comparative Public Administration?

1.4 Development of Comparative Public Administration as a Discipline

There was increased awareness towards developing Comparative Public Administration as a discipline in the late 40s. There were several new developments in this field and important new literature was created. However, Comparative Public Administration emerged in 1952 when a committee was set up in the United States by the American Political Scientists. This committee was named “SHARP” Committee headed by Professor Walter Sharp. The aim of this committee was to look into the study of Comparative Public Administration in a scientific way. In 1953, another committee was set-up by the society of American Public Administration, called “Comparative American Group” headed by Fred. W. Riggs and was affiliated to American Society for Public Administration. This committee was to look into the development of Comparative Public Administration and to develop criteria of relevance and objective. These two committees were set up in order to move the discipline forward.

Moreover, the Comparative Public Administration movement received a major boost, when it received the first professional recognition in 1953 through the appointment of an adhoc committee on comparative administration by the American Political Science Association, which led to the establishment in 1960 of the Comparative Administration Group (CAG) and was affiliated to American society for public administration. Fred W. Riggs was appointed the chairman of CAG.

The Comparative Administration Group in the United States has done commendable work in the field of Comparative Public Administration. It has prepared more than one hundred research papers on various aspects of comparative administration. The group received generous grants from Ford foundation in 1962, through the American society for public administration and was publishing quarterly journals of Comparative Administration. It has sponsored experimental technique projects and promoted field research in comparative administration. Comparative public administration as a subject was included in the courses of study in several colleges and universities in the United States and other developed countries. Dwight Waldo started comparative public administration as a course of study in the University of California (Barkley) in 1948. Thereafter, it began to receive much greater attention which widened the scope of the study.

Self-Assessment Test 2

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



1.5 Summary

This unit has been able to explain the evolution of comparative public administration. It highlighted the motivating forces leading to its emergence as a course of activity and a course of study in universities, especially during and after the World War II. The World War II is often regarded as the dividing line between the old and new literature on the subject of public administration, as a new discipline under the name of new public administration came into being. Beside the World War II, there were a number of factors which attracted the attention of American scholars to the comparative study of public administration, they are: new scientific, theoretical and technological developments which influenced the structures of administration stimulating interest in the comparative study of administration; the emergence of free nations after the world war and efforts by these nations to achieve rapid socio-economic development; the assistance programmes initiated by the United States to help the newly independent countries; new intellectual developments in comparative Sociology, Anthropology, politics and other areas which stimulated the students of Public Administration to develop theoretical constructs with a cross-cultural, cross-national and cross-temporal relevance in their field; 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; and the concern of Public Administration scholars searching for “science of Public Administration”



1.6 References/Further Readings

- Basu, R. (2004). *Public administration: Concepts and theories*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Ltd.
- Eneanya, A.N. (2010). *Comparative public administration and public policy: Theories and applications*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press Ltd.
- Heady, F. (2001). *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, 6th ed. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Heady, F. (1979). *Public administration: A comparative perspective*, 2nd edition. New York: Mariel Dekker.
- Sharma, M.P, Sadana, B.L., and H. Kaur (2011). *Public administration in theory and practice*. New Delhi: Kiah Mahal Publishers
- Thomas, A. N. (2012). *Introduction to comparative politics and administration*. Lagos: Amfitop Books Ltd.



1.7 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) within the Content

Answer to SAE 1

Give highlights of the evolutionary trends of CPA?

Prior to World War II, there was not much of literature on CPA. The major shift from traditional public administration to comparative approach to administration was stimulated by a number of factors starting with the World War II. The World War II created a scenario which called for post-war military occupations and accelerated technical assistance programmes sponsored by the United Nation, United States and some private

foundations like the Ford Foundation. As such, numerous students from the USA at the time took part in the Aid programmes which offered them the opportunity and exposure to government systems and culture 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 addition to the scenario created by World War II, other events that spurred CPA include:

1. New scientific, theoretical and technological developments influenced the structures of administration stimulating interest in the comparative study of administrative;
2. The emergence of free nations after the world war and efforts by these nations to achieve rapid socio-economic development.
3. The assistance programmes initiated by the United States to help the newly independent countries in the task of their national development insisted on the establishment of modern personnel, budgeting and planning agencies by the recipient states.
4. New intellectual developments in comparative Sociology, Anthropology, politics and other areas stimulated the students of Public Administration to develop theoretical constructs with a cross-cultural, cross-national and cross-temporal relevance in their field.
5. The behaviour movement in Social Sciences led the students of Public Administration to move away from the traditional legal formal approach and to concentrate on the facts of actual behaviour of human beings in an administrative organization; and
6. The concern of Public Administration scholars searching for “science of Public Administration”

Answer to SAE 2

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

1. New scientific, theoretical and technological developments influenced the structures of administration stimulating interest in the comparative study of administrative;
2. The emergence of free nations after the world war and efforts by these nations to achieve rapid socio-economic development.
3. The assistance programmes initiated by the United States to help the newly independent countries in the task of their national development insisted on the establishment of modern personnel, budgeting and planning agencies by the recipient states.
4. New intellectual developments in comparative Sociology, Anthropology, politics and other areas stimulated the students of Public Administration to develop theoretical constructs with a cross-cultural, cross-national and cross-temporal relevance in their field.
5. The behaviour movement in Social Sciences led the students of Public Administration to move away from the traditional legal formal approach and to concentrate on the facts of actual behaviour of human beings in an administrative organization; and
6. The concern of Public Administration scholars searching for “science of Public Administration”
7. The World War II created a scenario which called for post-war military occupations and accelerated technical assistance programmes sponsored by the United Nation, United States and some private foundations like the Ford Foundation

UNIT 3: RIGGS' CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Unit Structure

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main content
 - 1.3.1 Trends in the study of Comparative Public Administration by Riggs
 - 1.3.2 Riggs' Contribution to Ecology of Comparative Public Administration
- 1.4 Summary
- 1.5 References/Further Reading
- 1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s)



1.1 Introduction

In the last unit, you were taken through events and activities that birthed and grew comparative public administration as a discipline. This unit will specifically acquaint you the contribution of Fedrick Riggs' to CPA. 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).



1.2 Learning Outcomes

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

- (a) Describe the trends in the study of Comparative Public Administration by Riggs
- (b) Explain the nexus between ecology and Comparative Public Administration



1.3 The study of Comparative Public Administration by Riggs

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 parts of the world, it became clear that a limited culture-bound normative approach to the study of Public Administration was not adequate.

The behavioural approach highlighted the value of studying the facts and reality in 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 hypotheses and theories. The objective of such studies is to look at the similarities and differences of various administrative systems existing in different nations and cultures and then draw certain 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 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.

Self-Assessment Exercise 1

State the three trends highlighted by Riggs in the study of Comparative Public Administration?

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 traits (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.

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.



1.4 Summary

The unit highlighted the trends in the study of Comparative Public Administration by Riggs and the contribution of Riggs in developing the ecological approach to the study of public administration. Riggs has contributed immensely to 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 contribution to trends in CPA are summarized as follow:

- 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



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. & Namusi, C. W. (2016). Comparative Public Administration in *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)* ISSN (Online): 2319-706
- Thomas, A. N. (2012). *Introduction to comparative politics and administration*. Lagos: Amfitop Books Ltd.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) Within the Content

Answer to SAE 1

State the three trends highlighted by Riggs in the study of Comparative Public Administration?

- 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.

UNIT 4: RATIONALE FOR COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION STUDIES

Unit Structure

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main content
 - 1.3.1 Significance of Comparative Public Administration
- 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 units, you have been acquainted with the evolutionary trends of comparative public administration and the huge role played by Fred W. Riggs in the development of the discipline. This unit will take you through the rationale behind the study of the course Comparative Public Administration. Attempt will therefore be made in discussing the rationale or significance of Comparative Public Administration as a discipline.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

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

- i. Understand and appreciate the significance of Comparative Public Administration studies to the students of Public Administration



1.3 Significance of Comparative Public Administration

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 psycho-logical 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 & 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 identified the four elements of the contribution of Comparative Public Administration as follows:

- i. It has widened the horizons of public administration.
- ii. It has opened the doors of the discipline to all kinds of social scientists.
- iii. It has made the scope of the field more systematic by studying different administrative systems in their ecological settings.
- iv. It has stimulated interest on the part of its members in the problems of developing administration.
- v. On the other hand, according to T. N Chaturvedi, the various contributions of comparative study in public administration are:
- vi. It has helped to eliminate the narrowness of —provincialism and —regionalism.
- vii. It has broadened the field of social science research, which was earlier confined to cultural limitations.
- viii. It has led to a greater scientific outlook in theory construction.
- ix. It has encouraged the process of broadening the field of social analysis.
- x. It has played an important role in making the subject of public administration broader, deeper, and useful.
- xi. 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

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. 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.



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

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

Importance of comparative study in public administration include:

- 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.

UNIT 5: FORMS/DIMENSIONS OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION STUDIES

Unit Structure

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main content
 - 1.3.1 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)



1.1 Introduction

Having discussed the significance for the study of comparative public administration in the previous unit, this unit will take you further by introducing you to the various forms and levels of analysis of comparative public administration and the different dimensions of comparative public administration studies.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

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

- Explain the various level of analysis of Comparative Public Administration
- Describe the different forms or dimensions of Comparative studies



1.3 Dimensions of Comparative Public Administration Studies

1.3.1 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) (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 a 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.

Self-Assessment Exercise 1

State the three level of analysis of Comparative Public Administration studies?

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 2

--

Outline any three forms of Comparative Public Administration studies



1.4 Summary

In summary, 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.



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

Answer To SAE 1

State the three level of analysis of Comparative Public Administration studies?

The three analytical levels of CPA are: macro, middle-range and micro.

(a) Macro studies: focus on the comparisons of whole administrative systems in their proper ecological contexts. For instance, a macro study would involve a comparison of the administrative systems of India and Great Britain or Nigeria and Senegal. It will comprise detailed analysis of all important aspects and parts of the administrative system of the two nations. Generally, the relationship between an administrative system and its external environment is highlighted in the macro level studies.

(b) The Middle-range studies: focus 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.

Answer to SAE 2

Outline any three forms of Comparative Public Administration studies

Forms/Types of Comparative Public Administration Studies

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.

b. Intra-national Analysis

An analysis in a comparative perspective taken up among various administrative systems functioning **within a country**. 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.

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.

MODULE TWO

UNIT 6: COMPARISON BETWEEN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Unit Structure

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



1.1 Introduction

Having introduced you to the different levels of analysis and forms of comparative public administration in the last unit, here, we are going to proceed to comparison of the traditional (conventional) public administration and 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 past 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 Outcomes

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

- Describe the Traditional Public Administration
- Briefly describe Comparative Public Administration
- Make comparison between Traditional and Comparative Public Administration



1.3 Comparison Between Public And Comparative Public Administration

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.

Piffner 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.

1.3.3 Comparison between Public Administration and Comparative Public Administration

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



1.4 Summary

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.



1.5 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): 2319-7064
- 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.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) Within the Content

Briefly distinguish between Traditional public administration and comparative public administration?

- (a) Public administration is 'culture-bound' (ethnocentric) while comparative public administration is 'cross-cultural' in its orientation and thrust. 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.

UNIT 7: USES OF MODELS AND APPROACHES IN COMPARATIVE STUDIES

Unit Structure

- 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

Having concentrated on the fundamentals of comparative public administration in module one of this course material in order to acquaint and build your knowledge for better comprehension of more complex topics and issues, this unit therefore takes you further and deeper by discussing various model and approaches to comparative public administration studies. Models are used to organize information and facts about a phenomenon. 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, you should be able to:

- Explain the uses of models and approaches in Comparative Public Administration studies and identify the common tendencies shared by different models
- Make comparison between Models and Approaches



1.3 Approaches in Comparative Studies

1.3.1 Uses of Models and Approaches in Comparative Studies

The word model is treated in this unit as submitted by Waldo, to simply mean 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 Olle 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 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 analyzing 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

Identify four uses of model in comparative public administration

Uses of Models in CPA

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.

UNIT 8: CROSS-CULTURAL APPROACH TO COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION STUDIES

Unit Structure

- 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)



1.1 Introduction

Having been acquainted with the concepts of theory, models and approaches as well as their uses and distinctions in the previous unit, this unit will now take you further by discussing the various models and approaches that have been engaged to explain

comparative public administration studies. This unit, particularly 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:

- i. Explain Cross-cultural approach to comparative public administration
- ii. Understand how to apply Cross-cultural approach in Comparative Public Administration studies



1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 Cross-Cultural Approach

A cross-cultural 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

The cross-cultural analysis of administrative system involves countries forming part or different "cultures", which could be studied with the chief purpose of identifying variations in their social, cultural and political systems. This is called a cross-cultural analysis. 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.



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.
- Thomas, A. N. (2012). *Introduction to comparative politics and administration*. Lagos: Amfitop Books Ltd.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) Within the Content

Briefly describe the cross-cultural approach?

A cross-cultural 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.

UNIT 9: BUREAUCRATIC APPROACH TO COMPARATIVE STUDIES

Unit Structure

- 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, you should be able to:

- i. Describe and understand the application of 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 as submitted by Weber



1.4 Summary

Bureaucratic approach conceives organisation as having structural pre-requisites. No discussion on the conception of a bureaucratic organisation can proceed without reference to the Weberian model of bureaucracy. Evidently, the Weberian and socialist conceptions of bureaucracy differ regarding its specific functions and role. Weber views bureaucratic organisation in a value neutral context; it stands for rationality and machine-like efficiency. In Marxist-Leninist conception, it is an organ of political coercion in a class society. Weber underlines the continuity and permanence of bureaucracy and considers

it an indispensable machinery for managing a complex industrial society.



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.

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



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) Within the Content

Outline four features of bureaucracy as submitted by Weber?

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.

UNIT 10: CASE STUDIES APPROACH TO COMPARATIVE STUDIES

Unit Structure

- 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. This unit will introduce you to case study approach in comparative public administration studies.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

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

- Define Case Studies approach to Comparative Public Administration study
- Explain its application to Comparative Public Administration



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 & 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 cross-cultural 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

A case is a narration of what has actually taken place in administration, keeping in fact the context and all relevant dimensions. A case study, when properly 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, G. A., & Sidney Verba (1965). *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations, An Analytic Study* eds. 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, M.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

Briefly explain the case study 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. 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. 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.

MODULE 3

UNIT 11: INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH TO COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION STUDIES

Unit Structure

- 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

This unit discusses the institutional approach in comparative public administration study. 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 thought 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.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

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

- i. Define Institutional approach to the study of comparative public administration
- ii. Explain the application Institutional approach to comparative analysis of public administration



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 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 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

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. 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.



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.
- Thomas, A. N. (2012). *Introduction to comparative politics and administration*. Lagos: Amfitop Books Ltd.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) Within the Content

Institutional approach

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. 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.

UNIT 12: STRUCTURAL-FUNCTIONAL APPROACH TO COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION STUDIES

Unit Structure

- 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)



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 Structural-Functional Approach was 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 sub-system. These and others will be the focus of this unit.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

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

- i. Define structural-functional approach to the study of comparative public administration
- ii. Explain application structural-functional approach to comparative analysis of public administration



1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 Structural-Functional Approach

In structural-functional approach, government needs specialized institutions—agencies, and departments—to formulate and implement its policies in order to meet its obligations. 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: 20). 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 (Selznick, 1948). 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 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.

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 agrarian 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). 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

List the five functions of structural-functional approach as submitted by Riggs?



1.4 Summary

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. 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.



1.5 References/Further Reading

- Almond, G., & 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: Mariel Dekker.
- Marume, S. B. M., Jubenkanda, R. R. & Namusi, C. W. (2016). Comparative public administration. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)* ISSN (Online): 2319-7064
- Riggs, F. W. (1961). *The ecology of public administration*. New York: Asia Publishing.
- Riggs, F. W. (1964). *Administration in developing societies*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) Within the Content

List the five functions of structural-functional approach as submitted by Riggs?

Structural-Functional Approach

In structural-functional approach, government needs specialized institutions—agencies, and departments—to formulate and implement its policies in order to meet its obligations. 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 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.

UNIT 13: PRISMATIC MODEL AND COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Unit Structure

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



1.1 Introduction

Riggs offered his prismatic model (as an attempt to conceptualize 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:

- i. Understand and examine the Riggs Prismatic Model in Comparative Public Administration study
- ii. 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

According to Riggs, 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:

- i. 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.
- ii. 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 features resembling to both. It is on the path to become a developed society from an agricultural society. Examples are India, Thailand, etc.
- iii. 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.

Also, Riggs came out with the improvised typology: i.e. Fused-Prismatic-Diffracted Model: 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 specialisation 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.

1.3.2 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:

(a) 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.

(b) 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 government 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.

(c) 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



1.4 Summary

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



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.
- 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.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) Within the Content

Briefly explain the Riggs' Prismatic model and Prismatic Sala model?

The prismatic model by Riggs was used to describe the underdeveloped, developing and developed societies, i.e. the agrarian, transitia and industria and the modified version of fused-prismatic and diffracted models. Also, the Prismatic Sala model which is used by Riggs specially to describe the systems of administration as manifested in developing countries Nigeria inclusive. 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 heterogeneity, formalism and overlapping.

UNIT 14: CONCEPT OF BUREAUCRACY

Unit Structure

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main content
 - 1.3.1 Max Weber's Bureaucracy
 - 1.3.2 Features of Bureaucracy
 - 1.3.3 Civil Service
- 1.4 Summary
- 1.5 References/Further Reading
- 1.6 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, you should be able to:

- i. Define of Bureaucracy as explained by Weber
- ii. Identify the features of Bureaucracy
- iii. Explain the meaning and function 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 sub-units. 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 sub-systems of bureaucracy, each of these units and organizations by itself may also be considered a system. Viewing bureaucracy as a large system with many sub-systems 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:

- i. specialization,
- ii. hierarchy of authority,
- iii. impersonality,
- iv. system of rules,
- v. written records, and
- vi. 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.

1.3 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; and
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?



1.4 Summary

Bureaucracy refers to agencies, bureaus, units, organizations, departments, ministries, or appointed committees of the public sector. 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 sub-systems of bureaucracy, each of these units and organizations by itself may also be considered a system. 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 core elements of the bureaucracy are: specialization, hierarchy of authority, impersonality, system of rules, written records, and recruitment process based on merit (education, training, and skills).

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 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



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.

Eneanya, A.N. (2020). *Theory and practice of public administration*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press and Bookshop Ltd.

Obikeze, O.S. & Anthony, O.E. (2004). *Public administration in Nigeria: A developmental approach*. Onitsha: Book Point Ltd.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) Within the Content

Define bureaucracy and list five features of bureaucracy?

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 sub-units. 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 sub-systems of bureaucracy, each of these units and organizations by itself may also be considered a system. Viewing bureaucracy as a large system with many sub-systems 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.

The core elements of the bureaucracy are:

- i. specialization,
- ii. hierarchy of authority,
- iii. impersonality,
- iv. system of rules,
- v. written records, and
- vi. recruitment process based on merit (education, training, and skills).

UNIT 15: NATURE OF ADMINISTRATION/BUREAUCRACY IN DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Unit Structure

- 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

Having discussed bureaucracy and its nature as well as civil service and its functions in the previous unit, this unit will take you further by looking at the nature and system of bureaucracy in developed countries in order for you a good grasp of the concept necessary for appropriate comparison with the nature and system of administration in developing countries. Therefore, the unit will look at the nature of administration in developed societies and identify features prevalent in administrative of developed countries.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

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

- i. Describe the nature of Administration in developed countries
- ii. Identify key features 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: 141). 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, 163).

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: 13). 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 societyll 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. Traditional elites (tribal or religious) have lost any real power to affect major governmental decisions.

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

Self-Assessment Exercise

Outline five (5) features of the administration system of developed countries?



1.4 Summary

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.



1.5 References/Further Reading

Eneanya, A.N. (2020). *Theory and practice of public administration*. Lagos: University of Lagos Press and Bookshop Ltd.

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

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



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) Within the Content

Outline five (5) features of the administration system of developed countries?

- (1) There is high degree of task specialization. A large number of

specific administrative structures each specialized for particular purpose-agricultural, transport, regulatory, defense, budgetary, personnel, public relations, planning etc.

- (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.
- (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.

MODULE 4

UNIT 16: SYSTEMS OF ADMINISTRATION IN DEVELOPED ANGLOPHONE COUNTRIES: BRITAIN

Unit Structure

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



1.1 Introduction

France is the example of a parliament under a hybrid presidential regime. The French government is responsible to parliament. But unlike in the United Kingdom, parliament power is circumscribed in controlling the executive and to legislate. This unit features

discussion on the system of administration in both Britain and France.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

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

- i. Understand and describe the nature of Administration in Anglophone countries with reference to Britain



1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 System/Nature of Administration in Britain

While in the USA and France there were successful enough effort to differentiate the role of administration and government as a distinctive one, such distinctions never occurred in Britain till the beginning of the nineteenth century. The evolution of state system from the twelfth century to the nineteenth 'century, there were no clear distinctions between administrative and political role. Recruitment was largely by patronage to the members of royal families and to the feudals of landowning classes. Merit based recruitment and rational-legal modes of personnel administration in the UK started only by the nineteenth century. The modern personnel administrative system in the UK was formed by two major official investigations of civil service:

Generalist administrators' has been a unique contribution by the British experience of administration to the world. The Northcote-Trevelyan report recommended for merit system of recruitment and also firmly affirmed the need for generalist service. The Futton committee strongly opposed the generalist cadre of British top civil posts and it wanted to induce more professionalism into the service. Out of 158 recommendations the most striking recommendation was the creation of career management approach to public services. Thus, a permanent civil service systematic recruitment, and a clear division of authority and uniform rules for civil servants emerged only in the early part of the nineteenth century. The American experience of spoil system never took root in Britain. In the same way, the legacy of past administrative institutions like that of the prefectoral system of France has not been an experience of the British personnel system.

However, by the beginning of the nineteenth century the UK, the USA and France never failed to conduct merit system in the recruiting process. Secondly, the clearly differentiated the political role from the administrative role. In these three countries civil service is largely regulatory in nature. But by the beginning of twentieth century, it expanded very widely and included many social services under the control of permanent civil servants. For instance, in the UK new kinds of services were included with the passage of the Old Age Pension Act of 1908, the Labour Exchange Act of 1909 and the National Health Insurance Act of 1911.¹³ It was rightly recommended by Professor Greaves that "the social service democracy of the twentieth century was born before the maladministration and paternalism of the eighteenth century

had wholly disappeared.

The only major difference is that both France and Britain developed their personnel system from a centralised administrative framework. On the other side the USA expanded its civil service from the requirement of a federal polity.

Recruitment

Merit is highly followed in UK and they relied more on non-specialists in the career civil service system. It rested on open written examinations set by the civil service commission in academic subjects. After the successful written examinations, the candidates' personality is tested by interview methods. For the past 50 years in the UK, there are three kinds of non-specialist civil servants being recruited by fixing the following qualifications.

1. Administrative class-recruited primarily from university graduates Age 21-28 years.
2. Executive class-recruited at matriculation standard, minimum age 18 years.
3. Clerical class-required qualification is a pass in the first major school examination (General Certificate of Education). Minimum age is 15 years but recruits are accepted up to the age of 59.

Training

In Britain, the Civil Service College (CSC) (1970) imparts training in three main ways:

1. Post-entry training for administrative recruits in economic, financial or social areas of government.
2. Courses in administration and management for specialists.
3. Conducting research into administrative problems.

One unique feature of the British training institute is that it also organises a wide range of shorter training courses for local government staff, industry, and the lower rungs of the civil service and the British training programmes are largely a product of their own tradition and based on the functional requirements of 'generalist' cadre of various departments.

The major weakness of training in Britain is largely due to the lack of in service training or indoctrination for specialist groups.

Promotion

At the top of civil service administration in the UK, promotions are made on merit but at the lower levels promotion tends to take place in accordance with seniority rules agreed to by the staff union. Such automatic promotion at the lower levels was criticised by Fulton Committee report and suggested introduction of the system of promotion by merit for the entire system of administration.

In the UK, promotions of civil servants are made partly through centrally conducted competitions and partly by departments. In this regard, promotion to most of the highest positions in civil service, for instance, permanent secretaries, deputy secretaries, are approved by the prime minister who is advised in these matters by Head of the Home Civil Service. Automatic promotion based on seniority principle

applies to Grade 7 from Grade 4 while a combination of merit based performance appraisals and seniority applies to Grades 3 and 4 for Grades 1 and 2 on purely political and merit consideration.

Retirement

1. Civil service pensions have been governed comprehensively by non-statutory (superannuation act) enabling act. Therefore, it is possible to make any change pension without further legislation.
2. Ten years minimum service is requirement to receive pension.
3. A civil servant is eligible to receive an annual pension of one-eighth of his average salary over the last three years of service.
4. Temporary civil servants who have served five years or more are eligible to receive a lump sum quantity.
5. No. contribution is made by a civil servant towards his pension.
6. Widows and children of the pensioner will get pension through contributory scheme.
7. Superannuation benefits are the same for men and women, except that an established women civil servant who chooses to resign on marriage after not less than six years' of reckonable service may be granted a marriage gratuity of one month's pay for each completed year of her established service, subject to a maximum of 12 months' pay.

Self-Assessment Exercise

Briefly compare the administrative system of Britain and France?



1.4 Summary

In summary, we have looked at the system of administration in developed Anglophone and francophone using Britain and France as case. However, the recruitment, training, promotion and retirement criteria are used for the purpose of our discussions. Both Britain and France are Unitary Systems, concentrating, power in the central government. France is more strongly unitary than Britain, because in Britain local government like cities and countries enjoy certain autonomy. A comparative political study of Britain and France is more feasible, since both of them are unitary governments. But the basic difference is that the British constitution grew gradually and peacefully while it is not so with France. While members of civil service are recruited by the open competition which is generally open to the society at large as it is practised in the UK, the French system is somewhat different. The French Civil Service has been organised on the basis of 'corps' categories of staff which form the groups into which recruitment occurs.



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.
- Thomsan D. (1952). *Democracy in France*, London: Oxford.
- Rathod, P.B. (2007). Models of comparative public administration. *Comparative Public Administration, Jaipur, India: ABD Publishers*.
- Ridley, F. & Blondel, J. (1969). *Public administration in France*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul 1969, pp. 15-16.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) Within the Content

Briefly compare the administrative system of Britain and France?

Both Britain and France are Unitary Systems, concentrating, power in the central government. France is more strongly unitary than Britain, because in Britain local government like cities and countries enjoy certain autonomy. A comparative political study of Britain and France is more feasible, since both of them are unitary governments. But the basic difference is that the British constitution grew gradually and peacefully while it is not so with France. While members of civil service are recruited by the open competition which is generally open to the society at large as it is practised in the UK, the French system is somewhat different. The French Civil Service has been organised on the basis of 'corps' categories of staff which form the groups into which recruitment occurs.

UNIT 17: SYSTEM OF ADMINISTRATION IN DEVELOPED FRANCOPHONE COUNTRIES: FRANCE

Unit Structure

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



1.1 Introduction

France is the example of a parliament under a hybrid presidential regime. The French government is responsible to parliament. But unlike in the United Kingdom, parliament power is circumscribed in controlling the executive and to legislate. This unit features

discussion on the system of administration in both Britain and France.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

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

- i. Understand and describe the nature of Administration in Francophone countries with reference to France



1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 System/Nature of Administration

The French Revolution was driven by hungry citizens who revolted against the whole sinking political and economic structure of privileges and monopolies granted by the king. This revolution made it the duty of government to provide for welfare of the people. It transformed the nature of politics and administration by the dramatic introduction of notions such as citizen, rights, liberty, equality, and justice (Jreisat 1997: 14).

France claimed to be the oldest form of public personnel system even though there are historical accounts which subscribe that well-established personnel system existed in China (353 BC) and Kautilya has accounted the existence of a well-established administrative system in his most celebrated book The Arthashastra. But these earlier personnel, institutions and practices of administration has been considered by western scholars for various reasons shall we refer, it was never western scholars' academic hegemony or they were ignorant such historical truths. The earliest known modern personnel system in France was the institution of prefects. It is an inheritance of the pre-1789 System of Intendants. Pre-1789 French society was administered by 30 Intendants under the direct control of the king of France. Each intendant was responsible for the administration of a single province and there were totally 30 provinces.

In 1800, Napoleon Bonaparte provided successors to the Intendants and replaced provinces with territorial divisions. Each territorial division was administered by prefects. During the nineteenth century the prefects took charge of the entire administration of the territory under their control. They were charge of public order, the police and the preparation of elections. In the course of Second, Third and Fourth Republic the prefectural administrative power had steadily increased and they were also largely represented as the advisers of the cabinet ministers from earlier times.¹⁰

In England during the same period of historical development, it was the parliament which asserted the right to control the crown, while in France a highly centralised administration was being established which asserted the right to assist the king and to control him. The French prefects were appointed based on the patronage, kinship and appointed by feudal lords. Despite various changes in the prefectural system of administration since 1800, the basic original features are still maintained. Today, the prefects and sub-prefects are government's appointees at the local level in charge of local administration. However, the prefectural career is now a regular civil service career. It is open to graduates of the Ecole Nationale

Administration. The other pattern of personnel system was started by the French king and was reaffirmed by Napoleon. Democratic and rational legal administrative elements were introduced later by successive regimes, where liberal or authoritarian.

Recruitment

The French civil service is organised on the basis of "Corps" -categories of staff which form the groups into which recruitment occurs. The National School of Administration (NSA), the Ecole Normale, Supérieure, the Ecole Poly technique (School of mining public works, etc.) and Ecole Centrale des Arts et manufactures gives the country the greater part of its upper technical staff and also many of its managers. Members of the 'grands corps' (which includes the senior level of general administrators) are recruited from the graduates of special competitive entry training schools founded by the state.

Training

The best method of training is imparted to the civil servants only in France. Training in France, unlike in the UK, the USA and India, starts before recruitment. Nontechnical civil service training by Ecole Nationale d'Administration provides the best training for the administrators than its counterparts elsewhere. The total training period is about 3 years and consists of the following packages:

1. One-year practical learning about public administration in prefectural provinces.
2. Specialised training by attending lectures and seminars which are necessarily spent at ENA, Paris.
3. At the end of the second year, the student joins a department of his own option and remains there on probation for 2 or 3 years.

Promotion

In France, promotion is affected only within the same corps and there is less scope for promotion unlike the USA, the UK and India where the scope of promotion is not limited but goes well beyond the compartmentalised administrative hierarchy. The restricted scope for promotion in France is due to the fact that each category and corps is classified on a three-fold basis such as grades, classes and echelons. Each of these grades differs in their authority and responsibility. Promotion of echelon is automatic and mainly based on seniority and to some extent annual rating. A list is prepared every year by ENA and is submitted to an advisory committee composed of an equal number of staff representatives and the representatives of the official side. The committee is empowered to approve the list for promotion and can also solve any conflict of interests in the promotional list. There is also an existence of promotion outside the government organisation to provide bodies which is legally allowed in France. A civil servant can retain his authority of corps and is also empowered to get back his post after serving sometime in the private organisation. But such civil servants may lose their pension rights. Thatcher (1979-89) strongly favoured such kind of disguised promotion and exchange of public and private pensions at the managerial level.

Retirement

In France, the retiring age for a civil servant is fixed at 60 years, 60 in the UK. There are certain services in the USA for which the retirement age is 70 (Judges of Federal and State Courts). In India, for Supreme Court Judges it is 65 years and for High Court Judges it is 62 years. To qualify for pension benefits different yardsticks are applied in France:

1. Pension calculated as a proportion of the last salary received.
2. Those who worked for 30 years will receive half the salary received last.
3. Those who spent 40 years in service will receive two- third of the salary received at the time of retirement.
4. To qualify for pension, a minimum of 15 years must have been spent in service.
5. Pension amount increases automatically when there is a pay increase in the civil service.
6. The widow of the pensioner will receive half the pension.
7. Children of the demised pensioner will receive 10 per cent of the pension amount till they attain 21 years of age.

Self-Assessment Exercise

Briefly compare the administrative system of Britain and France



1.4 Summary

In summary, we have looked at the system of administration in developed Anglophone and francophone using Britain and France as case. However, the recruitment, training, promotion and retirement criteria are used for the purpose of our discussions. The French system of administration is unitary in nature, concentrating power in the central government. France is more strongly unitary than Britain, because in Britain local government like cities and countries enjoy certain autonomy. A comparative political study of Britain and France is more feasible, since both of them are unitary governments. But the basic difference is that the British constitution grew gradually and peacefully while it is not so with France. While members of civil service are recruited by the open competition which is generally open to the society at large as it is practised in the UK, the French system is somewhat different. The French Civil Service has been organised on the basis of 'corps' categories of staff which form the groups into which recruitment occurs.



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.

Thomsan D. (1952). *Democracy in France*, London: Oxford.

Rathod, P.B. (2007). Models of comparative public administration. *Comparative Public Administration, Jaipur, India: ABD Publishers.*

Ridley, F. & Blondel, J. (1969). *Public administration in France*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul 1969, pp. 15-16.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) Within the Content

Briefly compare the administrative system of Britain and France?

Both Britain and France are Unitary Systems, concentrating, power in the central government. France is more strongly unitary than Britain, because in Britain local government like cities and countries enjoy certain autonomy. A comparative political study of Britain and France is more feasible, since both of them are unitary governments. But the basic difference is that the British constitution grew gradually and peacefully while it is not so with France. While members of civil service are recruited by the open competition which is generally open to the society at large as it is practised in the UK, the French system is somewhat different. The French Civil Service has been organised on the basis of 'corps' categories of staff which form the groups into which recruitment occurs.

UNIT 18: NATURE OF ADMINISTRATION/BUREAUCRACY IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Unit Structure

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Learning Outcomes

1.3 Main content

1.3.1 Nature/System of Administration in Developing countries

1.4 Summary

1.6 References/Further Reading

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



1.1 Introduction

Many developing countries face an ongoing need to build institutions and organizations with abilities to overcome traditional barriers to effective implementation of developmental policies. The creation and use of these abilities have always been primary challenges of development administration. The absence and breaking down of these abilities have often been major factors in development administration's failure to meet satisfactory levels of performance. As a result, development administration has not fared well in some critical areas, such as the conception of an inspiring, compatible vision and managing effectively to achieve this vision. In utilizing modern techniques, development administration, for example, seems to lag behind the private sector in leveraging technology to improve internal operations and to enhance the overall effectiveness of development organizations. Unable to attain a timely correction of its deficiencies or to learn from its failures, development administration largely remains burdened by a combination of inherited structures and behaviors and deeply internalized local cultural patterns. This combination of legacies has had the effect of impeding performance and wasting badly needed institutional energies on other than productive endeavors to accomplish developmental mandates. One finds a high measure of concurrence in the literature when searching to identify and to define typical problems and characteristics of these administrative systems.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

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

- Understand and describe the nature of Administration in developing countries
- Identify key features of Administrative system in developing countries



1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 Nature/System of Administration in Developing Countries

The general attributes of public administration in developing countries especially those attributes defined by Fred Riggs (1964) as characterizing transitional systems seeking modernization include:

- **Overlapping and heterogeneity.** The administrative system in a developing country gives an illusory impression of autonomy, whereas in fact it is deeply enmeshed in and cross-influenced by remnant of older traditional social, economic, religious, and political systems. Thus, to understand public administration in a heterogeneous social system, one must also study —overlapping interrelationships.
- **Formalism.** Forms in developing countries do not always represent reality. Laws passed by legislators are not enforced by the administration, necessitating more rules, which remain as formalistic as the previous ones.

▪ **Diffusion.** This is an attribute of a low level of differentiation (or no differentiation) of administrative structures and functions: Everybody is doing everything. The opposite of diffusion—as used by Riggs—is diffraction, where structures of the system are specific and perform particular functions. Here, the system becomes differentiated, and the processes are universal and achievement oriented. Thus, diffusion is low differentiation—a characteristic of underdevelopment.

▪ **Particularism and ascription.** Administration in developing countries tends to apply rules variably according to family connections, wealth, and influence rather than uniformly according to universal rule. Based on experiences of many developing countries, these conclusions are widely acknowledged:

1. Genuine national development is not based on a priori economic assumptions, but on empirical understanding of local political, administrative, and economic realities.
2. National development is a collective effort that involves the full capacities of private and public institutions, in a partnership.
3. Sustainable development is not totally dependent on capital infusion from external sources, nor limited to export-orientation of the economy. Development is more dependent on self-reliance and on employing processes that address community needs and demands and employ relevant technologies in creative ways to cause an overall improvement of productivity.
4. The development process is qualitatively enhanced when public decisions are transparent and accountability of public officials and institutions is affirmed.
5. Application of scientific and technological methods to achieve growth and increase production is unavoidable.
6. The process of development faces the continuing challenge of transforming institutions and cultures to embody efficiency, orderliness, rationality, and knowledge-based decision processes.

Finally, today's human development concept encompasses producing enabling environment for people to live productive, healthy, and creative lives, and to develop their full potential. Also, development entails sustainability and affirmation that people are the real wealth of a nation.

The Implementation Challenge Public managers in developing countries are particularly challenged by the complex requirements and needs of managing national development. Conceptually, development management (administration) is regarded as an outgrowth or a subfield of international and comparative administration.

A cluster of common administrative patterns typical of administration in developing countries, according to Heady (2001: 299-302):

- (a) Imitation rather than development of indigenous public administration. This refers to the conscious effort to imitate some version of modern Western bureaucratic administration or to introduce it into developing countries.
- (b) Bureaucracies deficient in skilled workers necessary for developmental programs despite high levels of unemployment. Bureaucracies in developing countries face shortages of trained managers with technical and managerial capabilities.

- (c) Bureaucracy that is not production-oriented. Much of bureaucratic activities are channeled toward the realization of goals other than pro-gram objectives.
- (d) Formalism. There is a widespread discrepancy between form and reality.
- (e) Bureaucracies with generous amounts of operational autonomy. This is the result of several factors, including lack of transparency and poor institutional control.

A cluster is derived from an examination of administrative systems of several developing countries, with special reference to the Arab states, confirming some of the characteristics suggested by Riggs and Heady, though with some different emphases. A number of studies have assessed implementation and outcomes of proposed reforms of administration in the contemporary Arab societies, and provided appraisals (Ayubi 1989; Jabbra 1989; Palmer, Leila, and Yassin 1988; Jreisat 1997; 1988).

These are some the reported attributes of bureaucracies: Overstaffed public organizations whose employees are underpaid and whose productivity is low. The growth of bureaucracies in most Arab states has been excessive without commensurate improvements of public services. The magnitude and the type of growth in public employment indicate that the bulk of expansion is at the central offices and not at the local government; the growth is also in the —conventionall rather than —developmentall jobs. Except for major oil-producing countries, in most Arab or African states, public employment is an opportunity to have a job in countries with chronically high unemployment rates, as in Egypt or Nigeria. The state has always been the largest employer, and its hiring practices aimed at meeting minimum standards rather than seeking the most qualified applicant. In most of these states, wages as well as expectations of productivity are kept perennially low (Jreisat 1999: 29-30). Administrative structures, mirroring the political context, that have not adapted to the urgent need for inclusive decision-making processes. Public employees have not experienced involvement and participation that induce them to improve their performance. Moreover, citizens (at least those directly affected) are not included in deliberations of policies that shape their lives and affect their futures.

These typical patterns of development administration survive as long as the political and cultural contexts have not embraced or internalized fundamental principles of a civil society, a term that has been used to denote the rule of law, property right, and human rights. Also, wherever the state is highly centralized and dominant in the economy through direct ownership or excessive regulations, the nongovernmental sector has been generally stymied, its functions limited, and its competitiveness constrained.

But, during the past few years, most nations have been attempting to correct traditional shortcomings by adopting more decentralized political and administrative systems, employing more trained workforce, and paying more attention to human rights issues as well as to matters of global concern such as migration, environment, security, and healthcare. Comparative analysis and continuing internationalization trends in public administration have enforced these tendencies (Jreisat 2005). Universal values are stimulating new needs for administrative knowledge and skills, thus the distinctiveness of development administration has been

diminishing in the face of increasing internationalization of management and the growing emphases on universal needs and values for public administration.

Self-Assessment Exercise

Describe the nature of administration in developing countries?



1.4 Summary

Overlapping and heterogeneity, formalism, diffusion, particularism, ascription, imitation rather than indigenous deficiency of skills, nonproduction- oriented bureaucracy, formalism autonomy, overstaffed public organizations Underpaid public employees Low productivity Lack of innovative and skilled public managers, excessively centralized decision making, and corruption mirrors the administration system in developing societies. These have been cogs in the wheel of effective administrative system in developing countries



1.5 References/Further Reading

- Achegbulu Joseph & Gabriel Nelson (2020). The challenges of New Public Administration in Nigeria: A review. *Gombe Journal of Administration and Management (GJAM)*, 3(2), 41-49
- 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.
- Palmer, M., Leila, A. and Yassin, E. (1988). *The Egyptian Bureaucracy*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press and the American University in Cairo Press.
- Palmer, Monte, et al. (1989). Bureaucratic innovation and economic development in the Middle East: A study of Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and the Sudan. *In Bureaucracy and Development in the Arab World*, ed. Jabbra, J. G. pp. 12-27. New York: E. J
- Riggs, F. W. (1964). *Administration in Developing Countries*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) Within the Content

Describe the nature of administration in developing countries?

The general attributes of public administration in developing countries especially those attributes defined by Fred Riggs (1964) as characterizing transitional systems seeking modernization include:

- i. Overlapping and heterogeneity. The administrative system in a developing country gives an illusory impression of autonomy, whereas in fact it is deeply

enmeshed in and cross-influenced by remnant of older traditional social, economic, religious, and political systems. Thus, to understand public administration in a heterogeneous social system, one must also study —overlappingly interrelationships.

ii. Formalism. Forms in developing countries do not always represent reality. Laws passed by legislators are not enforced by the administration, necessitating more rules, which remain as formalistic as the previous ones.

iii. Diffusion. This is an attribute of a low level of differentiation (or no differentiation) of administrative structures and functions: Everybody is doing everything. The opposite of diffusion—as used by Riggs—is diffraction, where structures of the system are specific and perform particular functions. Here, the system becomes differentiated, and the processes are universal and achievement oriented. Thus, diffusion is low differentiation—a characteristic of underdevelopment.

iv. Particularism and ascription. Administration in developing countries tends to apply rules variably according to family connections, wealth, and influence rather than uniformly according to universal rule. Based on experiences of many developing countries, these conclusions are widely acknowledged:

UNIT 19: SYSTEMS OF ADMINISTRATION IN DEVELOPING ANGLOPHONE COUNTRIES: NIGERIA

Unit Structure

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Learning Outcomes

1.3 Main content

1.4.1 Nature of Administration in Developing Anglophone: Nigeria

1.5 Summary

1.6 References/Further Reading



1.1 Introduction

Having been introduced to the nature and system of administration in developing countries where a general features were highlighted in order to provide a good a context for comparative analysis, this unit takes you further by discussing the system of administration peculiar to Nigeria as a country. You will be acquainted with the bureaucratic system in practice with reference to constitutional provisions, recruitment training and promotion processes as well as remuneration system.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

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

- Describe the nature of Administration in developing Anglophone countries with reference to Nigeria
- Identify the key features of the Administrative system in Nigeria



1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 Country's Profile

Nigeria is the most populated country in Africa, with a population of approximately 200 million, nearly half (47%) of West Africa's population. The population is made up of at least 200 ethnic groups, who speak 500 indigenous languages and practice two major religions – Islam and Christianity. Nigeria is a Federal Republic with a presidential system. Chief of State, Head of the Government and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces is the president. Nigeria's constitution provides for separation of powers among the three branches of government (executive, legislative and judiciary). The bicameral National Assembly consists of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The country has a mixed legal system of English common law, Islamic law (in 12 northern states), and traditional law. Sharia has been instituted as a main body of civil and criminal law in 9 Muslim-majority and in some parts of 3 Muslim plurality states since 1999.

The Nigerian Civil Service, to a large extent has its root in Whitehall, the British Civil Service. As a result of this, a significant aspect of this civil service inherited the British established tradition and practice. This includes the idea of a career civil service established with the general principles contained in the 1854 Northcote-Trevelyan Report on the Reform of the British Service. This report, till date, informs the nature of the civil service in Nigeria.

1.3.2 The Civil service/Bureaucracy

Legal basis

The legal basis is provided by the Civil Service Rules that replaced the General Order (GO)—bequeathed to the civil service by the British colonialists—and the Civil Service Handbook. Those covered by the Rules include all public officials, including the President of the Republic. The Civil Service Rules cover, among other issues: appointments to and separation from service, civil servants' discipline, salaries and increments, annual

performance evaluation reports and certificate of service, petitions and appeals, leave and travel and reward for outstanding work.

Federal Service Commission

The Federal Civil Service Commission is a constitutional body, established under Section 153(1) d of the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. Part of (D), Paragraph 11b of the Third Schedule of the Constitution vests the Commission with powers to appoint persons to offices in the Federal Civil Service; and to dismiss and exercise disciplinary control over persons holding such offices. Each of the 15 Commissioners is assigned to oversee a number of States and Federal ministries/extra-ministerial departments. They meet regularly to consider briefs on recommendations from ministries/extra-ministerial departments on appointments, transfer, promotion and disciplinary matters, etc. The Commission has delegated some of its powers on appointments, promotion and discipline of officers on Salary Grade Levels 01 to 06 and the promotion and discipline of officers on Salary Grade Levels 07 to 13 to ministries/extra-ministerial departments.

Recruitment

Appointments into the Federal Civil Service are done through recruitment, transfer and secondment. By recruitment is meant —the filling of vacancies by appointment of persons not already in the Civil Service 13. Transfer means —permanent release of an employee. A State Civil Service Commission holds the same powers regarding the State Civil Service. The Constitution also provides for a Federal Judicial Service Commission and a Police Service Commission vested with equal powers under their respective authority. The Commission has reserved the right to exclusively appoint the entry grades of Senior Staff on Grade Levels 07 to 10. Appointments to posts graded - Grade Level 12 to 14 are done directly by the Commission —after due advertisement as the need arises 15. Appointments of directorate staff, Grade Levels 15 to 17, are made by the Commission —in consultation with the Head of the Civil Service of the Federation 16 and —in response to advertised vacancies 16. Appointments into the Federal Civil Service are determined by three (3) major factors. The first is the availability of vacancies. Vacancies for posts are to be declared by ministries/extra-ministerial departments to the Commission through the Office of Head of Civil Service of the Federation.

The second factor is qualifications. The specific qualifications and skills required for every post are prescribed in Schemes of Service. The third factor that determines appointment into the Federal Civil Service is Federal Character. For the Federal Civil Service Commission, the major problem is how to confront the increasing and persistent pressure for employment into the Federal Civil Service. In 2000 alone, over 100,000 well qualified graduates applied for employment into the Federal Civil Service. This has serious implications on the logistics of the commission, and the selection of candidates for appointment into the Service.

Promotion

There are four major criteria that determine and influence promotion in Nigeria Federal

Civil Service. The first is that the officer must have spent the required minimum number of years in his/her grade. For staff on Grade Levels 01 - 06, it is two (2) years; for officers on Grade Levels 07 - 14, it is three (3) years and for officers on Grade Levels 15 to 17, it is four (4) years. The fourth criterion is that affect the promotion of an officer is the availability of vacancies or jobs at a higher level.

Remuneration

One major problems of the Civil Service is the very poor remuneration package of civil servants. According to the Director of Recruitment and Appointment in the Federal Civil Service Commission in 2003, the civil servants are the most disadvantaged and depressed wage earners in Nigeria. Also, through a Government Circular issued on 27 June 2003, under the title —Monetization of Fringe Benefits in the Federal Public Servicell, the Federal Government of Nigeria formally introduced its monetization policy into the core Federal Civil Service.

Training

In Nigeria, the Office of the Head of the Federal Civil Service is the body charged with this vital responsibility for providing central guidance in manpower development. Secretarial staff is trained at Federal centers to acquire basic secretarial skills, Technicians and Professionals aspiring to become managers of resources are given managerial training at, inter alia, the Administrative Staff College of Nigeria (ASCON), Agricultural and Rural Management (ARMTI), Centre for Management Development (CMD), etc. Managers and senior administrators and professionals aspiring to occupy leadership positions are prepared at higher training and policy and institutions, especially the National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS), where a lot of emphasis is put on strategic policy studies.

Self-Assessment Exercise

Briefly describe the system of administration in Nigeria?



1.4 Summary

In summary, the system of bureaucracy in Nigeria is similar to her former colonial master Britain. While formally reflecting the British administrative rules and ethics, these systems have usually failed to evolve to take into account changes and have not been modernized due to lack of political will and commitment, widespread corruption and little or no public participation in the administrative and political process. The administrative practice is often not in line with the written requirements and is characterised by a lack of public service ethics and a dominance of traditional behaviours, such as patronage and clientelism, which are not foreseen in the statutes.



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.

Ngu, S. M. (2001). *Government and administration in Asia and the Middle East*. Zaria: Shareef Salam Press.

Ngu, S. M. (2001). *Government and administration in Europe and America: A comparative and evolutionary perspective*. Zaria: Shareef Salam Press.

Public Service Ethics in Africa; Global Integrity University of Minnesota Human Rights Library: CEDAW Observations. Senegal

African Civil Services Observatory (OFPA) <http://www.ofpa.net/>



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) Within the Content

Briefly describe the system of administration in Nigeria?

The system of bureaucracy in Nigeria is similar to her former colonial master_ Britain. While formally reflecting the British administrative rules and ethics, these systems have usually failed to evolve to take into account changes and have not been modernized due to lack of political will and commitment, widespread corruption and little or no public participation in the administrative and political process. The administrative practice is often not in line with the written requirements and is characterised by a lack of public service ethics and a dominance of traditional behaviours, such as patronage and clientelism, which are not foreseen in the statutes.

UNIT 20: SYSTEMS OF ADMINISTRATION IN DEVELOPING ANGLOPHONE COUNTRIES: UGANDA

Unit Structure

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Learning Outcomes

1.3 Main content

1.3.1 Nature of Administration in Developing Anglophone: Uganda

1.4 Summary

1.5 References/Further Reading

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



1.1 Introduction

Still on the discussion of case studies of bureaucracy in developing countries, this unit focuses on the system of administration in Uganda as a country. As such, you will be acquainted with the bureaucratic system in practice with reference to constitutional provisions, recruitment, training and promotion processes as well as remuneration system.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

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

- Describe the nature of Administration in developing Anglophone countries with reference to Uganda
- Identify the key features of the Administrative system in Uganda



1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 Country's Profile

Uganda (*Yuganda* in Ugandan languages), officially the Republic of Uganda is a landlocked country in East Africa. The country is bordered to the East by Kenya, to the North by South Sudan, to the west by the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to the south-west by Rwanda, and to the south by Tanzania. The Southern part of the country includes a substantial portion of Lake Victoria, shared with Kenya and Tanzania. Uganda is in the African Great Lakes region. Uganda also lies within the Nile basin and has a varied but generally a modified equatorial climate. It has a population of around 46 million, of which 8.5 million live in the capital and largest city of Kampala. Beginning in 1894, the area was ruled as a protectorate by the United Kingdom, which established administrative law across the territory. Uganda gained independence from the UK on 9 October 1962. Uganda operates a unitary parliamentary system of government with the president as both head of state and government. The Civil Service like other Anglophone countries, to a large extent has its root in the British Civil Service.

1.3.2 The Civil service/Bureaucracy

Legal basis

The Constitution of the Republic of Uganda sets out National Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy that guide all organs and agencies of the State, all Citizens, organizations and other bodies and persons in applying or interpreting the Constitution or any other law and in taking and implementing any policy decisions for the establishment and promotion of a just, free and democratic society. The Constitution under

implementation of Objectives, sub paragraph (ii), provides that the President shall report to Parliament and the Nation at least once a year, all steps taken to ensure the realization of these Policy Objectives and Principles. These policy objectives and principles are the foundations on which any public policy development process should rest.

Public Service Commission

The Public Civil Service Commission is a constitutional body, established under Section 166 sub-section 1 - 4 of the 1995 Constitution as amended. These sub-sections of the Constitution vest on the Commission with powers to appoint persons to offices in the Civil Service; and to dismiss and exercise disciplinary control over persons holding such offices. The officers of the commission meet regularly to consider briefs on recommendations from ministries/extra-ministerial departments on appointments, transfer, promotion and disciplinary matters, etc. The Commission delegates some of its powers on appointments, promotion and discipline of officers on certain Grade Levels to ministries/extra-ministerial departments.

Recruitment

Appointments into the Civil Service are done through recruitment, transfer and secondment. By recruitment is meant —the filling of vacancies by appointment of persons not already in the Civil Service. Transfer means —permanent release of an employee from central agencies to district. Appointment into the civil service is largely characterised by political loyalties as against merit and competency.

Promotion

There are four major criteria that determine and influence promotion in Uganda Civil Service. The first is that the officer must have spent the required minimum number of years in his/her grade. For staff on Grade Levels 01 - 06, it is two (2) years; for officers on Grade Levels 07 - 14, it is three (3) years and for officers on Grade Levels 15 to 17, it is four (4) years. The fourth criterion is that affect the promotion of an officer is the availability of vacancies or jobs at a higher level.

Remuneration

One major problems of the Civil Service is the very poor remuneration package of civil servants. According to the Director of Recruitment and Appointment in the Public Civil Service Commission civil servants are the most disadvantaged and depressed wage earners in the country. This has made civil servants in the country to be susceptible and prone to sharp practices.

Self-Assessment Exercise

Briefly describe the system of administration in Uganda?



1.4 Summary

In summary, the system of bureaucracy in Uganda is similar to her former colonial master_ Britain. While formally reflecting the British administrative rules and ethics, these systems have usually failed to evolve to take into account changes and have not been modernized due to lack of political will and commitment, widespread corruption and little or no public participation in the administrative and political process. The administrative practice is often not in line with the written requirements and is characterised by a lack of public service ethics and a dominance of traditional behaviours, such as patronage and clientelism, which are not foreseen in the statutes.



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.
- Ngu, S. M. (2001). *Government and administration in Asia and the Middle East*. Zaria: Shareef Salam Press.
- Ngu, S. M. (2001). *Government and administration in Europe and America: A comparative and evolutionary perspective*. Zaria: Shareef Salam Press.
- Public Service Ethics in Africa; Global Integrity University of Minnesota Human Rights Library: CEDAW Observations. Senegal
- African Civil Services Observatory (OFPA) <http://www.ofpa.net/>



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) Within the Content

Briefly describe the system of administration in Uganda?

The system of bureaucracy in Uganda is similar to her former colonial master_ Britain. While formally reflecting the British administrative rules and ethics, these systems have usually failed to evolve to take into account changes and have not been modernized due to lack of political will and commitment, widespread corruption and little or no public participation in the administrative and political process. The administrative practice is often not in line with the written requirements and is characterised by a lack of public service ethics and a dominance of traditional behaviours, such as patronage and clientelism, which are not foreseen in the statutes.

MODULE 5

UNIT 21: SYSTEM OF ADMINISTRATION IN DEVELOPING FRANCOPHONE COUNTRIES: SENEGAL

Unit Structure

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Learning Outcomes

1.3 Main content

1.3.1 Nature/System of Administration in Senegal

1.4 Summary

1.5 References/Further Reading

1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s)



1.1 Introduction

The last two units have focused on the nature and system of administration in Anglophone countries trying to identify their key features and whether they share certain similar characteristics by virtue of being colonized by the same country_ Britain. This unit will therefore advance the discussion further by looking at the system of administration in Francophone countries beginning with Senegal. Our focus will be on the mode of recruitment, training, promotion, discipline and remuneration.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

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

- i. Understand and describe the nature of Administration in developing Anglophone and Francophone countries with reference to Nigeria and Senegal



1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 Country's Profile

Senegal is situated between Mauritania and Guinea-Bissau. The country also borders on Gambia, which is almost an enclave within Senegal, Guinea, Mali, and the North Atlantic Ocean. Predominantly rural and with limited natural resources, Senegal earns foreign exchange from fish, phosphates, peanuts, tourism, and services. Its economy is highly vulnerable to variations in rainfall and changes in world commodity prices. Of Senegal's estimated 12.5 million people, approximately 51% live in rural areas. French is the official language, but it is used regularly only by the country's literate minority. All Senegalese speak an indigenous language; of these Wolof is the one most commonly used. Other commonly spoken indigenous languages include Pulaar, Jola, and Mandinka. Ninety-four percent of Senegal's population is Muslim. The remaining 6 percent of the population adhered to the tenets of Christianity (5 percent) or indigenous beliefs (1 percent). Senegal was once part of the Mali Federation, which integrated Senegal and the French Soudan into one political entity. This Federation, formed in January 1959, became fully independent in on 20 June 1960, as a result of France's signature on a transfer of power agreement. Internal political difficulties caused the Federation to dissolve on 20 August 1960. The French Soudan (renamed the Republic of Mali) and Senegal declared independence. That same month, Leopold Senghor was elected to be Senegal's first president.

1.3.2 The Civil Service/Bureaucracy

Legal basis

The Senegalese law requires that its civil service sector be impartial, independent, and fairly managed. While the Senegalese constitution has no national regulations to prevent nepotism, cronyism and patronage within the civil service, because it has ratified the relevant UN convention such restrictions are automatically part of its legal provisions. (Article 98 of the country's constitution states that legally ratified conventions have immediate effect over the law.) Under Senegalese law, civil servants convicted of corruption are prohibited from future government employment.

Recruitment

Each sector of the public service has a unit responsible for the management of public servants. The head of this unit is assisted by two or three chiefs, one of whom is solely responsible for the management and monitoring of the careers of public servants: recruitment, assignment, disciplinary sanctions, and so forth. Public servants are briefed about the ethical standards by which they are bound during their pre-recruitment induction training. Prior to their recruitment, public servants attend a training course during which they are introduced to the values and standards concerning their future functions. It is only after satisfactory tests following such training that the public servant is given a permanent contract. The Senegalese system is a combination of merit-based and loyalty-based recruitment. Merit is an important factor in this process, but personal, political and economic connections are significant as well.

Promotion

In practice, promotions in the civil service are not based on nepotism, cronyism or patronage, but are instead based on an individual's professional criteria. However, treatment can change based on the civil servant's political loyalties.

Remuneration

Civil servants are not known to receive high wages or salaries in Senegal. They do receive bonuses, but these bonuses generally constitute no more than 10 percent of total pay.

Training

Training for public officials is mandatory. Part of this training focuses on public service ethics.

Self-Assessment Exercise

Briefly describe the system of administration in Nigeria and Senegal



1.4 Summary

In summary, the system of bureaucracy between Nigeria (Anglophone) and Senegal (Francophone) were highlighted. Similar to former British colonies, francophone African states have often inherited and maintained the administrative and legal systems put in place by their occupiers. While formally reflecting the French administrative rules and ethics, these systems have usually failed to evolve to take into account changes and have not been modernized due to lack of political will and commitment, widespread corruption and little or no public participation in the administrative and political process. The administrative practice is often not in line with the written requirements and is characterised by a lack of public service ethics and a dominance of traditional behaviours, such as patronage and clientelism, which are not foreseen in the statutes.



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.
- Ngu, S. M. (2001). *Government and administration in Asia and the Middle East*. Zaria: Shareef Salam Press.
- Ngu, S. M. (2001). *Government and administration in Europe and America: A comparative and evolutionary perspective*. Zaria: Shareef Salam Press.
- Public Service Ethics in Africa; Global Integrity University of Minnesota Human Rights Library: CEDAW Observations. Senegal
- African Civil Services Observatory (OFPA) <http://www.ofpa.net/>



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) Within the Content

Briefly describe the system of administration in Nigeria and Senegal?

The system of bureaucracy between Nigeria (Anglophone) and Senegal (Francophone) are highlighted. Similar to former British colonies, francophone African states have often inherited and maintained the administrative and legal systems put in place by their occupiers. While formally reflecting the French administrative rules and ethics, these systems have usually failed to evolve to take into account changes and have not been modernized due to lack of political will and commitment, widespread corruption and little or no public participation in the administrative and political process. The administrative practice is often not in line with the written requirements and is characterised by a lack of public service ethics and a dominance of traditional behaviours, such as patronage and clientelism, which are not foreseen in the statutes.

**UNIT 22: SYSTEM OF ADMINISTRATION IN DEVELOPING FRANCOPHONE
COUNTRIES: BENIN REPUBLIC**

Unit Structure

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Learning Outcomes

1.3 Main content

1.3.1 Nature/System of Administration in Benin Republic

1.4 Summary

1.5 References/Further Reading

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



1.1 Introduction

While we can assume that the different methods of colonization and colonial experiences influenced post-colonial methods of government, yet, apart from the fact that Belgian colonization was at least as different from the French as the English, the colonial masters themselves adopted quite different colonial practices depending on the territory occupied. For instance Morocco was not colonized in the same way as Algeria or Kenya, and the list goes on. Thus, risk of over-differentiation between francophone and Anglophone systems some sources point to the fact that the difference traditionally highlighted between English indirect colonial rule and French direct (assimilation) colonization has been blown out of proportion and really does not tie in with actual and, in any case, uniform practice. The unit discusses the system of administration in Benin Republic.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

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

- Understand and describe the nature of Administration in developing Francophone countries with reference to Benin Republic



1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 Country's Profile

The Republic of Benin is a francophone country in the West African region of Africa, formerly called the Republic of Dahomey at independence on 1st August, 1960. It is bounded in the South by the Bight of Benin, in the Gulf of Guinea, which is north of the Atlantic Ocean, with a coastal line of 121 km long, in the West by Togo, up North by Burkina Faso and Niger and in the East by Nigeria (World Bank Group, 2009, Turner, 2012). The Republic of Benin has an area of 114,763 km², with a population of 9 million people (est. 2012), with the majority of the population living in the coastal region, with Porto-Novo as the capital of the country and also the largest city, with Cotonou being the major port and the cultural and political center of the country. The Republic of Benin has one of the oldest democracies in Africa, since its independence on 1st August, 1960 and named Dahomey, until 1975 when the name was changed to the Republic of Benin (République du Bénin in French). Dahomey was a well-organized and very powerful state from the 17th century, trading extensively in slaves through the port of Whydah with the Portuguese, British and French (Benin DHR, 2009).

1.3.2 The Civil Service/Bureaucracy

Legal basis

Since December 11, 1990, the country adopted a Constitution that made provisions for a presidential regime and assembly elected through universal suffrage that allowed the institution of human rights and gradual implementation of the rule of law. The administrative organization of the Republic of Benin has been decentralized into 12 regions since January 15, 1999, in accordance with Law No 97-028. These include: Alibori, Atacora, Atlantique, Borgou, Collines, Couffo, Donga, Littoral, Mono, Ouémé, Plateau, and Zou. These regions are also divided into 77 communes, among whom three have a particular status, including Cotonou, Porto-Novo and Parakou. The 77 communes are further subdivided into 546 arrondissements which are composed of around 3743 villages and neighborhoods, the villages are the smallest administrative units in a rural constituency (Turner, 2012).

Recruitment

Each sector of the public service has a unit responsible for the management of public servants. The head of this unit is assisted by two or three chiefs, one of whom is solely responsible for the management and monitoring of the careers of public servants: recruitment, assignment, disciplinary sanctions, and so forth. Public servants are briefed about the ethical standards by which they are bound during their pre-recruitment induction training. Prior to their recruitment, public servants attend a training course during which they are introduced to the values and standards concerning their future functions. It is only after satisfactory tests following such training that the public servant is given a permanent contract. The Beninese system is a combination of merit-based and loyalty-based recruitment. Merit is an important factor in this process, but personal, political and economic connections are significant as well.

Promotion

In practice, promotions in the civil service are significantly based on nepotism, cronyism or patronage, as against individual's professional criteria. However, treatment can change based on the civil servant's political loyalties.

Remuneration

Civil servants are not known to receive high wages or salaries in Benin. They do receive bonuses, but these bonuses generally constitute no more than 10 percent of total pay.

Training

Training for public officials is mandatory. Part of this training focuses on public service ethics.

Self-Assessment Exercise

Briefly describe the system of administration in Benin Republic?



1.4 Summary

Similar to former British colonies, francophone African states have often inherited and maintained the administrative and legal systems put in place by their occupiers. While formally reflecting the French administrative rules and ethics, these systems have usually failed to evolve to take into account changes and have not been modernized due to lack of political will and commitment, widespread corruption and little or no public participation in the administrative and political process.



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.
- Ngu, S. M. (2001). *Government and administration in Asia and the Middle East*. Zaria: Shareef Salam Press.
- Ngu, S. M. (2001). *Government and administration in Europe and America: A comparative and evolutionary perspective*. Zaria: Shareef Salam Press.
- Public Service Ethics in Africa; Global Integrity University of Minnesota Human Rights Library: CEDAW Observations. Senegal African Civil Services Observatory (OFPA) <http://www.ofpa.net/>



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) Within the Content

Briefly describe the system of administration in Benin Republic?

Similar to former British colonies, francophone African states have often inherited and maintained the administrative and legal systems put in place by their occupiers. While formally reflecting the French administrative rules and ethics, these systems have usually failed to evolve to take into account changes and have not been modernized due to lack of political will and commitment, widespread corruption and little or no public participation in the administrative and political process.

UNIT 23: PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS OF BUREAUCRACY ON NATION BUILDING

Unit Structure

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Learning Outcomes
- 1.3 Main content
- 1.3.1 Roles of Bureaucracy in Nation Building

- 1.3.2 Problems of Bureaucracy in Developing countries
- 1.3.3 Bureaucracy and privatization policy
- 1.3.4 Prospects of Bureaucracy
- 1.4 Summary
- 1.5 References/Further Reading
- 1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(s) within the content



1.1 Introduction

Today's bureaucracy, however, has largely been customized and profoundly adapted to fit the conditions of its context. Also, within the national bureaucracy (administration), each organization is distinct in its practices and proficiency. Much advancement in knowledge of human behavior over the past several decades has resulted in modifications of Weber's classic formulations. The impact of change in managerial concepts and practices as a result of new approaches such as Human Relations School, Team Building, and Total Quality Management has been profoundly manifested. The rationale for the CPA in focusing on Bureaucracy is a prevalent institution, operating in almost all countries, albeit with different competencies and accomplishments. It is hard to imagine governance of the state without the institution of bureaucracy that brings necessary insights and knowledge not only for delivery of public services, but also for the greater domain of policy making and policy implementation. Therefore, this unit focuses on the role of bureaucracy on nation building, problems of bureaucracy in developing countries, bureaucracy and privatisation and the prospect of bureaucracy on nation building.



1.2 Learning Outcomes

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

- Identify the roles of Bureaucracy in Nation Building
- Highlight the Problems of Bureaucracy in Developing countries
- Describe the link between Bureaucracy and privatization policy
- Identify the prospects of Bureaucracy especially in developing countries



1.3 Main Content

1.3.1 Roles of Bureaucracy in Nation Building

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

crucial importance. Generally, the major functions of bureaucracy in these countries are as inter alia:

(1) The most important functions are directed towards nation building and economic growth. The importance of public administration in the emerging countries of Africa and Asia goes beyond directing the organisational process and economic and social fields. It has the immense task of creating a national unity and national personality capable of surmounting the centrifugal force of tribal and regional rivalries and on the other hand, instilling the ferment of change in traditional societies. Differences of race, ethnicity, language, religion, region and tribe often threaten the unity, stability and progress of many developing countries. Therefore, it is the task of public bureaucracies to either eliminate or satisfactorily enmesh the sub-cultural differences. This task may prove to be more difficult than economic development.

(2) Another area in which public bureaucracies in developing countries may play a critical role is the establishment of democracy. Most of these countries lack a genuine commitment to democratic values and process despite the lip service they pay to them. In some countries like India, Israel and Mexico, democracy ranks with economic development as a major goal. The issue is important because bureaucracy is inherently undemocratic and a strong bureaucracy may be a threat to democracy.

(3) In developing countries, bureaucracies help to maintain the framework of a unified polity as well as the capacity to absorb varied demands and to regulate them effectively. Not only were they important instruments for unification and centralisation, but they enabled the rulers to implement continuous policy. In addition, they also served as important instruments for mobilization of resources -taxes, manpower and political support.

(4) In many of these countries, bureaucracy performs the important function of political socialisation. In many cases, in addition to being administrative arm, it constitutes itself as an effective executive or part of it. It plays a part in setting up, determining and implementing political goals, and establishing major policy directives. In many developing countries, apart from the head of the executive, it is the only body capable of formulating clear political or administrative objectives.

(5) Bureaucracy is one of the main channels of political struggle in which and through which different interests are regulated and aggregated.

(6) Bureaucracy in most of these countries is also the major instrument of social change. It maintains service orientation to both the rulers and the major strata of society.

1.3.2 Problems of Bureaucracy in Developing Countries

Undeniably, powerless public institutions, often controlled by corrupt and authoritarian leaders, have been at the root of the myriad of economic, political, administrative, and social problems afflicting a large number of developing

countries. In numerous cases, processes of public policy formulation and implementation—major vehicles of the governance processes—have been rendered almost inoperable. The catalog of failures and deficiencies of governance in these situations can be quite lengthy. Political leaders regularly decline the opportunity to develop reliable methods of succession that evoke citizens' confidence and trust. They fail to advance sustainable and equitable political and economic policies that are institutionally rather than personally based. From Latin America, to Asia, and to Africa, the similarities of issues and problems of governance are truly remarkable: issues of leadership succession, poor results of developmental policies, and lack of enforce- able legal rights of citizens within a civil society. Finally, the evolving complex global reality requires compliance or participation by all countries to share in its promised benefits and to minimize any potential negative consequences. Such involvement is not fruitful without developing competent and ethical institution of national bureaucracy.

Interestingly enough, it seems that a mixture of caricature approximation, with a measure of distortion, provided the backdrop for Osborne and Gaebler's (1992) characterization of bureaucracy to justify their —reinvention of government. A less subtle but still depreciating bureaucracy is the claim that the traditional public administration is superseded by —a new approach to public sector governance, i.e. contractualism (Lane, 2000:3). The common assumption is that bureaucracy, preoccupied with standardization, setting rules and routine, tends to turn into a rigid, non-changing, noncreative edifice impeding effective governance. Less recognized, however, are the conditions that induce the occurrence of such tendencies. Misunderstood also is the fact that lack of rules and standards could create far more damaging conditions in managing public or private organizations. The issue, then, is excessiveness in reliance on rules and standards, notion sociologists refer to as —ritualism in applying rules that they become the end rather than the means. In this context the following concepts are germane:

(1) Compliance with rules and regulations is a common phenomenon encountered in managing organizations of all types. Rules are tools for ensuring accountable behaviors and preventing chaos.

(2) Excessive compliance often results from an organizational culture that punishes mistakes by employees, fosters dis- trust among various echelons of positions, and centralizes decision-making powers in the hands of the few at the top of the organization.

(3) Over-compliance could follow overall management incompetence that employees use rules to cover lack of wits and inability to exercise judgment. Accountability and responsiveness to citizens' needs and demands by public employees come to the forefront of discussion. But accountability involves various relationships, types of incentives, degree of control, and behavioral expectations (Romzek 1997: 35). Organization theory faces a real dilemma on this feature. To improve administrative responsiveness and effectiveness, critics and reformers seek deregulation and removal of layers of rules, regulations, and constraints. This

means also decentralization and more discretion and flexibility at lower levels of authority. Problem is the result may be loss of control and even loss of accountability.

As Romzek (1997: 36) points out, the trends correspond to a pendulum that swings between two extremes: one is the direction of control, red tape, and rigidity and the other is towards greater discretion and flexibility. Recent calls for eliminating red tape, streamlining procedures, adopting customer service orientation, engaging entrepreneurial management, and similar acts of managerial is mere another swing of the pendulum in the opposite direction of the bureaucratic rigidity. Fearing for their jobs in societies with high unemployment levels, and dreading unrestrained political and administrative powers at the top, public employees seek safety through compliance and by avoiding risk. —Following the rules, usually means minimizing the chances of making punishable mistakes. Under these conditions, changing organizational culture, empowering employees, and training and personnel development usually go a long way to remedy some of these symptoms and to stimulate creativity and change. Addressing the issue of costly bureaucracy in the Pentagon, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates pointed out that a simple request for a dog-handling team in Afghanistan must be reviewed and assessed at multiple high-level headquarters before it can be deployed to the war zone. The secretary continued to say, —Can you believe it takes five four-star headquarters to get a decision on a guy and a dog up to me? (Jaffe 2010: A03).

1.3.3 Bureaucracy and Privatization Policy

By redefining Public Administration role toward the Private Sector its role is being reexamined, and proposals for employing market mechanisms of competition for achieving higher efficiencies in public organizations have been at the center of debate. Public policy making in advanced states often seems to face the dilemma of choosing between efficiency, on the one hand, and government's obligations to realize accountability, equity, and justice, on the other. The market claims commitment to and competence in the domain of efficiency. The state seeks a balance of the two, never totally sacrificing one at the expense of the other. Larry Terry pointed out, —the blind application of business management principles and practices can undermine the integrity of public bureaucracies and so threaten our democratic way of life (1999: 276). Other alternatives have been considered with some success. The possibility of joint public-private ventures is increasingly appealing, particularly in Europe. In these ventures, links with the private sector are kept consistent with the principles and values of public service.

The most notable example is the practice of creating joint public-private partnerships (PPPs) instead of cloning business practices and substituting them for public management. The —partnerships between the private and public sectors to fund and operate infrastructure projects (have been significantly) set to take off in Europe (Timmins 1999: 3).

The use of private money and private companies to finance and operate

infrastructure that used to be entirely publicly funded is a —profound cultural changel (Timmins 1999: 3). PPPs may become an alternative to a wholesale privatization, which often seeks to exclude government entirely, except as a remote regulator. In a partnership, government is a party to the activity, and private funding is a factor in expediting the implementation of such ventures. This is an example of how public administration remains involved and how public service values are kept as an important factor of governing. Developed countries have not ignored the internal processes of public organizations. In fact, they have introduced many administrative changes aimed at building overall managerial capacities.

1.3.4 Prospects of Bureaucracy

To be sure, developing countries are truly displeased with the rules of the game, but they are not against globalization itself. To be equal players, not mere subjects of a new imperialist capitalism, these countries must recognize that good governance is no less important than the free markets. Moreover, in preparing globally competent administrators and organizations, —the ability to manage diverse, multi-disciplinary and multi-organizational work teams is critical (Klingner, 2009: 19).

Effective governance and a properly functioning legal system and regulatory process, supported by an accountable, legitimate political authority are also important for professional bureaucratic performance in diverse global context. However, team building, networking, and developing cooperative systems are increasingly becoming central elements in global administration. This review chapter is an attempt to convey the complexity and the diversity of views on the subject of bureaucracy. Many of the assessments of bureaucracy are directed at its dysfunctions rather than addressing its wide range of features and functions with detachment. This is not to ignore the dysfunctions and unanticipated consequences of the model, but to state that they are neither intended nor inevitable.

Certainly, applying the bureaucratic model in its value neutral sense would make it a functional framework for comparative analysis until we are able to devise a more appropriate research model. In the meantime, while comparative analysis is deliberating its own limitations and how to revive its research commitment, the comparative study of bureaucracy raises additional questions and challenges. The resolution of most of these issues and concerns is possible only through more empirical research and field observations. Effective application of comparative methods of research is the most likely venue to resolve many pressing practical issues and concerns as it is the certain path for the advancement of theory and practice of public administration.

Also, today, one finds plenty of proposed ideas on what is needed to transform the habits, culture, and performance of contemporary public organizations. Some even promise to —reinvent the government and to redefine it. The ideas for change vary in their range of coverage as well as in their sense of reality. Recommendations for change of governance offer different recipes:

(1) Limit or substitute public bureaucracy by promoting mission-driven entrepreneurial leadership, enhancing competition and deregulation, reducing civil service, privatizing and contracting out as much as possible of public functions, and relying on the magic of the market to attain the desired end.

(2) Restrict, define, and reduce administrative power and discretion by invigorating oversight and revitalizing the policy making process.

(3) Reinvent government, focusing on the customer, fostering —total quality management, decentralizing to local authorities, and privatizing wherever feasible. Regardless, in adapting the political-administrative exchanges and linkages, the managerial leaders have not only to change their organizations, but also they need to learn how to manage their interdependence with elected politicians and apply political skills in the process of managing performance and change (Milner and Joyce 2005: 1). The various ideas for change are not mutually exclusive, but they are often contradictory (Carroll 1995; Moe 1994). For generations, reformers have been attempting to separate certain activities from the political heat.

Public administration at all levels of governance has been making measureable progress in improving definition of mission and objectives, empowering employees, empowering independent regulatory agencies, stressing the values of public service, emphasizing ethics of public service, improving civil service and budget processes, fostering human rights in public service, and actively improving professional education and training for preparing future generations of competent and ethical managers. —There have always been innovators in the public services, but the pressure to reform and modernize the public service are predominantly political (Milner and Joyce 2005:1). The role of public administration is established in enabling statutes and other instruments that provide administration with the necessary authority for rule making, regulation, and administrative adjudication. No private sector organization is qualified or capable of substitution for public management authority or taking over its legitimate duties and responsibilities in the modern state. Actually, the reality of the modern state indicates that administrative discretion is essential for defining, interpreting, and enforcing public policy decisions. The obvious fact is that eliminating administrative—bureaucratic—discretion in the modern state is impractical as it will bring about a paralysis of public institutions and governance itself.

However, the future of bureaucracy lies in the New Public Management (NPM) which has been touted as a remarkable change sweeping public management in the industrial systems and around the world (Kettl 2005:1). Therefore, —Public administration across the world is supposedly converging around a new paradigm of public management (Common 1998: 59). The problem is that this new paradigm of NPM is hard to define and has become a collection of concepts and practices that vary according to the user. The NPM has been described as contradictory, haphazard, lacking precise definition (Common 1998:59), and a —shopping

list that countries choose from (Pollitt 1995:133). In the United States, the NPM conjures familiar images of —reinvention, applying market economic practices, fostering competitiveness, privatization, and downsizing of government programs. Advocates of the NPM in the United States were well represented in the government movement to reform the federal management through the efforts of the National Productivity Review, during the Clinton-Gore administration. Across the Atlantic, despite the well-known criticisms, the image of NPM is somewhat different from that in the United States.

—NPM has been understood as a trend exemplified by the United Kingdom, New Zealand, and Australia, wrote Barzelay (2001: 9). Even if no agreement can be established on what exactly NPM is, let alone pinpointing where it started, the general conception is different. European scholars believe that the approach of the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and some European countries was more focused on the institutional and the policy side of change, relying on economic and political science concepts and methods (Lane 2000; Hood 1995; Barzelay 2001; Pollitt 1996).

Nevertheless, enormous managerial changes are in progress in many locations, involving all aspects of public management, at both the conceptual and at the operational levels. The call for administrative reform has become universal, induced by legacies of costly failures of many governments that have been attempting to implement their policies and reach their national objectives. Administrative reform successes in some countries also have encouraged a much wider pursuit of change. —The integration of the American governmental reform movement into a larger international movement (Roberts, 1997: 466) is only one outcome of such efforts.

Other significant drives for management improvement have been initiated in countries such as members of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom, among others. Although these cases of administrative reforms constitute a reliable source of information, they have not yet resulted in definitive generalizations, which can only evolve through systematic comparative assessments and evaluations. Within a dimly defined domain of the NPM, comparative analysis is largely underdeveloped, and generalizations, however tentative, remain under-specified (Jreisat 2001: 540). Nor has the profusion of scholarly contributions and country reports, regularly recounting cases of management reforms, produced an agreement on a reliable and coherent approach for achieving reform (Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2004).

At the dawn of the twenty-first century, public administration literature is overflowing with examinations and reviews of various attempts to modernize and to adapt the management of public organizations in changing political, social, and economic contexts. Even when the NPM is presented as a major —paradigm shift (Kettle 1997; Osborne and Plastrik 1997: 15; Roberts 1997; Mascarenhas 1993), ushering in a —new world order of management, there is no

consensus on the content, much less on the practice, of this NPM. Economics-Based —New Paradigm Canada is one example of the countries that have substantially restructured their public services in line with what the OECD has called the —new paradigm in public management, which has accepted many of the NPM prescriptions. The restructuring of the Canadian federal and provincial governments is similar to reforms undertaken by other Western democracies, particularly the United States (Roberts 1998). The precise purpose is to make government —work better and cost less. This —new paradigm, the foundation for the recent Canadian reform efforts, has been applied by OECD countries in the 1990s.

Basically, the reforms have had three key objectives: (1) cut all—nonessential or —noncore public spending, (2) rely less on conventional government bureaucracies for delivering public services, and (3) make public institutions rely less on tax revenue to finance their operations and more on nontax revenues such as fees for services (Roberts 1998: 1). Christopher Hood (1995, 1991) and June Pallot (1998, 1996), for example, consider the dominant features of the NPM as the removal of private-public distinctions and the imposition of explicit standards and rules on management practices.

According to Pallot (1996:2), the following are the main characteristics of the NPM:

- Greater segregation of public sector organizations into separate—product centers
- i. A shift toward competition among the separate units offering the services
 - ii. The use of management practices (e.g., accrual accounting, organizational design, career structure and remuneration practices) broadly drawn from the private sector
 - iii. An emphasis on efficiency and cost reduction
 - iv. The rise of new managerial elite
 - v. More explicit and measurable standards of performance
 - vi. Attempts to control public sector organizational units through preset output measures.

Therefore, the future of comparative public administration, Ferrel Heady said that the "comparative perspective will become more prominent, enriching general public administration by widening the horizon of interest in such a way that understanding of one's own motivational system of administration will be enhance by placing it in a cross-culture setting. In the present era of globalisation and liberalisation, the interaction between the nations of the world has increased. In this context, the new thrust areas for an analysis of comparative public administration can include the following:

- 1) Human rights enforcement.
- 2) Disinvestment of public sector enterprises.
- 3) International interdependency of bureaucracies.
- 4) Study on citizen charter.
- 5) Role of people in promoting or resisting administrative reforms.
- 6) Debureaucratisation.
- 7) Role of private sector.
- 8) Role of voluntary agencies/non-governmental organisations.

Self-Assessment Exercise

1. Outline five roles of bureaucracy in nation building
2. Highlight the problems of bureaucracy in developing countries



1.4 Summary

We have discussed the role of bureaucracy and development administration in developing countries. It should be noted that most of the sins attributed to bureaucracy are either magnified misdeeds or consequences of misapplication. A basic question is whether bureaucracy indeed exerts a hobbling effect on political development.

Although bureaucracy can accumulate excessive powers, more often than not, it remains subservient to the political order. Bureaucratic power is the result of attributes that make bureaucracy imperative in the first place such as expertise and continuity in office. But, an effective political system has the oversight means to check bureaucratic deviations, maintain reliability of the processes of performance, and continually stimulate administrative improvement to counterbalance any excess of bureaucratic influence. To bypass some traditional shortcomings of bureaucracy in developing countries, development administration was prescribed with features that promise to serve better the objectives of national development.



1.5 References/Further Reading

- Carroll, J. D. (1995). The rhetoric of reform and political reality in the national performance review. *Public Administration Review*, 55(3):302-312.
- 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.
- Jaffe, Greg (2010). Gates: Cuts in pentagon bureaucracy needed to help maintain military force. *Washington Post*. (Sunday May 9: A03).
- Klingner, D. C. (2009). Using US public administration to support global development. *Journal of Regional Studies and Development*, Vol. 18, (2): 1-29.
- Marume, S. B. M., Jubenkanda, R. R. & Namusi, C. W. (2016). Comparative public administration. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)* ISSN (Online): 2319-7064
- Milner, E., and P. Joyce.(2005). *Lessons in leadership*. London: Routledge
- Osborne, D., and Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Romzek, B. S. (1997). Accountability challenges of deregulation. In *Public Personnel Management*, eds. Ban, C. and N. M. Riccucci, 35-54. White Plains, NY: Longman.



1.6 Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise(S) Within the Content

Roles of Bureaucracy in Nation Building

Generally, the major functions of bureaucracy in developing countries are:

(1) The most important functions are directed towards nation building and economic growth. The importance of public administration in the emerging countries of Africa and Asia goes beyond directing the organisational process and economic and social fields. It has the immense task of creating a national unity and national personality capable of surmounting the centrifugal force of tribal and regional rivalries and on the other hand, instilling the ferment of change in traditional societies. Differences of race, ethnicity, language, religion, region and tribe often threaten the unity, stability and progress of many developing countries. Therefore, it is the task of public bureaucracies to either eliminate or satisfactorily enmesh the sub-cultural differences.

(2) Another area in which public bureaucracies in developing countries may play a critical role is the establishment of democracy. Most of these countries lack a genuine commitment to democratic values and process despite the lip service they pay to them. In some countries like India, Israel and Mexico, democracy ranks with economic development as a major goal. The issue is important because bureaucracy is inherently undemocratic and a strong bureaucracy may be a threat to democracy.

(3) In developing countries, bureaucracies help to maintain the framework of a unified polity as well as the capacity to absorb varied demands and to regulate them effectively. Not only were they important instruments for unification and centralisation, but they enabled the rulers to implement continuous policy. In addition, they also served as important instruments for mobilization of resources -taxes, manpower and political support.

(4) In many of these countries, bureaucracy performs the important function of political socialisation. In many cases, in addition to being administrative arm, it constitutes itself as an effective executive or part of it. It plays a part in setting up, determining and implementing political goals, and establishing major policy directives. In many developing countries, apart from the head of the executive, it is the only body capable of formulating clear political or administrative objectives.

(5) Bureaucracy is one of the main channels of political struggle in which and through which different interests are regulated and aggregated.

(6) Bureaucracy in most of these countries is also the major instrument of social change. It maintains service orientation to both the rulers and the major strata of society.

