Abstract

This paper seeks to assess the history of comparative public administration and considers some of the main explanations for the importance of comparison in public administration and the development of comparative studies after World War II. It also explains the characteristics, decline, future expectations, and options that highlight the development of comparative politics and public administration. The study revisited the historical development of comparative public administration in many ways in academic literature, including scientific and modern eras, and analyzed previous research and theories. After examining various dimensions, the study argues that there is a dearth of data regarding the history of comparative public administration in less developed countries, but that the majority of these nations are eager and persistent to apply the existing administration systems developed by western countries. The study revealed that Britain, India, and France have significant bureaucrats who have stronger authority than elected officials in terms of administrative and policy decisions.
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1. Introduction

The historical development of comparative public administration as a field of study is a more contemporary endeavor with primordial roots. Even though comparative studies can be traced back to ancient Greece, as a systematic work, Comparative Public Administration’s starting point was Wilson’s essay in 1887 (Heady, 1996). Wilson’s perspectives on public administration studies had a great impact on the rest of the world. As the first comparative, Wilson compared the American government system with the United Kingdom Cabinet System to demonstrate the administrative deficiencies of the U.S. (Rathod, 2007). At first, small-scale comparative studies began with various reform movements in the U.S., such as
the Municipal Reform Movement and Civil Service Reforms, and these comparative studies primarily aimed to increase the efficiency of public administration (Rathod, 2007). But the problematic part of Wilson’s approach was his famous dichotomy, in which he suggests that the field of public administration is a field of business and comparative public administration studies are non-political. The American political scientist Marshall Dimock criticizes Wilson for being unrealistic (Rathod, 2007).

Despite the early developments, perpetual attempts and studies for comparative analysis of public administration have taken place for last five decades (Farazmand, 2001). At the second half of 1940’s comparative administration, movements gained pace and continued to the present largely growing number universities. Academies and colleges opened courses and some of them made this field as a specialized area for graduate studies. During the first two decades after WWII, two important associations draw attention on public administration; first the appointment of a committee by American Political Science Association (APSA) in 1953, and secondly the establishment of Comparative Administration Group (CAG), by American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) in 1960 (Heady, 1996).

The CAG was the center of the comparative public administration movement. Development of Comparative Public Administration Weidner observed that political aspects can be an obstacle in administration in minimum in two things;

- Political evolution objectives can conflict with a broad numerous of administrative approaches and process.
- Political evolution objectives can escape conflicting to notion of public (civil servant) expertise or common perceptions of an administrative levels. In the area of political fields things are changing routinely and unpredictable but administration offers balance for political behaviors and two of them commonly rely on.

Therefore, comparative public administrative studies should acknowledge those factors that developed from politics and with providing a useful description of the administrative experience (Rathod, 2007).

1.1 The importance of comparison in public administration

The comparative public administration is encouraged to investigate public institutions, systems, and ways of behaving in the organizational context at regional and national boundaries. Comparison identifies the fact of being similar and distinguished and underlines achievement operations. Therefore, there could be a possibility of developing new approaches for enhancing the administrative performance of public institutions. According to Heady, the concept of public administration as governmental activity has occurred if political systems have been functional and demanding to attain program objectives through the political decision-makers.

The significance of comparative studies can be observed in Prussian cameralists’ works during the eighteenth century and later in the work of French public administration experts. For instance, Wilson said that the liberal U.S. must learn from authoritarian Prussia and
revolutionary France. Wilson, the founding father of American public administration, emphasized that the real value of comparative methodology lies in the examination of continental Europe, not Africa or Asia (Güler, 2008). Usually, these studies focused on the continental administrative law system and its related issues, but the French case studies foresaw the many concepts that American public administration theorists had in mind (Martin, 1987).

There are two main benefits of comparative studies: first, it gives one the ability to know and identify one’s own system better, and second, it enhances the ability to solve problems by providing an expanded perspective (Güler, 2008). Along with the pioneers, it is a widely accepted fact that the systematic grounding of comparison in social sciences begins with John Stuart Mill in the nineteenth century, when he suggested five methods to explain the causative relations: (1) method of agreement, (2) method of difference, (3) a combined version of these first two, (4) method of concomitant variation, and (5) method of residues (Güler, 2008). By 1945, for comparative researchers in the U.S., all parameters had changed, and comparative studies began to focus on Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Public administration is a much more recent field of systematic study, as Woodrow Wilson (1887) observed correctly. He meant that "the study of administration" is generally considered the starting point. Since that time, public administration has become a well-recognized area of specialized interest, either as a subfield of political science or as an academic discipline in its own right. After several years of improvement, harmony about the opportunity of public administration is still missing, and the field has been designated as main featuring heterodoxy and slightly orthodoxy. Subsequently, the motivation of this investigation is to provide a basic explanation for the comparative scrutiny of public administration in the sovereign states of today. This was not uncovered recently, as a matter of course. The Western academics had already made a comparative study before two centuries. Nevertheless, these scholarships are interested in highlighting discussions connected to various continental (structure) systems in administrative law; however, the French studies especially predicted a multitude of abstract ideas handled with success by the American public administration systems. Obviously, in the comparative method, as a famous political scientist, James Coleman, said, "You cannot be scientific if you are not comparing." The administrative structure of states is not special in comparison to other countries (P.B. Rathods, 2007).

Moreover, there have been many interesting examples of American politicians and academic scholars’ inexperience in other places. Between the creators of the United States constitutional system and political leaders for the period of the first century, it was mostly for the determination of embracing external advisors or experience to American demands. Though there are many inventors in the scholarship of public administration, such as W. Wilson, F. Goodnow, and Ernst Freund, who described European expertise in their efforts to understand and improve American administration, most succeeding authors are rigorous on the local scene, with only accompanying references to other schemes of administration. Another contemplative assessment and historical outlooks were certainly not the main inventiveness in most of the public administration literature when it was established in the United States during the 1940s: "Comparison is so central to good analysis that the scientific
method is inevitable comparative.” (Collier et al. 1991) Similarly, as argued by Wilson W., eds., J.M. Sharfritz A.C., and Heady (1997, 4th ed., 1887), comparative public administration looks for the shapes and regularities of administrative action and behavior to produce new knowledge and perceptions and to assert and improve existing information. Moreover, public administration has an important formal and informal impact on its surroundings.

Heady emphasized that several administrative policies settled overseas could possibly demonstrate the value of reflection for adoption or adaptation at home. The impact of Western patterns of administration in the newly liberated states is famous and simply comprehensible. Less clear is the developing interest in superior countries regarding administrative technology that originated in smaller countries. It is stimulating to discover in comparative scrutiny what vital influences support the rise of administrative efficiency. It could also develop an understanding of the administrative functions and other states and accept these as appropriate to their respective nations and their structures. In many cases, there are little problems and risks associated with such a narrow range of interest, which has recently been acknowledged and eventually started a new period in administrative studies that emphasizes analyzing comparative public administration. In convincing terms, the justifications lie behind this restructuring. Those trying to create a science of administration have identified that this relies, among other things, on accomplishment in constructing theories regarding administrative behavior that go beyond national boundaries. Apart from, the needs of scientific (methodological) questions, there should be other benefits to be attained from a great understanding of public administration that transcend national boundaries. Obviously, the growing reliance of countries, regions, and the global community makes the conception of the performance of administration much more vital than in the past (Heady, 1996).

This demands, as Professor Robert Dahl noted in his influential 1947 paper, that comparative features of public administration have been mostly disregarded, and during the study of public administration, a comparison, assertion, or science of public administration was slightly honored. It is understandable that there could be a science of British public administration, French public administration, and American public administration; however, there could be a science of public administration in the perception of a figure that was more widespread and unrestricted by their specific national situation (Dahli, 1947).

Significantly, establishing most concepts concerning public administration in the UK, USA, and France could be hard enough, but this would be quite insufficient in a world with the considerable numbers and variety of national administrative systems that should now be incorporated in the common interest area. At the same time, public administration in a moment and earlier Communist states and in situations where numerous independent nations were dispersed around the world must have also been taken into account.
1.2 Literature Review of Comparative Administration

Though the analytical investigation is crucial for improvement, it also interests professionals through their perspectives on alternatives and their ability to discover, study, and enhance achievement. Of course, the professionals advance broad consideration of the system, and more political development has a particular impact on them in matching practice or observations athwart borders and athwart organizations or institutions. Public administration, as a component of governmental activity, primarily focuses on the accomplishment of program goals established by policy or political decision-makers. Even though its systematic grounding is generally accepted as a field of study, it began with the publication of Woodrow Wilson’s article The Study of Administration (1887). Traces of public administration could be tracked back to Machiavelli’s The Prince and ancient sources such as Aristotle’s Politic, but only in the eighteenth century did this systematic management of governmental affairs become a domain for German scholars (Heady, 1996).

In the modern sense, public administration is the term that refers to the central and local management aspects of the state that have been centralized and institutionalized by capitalism. Focusing on the studies of Marx, Weber, and Güler suggests that comparative public administration examines the administration of public affairs in capitalist societies (Güler, 2008). As a common methodology, according to Comte and Durkheim, the comparison in the social sciences is equivalent to experiments in the natural sciences. In other words, a public administration discipline that must examine the phenomenon of public administration in general, not the administration systems of each different country, could exist only by using comparative methodology (Güler, 2008).

1.3 The Heayday of the Comparative Administration Development

The above discussion illustrated a multitude of important comparisons in comparative public administration. This section outlines the main part of Comparative Administration as developed by Heady. The author mainly elaborated on the establishing of Comparative Administrative Group (CAG), which was his greatest strive and strength, effect, etc. is the reference meaning of Professor Heyday, defining correctly the comparative administration development throughout the time almost a decade starting in 1962, the year in which the Comparative Administration Group received its first sponsoring from the Ford Foundation into an agreement to give to the American Society for Public Administration, CAG’s parent organization. More importantly, during these periods, scholars of comparative public administration revealed an astonishing productivity, and their interest areas have grown swiftly in attractiveness and good image (Heady, 1996).

Instead of the United States, which had close to 500 representatives in 1968, the comparative administration group’s main activities included many practitioners and academics from various nations. The conceptual source of finding support was the Ford Foundation, which made grants to the Comparative Administration Group of about 0.5 million dollars in all, starting in 1962 with almost 3 years of grants that were added for a year and then resumed in 1966 for another five years. In 1971, this sponsorship was not renewed, and then comparative administration group funds were decreased with a matching reduction of
programs. On the contrary, in conjunction with these two groups, the key interest of the Ford Foundation was to focus on the administrative challenges among developing countries, and the Cooperative Administration Group was anticipated to secure these issues in the context of societal environmental factors initiated in these states.

During this period, the Comparative Administration Group had a strong administrative direction and was interested in spotting the transfer of knowledge and skills from CAG programs to actual operations through technical or professional project supports and local developmental approaches within the specific countries. The CAG has organized several summarizing seminars at different times and universities. During those capacity-building seminars, senior scholars prepared a variety of programs for graduate assistants and experts. Similarly, separate conferences and workshops were scheduled on numerous occasions in the United States and other specific foreign countries.

Moreover, some small funds were allocated to new educational teaching programs, and there are so many interesting surveys in the field of comparative public administration conducted by CAG that this was reflected in the syllabus and other publications intended for institutes and universities of public administration dispersed globally, generally as technical assistance projects, without considering the quality and quantity of these efforts.

The structural view of the comparative administration committee was to identify various geographical positions relating to the EU, Asia, Africa, and Latin America, and others were also focused on urban studies, including national development planning, comparative educational administration, organization theory, legislative studies, global administration, and structure theory. These groups were not as active and fruitful (Heady, 1996).

1.3.1 General Characteristics

The primary purpose of the Comparative Administration Group was to formulate a universal comparative theory of public administration. And after receiving early and generous funding from the Ford Foundation, which was about half a million dollars, F.W. Riggs led many fieldwork projects, research programs, seminars, and experimental research projects (Rathod, 2007). The initial focus of the Ford Foundation was on administrative problems in developing countries, and they expected CAG to analyze these problems in socio-environmental conditions within targeted countries.

In a five-year term, more than 100 papers were published, and between 1969 and 1974, Sage Publications issued the Journal of Comparative Administration once every quarter of the year in cooperation with the Comparative Administration Group. One clear sustainable effect was technical assistance programs that can be traced back to post-war efforts to export administration know-how projects. The CAG has shared many attitudes and reputations with the technical assistance attempts of the 1950s. The widely exported attitudes and reputations were in the fields of financial administration, budgeting, personnel administration, tax and revenue administration, and administrative planning. (Heady, 1996).
1.3.2 Evaluation of Comparative Studies After World War II

After looking at different dimensions of the heady movement of comparative public administration, we also try to find out how comparative studies have evolved in the division of public administration. A constructed vibrant has been made in comparative obscurity in the field of public administration for the last five decades. The movement in the history of public administration reached a peak of intensity at the end of WWII, and it continues to this day. An Engaging, W. Wilson’s perspective of comparative study in public administration was intensively expressed in his earliest comparativist, which compared the United States government structure to the executive system in Britain to reveal that the USA’s absence merges authorization in numerous areas of administration.

Wilson’s critical comparative investigation was initially linked to the subject of the preservation of the democratic state (P. Rahod, 2007). His perception of the comparative model was summarized by the following characteristics:

- The administrative science in America should be emphasized according to democratic outlooks.
- Highly standard government activities with the applications of public administration
- Municipality administration was equally significant to those who conducted the everyday affairs of the government.
- Organizations could be evaluated at their best only by removing the political aspects of administration.

To illustrate this methodology, it reflects the government’s operations in different socio-economic and traditional situations. Considerably like public administration, comparative administration covers an extensive variety of events. Engaging academics in a comparative approach places emphasis on a variety of matters with public policy and execution in both advanced and emerging areas.

Nevertheless, comparative administration seeks to strengthen the understanding of the extent of administrative systems by insisting on expanding the practical operation of the field; In concerning the interest of administrative systems in all environmental and socio-economic settings, there is a further universal outlook in the superior field (Eric E. Otenyo and S. Lind, 2006). However, the influential validations for the comparative system are well recognized by Heady. In his position, formulating general principles of administration requires a larger pool of cases, hence the need to study diverse administrative institutions and processes. Apparently, continued strength to carry out comparative scrutiny in public administration has been engaged for the last five decades. Heady proposed a valuable pattern of classification that splits the literature as follows: 1) modified traditional, 2) development-oriented, 3) general system model-building, and 4) middle-range theory formulation. He observed literature in this field in the four above-mentioned types. On the other hand, the modified traditional category showed the greatest continuity with more narrowly focused literature. Between the subtitles described were an administrative
organization, human resource management, financial administration, and program areas like agriculture, education, and health (Heady, 1996).

The second category, development-oriented features, comprises numerous investigations that were initially classified in institutional contrasts, particularly in west administration, accompanied by personnel systems and administrative organization. As Swerdlow observed, less developed countries have particular features that show a tendency to formulate a distinct character for the government system. These features were extended government positions, specifically the consequences of an economic expansion, which show up to prepare the functions of the public officials, which are significantly different (Swerdlow, 1963). In comparing the above first two features demonstrated here, I was embarrassed by the building of models for the comparative objective.

The third category, Common Structure of Model-Building," is one more famous inclusive reference to model-building and its outputs as a basis for security. As Waldo noted, the main problem of theory building in the investigation of comparative public administration is to choose a fashion model that is sufficient to hold the surrounding situations, which are lacking, through the advantage of its big elements and control over administration (Waldo, 1964). The fourth category, At the beginning of 1960, the famous and committing middle-range theory accessible for comparative investigation in administration was formed as the bureaucratic sole, as the foundation of the perfect-category model of a civil servant or public administration developed by Max Weber, however, with considerable following amendments, changes, and editions (Wabers, 1947).

In the same way, comparative systems that had been implemented through academics in public administration faced some criticism. The researchers found that most of the comparative performance in public administration was restricted. The investigation of comparative administration solely indicates the study of European administrative structures. in the late 1980s stressed that non-European administrative structures designated a site of delight in educating and investigating comparative administration. The study of comparative administration was too developed to be recognized. Therefore, it requires remarking upon the system selected to uncover the spaces that are quite similar to those to be achieved in the area of comparative research (Rathod, 2007).

Professor Fred W. Riggs observed three dominant trends in the comparative study of public administration during the last three decades; all these trends are perceived in Riggs theory or model. The first is a movement from normative studies, which deal with what has to be, to empirical approaches and studies, which deal with what is. It could be understood that the favorite group for administration topics usually had a passionate point of view.

The second trend Riggs states comes from ideological approaches (one-state studies or original) and nomothetic studies (common studies). The nomothetic approach is basically differentiated among studies that focus on the specific case and those that look for common conceptions, laws, theories that assert consistency behavior; and the relationship between variables, while it is not unavoidably disturbed by any unbreakable forms.
The third trend is a shift from a non-ecological approach, which refers to administrative phenomena as separate entities existing apart from their cultural settings (or isolated ones), while ecological studies are concerned with their external environment. As stated by Riggs, non-administrative issues are essential to being connected to the administrative, and in his notions, the single scholarships that are truly comparative are those that are empirical, nomothetic, and ecological. Keith Henderson acknowledges that Riggs viewpoints are at the forefront of the comparative public administration effort. Rig's mechanisms are entirely ecologically oriented, and his theory structure is typically limited to ecological perception. Riggs’s Model or Theory of Comparative Public Administration is generally the "ecology of administration approach." Therefore, in comparative public administration, Riggs demonstrated the empirical, which is accurate and scientific, and the nomothetic, which is inattentive and universal. Ecological: This is logical and non-parochial or limited (Riggs, 1962).

Through research and development in comparative analysis, new organizations interested in the improved global economic situation will be allowed. Additionality, economy, and effectiveness are the mottos for improving administration. The Buildings Basic Argument of Comparative Public Administration Administrative Concepts, Organization, Techniques of Training Systems, Guidelines, Rules, and Procedures are to some degree much needed to operate inside the setting of Global Economic Direction (P.B. Rathod, 2007). Nonetheless, the performing bureaucrats, as well as academic experts in public administration, have realized that comparative study is of key significance to their fieldwork.

It’s indispensable to connect the comparative study of the public administration itself with the other types of social sciences, whereby orthodox logical comparisons could be made. More importantly, the conventional comprises political science, economics, psychology, and sociology. Fascinatingly, it is because of the comparative approach of public administration that the United States is concerned with the learning of the discipline.

Definitely, no public administration theories or models will remain based on the extraordinary experience of the United States. In the beginning, the Comparative Administrative Group (CAG) concentrated on this improvement of administration by way of the Third World problem. Nonetheless, in the present day, it similarly consists of an understanding of a nation’s public administration in its universal situation. On the other hand, in 1987, Professor Heady proved exactly how comparative study introduced external (foreign) models and performances that have backed the determining of the American political and administrative institutions.

2. Methods and materials used

The study evaluates several academic scholars and practitioners who study in the fields of public administration and comparative public administration. In principle, comparative studies are enlarged knowledge circumstances useful for powerful or poor administrative functions by concentrating on administrative performances and features of the structures performing them. To study the ultimate functions is to support the identification and application of the most applicable organizational systems and procedures.
3. Methods and Materials

This study revisited the history of comparative public administration in many kinds of literature, both scientific and modern. However, the approach to public administration and public policy is vigorous and has formed numerous new models in the field. Despite encouragement from academics, practitioners of public administration were not uniquely and broadly engaged in investigating several administrative structures.

4. Discussions on Decline, Re-examination, and Suggestions

The time interval between 1970 and 1980 was a period of less support for the public administration. The technical assistance-dominated field has now turned into an area of introspection.

The CAG and affiliated programs stayed at the center of public administration and technical assistance efforts during the 1960s. However, by the beginning of 1967, it had declined at a rapid pace and lost favor. The cuts in annual support from the United States for public administration aid decreased by a considerable amount, less than half what it had been between 1955 and 1965. In addition, in 1971, support from the Ford Foundation was not renewed. And the POSDCORB types of 1950s public administration technicians were eliminated by new development economists. The Journal of Comparative Administration, as mentioned above, stopped its publications in 1974, while the Duke University Press continued its publications through 1973 by using the previous years' studies. But the most significant indicator of decline was the disappearance of the Comparative Administration Group itself in 1973, but it kept going under a new form of organization: the Section on International and Comparative Administration (SICA).

The critiques of the comparative administration movement accompanied the decline process. And the content of the appraisals mostly expresses negative judgments. Quote from Peter Savage, "Heady uses the honeypot syndrome to define the beginning of orthodoxy, with money and professional rewards. Another common complaint about comparative public administration was its inability to build and establish itself as a field of study with a cross-national theory of public administration. In 1969, Keith Henderson asked the question, "What was not included to identify the crisis in the field?" And the comparative public administration was a depth in the struggle at that time when other social scientists finally recognized the central role of bureaucrats and bureaucracy in the political process.

5. Suggestions

The most common complaint had been that comparative public administration never able to establish its paradigmatic consensus. And many times, it was stated out; the most common recommendation was that these deficiencies must be remedied to proceed as a standing intellectual field and academic maturity. Another issue that addressed was the problem of data for research. The data from several sources guaranteed the availability, however, its reliability stayed as an important question. The mutual progress of globalism and localization opens a new field for comparatives. The public administration researchers based
on a comparison of different countries’ administration systems will be replaced by comparative studies of sub-national administration levels (Heady, 1996).

6. Future Expectations and Options

By the beginning of 1980, future expectations for comparative public administration were not as hopeful as they had once been. The CAG lost its unique identity, and enormous technical assistance in public administration was over. Additionally, positive expectations about conducting changes and finding solutions for problems in developing societies started to be questioned as many nations were suffering from an increasing rate of problematic issues in political stability and economic growth matters. During the two decades between 1980 and 1990, we observed a reassurance of activities in comparative public administration (Heady, 1996). In contrast to the fact that in many cases there is an increasing functional principle, for the last few decades, a new term of management has appeared in the field of public administration. This term was compatible with administration, from the traditional model of administration to the new management. This new advance was much more efficient than administration.

In countries, for example, where the achievement of public policy goals requires a high rate of change in social, economic, and social directions, the term development administration, in its broadest sense, refers to the variety of perspectives and approaches used to address the studies of public administration in developing countries (Rodman, 1968). Development administration is a process rather than a fixed purpose. Dwight Waldo emphasized the significance of the concentration of the themes on development, which would help us clarify some methodological problems that had emerged before in this field (Waldo, 1968).

Development administration has been a long-debated issue since the first days of the comparative administration movement, and as a phenomenon, it appears to be particular to certain countries under certain circumstances; in some nation-states, it may exist but not in others. In order to achieve the goals and objectives—actually, this is a characteristic of all public administration systems—development administration appeared to be the most appropriate tool to achieve the determined purposes.

Heady refers to Nazi Germany as a consideration for such an example of development administration to virtualize the need for clarification of terms such as public policy goals and development (Heady, 1996). With twenty-five years of preparation and thinking, George Gant published his 1979 book, Development Administration: Concepts, Goals, and Methods, in which he generally credited the term development administration in the mid-1950s. (Gant, 1979).

Originally, development administration refers to the concentration of administration on the support and management of development as a separate field from administration. And it is important to notice that in this case, development administration does not refer to the small things as public administration or comparative public administration. Gant explained it as distinct from other aspects and concerns of public administration. In simplest terms, Heady refers to two contributors to Gant, Nasir Islam and M. Henault, and their labeled models:
Model I and Model II. The first model is associated with the technical assistance programs of the mid-1960s. And the second model is defined as restructuring the aid-giving projects of the World Bank and other development agencies, along with the U.S. Agency for International Development (Heady, 1996).

Comparative public policy is the cross-national study of how, why, and to what effect government policies are developed, which include environmental policy, education policy, economic policy, social policy, and an examination of the state’s strategy, methodology, and applications. Comparative public policy carries great importance for several reasons. First, the success of comparative public policy in comparison with other comparative studies shows that in the United States, the major reorientation was applied on a comparative basis. Second, comparative public policy basically deals with cross-cultural factors. Third, researchers are blamed for making studies that are overly theoretical and speculative and have less relevance for policymakers. And lastly, there is the ambiguity of whether comparative public policy refers to comparisons among nation-states or is just the use of a comparative methodology in public policy analysis (Heady, 1996).

7. Conclusion

In developing countries, there is a growing body of knowledge about public policy that the public and administration scrutinize. This study discussed the history of comparative public administration in many kinds of literature, scientific, modern. However, the approach to public administration and public policy is vigorous and has formed numerous new models in the field. Despite encouragement from academics, practitioners of public administration were not uniquely and broadly engaged in investigating several administrative structures.

Relevance: many remarks have been made about the development of history and comparative public administration, but many scholars have shared similar or dissimilar thoughts. Comparative public administration looks for the model and consistency of administrative measures and functioning to provide new knowledge and perceptions and to assert and clarify lasting information. The comparative public administration yields confirmed and functional expertise of the real work on the field. After looking at different dimensions, it has been noted that there is a lack of data about the history of comparative public administration in less developed countries, but most of them have the eagerness and persistence to apply the existing administration systems developed by western countries.

The study noted that in Britain, for instance, and in India and France, often the practicing administrators have more power than the elected people in terms of expectations in the bureaucracy or decisions about policy. General motivations and movements in the various research projects or courses develop the theoretical framework in the two subjects of public administration and political science.
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