COMPARATIVE AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION: A SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

by **Patom Manirojana***

This paper is an outcome of the reading done extensively in the areas of 'comparative public administration,' 'development administration,' and such certain relevant area as political development. The purpose of this paper is very modest. It is not our intention to carry out a very ambitious sophisticated scheme of treatment by conceptualizing, analyzing and presenting a variety of ideas under any single general theoretical framework. Briefly speaking, our primary concerns are to survey extensively the development of the areas; to locate roughly their positions in, or their relation to the field of Public Administration; to examine selectively some remarkable elements as well as some relevants matters and, also, to estimate some future trends of the areas.

Our treatment of the subject begins with an extensive examination of a variety of aspects of comparative Public Administration: its emergence, its development and its major foci. Theoretical considerations of the area will be briefly reviewed as far as model-building and their application are concerned. Also, development administration will be treated as another focus of the area. Finally, in light of the current trends, the prospects of the area will be speculated on and assessed.

COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Up to this time there has yet been no consensus on the identity or scope of Public Administration. Thus, it is quite impossible for us to delineate the boundary and identify major elements of the field in order to point out where and how significant comparative Public Administration is in the context of Public Administration. According to Kronenberg, two substantive areas of greatest contemporary theoretical development in Public Administration, among others, are comparative Public Administration and organizational behavior.[1]

In cultural terms, comparative Public Administration can be either cross-cultural or intracultural.[2] Usually, the term 'culture' is loosely employed in a very broad sense that 'cross-cultural' can be frequently used interchangeably with 'cross-national.' More often than not, the

---

*Patom Manirojana, B.A. Hons (Pol. Sc., Chula), M.P.A. Hons. (NIDA), M.P.A. (Syracuse), Ph.D. candidate in Public Administration (Syracuse), Lecturer, School of Public Administration (NIDA).

1 Philip S. Kronenberg, "The Scientific and Moral Authority of Empirical Theory of Public Administration," in Frank Marini (ed.), *Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective* (Scranton: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971), pp. 193–94.

2 See Keith Henderson, "A New Comparative Public Administration?" in *ibid.*, p. 235.

comparative study of Public Administration refers to the comparison at the macro level of the total system--i.e. the comparison of the administrative systems of different cultural settings or different nation-states.[3] To many people, then, comparative Public Administration is almost taken for granted to mean cross-national or cross-cultural comparison. One major reason to support this fact, among others, is that comparative Public Administration (as well as comparative politics) is historically derived from the field 'comparative government,' which is mostly the study of national governments of different countries.

Other different concepts are mentioned. Marini, for example, states in his recent evaluation of the future trend of Public Administration that "Public Administration will become more comparative (especially intraculturally) ...."[4] The implication of this statement is likely to be that either cross-cultural or intracultural comparison is also regarded as comparative Public Administration. However, the term is much less frequently used in the sense to imply intracultural comparison. As mentioned earlier, comparative Public Administration derives from the same source and connotes the same sense as comparative politics. In this regard Blau and Meyer make it definitely clear that if used in research on politics, "...'comparative' means cross-national: the research concerns two or more countries."[5]

Our position taken in this essay is simply that in order for comparative Public Administration to maintain its identity and to remain a more meaningful and useful term, its meaning should be confined to the 'comparative' in the cross-national sense only. Nevertheless, this is not to say that a comparative study of public organizations cannot be conducted intraculturally. Actually, there is yet a more flexible concept of comparative study which tends to cover a wider range of levels of analysis. The comparative study of organization, for instance, refers to both the comparisons on the cross-institutional or cross-organizational basis in to same cultural setting and in the cross-national sense. As Blau and Meyer put it: "While the comparative study of national political systems must be international, because each country has only one, the comparative study of organizations does not have to be, because there are many organizations in every country."[6]

---

[3] See, for example, Robert A. Dahl, "The Science of Public Administration," *Public Administration Review* VII, 1 (1947); William J. Siffin, "Toward the Comparative Study of Public Administration," in William J. Siffin (ed.), *Toward the Comparative Study of Public Administration* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1959); Ferrel Heady, *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966).

[4] Frank Marini, "The Minnowbrook Perspective and the Future of Public Administration," in Marini (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 356.

[5] Peter M. Blau and Marshall W. Meyer, *Bureaucracy in Modern Society*, 2nd. ed. (New York: Random House, 1971), p. 84.

[6] *Ibid.*

In this part, comparative Public Adminsistration, in cross-national sense of course, will be reviewed extensively in a variety of aspects. Briefly put, an examination of the development of comparative Public Administration movement is intended to cover the inadequacies of a traditional approach of comparative study, some general ideas about international development--particularly in the area of foreign aid -- where the demand of the more refined conceptual frameworks and guidelines for cross- cultural missions is firstly felt, the responses of such academic communities as APSA and ASPA (CAG in particular) to such needs, and theoretical focus of the movement on model buildihg. Development, another major focus of the movement, will be treated more intensively in the following part.

Development of the Comparative Public Administration Movement.

Why cross-cultural comparison? A large portion of the answer to this question can be found in the review of the development of the comparative Public Administration movement. As a matter of fact, thorough surveys of the development of this movement have been done by many writers already. [7] Thus, the consideration in this essay will not go into very much detail as far as the development of the area is concerned.

Provided that an administrative system is a part of a political system, no wonder that comparative Public Administration has a very close relationship with comparative politics. Actually, it is close enough to worry some concerned scholars that it will lose an identity and be placed within the confines of comparative politics.[8] In fact, the history of comparative politics can be traced back to Aristotle.[9] But comparative Public Administration, although sharing the same root as comparative government, has come into being very recently. One obvious reason is that the field of Public Administration itself had no identity until the early part of this century.[10] In a way, World War II seemed to be a significant turning point of the enterprise. Before the war, comparative Public Administration as a sub-area of comparative government was primarily concerned with "legalistic aspect of public administration in European countries and, to lesser extent, with colonial administration."[11] Later on, particularly after the war was over, it was felt by some scholars that the approaches employed in those early days were not truly 'comparative'. In his observation of the comparative study of Public Administration, Fred Riggs mentions notable trends

---

[7] Some of these writers are Dwight Waldo, *Comparative Public Administration: Prologue, Performance and Problems*, Paper in Comparative Public Administration No. 2 (Chicago: American Society for Public Administration, 1964); Heady, *op. cit.*, ch. 1; Nimrod Raphaeli, "Comparative Public Administration: An Overview," in Raphaeli (ed.), *Readings in Comparative Public Administration* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969), pp. 1–24

[8] Henderson, *op. cit.*, p. 244.

[9] Raphaeli, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

[10] See Waldo, *op. cit.*, p. 1, see also, *ibid.*

[11] Raphaeli, *ibid.*, p. 1.

in three main characteristics of the study. These are trends: from ideographic to nomothetic; from normative to empirical; and from non-ecological to ecological.[12] To Riggs, the study would be considered as "truly" comparative only if it is empirical, nomothetic and ecological. In this sense, earlier studies should be more properly labelled "government of foreign areas" rather than "comparative government" for they are not truly 'comparative.'[13] Also, numerous charges against the old comparative government is noted by Waldo:

> . . . that its interests and its concepts were limited to Western countries; that it was too normative because of its commitment to the values of constitutionalism and Western liberal democracy (and perhaps too naive in a belief that there is a natural evolution in this direction); that it concerned itself too much with studying words and too little with studying action; that it concentrated on institutions to the neglect of processes; that it was too descriptive and naively empirical, too little analytical and theoretical; that government was studied without properly relating it either to the motivation of the actors on the one hand or to its socio-economic context on the other; that the other social and behavioral sciences were in many ways more advanced than political science and that they should be combed for concepts and techniques valuable in studying comparative government; that more attention needs to be given to the study of scientific method and to the crucial role of theory in the scientific enterprise.[14]

In fact, another famous argument for the cross-national comparativeness of Public Administration was earlier made by Robert Dahl in his highly celebrated essay, "The Science of Public Administration." As he puts it in the frequently cited statement:

> 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 transcend national boundaries and peculiar historical experiences.[15]

In connection to the above consideration, a couple more questionsmay be posed for exploration. Comparison for what? Why truly comparative? With regard to the purposes of comparative study, a few basic ideas should be considered at the outset. At least we can be sure

---

[12] For further details see Fred W. Riggs, "Trends in the Comparative Study of Public Administration," in Maurice E. O' Donnell (ed.), *Readings in Public Administration* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966), pp. 13–19

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 16; see, also, Keith Henderson, *Emerging Synthesis in American Public Administration* (New York: Asia Publishing House, 1966), p. 48.

[14] Waldo, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

[15] Dahl, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

about one thing. The goal of the entire comparative effort is not confined just to compare for comparison's sake. Nor is it just to make Public Administration move closer toward the state of being 'science.' In this light, some associations between the comparative Public Administration movement and certain practical needs in the real world should be explored. The way we see it an emergence of this movement is an academic response to existing operational problems particularly in the area of international development. This global enterprise does involve the transference of a variety of resources--financial, material as well as human--and technical know-how from place to place. The implication of the affairs goes far more deeper than it seems to appear. Incorporated in the resources (especially human) and technology transferred from the donor countries are patterns of organization, processes, techniques and experience based on certain kinds of values, outlooks, ideologies or philosophies. These input resources and technology are supposed to undergo the conversion process in the receiving countries whose economies are usually subsistence, social structures are traditional and can often be characterized by mass poverty, illiteracy, sickness and rurality. Moreover, in ecological terms, those structures are yet functioning in a relatively different set of cultural settings and manned by the people oriented toward unfamiliar values and belief systems. In light of these considerations, international development or foreign aid undoubtedly involves a series of questions. How to attain the developmental goals? How to maximize the outputs? What are the obstacles and how to overcome them?

Underlying U.S. global commitment is an outward-looking attitude and values which emerged after the war in contrast with isolation ideas held earlier. The reason behind the postwar foreign aid effort is not an easy one to point out. One of the major difficulties is that there is no one reason but a complex combination of a variety of reasons ranging from the political and military 'domino theory' through the doctrine of economic interdependence to the humanitarian considerations. No matter what the ultimate purpose of foreign aid is, what is quite apparent to us is the transference of a substantial amount of resources and technology earlier mentioned. Several questions are involved here. One of the most serious problems is how well the people engaged in the area are equipped to conceptualize, assess, analyze and set up an appropriate strategy to work under those unfamiliar circumstances surrounded by a complex relationship of numerous variables both known and unknown to them.

Some doubts have been cast on the success of U.S. foreign aid by quite a few writers. For example, Waldo notes on the basis of his own experience that

> ...my annual "foreign aid" worry that four billion dollars is not proportionate to the need is simultaneously increased and tempered by my reflection that we lack the clarity of objectives, trained manpower, and know-how to spend that much money on overseas assistance without serious of more harm than good to both receiver and giver.[16]

16 Waldo, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

The failure of foreign aid occasionally observed seems to justify this worry. In fact, a number of variables are considered to have accounted for this failure. First of all, the problems seem to arise from the conflict of numerous competing goals of aid itself. One of the mostly criticized points is the fact that military and economic aid are put in the same package. An appropriate combination or balance between these two competing objectives is one of the toughest difficulties. A few questions are pointed out by Eugene Staley:

> Are we helping some of these countries to create more military officers than businessmen, to have more modernized know-how in military staff planning than in marketing, educational administration, industrial relations and farm cooperatives? The role of modernized military forces in countries where other things are much less modernized is problematical. Is it wise for us to cooperate in such countries in the creation of military forces substantially beyond the needs of domestic order?[17]

The positions taken by some other writers are even stronger. "Military aid," says McCord, "has been an almost total waste."[18] The crucial role of the military, particularly army, in the process of development in the third world has become the center of interest after the war. Numerous studies have been conducted to explore this newly emerged problem.[19]

Some other causes of the failure of foreign aid are misjudgement and mismanagement. As Donald Stone puts it, "the primary obstacles to development are administrative and political not economic."[20] To him, a crucial administrative step is the creation of a realistic and operationally feasible development plan which should be based on a realistic assessment of resources and of implementation capabilities.[21] McCord's observations of the Vietnam and Indonesian cases are good illustrations although a little bit extreme and impressionistic as it may seem:

---

17 Eugene Staley, *The Future of Underdeveloped Countries: Political Implications of Economic Development* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger Publisher, 1961), p. 374.

18 William McCord, *The Springtime of Freedom: The Evolution of Developing Societies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 163.

19 Some of these studies are John J. Johnson, *The Military and Society in Latin America* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1968); John J. Johnson (ed.), *The Role of the Military in Underdeveloped Countries* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1963); and Morris Janowitz, *The Military In the Political Development of New Nations* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964).

20 Donald C. Stone, "Public Administration and Nation-Building," in Roscoe C. Martin (ed.), *Public Administration and Democracy* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1965), p. 258.

21 Stone's elaboration about a comprehensive plan is worth noting. In his words: "Comprehensive plans for nation-building objectives must deal not only with a country's economic and social goals but also with its policies and programs for utilizing all resources, internal and external. Plans must include or be supported by definitive programs and projects for each sector, i.e., infrastructure, agriculture, education, health, village and community development, urban development, and industrialization" See *ibid.*

> Millions of francs and dollars have disappeared in Veitnam with not tangible progress in the people's welfare and Indonesia presents a classical picture of disillusion. Western nations have donated $1.5 billion to Indonesia between 1949 and 1962, while the Communist bloc contributed $563 million. As the people starved, Surkarno used much of this money to crush rebellions and invade West Irian. Japanese reparations went to building an $11 million hotel, surrounded by hovels. Russia constructed an Asian Games complex, including a beautifully useless stadium seating 100,000 persons. And America built a four-lane, neon-lighted highway, whose sole function was to connect the hotel with the Games site. By 1963, misjudgement and mismanagement had led Indonesia to the edge of economic disintegration.[22]

Many other factors to affect the success of foreign aid programs carried through transitional administrative systems can be subsumed under what John Gaus and Fred Riggs term 'ecological factors.' Using an ecological approach, it is believed that "... bureaucracies, as well as other political and administrative institutions, can be better understood if the surrounding conditions, influences, and forces that shape and modify them are identified and ranked to the extent possible in the order of relative importance"[23] In transitional societies, there has been a general tendency to establish formal political and administrative institutions which mostly remain formalistic. For this reason, according to Riggs, "...effective behavior is still determined, to a considerable extent, by traditional structures and pressures, the family, religion, and persisting socioeconomic practices. Hence it is possible to understand politics and administration in these countries only ecologically, i.e. by relating these non-administrative factors to the administrative."[24]

Additionally, it is also suggested by some writers that some considerations should be given to the temporal dimension of the problems. This is to say that not only the current but also certain historical features of the ecological factors should be taken into account. Diamant notably observes that "the study of public administration has taken a firm 'nonhistoric stance' and has only recently come to realize that 'history'--social, cultural, economic, political--has a tendency to play tricks with POSDCORB and the scalar principle when applied to certain less developed countries."[25]

So much for the discussion of the problems impeding and affecting the foreign aid enterprise. No one seems to deny that these problems are too serious to be left solely to the practitioners directly engaged in the area. All help they can get are desperately needed, particularly from the academic arena as far as the study of Public Administration is concerned. More or less, it seems to be these problems to which the emergence of comparative Public Administration is

---

22 McCord, *op.cit.* p. 163.

23 Heady, *op.cit.*, p. 24.

24 Riggs, *op.cit.*, p. 18.

25 Alfred Diamant, "The Relevance of Comparative Politics to the Study of Comparative Administration," in Raphaeli (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp. 29-30.

intended to respond. Henderson points out that "the unsuccessful efforts at introducing technical change have suggested that not only do we need a fuller understanding of the cultural context of public administrative institutions but that we need some new ideas about Public Administration itself."[26]

As observed by Van Nieuwenhuijze, Public Administration has an American and a European root, namely power politics and administrative law, respectively. But both concepts are "time-and-place conditioned."[27] He continues to point out that culture is a prime determinant of specificity and, through specificity, of variety of the field. It is a main conditioning factor both for action and for scholarship.[28] Generally put, whatever term is used to describe an inadequacy of American Public Administration--parochialism, provincialism, ethnocentricity, time-and-place conditioned, or culture-bound--the main implications of these several ideas tend to point to the same thing, the need to transcend the existing intellectual boundaries or the need for theoretical framework for comparative conceptualization. Again, we come back to the point suggested by Dahl:

> . . . 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. . ., can there be a "science of public administration" in the sense of a body of generalized principles independent of their peculiar national setting.[29]

Intellectual Response to Practical Needs.

The response to the problems in the area of international development has not come only from the comparative Public Administration movement. In fact, this problem area has been examined by several other groups and individuals. For a while, let us examine some of these works before an intensive review of the comparative Public Administration movement.

The first work to be examined is Staley's *The Future of Underdeveloped Countries.*[30] This book came out in 1954. It is the result of a series of meetings of a study group of the Council on Foreign Relations held in 1952. Despite Staley's scholarly effort to organize, analyze and

---

[26] Henderson, *Emerging Synthesis .....op.cit.*, p. 49.

[27] C.A.O. van Nieuwenhuijze, *Public Administration, Comparative Administration, Development Administration : Concepts and Theory in the Struggle for Relevance.* A paper presented in the National Conference on Comparative Administration held at Hotel Syracuse, April 1-4, 1971. p. 1 (mimeogr aphed).

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[29] Dahl, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

[30] Staley, *op. cit.*

present this study in a very systematic way, it is yet felt that the study is not purely an academic enterprise. This point can be substantiated by a number of reasons. First of all the very fundamental facts underlying the context of the study seem to be the dichotomous nature of Communist and non-Communist camps. Consequently, the book is a view from the standpoint of the U.S. alone. In awareness of the burgeoning Communist interest in the third world, it is obvious that the whole idea behind this study is the "domino theory." Viewed in this light, the study does not address itself to the problem of the best possible shape or strategy for the development of underdeveloped countries. Rather, it seems to deal with the question of "What is an appropriate role of the U.S. to help develop the third world in order to neutralize the Communist influence or to check the Communist expansion?" The aim of the entire work is to ensure the U.S. interest or, more likely, the mutual interest between the U.S. and the aid-receiving nations.

Another work to be considered is *The Emerging Nations: Their Growth and U.S. Policy*, edited by Millikan and Blackmer.[31] This book is an outcome of the Center for International Studies, MIT. It is similar to Staley's work in the sense that, as its title indicates, it carries the same common theme. However, this latter work seems to be more theoretical and, also, more academic-oriented. In fact, its authors represent a wide range of a variety of social science views in terms of the disciplines involved. Other than two editors, some of the contributors are Daniel Lerner, Ithiel de Sola Pool, Everett Hagen, Lucian Pye, and W.W Rostow, to mention a few. Unfortunately, the contribution of each author became virtually impossible to identify in the process of drafting and redrafting. The major purpose of the study is to be an exercise in interdisciplinary analysis attempting to approach the problem of national development from different directions and with different interests. Like the goal of the comparative Public Administration movement, this study also attempts to see whether an effort to enlarge an understanding of forces at work in the transitional societies can help coping with the problems of U.S. policies. Among the aspects from where the study is directed are economic, sociological, cultural, political and psychological. Other than the general level of theoretical discussions, the study also includes some concrete suggestions such as the level of international aid.

Now, let us turn to consider the efforts of the comparative Public Administration movement. In fact, current interest in the movement is obvious in a wide range of evidence: bibliographies, conferences, new courses and a substantial numbers of articles and books. In the first place, it is useful to note the close relationship between comparative Public Administraiton and comparative politics. As Waldo indicates, "Not only there is similarity between the two movements in objectives, outlook, and core concepts, there is an overlapping of research interests and professional activities."[32] In the early fifties the APSA set up a committee on comparative administration.[33]

---

[31]Max F. Millikan and Donald L. M. Blackmer (eds.), *The Emerging Nations: Their Growth and United States Policy* (Boston : Little, Brown and Company, 1961).

[32]Waldo, *op.cit.*, p. 11.

[33]*Ibid.*, p. 6.

Notably, systematic research and teaching methods in comparative Public Administration is considered to be first conceived at a Conference on Comparative Administration held at Princeton in September 1952 under the auspices of the Public Administration Clearing House.[34] In the following year the committee on public administration published its report outlining research priorities and suggesting a method for the study of comparative administration. Although what have been outlined and suggested were not seriously acted upon right away, it is considered as the beginning of the contemporary movement of considerable size, complexity and intensity.[35] Among the indications of its growth is an amount of the literature published in the last decade.

Noticeably active in the movement is the Comparative Administration Group (CAG) a committee of the ASPA. Having financial support from the Ford Foundation, CAG has sponsored and stimulated comparative research in administrative problems which are international in scope of its operation including Asia, Latin America and Europe. Hundreds of pieces of literature, widely known as *CAG occasional papers*, were written, circulated and finally published. In addition to the focus of cross-cultural comparative research, CAG activities also cover other aspects of administration. Some broad ideas about CAG contributions may be obtained from looking at its internal structure. In terms of organization, CAG consists of eleven committees on Asia, Europe, Latin America, national planning, comparative urban administration and politics, theories of organization, international administration, comparative legislative studies, comparative educational administration, and systems theory.[36] The contribution of CAG to the burgeoning area of comparative Public Administration is substantial. In terms of the literature, the number of articles written amount to hundreds and books to dozens.[37] As for the value of this contribution, there is a wide range of varied viewpoints. The way we have observed it, this contribution has been, generally appreciated. However, there are also some groups who question the value of this effort. The contribution of the entire movement will be considered in more detail and evaluated later on in this essay.

Theoretical Concerns of Comparative Public Administration

It is more or less useful to view the entire enterprise in terms of Deutch's framework of the development of scientific fields. In this regard, the development of science is broadly divided into a philosophic stage and an empirical stage. In his own words:

> There is a time in which the science goes through a philosophic stage in its development; the emphasis is on theory, on general concepts, and on the

[34]Raphaeli, *op.cit.*, p. 2.

[35]Waldo, *op.cit.*, p. 6.

[36]Comparative Administration Group, *New Series of Books in Public Administration* A pamphlet distributed by Duke University Press, (Durham, Duke University Press, 1970), p. 2.

[37]See Edward W. Weidner (ed.), *Development Administration in Asia.* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1970), p. 3.

> questioning of the fundamental assumptions and methods by which knowledge has been accumulated. At the end of such a philosophic stage often stands an agreement on some basic assumptions and methods--though not necessarily on all of them--and a shifting of interest to the application of these methods to the gathering of detailed facts. The philosophic stages in the development of science define the main line of interest; in the empirical stages these interests are followed up.[38]

Viewed by this framework, the development of comparative Public Administration in the early fifties can be regarded to fall into the first stage of which the emphasis is on theory, general concepts, the questioning of basic assumptions and the methods. No question about this particular sub-area for the area of Public Administration itself is considered in the late sixties to subject to great conceptual confusion.[39] Some points about the generalization in comparative perspective are discussed by Riggs. "To formulate generalizations," says Riggs, "we need to proceed to a comparative method which assembles more than one item of a class of phenomena and then tries to discover uniformities or similarities of behavior and to account for the diversities that appear."[40]

Following Raphaeli, the principal concerns of the recent literature in comparative Public Administration will be distinguished as theoretical framework and development administration.[41] This section will be concerned with the first focus of the enterprise i.e. theoretical considerations. Another focus--development administration--will be discussed in the following section.

In a sense, the theoretical focus of comparative Public Administration can be considered to be a resdonse to the lack of the general framework to conceptualize the complexity of a wide range of confusedly associated variables of different administrative systems. The first noteworthy point about the newly formulated comparative frameworks is concerned with the cultural breakthrough. According to Caiden:

---

[38]Karl W. Deutsch, *The Nerves of Government: Models of Political Communication and Control* 3rd. ed. (New York: The Free Press, 1969), p. 3.

[39]Todd R. la Porte, "The Rediscovery of Relevance in the Study of Public Organization," in Marini (ed.), *op.cit.*, pp. 17,21.

[40]Fred W. Riggs, "Agraria and Industria: Toward a Typology of Comparative Administration," in Siffin (ed.), *op.cit.*, p. 23.

[41]Raphaeli, *op.cit.*, p. 5. Similarly, Ferrel Heady classifies the foci of these literature as follows: (1) modified traditional; (2) development oriented; (3) general system model-building; and (4) middle-range theory formulation.

> Although much of public-administration theory is imitative and culture bound, the study of comparative public and development administration, ... has broken through cultural barriers and is stimulating much original thinking.[42]

Despite such an advantage, there are also a number of problems involving the theory or model building. Among the most crucial ones is the dilemma between the generality and specificity. As described by Raphaeli, "The theory may be so abstract that it has no practical application, or so concrete that it provides little or no insight into specific relation."[43]

A remarkable area of the comparative theoretical concerns is the construction of model. In this particular area, a number of questions are worth considering. Firstly, the difficulty has to do with the definitional problems of the term 'model' itself. The definitions of 'model' are numerous and vary. It is useful to note some of them here.

> A model is an explicit statement of the structure which a scientist expects to find in any mass of data. The structuring of expectations is implied in any theoretical formulation. The construction of a model additionally requires that the structure be made explicit with reference to concrete "sets" of data which it is intended to organize. Modeling thus becomes a method of genuinely integrating theory (a structure of expectations) and research (a mass of data) by means of explicit postulates and hypotheses.[44]

> Model is simply the conscious attempt to develop and define concepts, or clusters of related concepts, useful in classifying data, describing reality and (or) hypothesizing about it.[45]

Occasionally, 'model' is used interchangeably with 'theory' by some authors. But some other authors point out distinctions between them.[46] A very basic idea about 'model' is that it provides a framework to be employed in viewing the reality but it is not, and never will be, the

---

[42]Gerald E. Caiden, *The Dynamics of Public Administration: Guidelines to Current Transformations in Theory and Practice* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971), pp. 47-48.

[43]Raphaeli, *op.cit.*, p. 5.

[44]Ernest R. Hilgard and Daniel Lerner, "The Person: Subject and Object of Science and Policy" in Daniel Lerner and Harold D. Lasswell (eds.), *The Policy Science* (Stanford Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1951), pp 28-9.,

[45]Waldo, *op.cit.*, p. 17

[46]See Vernon van Dyke, *Political Science : A Philosophical Analysis* (Stanford Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1967) , p. 107. See, also, Raphaeli, *op.cit.*, pp. 6-7.

reality itself. Truly enough, the model and the reality it represents must be in some degree isomorphic.[47] However, even if the isomorphism is complete the real world is always different. In an extreme case, the model may be far depart from reality.

The classification of model can be made in many different ways. According to Deutsch, models are classified as material and formal.[48] According to van Dyke, models can be physical models of physical things or a mental image of an actual or a fictitious phenomenon.[49] Also, Boguslaw classifies models as replica and symbolic.[50] Although differently labelled, however, these categories are virtually intended to convey the similar ideas. All material model, physical models or replica do refer to material or tangible objects. On the other hand, all formal models, symbolic models and mental image models are intangible and similarly involve the process of abstraction. Since we are dealing with "soft" rather than "hard" science, no wonder our attention is confined to the latter rather than the former kind of model.

Distinguished among model builders in the area of comparative Public Administration is Fred Riggs. We cannot possibly review all theoretical models developed in the field but at least we can briefly go over some of Riggs' works.[51] In his essay, "Models in the Comparative Study of Public Administration," Riggs distinguishes between an inductive model or "image" and a deductive model or "ideal type."[52] Generally speaking, Riggs' models are intended to be truly comparative in the sense of empirical, nomothetic and ecological oriented characteristics earlier mentioned. By taking ecological factors into considerations, his models include a much wider range of variables in the society than just the administrative elements. While the concerns of the more traditional study of administration is primarily confined just to the administrative systems or probably in association with few directly related variables, Riggs does treat the total society as a unit of analysis in his model. Although Riggs' purpose is to approach an administrative system through its super-ordinate social system, the general ideas about his model come very close to

---

[47]This is to say, they must be similar in structure or form or in other significant characheristics. See van Dyke, *ibid.*, p. 105.

[48]Deutsch, *op.cit.*, p. 11.

[49]van Dyke, *op.cit.*, pp. 104-106.

[50]Robert Boguslaw, *The New Utopians: A Study of System Design and Social Change* (Englewood Cliffs., N.J.: Prentice - Hall, 1965), pp. 9-10.

[51]In fact, Riggs' models have been analyzed and assessed before by many writers. See for example Waldo, *op.cit.*, pp. 18-19; Heady, *op.cit.*, pp. 26-29; Raphaeli, *op.cit*, pp. 10-12; and Henderson, *Emerging Synthesis.....op.cit.*, pp. 50-52.

[52]As cited in Raphaeli, *ibid*, pp. 10-11.

the general agreements of the group involved in the study of total societies.[53] Based heavily on the structural-functional approach derived from sociological concepts of such writers as Talcott Parsons, Marion Levy, Jr., and F. X. Sutton, Riggs firstly constructed the 'ideal type' model of societies-- "Agraria and Industria." The model corresponds to the polar-type agricultural and industrial societies at the two poles of the continuum. Among the variables included in this model are economic foundations, social structure, ideological framework, communication network, power and administration, and the public administration system.[54] One interesting criticism of the model is that the conceptualization is so abstract that the smaller distinctions within societies and between social systems with similar structures escape notice altogether.[55] Riggs himself later on was not satisfied with some weaknesses of this model. He then constructed the more sophisticated 'inescapable' model of 'prismatic' society. In this new model, he locates 'prismatic society' in between the two extreme polar-type societies (traditional 'fused society' and modern 'diffracted society.')[56] In comparison with the former work, this latter model seems to be better employed to conceptualize and explain the reality since most societies fall into transitional or prismatic society rather than the polar–type at the two ends of the continuum.

The extent to which model building contributes to comparative Public Administration may be considered in terms of what models can do. As noted by Caiden, models "..... highlight general characteristics and important relationships; facilitate instruction, research, and analysis; point to factors that may escape empirical observation; illustrate variables, and guide proposition building."[57] These functions seem to be just minimal. According to Deutsch, models can even do something more. Deutsch notes that models may be thought of as serving four distinct functions: "the organizing, the heuristic, the predictive, and the measuring (or measurative)."[58] If the new model organizes information about unfamiliar processes in terms of the more familiar framework, it is called explanation. Actually, explanation may or may not yield prediction. Prediction serves as heuristic devices leading to the discovery of new facts and new methods. In fact, there are different kinds of

[53]To execute the study of a total society, some agreements among a group of writer in the area are that "(1) a model of a total society might be constructed for heuristic purposes, (2) the model should focus upon processes of social change and (3) the model should consider the dependence of events in a society upon external events as well a the relations among elements withing a society." See Samuel Z. Klausner, "Prospects for the Study of Totals Societies" in Samuel Z. Klausner (ed.), *The Study of Total Societies.* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, 1967). p. 194.

[54]See Riggs, "Agraria and Industria ....." *op.cit.*

[55]Raphaeli, *op.cit.*, p. 12.

[56]The way Riggs defines it, fused-prismatic-diffracted continuum is although close but not quite the same traditional-transitional-modern model. See Fred W. Riggs, *Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society* (*Boston: Houghton Miffin Company*, 1964).

[57]Caiden, *op.cit.*, 260.

[58]Deutsch, *op.cit.*

predictions ranging from the simple yes-or-no type to the more complicated quantitative predictions. Whenever quantification is involved seems to be the point where measurement, the fourth function of model, is significantly needed.[59]

Other than the question of what models can do, an interesting question is how well models can be applied to the real world. As a matter of fact the benefits from an application of model tend to depend upon two primary factors : an availability of models and (if they are available) the choice of an appropriate model to fit in the purpose of a study. In this respect, careful examination and evaluation is necessary. Essentially, the main idea about good model selection is "... to select a model that is 'large' enough to embrace all the phenomena that should be embraced without being, by virtue of its large dimension, too coarse textured and clumsy to grasp and manipulate administration."[60] Certain criteria for the selection of models are mentioned by Deutsch. Relevance and economy of representation are regarded to be of primary significance. Additionally, some other criteria include simplicity, the predictive performance, organizing power, and originality.[61]

Up to this point, our considerations have covered just some of so many aspects of comparative Public Administration, namely its philosophy, its origin, its development and its foci. Our major concern in this section has been dealing with the first focus of the movement, its theoretical concerns, with particular respect to model-buliding efforts. In the following part we are going to deal with another major focus of the enterprise, development administration.

DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Development, Modernization and Change

Fundamental to the consideration of 'development administration' is the definitional problem of 'development' itself. To Waldo, the question about the meaning of development may even be unanswerable.[62] The lack of consensus or the diversity in the usages of this term is observed by Weidner:

---

[59] *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

[60] Waldo, *op.cit.*, p. 26.

[61] See Deutsch *op.cit.*, pp. 16-18.

[62] Dwight Waldo, "Public Administration and Change: Terra Paene Incognita," *Journal of Comparative Administration* Vol. 1., No. 1 (May 1969), 107; see, also, Dwight Waldo, "Scope of the Theory of Public Administration," in James C. Charlesworth (ed.), *Theory and Practice of Public Administration : Scope, Objectives, and Methods* (Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1968), p. 23.

> One group of scholars has equated development with growth. Another group has thought of it as a system change. A third school of thought has argued for goal orientation, especially modernity or nation-building and socio-economic progress. Still another popular approach to development has been to consider it in terms of planned change.[63]

Undoubtedly, development has some thing to do with 'change.' Occasionally, these two terms may be employed interchangeably. However, 'change' seems to have a broader connotation between the two. With particular regard to the political context, Huntington criticizes that the current interest in the theory and concept of political change tend to be confined to the development side and disregard the existence of political decay in reality. In other words, change in its broadest sense heads toward either development or decay.[64] In his recent aritcle, Waldo notes:

> . . . we do not mean by change only an aimless stirring around, a random disturbance of the status quo for the sake of disturbance; but rather change with a purpose, a purpose definable as a type of process to be established, as ends to be achieved, or both.[65]

Numerous interesting notions about the concepts of change can be elaborated here. The description and analysis of the word can be done from different standpoints and in different terms depending on how the concept is viewed. For instance, change can be either slight or drastic in terms of its magnitude; evolutionary or revolutionary in terms of form; incremental or dialectical in terms of process; slow or rapid in terms of pace or speed. Another aspect of change, direction, is essential. As earlier noted, in terms of direction, change may head toward either progress or decay.

Viewed in the context of change, development seems to have directional connotation. Generally speaking, development certainly implies a direction toward a positive side or progress. In this regard, another term with similar ideas -modernization-should be taken into consideration. While development is a particular form of change, modernization is regarded by Apter to be "a special case of development."[66]

---

[63] Weidner (ed.), *op. cit.*, *p.* 4

[64] See Samuel P. Huntington, "Political Development and Political Decay," in Claude E. Welch Jr. (ed)., *Political Modernizations : A Reader of Comparative Political Change* (Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1969), pp. 207-14.

[65] Waldo, "Public Administration and Change.....," *op. cit.*, p. 107.

[65] David E. Apter, *The Politics of Modernization.* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969), p. x.

In a way, the meaning of modernization tends to be very close to that of 'westernization." As defined by Eisenstadt, modernization is "the process of change toward those types of social, economic and political systems that have developed in western Europe and North America from the seventeenth century to the nineteenth and have then spread to other European countries and in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to the North American, Asian and African continents."[67]

No wonder 'modernization' is occasionally employed interchangeably with 'development.' On the one hand, 'development' may be narrowly conceived of only in economic terms. Subsequently, it will be regarded to equate the term 'economic development.' On the other hand development may be viewed in a much broader perspective to cover all aspects of societal change. As noted by Stone, "Development now is recognized as a comprehensive social, economic, political and administrative process which demands not only sound economic and fiscal measures, but also programs and projects capable of bringing about change."[68]

Of course, the term 'development' has been internationally popular--or fashionable, to be exact-- for about a couple of decades. From our examination of the term in relation to the concept of 'change' and 'modernization,' development does not seem to be such a complex concept that tends to induce much semantic or definitional trouble. However, things do not turn out to be as simple as it may appear. Once the term is applied to describe or explain the real world, particularly at the systemwide level, its value tends to be at stake and begins to be questioned. People might reach some degree of consensus on economic development, but they from time to time begin to wonder what they really mean by development in the noneconomic arena. More often than not, the term like underdeveloped country' tends to imply nothing more than 'economically less developed country' or 'low income country.' The idea that underdeveloped countries are underdeveloped or inferior in every respect is no longer convincing or tenable. Neither is the idea that developed countries are developed or superior in all respects. With particular reference to the United States, Waldo states an interesting illustration of this confusion:

---

[67] S.N. Eisenstadt, *Modernization : Protest and Change.* (Englewood. Cliffs N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966),p. 1. Two other definitions of modernization are noteworthy. Modernization is "the process by which historically involved institutions are adapted to the rapidly changing functions that reflect the unprecedented increase in man's knowledge, permitting control over his environment that accompanied the scientific revolution." C. E. Black, *The Dynamics of Modernization : A Study of Comparative History* (New York : Harp er & Row , 1967), p. 7; and according to Moore, "What is involved in modernization is a "total" transformation of a traditional or pre-modern society into the type of technology and associated social organization that characterize the "advanced," economically prosperous, and relatively politically stable nations of the Western World." Wilbert E. Moore, *Social Change* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice Hall, 1963) , p. 89.

[68] Stone, *op. cit.*, p. 250.

> The United States is undoubtedly a developing country. Its gross national product, to take a familiar index, is rising sharply. It is also in many ways an underdeveloped country. It has underused and neglected resources both physical and human. Still, if there were to be a category of "overdeveloped" countries, the United States would be a prime candidate for inclusion.[69]

The Political Context of Development

From our brief examination of the concept of development, there seems to have been no explicit disagreement as far as an economic aspect of development is concerned. The confusions tend to lie in the non-economic arena, i.e. socio-political context of development. Before an intensive exploring of development administration, it is useful to give attention to at least some parts of this area.

Besides the problem of social development, our primary concern in this section will be on another major area, political development. Hamsah Merghani, in his "Public Administration in Developing Countries--A Multilateral Approach," points out the relevance of the consideration of political development.

> To understand the goals of public administration in developing countries we have to consider them in terms of the rapid change and flux in which most of these countries are involved. At this stage the majority of these countries are more concerned with the adjustment of their entire social, political and administrative structure, with the demands of their societies seeking to modernize themselves, than with system.This creates a broader dimension and leads to a closer and more intimate connexion between public administration and public policy. Administrative development becomes, under such circumstances, very closely connected with political development.[70]

'Political development,' is another term characterized by definitional crisis. It can mean different things to different people. Rostow observed in his recent study that "there is no equivalent dialogue--no common language, no agreement, even, on how to pose the questions--among those concerned with the theory and practices of political development."[71] Also, in his study, Pye lists ten different meanings of the term as: political prerequisite of economic development,

---

[69] Waldo, "Public Administration and Change: ....." *op. cit.*, pp. 101-102.

[70] Cited in Alfred Diamant, "Bureaucracy in Developmental Movement Regimes: A Bureaucratic Model for Developing Societies," *CAG Occasional Paper*, prepared for presentation to the CAG Research Seminar, University of Michigan, June-July 1964, p. 16 (mimeo.).

[71] W.W. Rostow, *Politics and the Stages of Growth* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), p. 5; see, also, Alfred Diamant, "The Nature of Political Development," in Jason L. Finkle and Richard W. Gable (eds.), *Political Development and Social Change* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968), p. 91.

politics typical of industrial societies; political modernization; operation of a nation-state; administrative and legal development; mass mobilization and participation; building of democracy; stability and orderly change; mobilizaion and power; and one aspect of a multi-dimensional process of socialchange.[72]

It is not our purpose in this study to conduct an intensive survey of theories of political development. Our limited intention in this section is to review cursorily certain typologies or classification schemes developed, mostly in the area of comparative politics, in order to facilitate the study of political systems. For the sake of simplicity in the presentation and examination, we take for granted the arbitrary regrouping of the conceptual schemes into three main types: the dichotomous development-underdevelopment model; evolutionary models with directional implications; and the general classification model.

In the first type, a line of demarcation is sharply drawn between the state of being "politically developed" and "politically underdeveloped." In this type of model, a number of required characteristiqs of the politically developed systems are usually specified. For instance, a list of fifteen possible factors is presented in von der Mehden's study. Among these factors are, for example, a national conensus on basic social and political goals; communication between the leaders and the masses; the secularization of politics; literacy rate; and competitive political system, etc.[73] A similar set of characteristics or required functions of this type is also presented by others, for example Howard Wriggins and Milton Esman.[74]

In the second type of conceptual scheme, political development is conceptualized as changes in a political system through time along either uni-linear or multi-linear continuua. The direction of change does imply in the model. Usually, political change is conceptualized to undergo a number of phases or stages of development. For example, Organski's model constructed in his *The Stages of Political Development* falls into this type.

For illustration purposes Organski's work can be very briefly examined. Basically, his typologies seems to be obviously influenced by Rostow's earlier work on the stages of economic

---

[72] Lucian W. Pye, *Aspects of Political Development*. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966), pp. 41–45.

[73] Fred R. von der Mehden, *Politics of the Developing Nations* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969), pp. 5–6.

[74] See Howard Wriggins, "Foreign Assistance and Political Development," in Robert E. Asher, *et al.*, *Development of the Emerging Countries: An Agenda for Research* (Washington D.C.: Brooking Institution, 1962); see, also, Milton J. Esman, "The Politics of Development Administration," in John D. Montgomery and William J. Siffin (eds.), *Approaches to Development: Politics, Administration and Change* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), p. 59.

growth.[75] In a fashion similar to Rostow' scheme, political development is conceptualized by Organski as undergoing four consecutive stages: the politics of unification, the politics of industrialization, the politics of national welfare, and, finally, the politics of abundance. It is apparent that an economic element is considered as a determinant factor to mark the distinction between these stages. The idea of political change in this model is not unilinear. For instance, a successful political system at the stage of industrialization may take any of the following three forms: the bourgeois, the Stalinist or the syncratic.[76] While this model is concerned primarily with the political element of change, there are yet few other models with a broader scope of inquiry to cover the total social system. Lerner, for example, classifies types of societies in terms of the degree of modernization into three stages: traditional societies; transitional societies, and modern societies. The factors indicating the degree of modernization are urbanization, literacy, media participation, political participation and empathy.[77] Moreover, Riggs' prismatic model examined earlier can be classified as belonging to this group.

One major characteristics of the models in the second group is that they seem to imply one-way direction of change. This is to say, the builders and the users of this type of model tend to presume, explicitly or implicitly, that social change always undergo the same pattern from an earlier to the latter stages. Either reverse or cyclical patterns of change tends to be overlooked if not totally disregarded. As mentioned earlier in this paper, Huntington used to criticize this point and urged for more attention to the 'decay' side of the coin. Undoubtedly, this type of model tends to be based partly on what their builders have in mind (consciously or sub-consciously), the pattern of evolution of western-industrialized societies.

What distinguishes the third type of typologies from the second is that they do not imply any specific direction of social change. The classification systems of this type are set up and categories under each system are differentiated by the absence or the presence of certain variables and the difference in degree or extent of these variables. The determinant factors of the classifications formulated in this group tend to exhibit the variety or perspectives or interests of the people who construct them. As observed by Heady:

> The most significant point of agreement is that the groupings are not made on the basis of geographical propinquity or common colonial background, important though these factors concededly are; criteria for classification which cut across locational, historical, and cultural lines are used.[78]

---

[75] See W.W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), ch. 2.

[76] See A.F.K. Organski, *The Stages of Political Development*. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1965).

[77] See Daniel Lerner, *The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East* (New York: The Free Press, 1968), Ch. 2.

[78] Heady, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

Some conceptual schemes are designed to cover all political systems at any stage of development. Almond, for example, devides political systems into four broad categories: the Anglo-American, the pre-industrial, the totalitarian, and the continental European.[79] Although his classification is based on the concept of political structure and political culture, it seems to be more or less influenced by a geographical factor. Fourteen years later, he admits that this typology was just "a preliminary sorting operation,"[80] In his more recent work, he and Powell Jr., develop a more elaborate classification of political systems according to degree of structural differentiation and cultural secularization. These categories are primitive systems, traditional systems, and modern systems.[81]

The efforts of many political scientists have been addressed to the problems of emerging countries as far as the construction of conceptual scheme is concerned. Of course, the building of these schemes are mostly an exercise within the confines of comparative politics. However, it is of some value to take a brief look into some of them since no one can deny the close association between administrative systems and their political ecology. The following consideration, thus, will include a number of typologies proposed by such prominent scholars as Shils, Kautsky, Heady, Esman, Almond, Coleman, von der Mehden, and Janowitz.

Shils' categories of polities in the new states are political democracy, tutelary democracy, modernizing oligarchy, totalitarian oligarchy and traditional oligarchy.[82] Shils' idea has a profound influence on a famous empirical study, *The Politics of the Developing Areas*, edited by Almond and Coleman. Four out of five of Shils' categories (except for tetalitarian oligarchy) are employd in this study with the other two additional categories--terminal colonial democracy and colonial or racial oligarchy.[83]

Kautsky, in an effort to indicate that Communism can be regarded as part of the larger movement of nationalism in underdeveloped countries, also did propose a classification system. His categories include traditional aristocratic authoritarianism, a transitional stage of domination by nationalist intellectuals, totalitarianism of the aristocracy, totalitarianism of the intellectuals,

---

[79] Gabriel A. Almond, "Comparative Political Systems," *The Journal of Politics* XVIII (August 1956), 391–409.

[80] Gabriel A. Almond, *Political Development: Essays in Heuristic Theory* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1970), p. 15.

[81] Gabriel A. Almond and G. Bingham Powell, Jr., *Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966), p. 217.

[82] See Edward Shils, *Political Development in the New States* (The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1962).

[83] See Gabriel A. Almond and James S. Coleman (eds.), *The Politics of the Developing Areas* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1970),pp. 53–55, 561–76.

and democracy.[84] Also, Heady constructs another classification plan of developing polities. His emphasis is on the relationship between the basic political characteristics of the regime and the political role of the bureaucracy in the system. His categories are traditional-autocratic system, bureaucratic-elite systems--civil and military, polyarchal competitive systems, dominant party semicompetitive systems, dominant-party mobilization systems, and communist totalitarian systems.[85]

In the context of nation-building, Esman assumes that regimes which share common characteristics will tend to approach the tasks involved in nation building and socioeconomic progress in similar ways. Based on this assumption, he classifies political systems into five categories. These categories are conservative oligarchies, authoritarian military reformers, competitive interest oriented party systems, dominant mass party systems, and communist totalitarian.[86]

There are yet some other classification schemes developed with specific interest. They are constructed in terms of certain particular dimensions of the political system. For example, von der Mehden builds a conceptual scheme in terms of the structure and functions of political parties and Janowitz take a point of view of political development in less developed countries in terms of the military role.[87]

Although the variables taken into account in the framework of the above categories are considered at the relatively high level of generalization, there has also been some treatment in the more concretized form. In his empirical study of data from 107 countries, Russet classifies the societies under study into five major types: traditional primitive, traditional civilizations, transitional, industrial revolution, and high mass consumption. These types or 'stages' of politicoeconomic development are distinguished by a variation of eight variables including GNP, per capita income, urbanization, literacy, proportion of students in higher education, hospital beds per inhabitants, radio ownership, voting turnout, and central government revenue as percentage of GNP.[88]

The conceptual schemes of political systems considered above are certainly only a segment of those developed in the past two decades. However superficial the presentation and discussion is, it hopefully serves to illustrate at least a few basic points. At least, it is hoped that the presentation does illustrate the existence of differences between the political systems in the rich industrial

---

[84] John H. Kautsky, "An Essay in the Politics of Development," in John H. Kautsky (ed.), *Political Change in Underdeveloped Countries: Nationalism and Communism* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967), pp. 3–11;

[85] Heady, *op. cit.*, pp. 74–97.

[86] Esman, *op. cit.*

[87] von der Mehden, *op. cit.*, pp. 49–59; see, also, Janowitz, *op. cit.*, pp. 5–7.

[88] Bruce M. Russet, *Trends in World Politics* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969), p. 127.

countries and the low-income countries and, moreover, the range or the extent to which these systems are varied.

Development Administration

The earlier examination of the concept of 'development' does not provide much clarification as an adequately firm ground for further serious consideration. Therefore, it is hoped that a similar ambiguity and confusion will continue to exist in the following consideration of 'development administration.' Admitting such limitation, this section, will be designed to deal with some very basic questions of the area. For instance, What is development administration? In what ways is it different from or related to Public Administration or comparative Public Administration?

In order to scrutinize what development administration is, it is useful to take into account the definitions of the term given by several authors as follows:

> Development administration is a carrier of innovating values. As the term is commonly used, it embraces the array of new functions assumed by developing countries embarking on the path of modernization and industrialization. Development administration ordinarily involves the establishment of machinery for planning economic growth and mobilizing and allocating resources to expand national income. New administrative units frequently called nation-building departments, are set up to foster industrial development, manage new state economic enterprises, raise agricultural output, develop natural resources, improve the transportation and communication network, reform the educational system, and achieve other developmental goals.[89]

> The process of guiding an organization toward the achievement of progressive political, economic and social objectives that are authoritatively determined in one manner or another.[90]

---

[89] Merle Fainsod, "The Structure of Development Administration," in Irving Swerdlow (ed.), *Development Administration: Concepts and Problems* (Syracuse: Syracuse Univerity Press, 1963), p. 2.

[90] Edward W. Weidner, "Development Administration: A New Focus of Research," in Ferrel Heady and Sybil L. Stokes (eds.), *Papers in Comparative Public Administration* (Ann Arbor: Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan, 1962), p. 98.

> . . . the engineering of social change.[91]

> . . . organized efforts to carry out programs or projects thought by those involved to serve developmental objectives[92]

> (Development administration) . . . refers not only to a government's efforts to carry out programs designed to reshape its physical, human, and cultural environment, but also to the struggle to enlarge a government's capacity to engage in such programs.[93]

Despite a certain degree of variation, several ideas in these definitions of 'development administration' can be subsumed under a general idea--the administration of development. As discussed earlier, the term development is currently conceived of as involving comprehensive processes of change in numerous sub-systems of a society--economic, political, social and administrative. Now let us see how much this conception does contribute to the better understanding of the subject matter. A very first impression is that the idea of comprehensive development is a sort of antithesis to the concept that equates 'development' to economic development. In this regard the assumption that economic growth automatically leads to development or progress in other sectors of the society seems to be regarded as too naive and, thus, no longer tenable. This point can be substantiated by empirical evidence. With particular regard to the political context, for example, Weiner notes that "there is abundant evidence that no correlation has existed historically between rates of growth and types of political systems."[94] Consequently, the idea of 'balance' between multidimensional approaches -- political, economic and social--of comprehensive change tends to gain somewhat firmer ground. With particular reference to the low - income countries, Staley notes:

> It is inconceivable that large-scale economic development, and particularly industrialization, can take place without bringing great changes in the political and socialstruc tures of the underdeveloped areas. Political and social change rarely takes place smoothly and easily, It is likely to involve strain, unrest, and perhaps violence.[95]

---

[91] Martin Landau, "Development Administration and Decision Theory " in Weidner (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 74

[92] Fred W. Riggs, "The Context of Development Administration " in Fred W. Riggs (ed.), *Frontiers of Development Administration* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1971), p. 73.

[93] *Ibid.*, p. 75.

[94] Myron Weiner, *The Politics of Scarcity: Public Pressure and Political Response in India* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1968), p. xv.

[95] Staley, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

Assuming the general recognition of the idea of 'balanced' development between political, economic and social dimensions, what, then, will be the contribution of the idea to the clarification of the problems, either intellectual or practical? Intuitively, an answer to the question seems to be that we are not going to get very far with this very high-level and sweeping generalization. Not to mention such a very fundamental question as "What is the most desirable form of political development?," there are yet other difficulties lying ahead. Even though we can assume away certain aspects of the problem--political decay, for example--from the consideration, still we cannot handle the problem of multi-dimensional development satisfactorily. To illustrate the point, assuming that totalitarian system is undesirable and that political competitiveness is desirable, economic progress is further assumed to be positively correlated with the political competitiveness according to Lipset, Coleman and Pye.[96] Even at this point, there are yet many basic questions to be dealt with. Among the most serious ones is the conflict among developmental goals themselves. Due to the scarcity of resources, particularly in low-income countries, these goals cannot be approached all together simultaneously. Priority has to be assigned to certain goals of development over the others. The trouble is that an attainment of one developmental goal does not necessarily lead to the others. Moreover, the success of some goals can be achieved only at the expense of the others. Such confusions or dilemmas can be cursorily outlined. The desired political competitiveness, as earlier assumed, has something to do with mass political participation in which the concept of political equality is more or less recognized. However, not only in socialist societies, it has been generally insisted by contemporary political theorists that "a high degree of social and economic equailty is, among other things, a prerequisite for a democracy."[97] Here we are facing anothet dilemma. The problem of choice between socioeconomic equality and economic growth has long been generally known.[98] What is to be chosen between these competing aims? As suggested by Nurkse, "Not a change in the interpersonal income distribution but an increase in the proportion of nationnal income devoted to capital formation is the primary aim of public finance in the context of economic development."[99]

Does development administration have anything to do with all these dilemmas? In its broadest sense, it is supposed to refer to the (public) administration of a large-scale planned development. Since it is much harder to gain a consensus on the meanings of political or social

---

[96] See James S. Coleman, "Conclusion: The Political Systems of the Developing Areas," in Almond and Coleman (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 538; Lucian W. Pye, "The Political Context of National Development," in Swerdlow (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 42.

[97] Robert A. Dahl, *Modern Political Analysis* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970)., p. 69.

[98] See, for example, Hla Myint, *the Economics of the Developing Countries* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1966), p. 168.

[99] Ragnar Nurkse, *Problems of Capital Formation in Underdeveloped Countries* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), p. 1.

development, than that of economic development, the 'development administration' thus tends to make more sense in economic context and particularly to economically less developed countries. According to Fainsod's definition, development administration refers to the functions of developing countries only. Although there is no explicit reference to this point in other definitions, some observations should be made about certain common ideas. On the one hand, although overt economic concern is common in those definitions, development plans by no means include merely economic elements. They also involve certain non economic context as determined by each respective country. On the other hand, most authors tend to agree at least upon one point that by 'development' they do not mean haphazard or laissez faire type change. Rather, in light of the above definitions, change has to be guided, organized, planned, designed, or engineered. An obvious illustration of the case is the country with macro-level or national development plan.

Up to this point, we have concerned ourselves in this part, with the discussion of the 'development' concept of development administration. Now it is time to turn to another key concept, *administration*. Supposing that economic growth is regarded as an overriding goal of the society and, also, the need for planned change is recognized, the question is that who or which segment of the economy does initiate the developmental goals, develop plans and policies, mobilize resources, set up strategies, and implement the development plans. Is the combination of these functions and activities labelled 'development administration'? In the case that development administration does exist in any country, is it coterminous with the entire public administration of the country?

In regard to the responsibility and burden of national development, it is not fair to say that just a few particular persons or segments in the society are responsible for them. In fact, in order for any nation to achieve its developmental goals, the conscious understanding, support and coopperation of the entire society is needed regardless of what sector, public or private, or which segment of the society they are. The public-private concept itself tends to be time-and-place bound. In functional terms certain public services which contribute substantially to the attainment of developmental goals in one country may be rendered in a private sector in another country. However, it has been quite obvious that the intellectual expansion of development administration does identify with Public Administraion and has almost nothing to do with Business Administration. Since the predominant idea of development administration, implied in the earlier examination, seems to be tied very closely to the concept of modernization, particularly in terms of economic progress, this might be one of the major reasons why the concept of development administration has not been as meaningful to economically developed countries (in which private sectors are relatively large and strong) as it has been to low-income countries.

With respect to the problems of low-income countries, another point has been frequently mentioned and is worth noting. It is the central significance of the public sector- -or public bureaucracy, to be exact--in assuming the leading role in the national development of these countries.

This fact can be, for the most part, explained by an existence of the wide gap between governing elites--military or civilian--and the mass of people. A number of reasons can be regarded to account for this phenomenon. Some of them are massive political apathy,[100] the lack of interest group structure,[101] the weakness of political parties,[102] and the desire on the part of the elites to perpetuate their powerful positions in the society[103]

According to LaPalombara, "In many places, government is the only significant social sector willing to assume the responsibility for transformation."[104] When the need for a very rapid rate of growth (despite the scarcity of available resources) is taken into account, the significant role of the political element becomes almost indispensable. As noted by Heady:

> Developmental aims and the urgency with which they are sought inevitably mean that state action is the principal vehicle for accomplishment . . . the political element almost automatically assumes a central importance in the developing society.[105]

An obvious significance, if not indispensability, of the role of government or political systems in the process of development in low-income countries is not very surprising. However, there are certain interesting dilemmas in this area. We shall look into them in the following section. Finally, in this section, an attempt will be made to consider the question posed earlier pertaining to the definitional clarification of 'development administration.'

In the case development administration, however defined, does exist in any country, is it coterminous with the entire public administration of the country? This point is crucial. If develop-

---

[100] An interesting observation of the cultural and psychological setback of the peasant majority of low-income countries is made by Heady. "The peasant majority in most of the new states," says Heady, "... still holds the old attitude that the best way to deal with government is by avoidance and noncommitment. Even the desire for political participation is rare, and its practice is rarer. Apathy and withdrawal are common, and efforts to bring about modernizing change may be actively opposed, or just as effectively, quietly resisted." See Heady, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

[101] See Millikan and Blackmer (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 72.

[102] In his study of the political systems in Southeast Asia, Pye notes that "... the parties throughout Southeast Asia have proved in the last decade to be unable to perform the type of functions that political parties are called on to perform in the West." See Lucian W. Pye, *Southeast Asian Political Systems* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967), p. 56.

[103] See Henry Maddick, *Democracy, Decentralization and Development* (Bombay: Asia Publishing House, 1963), p. 9.

[104] Joseph LaPalombara, "An Overview of Bureaucracy and Political Development," in Joseph LaPalombara (ed.), *Bureaucracy and Political Development* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969), p. 5.

[105] Heady, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

ment administration is regarded to equate to public administration, or meaningful distinction cannot be made between these two terms, it is quite pointless to establish the new area or to highlight any sub-area to serve a purpose or a set of purposes which are so vague and ambiguous.

Actually, there are not many reasons convincing us that development administraiton is exactly the same thing as public administration. Perhaps it will be the case of a low-income country with a large-scale development plan and nearly all public services seem to be more or less related to developmental goals. However, it should be made clear that, even in such an extreme case, not all public administration is development administration. Swerdlow points out that "... the concepts of 'development administration' as distinct from some other kinds of public administration is a useful one."[106] He continues to demonstrate the difference between these two terms by comparing the tasks involved in administering an urban renewal program and in operating a water department in an American city. The relative difference between the tasks of these two agencies from a cursory view is that the first task tends to have more "pioneering" nature and the second type tends to be more of day-to-day works. In his own words:

> Perhaps the difference lies in the degree of difficulty encountered in executing these functions, the amount of "pioneering" required, and the difficulties of finding adequate procedures for moving people in redesigning a section of the city, for establishing new relationships which involve major changes in how people and governmental agencies customarily do business.[107]

In fact Swerdlow's illustration about those two agencies is not impressive or powerful enough to justify the treatment of development administration as a distinguished area. However, some of his ideas have a singificant implication. One thing is his attempt to differentiate development administration from regular public administration in terms of degree of difficulty encountered in executing functions, the amount of "pioneering" required, certain administrative problems at the pre-POSDCORB stage, and difficulties in the political context of administration. Another thing he tries to point out is the significance of the differences between public administration in a poor country and in a high-income country. The relation of these two points might contribute to more understanding of development administration.

To take another look, the differences between the two agencies may be conceptualized in terms of the nature of functions to get done, the number and pattern of an association of the variables involved, and the ability of an organization to identify and cope with uncertainty of a complex set of variables in the turbulent environment as well as to handle the functions under responsibility

---

106 Swerdlow (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. ix.
107 *Ibid.*, p. x.

effectively. In the water department, most of the tasks seem to be routinized and most relevant variables under control. Also, the department is more or less well equipped to assume full responsibility. On the contrary, in the urban renewal program the nature of work is less routinized and more "pioneering." The tasks are mostly dynamic, uncertain and subject to influences by changing outside variables. It is questionable whether the organization, even though similarly well equipped, will be able to handle the situation as well as the water department does.

Viewed in these terms, the difference between public administration in poor countries and in high-income countries is the extrapolation of this illustration. Not to mention the nature of tasks, the administrative organizations in affluent societies of course have to deal with a wide range of complicated variables in rapidly changing environment. However, the ability of the organizations in these societies is very high in light of the availability of all kinds of resources to equip and strenghten them. On the extreme contrary, the administrative system in low-income countries has to deal with the situation with comparable, or a little bit less, complex variables with an antique or powerless device which is a little better than bare hands. They, in low-income countries, are poorly equipped in terms of competent manpower, financial, material, organizational, technical, managerial, and even psychological. They do not have adequate infrastructure to build these resources. And, viewed the other way around, they do not have resources to construct the required infrastructure either. There is no where to go but up. Considered in this light, it is quite justifiable to point out the differences between the administrative systems of high-income and low-income countries.

Administrative Development and Development Administration.

This section is designed to discuss another major dilemma in the context of development --administrative and political. As previously examined, the term political development is still very ambiguous and lacks a consensus. Thus, following Riggs, it is assumed here that political development refers to the maximization of democratic processes in the Western sense.[108]

To attain the desired developmental goals, the significance of planning is recognized. It has been mentioned earlier that in low-income countries the political system is almost the only force available and capable to assume the leading role in development. In order to formulate a good plan and implement it effectively, a competent public bureaucracy is needed. The development of bureaucracy or administrative development is, then, a prerequisite for the formulation and the implementation of plans which, in turn, is the central concern of development administration. It is useful to consider how administrative development is regarded to be in conflict with political (democratic) development.

---

108 Fred W. Riggs, "Bureaucrats and Political Development: A Paradoxical View," in LaPalombara (ed.), *op. cit.*, pp. 120–67.

Also assuming an indispensability of the active role of the political system in the development process, Riggs distinguishes a political system as bureaucracy and non-bureaucratic institutions. Bureaucracy simply refers to "the formal hierarchy of government officials." Other political institutions include the chief executive, political parties, legislatures, courts, interest groups, and electorates. Riggs bases his argument on the empirical ground observed from low-income countries that bureaucracies in those countries are too strong to be controlled or held accountable to the non-bureaucratic forces which are relatively weak. The findings in some other studies seem to support this view. For example, it is found in a study that the civil servant administrator serves an incredibly wide range of roles: policy maker, policy adviser, program formulator, program manager, program implementer, interest aggregator, interest articulator, agent of political communication, adjudicator, and agent of political socialization.[109] Riggs himself finds in his study such a very powerful bureaucracy that he labels the political system under study "bureaucratic polity."[110] Briefly speaking, Riggs' idea in this regard is clearly stated in his general thesis that "...premature or too rapid expansion of the bureaucracy when the political system lags behind tends to inhibits the development of effective politics ... separate political institutions have a better chance to grow if bureaucratic institutions are relatively weak."[111]

Braibanti, on the contrary, takes the opposite position by stating his assumption that "the strengthening of administration must proceed irrespective of the rate of maturation of the political process."[112] However, this does not seem to be a very serious intellectual confrontation. Braibanti himself allows a certain degree of flexibility. In his own words, "In recognition of the stress involved in rapid bureaucratic development occuring simultaneously with expanded mass participation in political life, we seek here to explore means of increasing the capability of other institutions not only to stimulate bureaucratic innovation but also to moderate administrative discretion, to enhance the symmetry of political growth, and to improve the quality of partici pation."[113]

---

[109] Richard L. Harris, *The Role of the Administrator Under Conditions of Systematic Political Change* CAG Paper 1967, as cited in Marshall E. Dimock and Gladys O. Dimock, *Public Administration* 4th ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969), pp. 146-47.

[110] See Fred W. Riggs, *Thailand: The Modernization of Bureaucratic Polity* (Honolulu: East-West Center Press, 1966).

[111] Riggs, "Bureaucrats and Political....." *op.cit.*, p. 126.

[112] Ralph Braibanti, "External Inducement of Political-Administrative Development: An Institutional, Strategy," in Ralph Braibanti (ed.), *Political and Administrative Development* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1969), p. 3.

[113] *Ibid.*

The basic idea that appears to us from the argument is that administrative development is always a prerequisite for development administration in low-income countries. Braibanti has no reservation in taking this position. The way we see it, Riggs' attempt to direct attention to the significance of democratic development is not a total refutation of this idea either. His contribution can be regarded as a suggestive invitation of general attention to the area which might be otherwise overlooked by an upstart viewer of the phenomena. As a matter fact, there have been some recent trends moving in this direction. One of the most interesting examples is an overt recognition of the role of popular participation in development as provided in the title IX of the Foreign Assistance Act 1966 of the U.S. A perceptive rationale of Title IX was expressed clearly by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs that "... failure to engage all of the available human resources in the task of development not only acts as a brake on economic growth but also does little to cure the basic causes of social and political instability which pose a constant threat to the gains being achieved on economic fronts."[114]

Recognizing that a variety of development purposes are served by government organization, Stone presents an interesting discussion of the significance of administrative development. From an intensive review of the organization of nine countries for planning and execution of development programs, he comes up with a number of generalizations as follows:

> The primary obstacles to development are administrative rather than economic, and not deficiencies in natural resources.
>
> Countries generally lack the administrative capability for implementing plans and programs.
>
> Countries share in common most of the same administrative problems and obstacles.
>
> A great deal of untapped knowledge and experience is available in respect to the development of effective organization to plan and administer comprehensive development programs
>
> Most persons charged with planning and other development responsibilities in individual countries, as well as persons made available under technical assistance programs, do not have adequate knowledge or adaptability in designing and installing organizations, institutions, and procedures suitable for the particular country.[115]

---

[114] David Hapgood (ed.), *The Role of Popular Participation in Development.* MIT Report No. 17 (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1969), p. 20.

[115] Donald C. Stone, "Government Machinery Necessary for Development," in Martin Kriesberg (ed.), *Public Administration in Developing Countries* (Washington D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1969), p. 53.

While Riggs' earlier point is concerned with the dilemma between bureaucratic and political (non-bureaucratic) development, Stone's generalizations here is suggesting a consideration of another dilemma--administrative vs. economic as competing primary obstacles to development. Stone says that the primary obstacles are administrative rather than economic and, the way we see it, he seems to need some effort to convince people (particularly economists) about this point. Assuming that administrative problems as obstacles to development are that serious, some of the following generalizations are worth considering. Accordingly, we are going to deal with the third generalization, i.e. the shared characteristics of administrative problems and obstacles that most low-income countries have in common.

The problems in this area have been examined by many scholars. Some treatments are cursory and impressionistic. For example, as far as the administration of foreign aid programs is concerned, Caiden briefly notes that foreign specialists are frustrated by poor administration. As he puts it, "Nothing seemed to work properly. Time was perceived differently. Cooperation was half-hearted. Business was more personal. The society lacked proper institutions. The organizations lacked proper methods. The people lacked proper skills."[116] More sophisticatedly, Heady mentions five general patterns of administration in low-income countries: (1) the basic pattern of public administration is imitative rather than indigeneous. All countries have consciously tried to introduce some version of modern Western bureaucratic administration; (2) the bureaucracies are deficient in skilled manpower necessary for developmental programs; (3) bureaucracies tend to emphasize orientations that are other than production-directed; (4) formalism--the discrepancy between form and reality--is widely prevalent; and (5) a generous measure of operational autonomy exists.[117] With particular regard to the structure of administration, Fainsod also notes some problems relating to such points as developmental skills, policy and plan implementation, the coordination problems of rapidly multiplied agencies, the complextiy of the role of planning organization, public enterprises, and training for development.[118]

Based on his recent observation of the major administrative obstacles to development to a number of low-income countries in Asia, the Middle East and Africa, Stone's outline of the answers frequently made seems to be one of the most comprehensive presentations of the problems. Among these problems are the dispersion of government functions, lack of public support to de development agencies, inadequate assessment of resources, lack of coordination, inadequacy in planning and following up implementation, etc.[119]

---

[116] Caiden, *op. cit.*, p. 266.

[117] See Heady, *op. cit.*, pp. 69–72.

[118] See Fainsod, *op. cit.*, pp. 6–20.

[119] For further elaboration, see Stone, "Government Machinery....." *op. cit.*, pp. 56–58.

In order for any country to overcome these administrative problems, a tactful strategy of administrative development is certainly needed. Administrative development has something to do with administrative reform. According to Caiden, administrative reform is "the artificial inducement of administrative transformation against resistance."[120] One thing we can be certain of is that administrative reform involves not only structural aspects or administrative reorganization. Caiden indicates that the administrative reformer's task is to improve the administrative performance of all levels--individuals, groups, and institutions--of the administrative system and to advise them how they can achieve their operating goals more effectively, more economically and more quickly.[121] In fact, administrative development for development administration is hardly confined to the factors within the administrative system alone. As Thompson points out, a set of administrative objectives for development administration includes: an innovative atmosphere, the combining of planning (thinking) with action (doing), a cosmopolitan atmosphere, the diffusion of influence, the increasing of toleration of interdependence, and the avoidance of bureaupathology.[122]

SIGNIFICANCE, PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

The significance of the areas of comparative Public Administration and development administration depends more or less on the perspectives from where the areas are viewed. If we take the viewpoint of the entire area of Public Administration, that may not get us very far. Basically, a consensus on the identity, scope and content of Public Administration is still lacking. We are not certain how many sub-areas into which the field is divided and what are they. As a consequence, intellectually, we are not able to pinpoint where in the field the sub-areas of comparative and development administration are located, to what extent they do cover, how crucial or insignificant the roles they play. This is to say we cannot highlight the significance of these areas from this perspective.

The significance of comparative Public Administration appears to be more observable when we consider the theory and concept of Public Administration in their relations to the problems in the real world. As we have earlier observed, comparative Public Administration is an intellectual response of an academic community to the expanding practical problems of cross-national

---

120 As elaborated by Caiden, "it is artificial because it is manmade, deliberate, planned; it is not natural, accidental or automatic. It is induced because it involves persuasion, argument, and the ultimate threat of sanctions; it is not universally accepted as the obvious or true course. It is an irreversible process. It has moral connotations; it is undertaken in the belief that the end results will always be better than the status quo and so worth the effort to overcome resistance." See Gerald E. Caiden, *Administrative Reform* (Chicago: Aldine Publishing, 1969), pp. 1, 65.

121 *Ibid.*, pp. 12-15.

122 See Victor A. Thompson, "Administrative Objectives for Development Administration," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, IX (June, 1964), 91-108.

transfer of resources, technical know-how and underlying ideas for the purpose of international development. Until the second World War, Public Administration in the United States had been living with its time-place-culture bound characteristics without conscious awareness of them. The focus of the field seems to be on what Henderson termed "U.S. Culture" Administration."[123] The then Public Administration was presumably thought of as being universally valid and applicable without experiencing a serious trans-national application in a relatively large scale. Had there been no grand-scale exportation of resources and technical (plus organizational and managerial) know-how at all, cross-national comparsion would have not been necessary and comparative Public Administration, thus, would have been almost of no value in terms of its relation to practical administration. This is not to say that comparative Public Administration so far has been able to overcome all difficulties prevailing in this area. Still in its philosophic stage, comparative Public Administration does take into account a variety of "ecological factors" which would otherwise have been overlooked or underestimated. Although there seems to be much more ground for comparative Public Administration to cover in terms of its scientific values or intellectual contribution, the development of the area so far is likely to be on the "right track" in general. This is a significance of the area the way we conceive it.

Many of the efforts of the comparative administration movement have been on the problems of development administration. This does not necessarily mean that comparative Public Administration and development administration are the same thing. In his study, Henderson regards comparative Public Administration as the broadening of the field of Public Administration and development administration as the way of strengthening administrative practice abroad.[124] Kronenberg notes in his study about some idea characterizing comparative administration as the scientific dimension and development administration as the operational or "applied" side of the field. However, he does not find it to be a helpful distinction of the enterprise.[125]

Following Kronenberg on this point, development administration does not seem to us as a proper "applied" side of comparative administration either. In terms of the level of generality, of course comparative Public Administration tends to deal with the problems at the relatively high level of generalization in order to maintain the attribute of powerful and meaningful comparability and development administration tends to be more concrete and specific in character in view of its primary concerns in achieving developmental goals. However, this does not necessarily mean that development adminstration covers the applied dimension of the entire body of theories and concepts developed in the area of comparative Public Administration. According to Siffin, comparative Public Administration is a line of approach involving perspectives, methodology,

---

123 Henderson *Emerging Synthesis.....op. cit.*, p. 59.

124 *Ibid.*, ch.4 and 5.

125 Kronenberg, *opi cit.*, p. 208.

and data of which utility is hardly limited to comparison purposes.[126] In a way, benefits from the framework of comparative approach can be utilized to achieve developmental objectives as well as the objectives other than developoment.

From certain perspectives, development administration may be regarded as the point where public administration and development come to meet. From our earlier analysis, development administration in any country constitutes only a part of public administration of the country. In other words, the entire development administration may be public administration but the entire public administration is not necessarily development administration. As defined by Caiden, development administration is "the aspect of public administration that focuses on government -influenced change toward progressive political, economic and social objectives."[127] Viewing the other way around, neither is administration the whole process of development. As noted by Esman:

> Administration is only one of several interrelated processes that are associated with development. Its role, however, is not completely determined by other forces, be they political, cultural, or technological, but administrative energy and action can themselves be powerful forces for change. Much of the change desired today must be induced, and therefore managed.[128]

It should be clear by now that comparative Public Administration and development administration are not the same thing and, moreover, seem to be designed to achieve different aims. The problems arise when an overemphasis is made in the comparative administration movement on development administration in comparison with other aspects of administration. In this regard, Caldwell makes an interesting remark:

> The movement called Comparative Public Administration faces now or will soon face a dilemma. If it concentrates its focus on development administration to the exclusion of all else, its purview will in fact cease to be comparative public administration. It will have transformed itself into a development administration effort in which the use of comparative methods would be secondary to a substantive objectivezto understand the development process. The comparative method would thereafter have neither more nor less relevance than it would have for the study of any process or behavior that was found in a crosscultural or international context.[129]

---

[126] Siffin, *op. cit.*, p. 1.

[127] Caiden, *The Dynamcis of Public Administration*:..... *op. cit.*, p. 267.

[128] Milton J. Esman, "CAG and the Study of Public Administration," in Riggs (ed.), *The Frontiers .....op. cit*, pp. 70-71.

[129] Caldwell, "Conjectures on Comparative....," *op. cit.*, p. 240.

Another problem is concerned with the nature of contribution from the area of comparative Public Administration itself. Undoubtedly, since its orientation becomes more and more on international issues, the contribution of the area also becomes more valuable for the countries other than the United States, particularly low-income countries. To what extent, then, has the comparative administration movement contributed to the alleviation of American administrative problems? Few writers have discussed the utility of comparative framework in the study of American Public Administration. Generally speaking, the utility can be said to be very limited. Caldwell observes:

> Interest in comparative study in public administration as applied to the United States has not been notable. An attempt to publish a comprehensive, parallelling, if not strictly comparative, set of studies of American state government and administration withered through, among other causes, lack of interest.[130]

It is useful to explore the reasons why comparative Public Administration and development administration are not of interest in the United States. One major, probably the most important, reason is the difference of public administration in high-income countries and in low-income countries. American society is characterized by highly advanced technology, industrialization, affluence and turbulent environment. There is nothing much in common between American public administration and those of the countries in the third world. These two areas themselves are still in their infancy. Unsurprisingly, the two areas are not found as sensible or meaningful in the United States as they have usually been in low-income countries.

This is a very important, if not the only, reason to explain the declining interest of these two sub-areas in the United States. Roughly speaking, the major turning points in the development of these areas can be marked by American's two big wars. The end of the second World War marked increasing American international interest which finally led to the highlighting of the needs of comparative framework of administration and development to cope with the diufficlties arising from the large-scale transference of resources for development. More or less, the perpetuation of the Victnam War gradually led to the demand for the reconsideration and reshaping of foreign policies. The formerly held theory underlying existing foreign policies became shaken and no longer tenable. People began to wonder what and why the United States had been doing overseas. The old justifications of the enterprise begin to be questioned. Moreover, the increasing domestic difficulties tended to aggravate the situation. An expanding public began to urge the redirection of exporting resources to deal with apparent internal troubles rather than to fulfill the international commitment for a set of vague and ambiguous reasons.

---

130 *Ibid.*, p. 233.

The more apparent this trend has been, the less popular and attractive comparative and development administration have become in the United States. Along with the general trend, the attention in Public Administration has been focused on an effort to deal with the unique administrative problems of this country --the administration of the highly technological, post-industrial, affluent and temporary society. No wonder the efforts to handle the problems of American public administration seem to gain only the slightest benefits from comparative and development administration whose primary concerns are the problems of the third world.

Henderson, in his contribution to the New Public Administration movement, beliefs that "Public Administration cannot survive unless it becomes relevant to current American problems."[131] He consciously urges the redirection of efforts and resources which had been earlier spent in the comparative Public Administration movement on the international development to deal with American internal problems. He argues that "...the United States has its own developing areas which stand in need of the same kind of attention given to developing areas in the third world."[132] This argument is persuasive and convincing enough to average American people. In general, most perceptible evidence seems to indicate that the areas of comparative and development administration are on their way downhill from the highest peak of the past decade. Both public and private sectors of American society, for numerous reasons, have drastically shifted their interests from the international commitment to the domestic problems. The CAG itself has encountered financial difficulties to proceed with its missions for the Ford Foundation has terminated its support.[133]

Despite their decline in the United States, the areas of comparative and development administration tend to have much better prospects in the low-income countries. The gap between public administration of the rich and the poor countries is likely to be widened. An importation of administrative theories and practices from the rich to the poor countries tends to be made with more discretion through the theoretical and conceptual frameworks developed in these sub-areas.

---

131 Henderson, " A New Comparative Public....," *op. cit.*, p. 248.

132 *Ibid.*, p. 247.

133 See Fred W. Riggs, "What Next?" in Riggs (ed.), *Frontiers of.....op. cit.*, pp. 601-608.