

---

## UNIT 4 DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION IN DEVELOPED AND DEVELOPING NATIONS

---

### Structure

- 4.0 Objectives
- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 More Developed Nations
- 4.3 The Developing Nations
- 4.4 Common Patterns in Development Administration
- 4.5 Activity
- 4.6 Conclusion
- 4.7 References and Further Readings

---

### 4.0 OBJECTIVES

---

This unit will provide you with an understanding of:

- Characteristics of development administration of developed nations;
- Salient attributes of development administration of developing nations; and
- Some common patterns in development administration.

---

### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

---

In this unit, certain salient characteristics of development administration that are common to more developed nations and to the developing nations are being discussed. These characteristics are not exhaustive, but only indicative. Their understanding will become clearer as we go along studying the succeeding parts of the unit.

---

### 4.2 MORE DEVELOPED NATIONS

---

It is very difficult to club all the developed countries under one rubric. Yet, certain scholars have made efforts to categorise the various developed countries according to their historical, political and administrative legacy and the contemporary status of governance. For instance, Ferrel Heady has distinguished between classical administrative systems such as France and Germany on the one hand and the civic culture of administrative systems such as the United States and Great Britain on the other. He presents Japan as an example of adaptive modernising administration and finds countries such as the Russian Federation and Peoples Republic of China as representing “Second Tier” of Development process (Heady, 1996). Despite these and other classifications, it remains problematic to group all the developed nations together, for they continue to vary in the levels of their political, economic and socio-cultural development. In the following sections, certain major characteristics of developed nations are being attempted, particularly in the context of development administration. It should be accepted that distinguishing between development and non-development administration becomes difficult in most developed nations in view of the common administrative machinery for regulating and promoting the traditional as well as developmental functions of governance.

### **High Level of Differentiation**

Administrative systems in developed nations are highly differentiated and functionally specific. This status has emerged out of long evolution of the politico-administrative systems where each new governance institution has emerged in response to the need for performing specific functions. Most of the governments in developed nations have experienced the phases of “stable growth” and have been conscious in assigning newer responsibilities to the existing institutions or in creating new structures for undertaking emergent functions. The result is highly specialised system of administration that engages itself in regulating various segments of development like agriculture, industry, commerce, education, etc.

### **High Degree of Professionalisation**

Structural differentiation and functional specificity have led to a high degree of internal specialisation of bureaucracy. This has become possible primarily on account of a visible stress on recruitment on the basis of merit and specialised educational background of the entrants into the civil service. In France, Japan, the United States of America and most other developed countries, it is the technocrat who has been recruited to hold important administrative posts and conduct the affairs of organisations involved in development administration. It is only in Great Britain that the legacy of the generalist administrator continues to dominate. Although since the late 1960s, as a result of the implementation of Fulton Committee recommendations, there has been an increasing amount of specialisation in the structure of bureaucracy in Britain.

As Heady observes, bureaucracy in developed countries exhibits to a marked degree “a sense of professionalisation, both in the sense of identification with the public service as a profession and in the sense of belonging to a narrow field of professional or technical specialisation within the service such as law, nuclear engineering, or social works” (Ibid).

### **Great Stress on Training**

In most developed countries, civil servants undergo rigorous training not only immediately after their entry into the civil service, but also throughout their career. With an intensive technical background through the education system in which they have been socialised, the specialised training imparted to them on the various functional areas makes them fully competent to undertake technical tasks required in the process of development administration. Specialised training institutions function in all developed nations that provide training in a specific area of governance.

Training in developed nations is imparted not only in realms of knowledge-enhancing and skill development but it is also given in attitudinal transformation, whenever required.

### **A Motivated Work Force**

In developed nations, the basis for recruitment of civil servants is “achieving” rather than “ascription”. It is the merit of a person that not only brings him into the civil service and it is his competence, alone which pushes him to the higher ladders of governance system. It is interesting to know that because of the flexibility in the recruitment of civil service at higher level in most developed nations, a large number of competent individuals, specialised in different areas of

development administration, are inducted into the civil service through a pattern of “lateral” entry and “contractual” appointments. Service conditions and compensation systems for those entering the civil service are made flexible in order to accommodate them and retain for whatever period they are needed. Thus, in developed nations, not only self-motivated individuals are inducted into the administrative system through aggressive recruitment, but providing them requisite attractions and supports also retain them.

### **State-of-the-Art Technology**

While in most developing countries, because of scarce financial resources, it is not always feasible to introduce modern technology into administration of development programmes, the situation is different in developed nations where financial constraints rarely come in the way of promoting technology in the functioning of the governance system. It is well known that the revolution in information technology enveloped the administrative systems in most developed countries much earlier than was the case in developing nations. The level of computerisation in administrative management in the Russian Federation, the UK, the US, Germany and Japan has remained high over the past three decades and more. This has helped not only in the formulation of sound public policies, making rational decisions, monitoring development programmes, implementing projects and keeping a watch on the delivery system, but this high level of administrative technology has also developed in the clients and customers a greater respect for the governance system. As the “penetration capacity” of a polity increases, the level of trust of people in the government also goes up proportionately.

### **Effective Integration**

In most developed countries, there has been a discernible improvement in the coordinative mechanism in the field of development administration as well as regulatory management of public affairs. This movement has taken two shapes: First, the top-level hierarchy in the government has been able to centralise information and decision making through a series of institutions directly working under the chief executive. Second, specific integrative mechanisms at various levels, which bring about coordination among various government organisations working in areas requiring mutual collaboration and cooperation, have to be created. The strengthening of the Executive Office of the President of USA, the Cabinet Secretariat in the UK, and the President Secretariat in France and the Chancellor’s Secretariat in Germany are only a few examples of the first kind of initiatives. As for the second kind of instrumental innovations, there are scores of examples. Various corporations, advisory bodies, standing committees and policy councils have been able to continuously provide directions to development policy and administration in most developed nations.

### **Sound Regulatory Mechanisms**

An interesting aspect of administration of development programmes in developed nations relates to effective role of government in regulating the private sector that is mostly responsible for operating and managing economic units. For instance, in the United States of America, the nine independent regulatory commissions such as Inter-State Commerce Commission, Federal Reserve Board and other regulatory bodies in important commercial and financial areas have played a most effective role in not only curbing activities against people’s interest but also in giving them direction in their policies and programmes. In other developed countries also there are regulatory mechanisms that have helped a systematic conduct of development administration activities in various areas.

## **Public-Private Partnership**

For a long time in Britain, a number of nationalised industries functioned in the economic sector, but Margaret Thatcher brought about economic reforms not only through denationalisation of most industries and commercial operations but also by instituting the process of privatisation on a big scale. Thatcher's contemporary in the United States, President Ronald Reagan, was also a great votary of liberalisation and these two leaders collectively heralded a new era of economic reforms which provided the private sector a central place in the national economies of developed nations. No country has remained untouched by this movement. The role of bureaucracy became that of a "facilitator" rather than "regulator" in these countries and the impact of this new spirit of bureaucracy was also felt on the not so developed emergent economies such as those of South Korea and other Asian Tigers. This example only underlines that there is a demonstration affect on developing countries, which imbibe the philosophy and practices of developed nations in promoting their process of growth. Today, the public-private partnership has become a key feature of most instrumentalities of development administration, whether in the developed countries or in developing world.

## **Participatory Governance**

Development administration in most advanced countries of the West is the primary responsibility of local government institutions in the urban as well as the rural levels. In developing countries like India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka, the shadow of their colonial heritage still looms large. Even decades of independence have failed to throw up truly autonomous structure of governance that enjoys genuine power over programme-formulation and implementation. Afflicted with the scarcity of resources, the local self-governing institutions have failed to dominate the development process in most developing countries. Conversely, the developed countries have accorded respectful status to their decentralised governance bodies and have vested them with adequate resources and powers to enable them to initiate, guide and regulate the process of socio-economic development in their respective institutions.

Local government institutions in Great Britain, particularly counties, have been able to transform the urban as well as the rural jurisdictions. Regional Economic Councils and Prefects have enjoyed enormous powers in France. Russia was known for its strong local government bodies, while the American regional and local organisations enjoy massive authority in most segments of development, and more particularly education.

There is a truly participatory democracy in most Western nations. This is the upshot of long healthy traditions of grass-roots democracy. It has made development administration in these nations people-centred and responsive.

## **Indicative Planning**

Starting with France which adopted the system of indicative planning in 1946 in a structured manner, most other developed countries have, at one time or the other, created institutions of planning for giving direction to their socio-economic development. Unlike the practice in developing countries, these developed nations have not adopted "detailed" or intensive planning. Their planning has been an instrument of indicating the direction of growth and of providing guidelines to the private sector. The objective of the exercise is to integrate the efforts of the government and the private sector in the areas of socio-economic change.

Sometimes, planning is confined to a few industries, as has happened in Great Britain in the pre-Thatcher period. Moreover, planning can also be a part of the established processes of economic policy making as is the case in the US where the President's Economic Report, presented to the Congress every year by the President, provides direction of economic growth in the coming year. Even the budgetary system in most developed countries carries certain features of annual plans. The word 'planning', however, is not used frequently in the western nations since it has been mainly associated with the totalitarian polities. Yet, the acceptability of the process of planning seems to be gaining ground in a subtle manner in most advanced countries.

### **Higher Level of Integrity**

In the surveys conducted by the Transparency International, most western developed nations figure high on the integrity score. These scores are based on the opinions of businessmen who interact with the governance systems functioning in various nations. Although this may not be the most authentic and reliable indicator for measuring the level of integrity at the cross-national level, yet its significance cannot be under-estimated, particularly in the absence of any competing criteria in this respect.

Since development administration in the western nations involves the management of a number of government-run programmes like education, health and anti-poverty, there is a direct contact between the government functionaries and the beneficiaries. It is commendable that one hears very few complaints of irregularities and corruption in the management of government funds at the lower level in developed countries. Over the years, the democratic process and the attendant control system, including those of the free press, have curbed petty corruption. Even though there are occasional scams unearthed in the government system in these nations, yet they do not generally touch the common man.

The vigilance machinery functioning in the western countries has, over the years, evolved strength and effectiveness and this has been a deterrent to corrupt practices indulged in by government functionaries. The general level of ethics in public has been relatively high in the Western nations and as a result, hardly any corrupt practices are highlighted in the press or otherwise remain unpunished. The high and the mighty have been brought to the book in the US, Japan, Italy and other developed nations. One factor that helps the process of punishing the culprits is the relatively fast pace of justice as compared to the dilatory judicial process in most developing nations, particularly those that have been ruled by the British. The criminal justice administration in these countries is cumbersome and slow, though the British system of today cannot be accused of tardy justice.

A positive result of relative low level of corruption in development administration in developed nations is that people's faith in the legitimacy of the government systems remains high and their cooperation and participation in development administration becomes voluntary.

### **Responsiveness**

Most developed countries are democratic systems. And in democracies, responding positively to people's needs and aspirations is imperative. The New Public Administration movement in the United States, for instance, places great emphasis on strengthening the attribute of responsiveness of the administrative system. It may be interesting to mention that the New Public Administration shares with development administration many other features and little wonder, both emerged on the scene during the 1960s.

Of late, Great Britain is passing through a massive movement of Citizens' Charters. Most public organisations, including local authorities, have promulgated Citizens' Charters, which are instruments of assuring to the beneficiaries of public system best attention, services, security and privileges. These charters are in the form of commitment of institutions like banks, the police and development agencies to care for the interest and happiness of the citizen who is now seen as a "customer". It is appreciable that most British organisations, take their charters seriously and therefore, these have improved the level of services to the common man.

Even if we leave the subject of Citizens' Charters aside, it must be accepted that in most public systems in developed nations, there is a visible concern for the citizen or the client. Harassment, delays and ambiguity in processes are conspicuous by their infrequency.

There has been a great respect for the traditions of transparency and right to information in most developed nations. These trends have been further strengthened in the last few years. In fact, they have been incorporated in declarations like Citizens' Charters, wherever they exist. All this has made the administrative system, including its developmental component, more effective in its manifestations as well as impact.

### **The Innovative Spirit**

One reason why there has been an increasing structural differentiation in the governance systems of developed countries is their penchant for imbibing an innovative culture. These nations have never desisted from experimentations and have therefore, attempted to keep their administrative systems in a creative mould. In the United States of America, administrative reforms in the structural sphere are difficult to come by in view of the legislative powers to approve or veto any major governmental reorganisation, yet the history of the past thirty years goes to prove that the US organs of state have taken initiative in introducing significant transformation in the administrative system. A yearning for greater effectiveness is visible in the efforts made in the realm of administrative reforms in recent years. The spirit of the Brownlow Committee (1938) and the Hoover Commissions (1949 and 1955) lives on in the form of continual reforms in the administrative system.

In Britain, by virtue of a parliamentary and cabinet government, administrative reforms have been the privilege of the political executive. Notably, every Prime Minister in recent memory has tried to initiate reforms in the administrative system and has succeeded in sustaining these. Whether reforms in local government, functional ombudsmen, Citizens' Charters or privatisation – there has been a continuous flow of reforms in the governance system.

Countries like France, Germany, Sweden, Finland, New Zealand and Canada, to name a few, have been part of the New Public Management enterprise that has stressed upon downsizing of government, debureaucratisation, liberalisation, privatisation, decentralization, responsiveness and performance-orientation (Gupta and Tiwari, 1998).

### **Balanced Polity**

Most developed western nations have enjoyed political stability. No doubt there have been exceptions such as France and Germany, but recent years have witnessed political stability even there. France, since 1958, has had a stable

regime under the Fifth Republic while Germany, even after unification, has not encountered any political traumas.

A positive outcome of political stability can be seen in the equilibrium existing between the political system (or the 'constitutive system, in Riggsian terminology) and its administrative subsystem. There has been almost a balance of power between these two significant components of government. The respective roles of the two are clear: The constitutive system is performing, *inter alia*, the critical role of law-making and policy formulation, while the bureaucratic system has been primarily engaged in the process of rule-implementation and providing crucial assistance to the constitutive system in the performance of its functions. Consequently, there is a mutual respect for each other's roles and the cases of boundary-violation or role-conflict are a few and far-between. This has led to a healthy environment in the governance system. It is opined by most Western scholars that development administration is facilitated in a balanced polity.

Above, then, are a few shared characteristics of development administration in the more developed nations. Let us now consider the most noticeable features of development administration in developing countries.

---

### **4.3 THE DEVELOPING NATIONS**

---

A critical difficulty in discussing the status of development administration in developing countries is the phenomenal heterogeneity in the environmental context, structures, behavioural patterns and outputs of the administrative system of these countries. There are prominent variations in the levels of political, economic, social, cultural and technological development in the so-called "developing nations" that cover geographically, a major part of the globe. Most nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America will fall in this category. Exceptions are, however, too obvious to be ignored. While Japan has joined the big league of developed nations, South Korea is not too behind. But most notably, the People's Republic of China is leaping towards the status of a Super-power and the Asian Tigers are not comfortable in the company of Nepal, Sri Lanka or Bangladesh. Thus, the variations in their level of socio-economic development create categories within the broader category of developing nations. And then there are countries such as North Korea, Cuba and Vietnam, which still value certain attributes of Communism, while there are nations like India and Philippines that have honoured the tenets of parliamentary democracy.

#### **Diversity in Political Regimes**

Assuming that regimes sharing common structural and behavioural characteristics are likely to approach the task of nation-building and socio-economic transformation in similar ways, Milton Esman had designated, more than three decades ago, five political regimes in developing nations (1) conservative oligarchies, (2) authoritarian military reformers, (3) competitive interest-oriented party system, (4) dominant pass party systems, and (5) communist totalitarian states (Esman, 1966). Merle Fainsod, basing his typology on the criterion of "the relationship of bureaucracies to the flow of political authority," distinguished five different political systems in the developing world: (1) ruler-dominated bureaucracies, (2) military-dominated bureaucracies, (3) ruling bureaucracies, (4) representative bureaucracies, and (5) party state bureaucracies (Heady, *op. cit.*). Ferrel Heady further explored the nuances of the above categories and came up with a six-fold classification: (1) traditional autocratic systems, (2) bureaucratic

elite systems-civil and military, (3) polyarchal competitive systems, (4) dominant-party semi-competitive system, (5) dominant party mobilisation system, and (6) communist totalitarian system (Ibid). Heady maintains that despite the recent shift in the political arrangements in a few developing nations, his classification would hold true even today. There does not seem to be any dispute about any specific classification of developing countries for they mostly deal with the nature of power and its distribution among the various organs of the political systems and more eminently, its bureaucratic system. The consensus remains that the nature of a political system influences the character and efficacy of development administration functioning in a country.

### **Bureaucratic Polity**

Most western scholars seem to believe that in the developing world, even the political regimes dominated by one party, one ruler or by a multi-party system, bureaucracy controls the crucial levers of power. Bureaucracy, by virtue of its educational background, competence, experience and expertise, has an edge over other subsystems for it enjoys power that is far in excess of what it should deserve in a legal-rational authority system. When major policies and decisions relating to a regulatory or development administration bear the stamp of bureaucratic expertise or discretion, it would be a trait of what Riggs calls a “bureaucratic polity”.

Riggs maintains that in a large majority of developing countries, one notices the working of a bureaucratic polity as against a “party-run polity.” Issue of ideology apart, a bureaucratic polity is likely to use the power of governance to its own advantage, leading to the dysfunctionalities of self-centeredness and personal aggrandisement. These negative attitudes, in turn, would prove inimical to the process of development.

As a corollary to this assumption regarding the relationship between bureaucratic power and socio-economic development, Riggs and other ideology-oriented scholars seemed to suggest that hastening of the development process in developing countries should be preceded by creating ‘balance’ in the polity and thus reducing the powers of bureaucracy. This approach is a direct legacy of the western concepts of “checks and balances” and “balance of power” and exhibits distrust in bureaucracy. Only a few scholars such as Ralph Braibanti question that wisdom of this approach and suggest that sometimes bureaucracy alone becomes the prime mover of the development process and a preconceived notion about its attitude towards power and development should not be adopted. There is need to take a broader ecological approach and judge the role and effectiveness of bureaucracy in a most rational and objective manner.

### **Varying Levels of Economic Development**

Heterogeneity is the key characteristic of the level of economic development in developing countries. The World Bank reports point out massive variation in the levels of national income, per capita income, industrial development, agricultural growth, etc., in these nations. To a great extent, the level of an economic development and the level of equity in the distribution of economic resources influence the nature of development administration in developing countries.

Nations which decided to move with the times in matters of globalisation and liberalisation of their economies, with the help of foreign assistance and investment, moved a lot faster on the road to economic development than did the others, which took initiative in this regard belatedly and haltingly.

## Differing Levels of Human Development

As the recent Human Development Report released by the United Nations Development Programme on 24 July 2002 shows there is a striking dissimilarity among developing nations in matter of human development. While India, Pakistan and Bangladesh are low in Human Development Index (HDI), there are many other nations of the Third World that enjoy a higher place in this realm, for example, Sri Lanka.

A lower index rate in Human Development is the cause as well consequence of an unsatisfactory development administration. Not that administrative or managerial factors are the sole causative factors for low HDI, yet the fact remains that the efficacy, or its lack, of a governance system cannot be considered as a peripheral factor in inducing or impeding Human Development.

---

## 4.4 COMMON PATTERNS IN DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

---

The developing world, characterised by a conspicuous heterogeneity in its political, economic, social and cultural systems, also finds itself in the company of variegated administrative systems. Wherever there is common colonial heritage as in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka, certain commonalities do prevail in the administrative systems such as the secretariat administration, district system and the revenue administration, yet all nations have also evolved their indigenous patterns that distinguish them from the rest of the developing world. In spite of the marked variations in the structure and behavioural patterns in the bureaucratic systems, there do remain perceptible common patterns of administrative systems devoted to development administration. It should nevertheless be accepted that the dichotomy between development and non-development administration does not exist in a discernible manner and therefore the administrative characteristics in developing countries would apply to developmental as well as non-developmental settings, though in varying proportions.

**Mixed Values:** Most developing nations exhibit values in development administration that are a blend of the legacy of the colonial past and the modernising values adopted after independence. As yet, bureaucrats show in the behaviour the traits of paternalism, elitism, aloofness and authoritarianism. A new pattern of values like empathy, sympathy and extension motivation are superimposed on the old value-set. Structurally, there are no development bureaucracies as such and in actual behaviour; generalist bureaucrats find themselves being shuffled between regulatory and development positions. Their attitude and orientation remain the same in both types of positions and the extra sensitivity or creativity that is expected in a development administrative system are found missing in bureaucrats. Little wonder, development administration is conducted on the lines of its hoarier companion, non-development administration.

Efforts need to be made and some have already been made to inculcate among administrators attributes that can make them more positive to the requirements of development. Training can help in this respect, but it is overburdened with the responsibilities for improving knowledge and skills, rather than changing attitudes.

**Significant Role in Developmental Policy Making:** Senior Administrators in developing countries have been involved in the formulation of crucial policies in the realms of education, health, agriculture, irrigation, industries, housing, women and child development and other associated developmental areas. They have not only performed advisory role in preparing progressive legislations and policies but have also come out with their own innovative ideas and initiatives in almost all areas of social concern

One major problem in this sphere has been a multiplicity of policies and a lack of synthesis among them. Every new political regime or chief executive generally rejects the policies of predecessors and frames new policies and programmes. And, administrators have only to follow the directions of their political masters. Even in the changed situations, their role and importance in policy making remain crucial to the success of development administration.

**Planning System:** All developing nations have adopted planning as the key instrument of development administration. Distinct organisations for plan formulation and evaluation have been set up at the federal, state, district and local levels in India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and other developing nations. The approach to socio-economic development is enshrined in plan-documents and the whole state machinery is expected to cooperate with the national planning body to implement faithfully the national plans.

Only recently, with the advent of liberalisation and privatisation, the role of government seems to have been redefined. There is stress on downsizing of the government and the transfer of development functions to the private sector. This has reduced the scope for detailed planning, and instead one notices a co-existence of the traditional government planning and the emergent “indicative” planning. For example, even the Planning Commission reports of the Government of India in the early nineties referred to the utility of indicative planning. For the foreseeable future, the co-existence of detailed sectoral and indicative planning is most likely to remain.

**Massive Public Sector and the Emerging De-emphasis on it:** Most developing nations have adopted a “mixed economy” model and have expanded the role of the state as an instrument of socio-economic development. The state entered the economic systems as entrepreneur, promoter, regulator and facilitator. Massive expansion of public sector helped in developing a strong infrastructure for development and in providing essential social services to the less-privileged sections of society. However, the bureaucratic styles of functioning made their progress slow and halting. Huge investments did not produce satisfactory results and with the blowing fresh winds of disinvestments and privatisation, their size is being reduced in most developing nations. A new era of public-private partnership has dawned and has come to stay.

**People-Centred Development:** In all developing nations, there has been a notable stress on promoting decentralised governance for development. At the district, city, town block and village levels, decentralised institutions of governance have been given the responsibility for managing development programmes. In the case of India, even the Constitution has been amended through the 73<sup>rd</sup> and 74<sup>th</sup> constitutional Amendment Acts. Functions and powers have been devolved to decentralised institutions in Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka as well. The objective is to make the development administrative system more responsive.

Moreover, cooperative organisations, non-government organisations and voluntary agencies are being promoted to take over functions aimed at the development of specific areas and groups. The notion of Administrative State is being modified.

**Weak Vigilance System:** Despite getting low ratings from the Transparency International in terms of public integrity, administrative system in developing countries continue to suffer from the malaise of corruption. The vigilance machinery in these countries needs to be strengthened. Moreover, the legal and the judicial systems need to be more effective in curbing bribery and unethical conduct in public life. Development administration can grow in an environment of probity and transparency. This would also require a change in the outlook of bureaucrats. Fred Riggs finds in developing countries a “preference among bureaucrats for personal expediency as against public-principled interest”. This preference needs to be reversed through proper control mechanisms and training.

**Administrative Development:** In all developing nations, a movement of administrative development has gained momentum. There has been a great stress on transforming the structures, processes and behavioural patterns of the administrative system. This is what has been termed as “administrative development”, which focuses on enhancing the capabilities of the administrative systems to facilitate the achievement of progressive political, economic and socio-cultural goals that it is expected and designed to achieve.

---

## **4.5 ACTIVITY**

---

1. Elaborate the major features of development administration in the developed nations. Mention some such characteristics of these countries, which are being imbibed by your country’s administration.
2. Suggest ways to bring improvements in developing countries’ administration.

---

## **4.6 CONCLUSION**

---

Developed nations are decades and, in a few cases, centuries ahead of developing nations. Yet both of them have to evolve goal-oriented administrative systems. Depending on the political stability and the level of socio-economic development of a particular category of nations, the progressiveness of these goals, will vary. And within the same category of nations, the goals to be achieved by their respective administrative systems will differ in nature and intensity. In all cases, the success of a society in achieving its goals of development will depend upon the competence, performance and attitude of its administrative system. All administrative systems need to be change-oriented, goal-oriented, progressive, efficient, decentralised, responsive and motivated. These features create a confluence between the development administrative systems of the rich and the poor nations.

---

## **4.7 REFERENCES AND FURTHER READINGS**

---

Heady, Ferrel, *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, Marcel Decker, New York, 1996.

Gupta, M.C. and R.K. Tiwari, eds., *Restructuring Government*, IIPA, New Delhi, 1998.

**Development Planning  
and Administration**

Heady, *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, op. cit

Esman, Milton, "The Politics of Development Administration" in John Montgomery and William Siffin, eds., *Approaches to Development: Politics, Administration and Change*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1966.