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This study examined decentralization of authority for national development in developing nation states. The objective of the study was to analyze the association between decentralization of authority and societal, economic, and physical development. Twelve countries were used as units of analysis for this purpose: the Philippines, Morocco, Tanzania, Malaysia, Egypt, Kenya, Burma, Sudan, Nigeria, Indonesia, Brazil and India.

The analysis was based on the hypothesis that the degree of decentralization of authority is positively associated with development when the Gross National Product of countries is similar.

From the analysis of the association between decentralization of authority and development, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. The degree of decentralization, as measured by (1) the average size in square miles of the governing
areas, (2) the number of provincial government units per million population, and (3) the average population per province. Although additional and different measures can be used, because of limitations on available data, the three indicators were employed to assess the degree of decentralization of authority in the twelve sample countries.

2. There exists a positive association between decentralization of authority and development. More decentralized nation states overall have greater output of societal, economic and physical development than the less decentralized ones, regardless of GNP level.

Given the aggregate nature of the indicators used, firm conclusions await further research.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Research Problem

1.1.1. Description of the Research Problem

This research dealt with decentralization of authority for national development in emerging nations states. One of the problems that has faced many, if not all, newly independent and less developed nations is overconcentration of decision-making authority and responsibility in the central government. There is a need to investigate whether or not the overcentralization associates with underdevelopment characterized by continued persistence of a high rate of illiteracy, absolute poverty, widespread disease, massive unemployment, poor public health care, primitive and substandard housing facilities, and inadequate transportation and communication systems.

Behind the overcentralization of authority in such countries may be various factors, including scarce national resources—material and financial—as well as shortages of skilled and well educated manpower.
Because governments in most developing nations have limited capacity, it is natural for them to conclude that centralizing power is their only recourse. . . . Scarce resources and manpower create pressures to concentrate both at the center, where they presumably can be used most efficiently.¹

Another decisive cause of overcentralized authority might be the unavoidable political situations that disrupt the developing nation states during the first years of their decolonialization. Indonesia can serve as an example. For more than two decades after her de facto independence in 1945, Indonesia faced internal and external political instability and territorial insecurity; these factors forcefully pushed the new republic toward centralization of all decision-making power, authority, and control in Jakarta.

Hawkins described the internal turmoil within the government:

In Indonesia itself a battle raged in 1955--culminating in the overthrow of the Ali Cabinet--between those out of power who blamed the cabinet for inflation, insecurity and corruption, and those in power who tried to place the onus on previous cabinets, the Dutch, and remnants of colonialism.²

Externally, throughout the country, the new republic faced many left-wing political riots, most of which originated out of the country's ethnic diversity. These gave the central government another compelling
reason for retaining and expanding its power and control over all territorial government units and statutory bodies. As Hawkins described it,

Indonesia has had her share of insecurity ever since the Japanese arrived in 1942, and especially since her declaration of independence on August 17, 1945. It is not necessary to review all the fighting which took place between that date and the Round Table Agreement of December 27, 1949 [Indonesia's de jure independence date]. Since then, cases of violence have occurred almost continuously in some part of the islands— the "Turk" Westerling revolt in West Java, the Ambon affair and the Republic of the South Moluccas, the rebellion of South Sulawesi (Celebes), still unsettled in the summer of 1955, the PERMESTA [Overall Struggle] revolution of the North Sulawesi, the Atjeh revolt of 1953-1954 in Sumatra and the recurrent raids by the Darul Islam in Central and Western Java, which have gone on for years. 3

Internationally, the Republic had been shaken by two political confrontations, one with the Dutch Kingdom over the territory of Dutch New Guinea (now Irian Jaya) in 1961, and the other with the Kingdom of Malaysia in 1965. Internally, Indonesia was rocked by the 1965 coup d'etat that cost the lives of many leaders, military officers and citizens.

As a result of this political instability and territorial insecurity, the central government tried to administer all governmental functions from Jakarta. Provincial governors are appointed from Jakarta and are responsible to the central government. Each ministry of
the nation has branch offices and officials at the provincial and regional (regency) levels, but decision-making authority rests in Jakarta. Many well educated public officials working in the central government, however, have realized that Jakarta could not possibly control the affairs of the entire country. The government could not make all decisions and disseminate them down the territorial hierarchy. Problems of dissemination have been further compounded by the inadequate transportation and communication systems.

At the initiative of the Minister of Home Affairs, governors' conferences were called from time to time to discuss common territorial issues, and top central public officials toured the various underdeveloped regions to listen to complaints either from the lower ranked public employees or from community leaders. As a result, in the spring of 1955 the first All-Indonesian Conference on Regional Autonomy was held in Bandung. Participants in the conference realized that greater transfer of authority to the provincial, regional, local and rural levels was necessary. The assumption was that allowing these regions to manage activities which are purely local in nature would bring about greater productivity, raise the standard of living of the mass
population, and promote the general welfare of the
nation. In the words of Paauw, "greater authority at the
local level, coupled with the right of local authorities
to levy, collect, and utilize locally certain taxes might
result in considerable important economic development."  

The objective of placing greater authority at the
provincial, regional, local and rural levels is to
change the underdeveloped conditions at these levels as
well as to involve the mass population in governmental
decision-making and the national development process. To
enable greater authority at the territorial level, scien-
tific methods and thinking must be employed. In the
language of the United Nations Division for Public Ad-
ministration (UNDPA), "special measures are needed in
these circumstances to introduce new ideas and practices
and to gain active participation by all elements of the
population in the development programs."  

One of the means that can be employed to enhance
authority at the territorial level, and enable wider mass
participation in the decision-making process is the de-
centralization of authority—that is, the transfer of
authority to territorial governmental units for managing,
making decisions, and executing public affairs which are
local in nature.
Decentralization is one of the terminologies in the field of social science in general and Public Administration, or administrative science, in particular that has received the attention of many scholars and practitioners; but there is diversity in their definitions of the term. Decentralization of authority has been widely discussed in many governments, democratic and socialist, throughout the world, and usually centers around the critical question of what Riggs labels an optimal balance between centralized decision-making according to norms which assure impartiality and prevent the arbitrary abuse of power, and decentralized or dispersed decision making by other autonomous centers of action.\(^8\)

Decentralization has been a frequent subject of research, viewed and defined by its proponents in many ways and used in a number of significantly different contexts.\(^9\) This study has used the definitions provided by Maddick and the United Nations Division for Public Administration:

Decentralization embraces both processes of deconcentration, i.e., the delegation of authority adequate for the discharge of specified functions to staff of a central department who are situated outside the headquarters (hierarchical), and devolution, i.e., the legal conferring of powers to discharge specified or residual functions upon formally constituted local authorities (non-hierarchical).\(^10\)

In the United Nations Division for Public Administration
the term is defined as follows:

The term decentralization refers to the transfer of authority on a geographic basis, whether by deconcentration (i.e., delegation) of authority to field units of the same department or level of government, or by devolution of authority to local government units or special statutory bodies.11

Also used in this study is the definition of authority offered by Dessler:

Authority is the right each position holder has to influence or command thought, opinion, or behavior. It gives managers the right to carry out their tasks by giving orders to their subordinates, and it gives them the right to expect compliance.12

The term development, like decentralization and authority, has been defined in many different ways by its proponents. This study has drawn on a number of researchers for a definition of development. Todaro, quoted by Bryant and White, saw the term as implying general qualities defining social change; he concluded that

it [development] is a multidimensional process involving major changes in social structure, popular attitudes and national institutions as well as the acceleration of economic growth, the reduction of inequality and the eradication of absolute poverty.13

For Biller, "development refers to the interactional process through which individuals associated in unit networks learn how to articulate and solve problems."14

In Joedono's view,
Social reality is change. . . . Such reality should be conceptualized in process-change and development terms: that development is basically learning, that is, the capacity to cope with problems . . . and that consequently, American Public Administration should be developing administration that is capable of keeping up with the manifold problems of change.\textsuperscript{15}

Deriving from these definitions of development, this study considered national development in two ways:

First, as a comprehensive improvement process involving continuing efforts of the government and its administrative organs to change the existing societal reality into a better and modern state. The development outputs of this comprehensive improvement process are tangible.

Second, as a comprehensive learning process involving continuing attempts of the government and its administrative organs to expand and improve the government's capability to manage and execute public functions, both public tasks and public affairs. This learning process includes efforts to improve the skills, knowledge, understanding, and competency of public employees and citizens to function as effective partners in the governmental decision-making process and national development.

The focus of this study may be expressed in two major research questions:

1. What are the structural aspects of
decentralization of authority in selected third world nation states?

2. What is the consequence of decentralization of authority for development?

1.1.2. Significance of the Research Problem

The research problem, decentralization of authority in governments of developing nation states, is significant conceptually. The conceptual contribution concerning the meaning of the subject under study—decentralization of authority—is specifically addressed in Chapter II: Decentralization of Authority in Theory. In a sense, the scientific methodology used to clarify the meaning of the term is to define it. To illustrate, Maddick viewed decentralization as

embracing both processes of [a] deconcentration, i.e., the delegation of authority adequate for the discharge of specified functions to the staff of a central department who are situated outside the headquarters; and of [b] devolution, i.e., the legal conferring of powers to discharge specified or residual functions upon formally constituted local authorities.16

The practical contribution has to do with the actual operationalization of the subject under study: the decentralization of authority and its impact on development. This is delineated in more detail in Chapter IV—
Decentralization of Authority in Practice. To accomplish decentralization of authority, governmental or structural steps must be taken. This can occur, for example, (a) through establishment of public apparatuses, both government units and public agencies, at the territorial level (i.e., provincial, regional, local and rural), and (b) through determination of the kinds of public functions, both tasks and affairs, which must be decentralized or established at the territorial level.

Decentralization of authority is a legitimate means used to disperse and distribute governmental responsibility, accountability and responsiveness among all layers of government throughout the country, to be borne by all its beneficiaries. Practically, it is impossible for a central government and central public employees to assume all governmental responsibilities, and to respond effectively and satisfactorily, especially in very large countries such as Indonesia. In Rose's words, "The tasks of government today are so great that the powers of the center can only be exercised by decentralization."  

Theoretically, the significance of decentralization is further emphasized by Furniss:

Not only does the management of the modern state involve coordination of private and quasi-public enterprise that cannot be resolved by diktat, but
also it can be argued that in the interests of both efficiency and harmony the need for decentralization is more pressing than ever.\textsuperscript{18}

Practically, the significance of decentralization can be further justified through its application by many less developed countries in their subgovernmental settings at the territorial level. In a 1962 study, the United Nations Division for Public Administration found that the governments of many developing countries are trying to make fuller use of local authorities and other forms of decentralization involving participation of the people in the administration of services required locally for social and economic development. In India, Pakistan and the United Arab Republic, for example, field administration units are being transformed into the executive arms of newly established local authorities. . . . Several Latin American countries are making a notable effort to improve the abilities of municipalities to discharge functions needed for development purposes.\textsuperscript{19}

In Indonesia, the practice of decentralization of authority extends back to 1905, the year when the first decentralization law, Decentralisatiewet, was enacted by the Dutch Colonial Administration. Since her de jure independence in 1949, Indonesia has attempted to apply governmental means of decentralization, both by devolution and deconcentration, as well as by semi-vertical decentralization. A practical example of decentralization of authority by devolution is the establishment of
territorial government units, e.g., metropolitan and provincial government units headed by governors; regional: city and shire or county government units; local: town and district government units; and rural: village government units. An example of deconcentration of authority is the establishment of representative offices of state ministries at the territorial levels, for example, the Representative Office of the Ministry of Education and Culture, the Ministry of Religious Affairs, and the Ministry of Mining and Energy. An example of semi-vertical decentralization of authority is the establishment of semi-vertical agencies such as the Regional Development Planning Agency, the Directorate of Social-Political Affairs, and the Directorate of Rural Development.

1.2. Organization of the Study

This study is organized into five interrelated chapters:

1. Introduction: The Research Problem and Objectives of the Study
2. Review of Literature
3. Research Methodology
4. Decentralization of Authority and Development in Practice: A Comparative Analysis of the Impact of Decentralization of Authority on Development in the Selected Nation States
5. Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations and Suggestions

The first chapter describes the research problem --decentralization of authority for national development in less developed nations--and its significance, both theoretically and practically. The second chapter is a review of the literature, exploring the scientific meaning of the research problem as observed and applied by its proponents. The third chapter is concerned with the research methodology, including the design of the research and the methods or techniques employed to implement the study. The fourth chapter is a comparative analysis of the impact of decentralization of authority on development in the twelve selected nation states. In this chapter, the degree of decentralization of authority in each country is determined for the purpose of comparative analysis of the relationship between decentralization of authority and development. Chapter five is a summary of the major aspects of the study. It presents conclusions and recommendations for restructuring the current provincial governmental arrangement in less developed nation states, and suggestions for future study of decentralization of authority.
Notes


11 UNDPA, Decentralization, p. 3.

12 Ibid., p. 20.

13 Bryant and White, Managing, p. 3.


16 Maddick, Democracy, p. 231.


18 Ibid.

19 UNDPA, Decentralization, p. 1.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

To establish the meaning of the words authority, decentralization, and development, the meaning of the term decentralization of authority for national development, and the mutual relationship among them, it is necessary to review the major literature in this area.

One of the first things social scientists who hope to influence the direction of social change in organizations must do is to give serious attention to issues of definitions, conceptualization, and theory about bureaucracies.¹

The review of related literature is organized into four subtitles:

2.1. Review of Literature on Authority
2.2. Review of Literature on Decentralization
2.3. Review of Literature on Development
2.4. Relationship between Decentralization of Authority and Development

The words authority, power, delegation, decentralization, devolution, deconcentration, and development--tangible and intangible--are legal terms that have been frequently explored in graduate schools of social science in general and Public Administration in
particular, and have been employed by governments throughout the world. Unfortunately, the meanings of these words are not universally agreed on or applied uniformly. It was the objective of this study to explore the meanings of these terms in the endeavor to apply them to the situation under study.

2.1. Review of Literature on Authority

In this section, the views of several major proponents of authority are examined in an attempt to understand the meaning of decentralization of authority. The review is presented under the following sub-titles:

2.1.1. The Concept of Authority  
2.1.2. Type of Authority  
2.1.3. Legal Authority and its Characteristics  
2.1.4. Power: What It Is  
2.1.5. Concluding View

2.1.1. The Concept of Authority

The English word authority is rooted in the Latin "auctoritas," or "auctor." An auctor, according to Lewis and Short's Latin Dictionary, is "he that brings about the existence of any object, or promotes the increase or prosperity of it, whether he first originates it, or by his efforts gives greater permanence or con-
tinuance to it."² According to Watt, quoting Mommsen,

Auctoritas in Roman republican government was not a right to rule; it was something quite distinct from the rights, potestas and imperium, to issue lawful commands which were legally enforceable. Each civil official had the potestas or the imperium, limited in time and in scope, that went with this office. Within these specified limits, his commands were legally binding. In addition, he possessed auctoritas, personal influence; and we have it on the auctoritas of Cicero that a Consul had auctoritas from the time of his nomination.³ . . .

The scope of auctoritas in Rome was much wider than that of government. Parents had it in relation to their children, tutors to their pupils, patrons to their clients, the old and the wise in relation to everyone else, and the dead in relation to the living. . . . Some other vessels of auctoritas, such as the emperor or the clergy were thought also to have potestas, a right to issue commands that ought to be obeyed, as well as counsel that ought to be respected.⁴

The English term authority, unlike its Latin predecessor, is not limited to the sphere of counsel, but also embraces command—potestas as well as auctoritas. According to Watt, the Oxford English Dictionary's first entry on authority refers to command and obedience; the first-cited fourteenth century use of the word is in reference to a decree. In the second college edition of the New World Dictionary of the American Language, the word authority has several meanings, including the power or right to give commands, enforce obedience, take action, or make final decisions.⁵ These brief citations
show that the term authority has organizational implications whereby one person issues commands or makes decisions, and the other obeys such commands and executes them.

The oldest authority is that between God and human beings—the authority to issue commands (the Ten Commandments) which must be obeyed by the people of Israel, and Christians throughout the world. The next authority rests with the parents of a family, whereby the parents can give commands and the children must obey them. Other examples are the authority resting with the nation and the state which can be vested in the government, or with stockholders and vested by them in their private organizations, as well as the traditional authority of village heads over village communities, teachers over students, owners over personal properties or belongings, and groups over their collective properties. Thus, governments have authority in relation to the country and the people, a central government to territorial governments, governments to public agencies, leaders or managers to subordinates, public employees to the society and to the government, and candidates to their constituents.
Such a relationship is a reciprocal one which legally binds two or more parties tightly together in an invisible, mutual obligation or psychological contract. This study deals primarily with the authority vested in the government which is related to the nation and the state, and which thus legally binds the government and the nation together in a continual, reciprocal relationship.

2.1.2. Type of Authority

Max Weber (1964-1920), a German sociologist and the father of the "bureaucratic model," defined authority in terms of three pure types of legitimate authority: (a) traditional authority, (b) charismatic authority, and (c) legal (or rational) authority. In traditional authority, the ruled (people) do not observe any enacted rules, regulations, or laws, but the leadership of individuals who have rightfully inherited chiefship in the traditional way. As Weber put it,

A system of imperative coordination will be called "traditional" if legitimacy is claimed for it and believed in on the basis of the sanctity of the order and the attendant powers of control, as they have been handed down from the past, have always existed.

In Cutchin's words, traditional authority is that in which
legitimacy is claimed on the basis of control patterns that have been handed down and that, presumably, have always existed. Based on personal relations between the ruler and the ruled, with the ruler's whim as an accepted form of dealing with people to resolve conflict.\textsuperscript{9}

Traditional authority usually rests on a widely held belief in the sanctity of tradition; traditional authority is based on what actually or presumably has always existed, and the legitimacy of those exercising authority.\textsuperscript{10} Traditional authority rests solely on the obligation of personal or group loyalty to the traditional leader. "Obedience is owed to the individual of the chief" who by hereditary rights possesses the traditionally sanctioned position of authority and who is bound by traditions and customs. It should be stressed that the obligation of obedience is not based on the impersonal order of enacted laws, but is a matter of personal and/or group loyalty to hereditary rulers within the domain of acceptance of accustomed obligation that directly and indirectly benefit the ruled.

Charismatic authority is also not bound by legislated laws of any kind, but rests solely on individual or group "devotion to a person because of the specific and exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of the individual person and of the normative patterns or
order revealed or ordained by him." In charismatic authority, according to Weber,

> It is the charismatically qualified leader as such who is obeyed by virtue of personal trust in him and his revelation, his heroism or his exemplary qualities, so far as they fall within the scope of individual belief in his charisma.¹²

According to Cutchin, in charismatic authority "power is assumed by virtue of innate personal qualities through which the leader may inspire devotion from followers. It differs from traditional authority in that it more often has a revolutionary base."¹³

Legal authority is bound by enacted constitutional laws, operating rules, and regulations; thus, it rests in the legality of these rules, regulations or laws and on the right of public employees possessing leadership or managership positions in the government or in formal organizations. These persons have the right to exercise authority, to issue orders, instructions or commands, to manage public affairs, and to lead organizational units and subordinates to accomplish organizational activities and operations. In this legal authority, in Weber's view, obedience is owed to the legally established order as well as to the person exercising the authority of office under it, only by virtue of the formal legality of their commands and only within
the scope of authority of the office. Thus, persons in a corporate body, as they obey a person in authority, do not owe this obedience to him as an individual, but to the impersonal order.\textsuperscript{14}

In the view of Katz and Kahn,

The legal type of authority asserts that obedience is to be rendered only by the law; that is, to the impersonal order of a person in a position of authority only within the sphere of his defined area of legitimate power.\textsuperscript{15}

This study is concerned exclusively with the last type of legitimate authority—"legal authority." This is the legitimate power delegated to a government and then decentralized, whether by devolution or by deconcentration, from the central government as the highest governing body, to the territorial level or to provincial, regional, local, and rural levels to allow establishment of subgovernment units and public and semi-public agencies.

2.1.3. Legal Authority and Its Characteristics

Conceptually, authority is a legal notion, which, according to Dessler, "may be thought of as the 'fuel' of organization, since without a distribution of authority, the organization structure is merely a shell."\textsuperscript{16} Max
Weber's notion of authority rested in the bureaucratic position, not in the person, or in the organization (office) and not in individual public employees. Weber's view is also supported by Follet, who pointed out that "authority belongs to the job and stays with the job." In Vocino and Rabin's words, "authority rests with legitimacy—the right to give orders and the expectation that they will be obeyed." To Urwick, "authority involves the ability to require action of others," and is the major principle of organization.

Barnard and Simon, who to a certain extent supported Weber's thinking, sought to provide an operational definition of the term "authority." Both employed the notion of "willingness to obey," or as stated by Barnard, "voluntary acceptance of certain... commands as a governing influence for behavior." The observations of Barnard and Simon can serve as a basis for operational definitions of legal authority. Within this context, Barnard defined authority:

the character of a communication (order) in a formal organization by virtue of which it is accepted by a contribution to or "member" of the organization as governing the action he contributes; that is, as governing or determining what he does or is not to do so far as the organization is concerned.

Simon, who defined authority as "the power to make
decisions which guide the actions of another,\(^25\) also cited an example of an operational definition of legal authority: "A subordinate may be said to accept authority whenever he permits his behavior to be guided by a decision reached by another, irrespective of his own judgment as to the merits of that decision."\(^26\) In addition, Watt stated that

> It [authority] is a relationship between two individuals, one "superior," the other "subordinate." The superior frames and transmits decisions with the expectation that they will be accepted by the subordinate. The subordinate expects such decisions, and his conduct is determined by them.\(^27\)

Similarly, Barnard also viewed authority as

> another name for the willingness and capacity of individuals to submit to the necessities of a cooperative system. Authority arises from the technological and social limitations of cooperative systems on the one hand, and of individuals on the other. Hence the status of authority in a society is the measure both of the development of individuals and of the technological and social conditions of the society.\(^28\)

Mooney and Reiley characterized authority as "the supreme coordinating power that provides legitimacy to the structure of the organization."\(^29\) For Mooney, authority is a coordinating means:

> The principle of perpendicular coordination is expressed in the single word, "authority." By authority I do not necessarily mean autocracy. In democratic forms of organization the supreme authority may be represented in the group as a whole, as it is under our government in the people of the
United States. Nor is authority something that, under any system, can ever be segregated at the top. Responsibility without corresponding authority is inconceivable, and sound organization demands a clearly defined responsibility for every act, from the greatest to the smallest. . . . It follows, therefore, that authority must have a clearly defined process through which it projects itself throughout an entire organization, so that everyone in the institution participates in the exercise of this authority, according to the nature of his duties. 30

In line with Mooney's observation, the legal authority meant by Weber is legally vested in the formal organization and is exercised by all employees, who in this study are public employees, according to the duties assigned to them, either by organizational prescription, or by supervisor instruction. Henri Fayol, a French management specialist, in his second principle of management, observed that

authority is the right to give orders and the power to exact obedience. Distinction must be made between managers' official authority [authority according to leadership and managership position], deriving from office, and personal authority, compounded of intelligence, experience, moral worth, and ability to lead. 31

Dessler considered authority to be

the right each position holder has to influence or command thought, opinion, or behavior. It gives managers the right to carry out their tasks by giving orders to their subordinates, and it gives them the right to expect compliance. 32

According to the UNESCO Research Center on Social and Economic Development in Southern Asia,
Authority . . . is the influence exerted by reason of one's hierarchic status, or superior position in a given social structure or strategic advantage, all of which of course imply the possibility of using a certain degree of compulsion. In this case, influence is exercised through formal or structural means, i.e., the authority, power, status, or office of the influence, with the persons influenced in a situation of involuntary dependence.\textsuperscript{33}

In all instances, authority as a right, an influence or a coordinating tool, requires all public employees, either superiors or subordinates, to serve the nation by performing all the tasks assigned to them by the government or by public agencies. Legally, each public employee, either manager or staff member, is expected to be supportive, obedient, and willing to execute the duties for which he or she was recruited. As a condition of "psychological contract,"\textsuperscript{34} once a citizen has agreed to work in the government, he or she is legally bound to perform the tasks entrusted to him or her by the government or by the public organization in which he or she works. In Dessler's words, "Subordinates who are hired and elect to remain with the organization generally do so with the understanding that they accept this authority as legal."\textsuperscript{35} Viewing authority from the standpoint of the subordinate, Simon wrote: "The most striking characteristic of the subordinate role is that it establishes an area of acceptance in behavior within
which the subordinate is willing to accept the decisions made for him by his superior.”36 Further elaborating on the role of the subordinate, Simon stated:

An individual accepts authority when he sets himself a general rule that permits the communicated decisions of another to guide his own choice (i.e., to serve as a premise of that choice) independently of his judgment of the correctness or acceptability of the premise.37

Thus, with legal authority or legitimate power, submission of a public employee does not rest on devotion to tradition or hereditary rulers. Rather, submission under legal authority is based upon an impersonal bond to the generally defined and functional "duty of office." The official duty—like the corresponding right to exercise authority . . . is fixed by rationally established norms, by enactments, decrees, and regulations, in such a manner that the legitimacy of the authority becomes the legality of the general rule, which is purposely thought out, enacted, and announced with formal correctness.38

These observations on legal authority demonstrate the responsibility of all public employees: the superior issues orders and gives instructions; the subordinate obediently carries out such orders within the legal zone of acceptance and the scientifically rational boundary.

2.1.4. Power: What It Is

Thompson, who made a distinction between authority and power, defined "power as the ability to
determine the behavior of others, regardless of the bases of that ability," and "authority as that type of power which goes with a position and is legitimated by the official norms."39 M. B. Parsons also distinguished between power and authority, defining "power as an ability to influence others to accomplish objectives," and "authority as a right to accomplish objectives."40 Cutchin viewed "power as authority, control, and influence needed to make others do what they might not want to do or would not otherwise do," and "authority as legitimate power based on a specific grant of power to an official office."41 To Weber, "power is the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which his probability rests."42

McMurry, another proponent of the subject, defined "power as the capacity to modify the conduct of other employees in a desired manner, together with the capacity to avoid having one's own behavior modified in undesired ways by other employees."43 He further stated that

without power there can be no authority; without authority, there can be no discipline; without discipline, there can be difficulty in maintaining order, system, and productivity. An executive figure
without power is, therefore, all too often a figurehead—or worse, headless.44

Similarly, Barnes stated that

Mankind has had a continuing historical fascination with power as a concept and with those who seem somehow to have mastered it. Possibly because of their special abilities to reward, punish, motivate, lead, and control others, the masters of power assume a place above the rest of us. Whether the person be Napoleon, Thomas Jefferson, Genghis Khan, Joan of Arc, Winston Churchill, or Adolph Hitler, he or she becomes a model of power. For good or for evil, these people seem to have understood how to use power in controlling the destinies of other people; the rest of us try to discover: how and why.45

Power can be conceptualized in many ways. There are types of power as there are types of authority. Etzioni defined power as an actor's ability to induce or influence another actor to carry out his directives or any other norms he supports.46 He distinguished among three types of power: (a) coercive power—power involving the application (or threat of application) of physical sanctions; (b) remunerative power—power of control over incentives and rewards; and (c) normative power—power deriving from one's esteem or prestige.47

Sherwood stressed that "power is not seen in limited, finite terms, but rather as expansive, indeed infinite in its potential." He identified seven bases of power available to the leader: (a) Reward power—power which involves the capacity to provide something of value
(material or non-material) to another; (b) Coercive power--power which involves the capacity to impose a cost on another; (c) Information power--power which goes to the old dictum that information is power; (d) Expert power--power which involves the notion that a person has special skills and competence from which another can benefit; (e) Referent power--power comprising a whole set of factors that add up to high personal attractiveness; (f) Associate power--the power referred to as "the who you know" element of the power spectrum; and (g) Legitimate power--power containing the notion of a "zone of acceptance" in which the formal leader is followed simply because of the incumbency factor.48

Like Sherwood, French and Raven also distinguished among several bases of power, which they identified as (a) Reward power--power whose basis is the ability to reward; (b) Coercive power--power involving one person's ability to manipulate the attainment by another of positive or negative rewards; (c) Referent power--power which one person has over another, similar to Weber's charismatic authority, and based on one person's identification with and attraction to another; (d) Expert power--power deriving from the fact that one
person is viewed as an expert in some area and others must therefore depend on him for advice and counsel; and (e) Legitimate power—characterized by the feeling of "oughtness" on the part of a person (similar to Weber's legal authority).49

Dessler defined power as "the possession of the potential for influencing others, or the ability to act or produce some effect."50 He saw legitimate power as "stemming from internalized values in a person that dictate that another has a legitimate right to influence him and that he has an obligation to accept influence."51 He believed that "the actual source of this legitimate power, and the reason subordinates feel they ought to obey, might be tradition, or might derive from the office the superior holds."52

To French and Raven, reward power is based on P's perception that O has the ability to mediate reward for him (such as by promotion); coercive power is based on P's perception that O has the ability to mediate punishment for him or to obtain compliance on the basis of fear; expert power is based on P's perception that O has some special knowledge or greater expertise in an area, and therefore O's orders should be followed; reference power (power of personality) is based on P's
identification with O. By identification French and Raven mean a feeling of oneness of P with O, or a desire for such an identity. In the words of Hellriegel and Slocum, referent power is defined as "leadership power based on attractiveness or charismatic qualities; that is, the leader's orders are obeyed because of some personal qualities with which the followers closely identify."\(^5\) Legitimate power is based on P's perception that O has a legitimate right to prescribe behavior to him. In other words, legitimate power of P/O is viewed as power which stems from internalized values in P, dictating that O has a legitimate right to influence P and that P has an obligation to accept this influence. Generally, this can happen only when O and P are working in the same formal organization where O is in a management position and P is his or her immediate subordinate. Legally, however, in public apparatuses, all public employees holding leadership positions have authority over all public employees who are subordinate and have lower status in the government. Thibault and Kelly pointed out that "all types of power derive from one person's dependence on another: the power of A over B is equal to, and based upon, the dependence of B on A."\(^5\)
The observation of Thiebault and Kelly is very true, as without subordinates, superiors cannot exercise the legitimate power vested in their leadership positions to accomplish organizational activities. Also, if subordinates refuse to obey superiors' orders and instructions, then such legitimate power or legal authority is meaningless. In Barnard's view,

If a directive communication is accepted by one to whom it is addressed, its authority for him is confirmed or established. It is admitted as the basis of action. Disobedience of such a communication is a denial of its authority.\textsuperscript{35}

In their examination of power as applied in the United States, Dolbeare and Edelman first defined power as "the use of resources in such a manner that others were induced to conform their behavior to that which the holder of the resources perceived to be desirable." They saw power as a relation between two or more people because of their consensus on a common purpose. They also argued that "social life is a web of power relationships." For purposes of manageability, they limited their definition of politics to include only those uses of power having to do with whether and how government was to be employed in regard to any given subject. From a focus on public policies and their consequences, they observed that "power included all the various uses of
resources, outside and inside of government, that culminated in government action or inaction." Within this context, they observed that

Power may be distinguished as to its location within the society. In most modern societies, private persons and entities have or can develop power resources which enable them to accomplish many of their goals. But some resources are almost exclusively available to government officials. One of these is the ENTITLEMENT, according to the established constitutional system, to take certain actions—such as to raise taxes, or prohibit strikes, to do other things commonly associated with government. This type of power is sometimes called "AUTHORITY," and the acceptance by the people of an existing government's right to do such things is termed "LEGITIMACY." The terms employed are not important, but the idea of certain resources and types of power being located only in one established government is. It means that the institutions and officials of government hold certain essential components of the total capacity for social control within the society. These components may be bestowed or withdrawn by the people, according to their judgments about how well the system is working, so that they do not exert a constant weight on the power scale.456

Regarding power resources, Cutchin believed that "potential political power resources include wealth, status, position, leadership skills, information, and authority, all of which can be brought to bear to affect policy outcomes." Organizational and political theorists, Cutchin continued, have different views of power and human nature: (a) classical theory—strong leader at the top (Max Weber, Thomas Hobbes);
(b) neo-classical theory--power is relational; the exercise of power is subject to continual review by subordinates (Chester I. Barnard); and (c) humanistic theory--power resides in the rank and file; power is shared, participative management and democracy (Jean Jacques Rousseau, John Dewey, Warren Bennis).\textsuperscript{57}

In his article, "Power and Politics in Organizational Life," Zalesnik identified three elements that make up the power base of a leader: (a) the quantity of formal authority vested in his position relative to other positions; (b) the authority vested in his experience and reputation for competence, and (c) the attractiveness of his personality to others.\textsuperscript{58}

Finally, in his view on national power which also constituted his proposed paradigm for building a science of administration, Wilson observed that

1. There will always be a single dominant center of power in any system of government; and the government of a society will be controlled by that single center of power.

2. The more power is divided the more irresponsible it becomes; or, alternatively, the more power is unified and directed from a single center, the more responsible it will become.

3. The structure of a constitution defines and determines the composition of that center of power and establishes the political structure relative to the enactment of law and the control of administration. Every system of democratic
government will exalt the people's representativeness to a position of absolute sovereignty.59

In a nation state, the central government is the single dominant locus of the highest national authority and power, whereby it has authority over all other government units, and all resources and properties belonging to the nation. At the territorial level, the provincial government is the next highest single dominant center of power, subordinating regional, local, and rural government units. The central government, as the holder of the final authority of the nation, has the right and obligation to control and coordinate, directly or indirectly, all government units throughout the entire country. Each provincial or metropolitan government is required to control and coordinate, directly or indirectly, all government units in the city and shire governments, town and district governments, and village governments, along with the public agencies established to assist them in the execution of public tasks and affairs.

In a time of national unrest, the central government has all authority and power to make final decisions on any critical subject, whether it is a central, provincial, metropolitan, district, or village issue. If there is to be decentralization, the central government is the
unit which must accomplish this. There must be both 
development and deconcentration of responsibility and 
functions as well as public apparatuses and resources to 
the territorial level or lower units throughout the en-
tire country. The goal is to distribute the burden of 
managing and executing public functions and affairs among 
all layers of the national community. Together they must 
al so bear the burden of accomplishing the government's 
mission to achieve a higher standard of living for all 
citizens.

2.1.5. Concluding View

From this review, legal authority (Weber, 1947) 
can be defined as legitimate power (Sherwood, n.d.; 
French and Raven, 1959; Cutchin, 1981) delegated by the 
people and the country to the government using constitu-
tional law (e.g., the Constitution of the United States 
and the 1945 Constitution of Indonesia). It rests with 
the government units and public agencies (Weber, 1947; 
Follet, 1942; Thompson, 1966; Mommsen, 1952). Descrip-
tively, legal authority can be viewed as a right to give 
orders and instructions (Fayol, 1949), to influence and/ 
or command thought, opinion and behavior (Simon, 1957; 
Dessler, 1980; UNESCO Research Centre, 1968), to make
decisions (Simon, 1957; Webster's New World Dictionary, 1968), to require actions of others, or to take action to accomplish organizational objectives (Urwick, 1943; Parsons, 1982; Webster's Dictionary, 1968), to exact or enforce obedience (Fayol, 1949; Webster's Dictionary, 1968).

According to Dessler, legal authority so defined is the "fuel of organization" that ought to be distributed throughout all of government so that the entire structure becomes a functioning unit. Mooney and Reiley viewed legal authority as "the supreme coordinating power that provides legitimacy to the structure of the organization." Within the context of this observation, Weber viewed legal authority as resting with the public apparatuses; to Follet, it belongs to the functions assigned to such public apparatuses; to the humanistic theorists (Rousseau, Dewey, and Bennis), it resides in the rank and file and is shared democratically by all participants or public employees working in the government. Thus, a public employee holding a leadership or managerial position can exercise the authority residing in that particular position to manage the tasks which he is to perform. This is also true of a routine staff member of the organization. It coincides with Mooney's view that "the
exercise of authority is according to the nature of someone's duties."

Managerial and staff tasks are responsibilities delegated to the government by the nation and the state to be accomplished by allocation of national resources. As Lowi has put it, "A delegation of power to the President or to agencies is in reality a delegation of personal responsibility."60 Personal responsibility is dependent on the tasks and affairs assigned to someone. The ultimate goal of delegation of authority and power to the government is responsiveness in the sense that the people and the country as the owners of the delegated authority and power expect a satisfactory return on the value of the power so delegated.

In short, legal authority is legitimate power vested in both government units and public agencies. It requires all public employees, both superiors and subordinates working in the public apparatuses, to perform their assigned tasks and duties for the nation and state. Organizationally, functionally, and legally, each public employee, management or staff, is expected to be supportive, obedient and willing to perform his or her tasks and duties in an effort to achieve the government's
mission. As a condition of the intangible legal and psychological contract, once a citizen has agreed to serve the public by working in the government, he or she is legally bound to perform the tasks and duties entrusted to him. Thus, accepting a position with the government means accepting government authority, policy, and procedures. This acceptance requires obedience, loyalty and willingness to support the authority of the government, its administrative organs, or public employees in leadership positions.

To accomplish the government's mission, authority must be decentralized, whether by devolution or by deconcentration, along with resources and functions to be performed by lower levels of government and lower ranked public employees. The delegated or decentralized authority must be clearly defined; this will bring about greater efficiency and productivity, which can enlarge the government's responsiveness to the nation as a whole.

2.2. Review of Literature on Decentralization

This section presents a review of the observations of certain proponents of decentralization. The section is organized under three subtitles:
2.2.1. The Concept of Decentralization

2.2.2. The Rationale for Decentralization: Rational Goals and Critical Consequences

2.2.3. The Types of Decentralization

2.2.1. The Concept of Decentralization

By definition, decentralization "means different things to different people, and a variety of motivations can be uncovered for the recent attempts to decentralize planning and administration in developing countries." Fantini and Gittell also found decentralization to be an ambiguous word.

Some view decentralization simply as an administrative device—as a shift in administration from the national to the state or city governments, from central city administrative offices to the field. Others insist that decentralization plans embody a design for meaningful shifts in power from central agencies to local communities.

In MacMahon's view, "None of the terms—decentralization, delegation, devolution, or deconcentration—has a fixed meaning in the literature of political science. Each must be defined in the context in which it is used." He considered the word decentralization to be the most loosely inclusive of all these terms.

Fesler described the specific definition of the term as employed in France, England and the United
States:

In French usage decentralization is a term reserved for the transfer of powers from a central government to an areally or functionally specialized authority of distinct legal personality (for example, the increase of the degree of autonomy of a local government or of a public enterprise corporation). Deconcentration, on the other hand, is the French equivalent for "administrative decentralization" within a single government's hierarchy (Waline, 1944). Efforts to obtain general acceptance of this neat distinction have been unsuccessful (Meyer, 1957, pp. 56-61; United Nations, 1962, p. 3; Maddick, 1963, p. 23).

In both England and the United States "decentralization" is the generic term and as such "administrative," "political," and "governmental" serve to specify narrower usage, whereas "federalism," "local self-government," and "intergovernmental relations" are alternative terms for special purposes. "Devolution" used by English but rarely American scholars, generally is equal to the French decentralization, but occasionally embraces deconcentration as well. 64

In a structural sense, according to Sherwood, most uses of the term "decentralization for development" embrace both hierarchical and non-hierarchical assumptions. 65 Maddick shared this view, seeing decentralization as embracing both processes of deconcentration and devolution. Deconcentration is the delegation of authority adequate for the discharge of specified functions to staff of a central department who are situated outside the headquarters (Hierarchical). Devolution is the legal conferring of powers to discharge specified or residual functions upon formally constituted local authorities (Nonhierarchical). 66

Sherwood defined centralization as "involving the concentration of power at the top of the pyramid within a
given hierarchical structure," and decentralization as indicating the "dispersal of power throughout the structure." "From this point of view," Sherwood continued, "decentralization and deconcentration become synonymous." He used the word devolution to describe the "nonhierar-
chical type of power relationship where the local govern-
ment is separated from the command system of the center." From this observation, Sherwood concluded that "decen-
tralization can be used to describe an intraorganiza-
tional pattern of power relationships, and devolution to describe an interorganizational pattern of power rela-
tionships."  

In writings from the United Nations Division for Public Administration, decentralization is considered the vesting of authority by the central government in the territorial government both by deconcentration and by devolution, a view similar to that of Maddick.

The term decentralization . . . refers to the transfer of authority away from the national capital whether by deconcentration (i.e., delegation) to field offices or by devolution to local authorities or other local bodies.

The term decentralization refers to the transfer of authority on a geographic basis, whether by deconcent-
ration (i.e., delegation) of authority to field units of the same department or level of government, or by devolution of authority to local government units or special statutory body.
White addressed the definition issue with more specificity than other writers. He considered decentralization to embrace the process of conferring authority—legislative, executive and judicial—to the lower branches of government.

The process of decentralization denotes the transfer of authority, legislative, judicial and/or administrative from a higher level of government to a lower. It is the converse of centralization and should not be confused with deconcentration, a term generally used to denote the delegation to a subordinate officer of capacity to act in the name of the superior without a transfer of authority from him.

This observation can be defined as decentralization of authority by devolution. Devolution is used to describe the autonomous provincial or village governmental system where, to use Sherwood's language, "the local government is separated from the command system of the center" or from the central government's direct command. Thus, once the national authority and power is vested in the government by the people, the central government is obliged by law to decentralize partially certain authority and power, along with substantial responsibilities on a geographic basis statewide, both by devolution and deconcentration, as used here.

Cheema and Rondinelli discussed "decentralization of authority by functions or tasks and affairs." They,
too, were more specific in defining the term decentralization:

Decentralization is defined broadly . . . to mean the transfer of planning, decision-making, or administrative authority from the central government to its field organizations, local administrative units, semi-autonomous and parastatal organizations, local governments, or nongovernmental organizations.72

For this study, their most important observation is that different forms of decentralization can be distinguished primarily by the extent to which authority to plan, decide, and manage is transferred from the central government to other organizations and the amount of autonomy the "decentralized organizations" achieved in carrying out their tasks.73

Thus, the writers specified what is to be decentralized, and the quantity of authority and responsibility that is to be decentralized to lower levels of public apparatuses to make them effective public instruments. From the definitions and observations of Maddick, UNDPA and Cheema and Rondinelli, four major forms of decentralization can be identified: (a) devolution to local governments, (b) deconcentration, (c) delegation to semi-autonomous or parastatal agencies, and (d) transfer of functions from public to nongovernment institutions.74

1. Devolution—"Through devolution," Cheema and Rondinelli contended, "the central government relinquishes certain functions or creates new units of
government that are outside its direct control." They identified several fundamental characteristics of devolution as follows:

First, local units of government are autonomous, independent, and clearly perceived as separate levels of government over which central authorities exercise little or no direct control. Second, the local governments have clear and legally recognized geographical boundaries within which they exercise authority and perform public functions. Third, local governments have corporate status and the power to secure resources to perform their functions. Fourth, devolution denies the need to "develop local governments as institutions" in the sense that they are perceived by local citizens as organizations providing services that satisfy their needs and as governmental units over which they have some influence. Finally, devolution is an arrangement in which there are reciprocal, mutual beneficial, and coordinate relationships between central and local governments; that is, the local government has the ability to interact reciprocally with other units in the system of government of which it is a part.

This observation coincides with Sherwood's view that local government units are autonomous in that hierarchically they are not directly controlled and commanded by the central government. In spite of this autonomy, however, the local government unit is a part of the national governmental system, and constitutionally or legally, it is responsible to the central government as the locus of national authority which holds power over the entire national governmental system.

The essential idea of devolution is system separateness, in which local governments discharge
obligations as part of a national political system and not as dependent elements of a central hierarchy. The concept of devolution is non-hierarchical in the sense that it posits a number of governments having a coordinate, system relationship with one another on an independent, reciprocating basis. Each, within geographic and functional boundaries established by the total system, enjoys autonomy. Particularly in recent years, devolution has been offered as a happy answer to problems of congestion at the center, red tape, and bureaucratic negativism.  

Viewed analytically, in any government system—monarchical or republican, federal or unitary, democratic or socialist—all nation states have to devolve authority and functions both by tasks and by affairs. Functionally, the devolved public apparatuses are autonomous and independent in their management and execution of public tasks and affairs, but governmentally—organizationally, legally, administratively and politically—they are still a part of the national system of government, and are obliged to be responsible to the central government. This situation is especially true in financial matters. In many newly independent nations, final financial decisions or the decisions on budgetary resources are usually made by the central or the higher government unit, especially in the countries with a unitary governmental system. In the actual practice of government, most unitary governments have retained partially centralized authority to inspect financial affairs at the
territorial and lower levels. In planning for development, the devolved public apparatuses at the territorial level must follow the guidelines of state policy for national development, especially in countries where natural and national resources are scarce. As observed by Cheema and Rondinelli,

Devolution is usually seen as a form of decentralization in which local government units are given primary responsibility for some functions over which the central government often retains some supervisory powers and in which it may play an important financial role. Even where most of the theoretical conditions for devolution are met, however, central governments often attempt to make local governments act consistently with national development policies and plans in performing their functions, and certain formal or informal controls are often maintained to accomplish that goal.

It should be understood that the devolved public apparatuses are autonomous in their governing functions and in managing and executing affairs which are locally funded; but for those programs supported by central financial resources, although the management and execution are devolved to the territorial government units, the central government still has authority to control the performance directly and to inspect it on the spot. This is essential for preventing misuse of financial resources. The mechanism is described by Cheema and Rondinelli:
When programs or projects carried out by local governments are funded or supported by the national government, the central ministries may have more direct controls or engage in more direct supervision through spot checks on performance by inspectors from the ministries, by requiring progress reports on programs and projects, through budgetary and financial regulations, by exercising administrative powers when local governments default or carry out programs ineffectively, by approving bylaws and procedures of local governments, and through judicial remedies.  

The United Nations Working Group on Decentralization has introduced several methods of devolution which stress the method of devolving powers and functions to territorial authorities as a key element in the distribution of power on an area basis. Such an approach, they contend, "affects not only the nature of the powers devolved but also the degree and methods of central control available." The Group suggested the following methods of devolution:

1. To authorize local authorities, constitutionally or by statute, to do anything for the good of the locality which is neither forbidden them by law nor within the exclusive jurisdiction of another government unit; 
2. To allocate functions to local authorities by ministerial order pursuant to a basic statute which lists the functions which can be devolved in whole or part, the standards to be met prior to devolution of functions and the procedure for devolution. The basic statute may provide for the issuance of a warrant or instrument of authority to each local authority as it is constituted, including specifications of the functions that it can undertake immediately; 
3. To allocate functions to local authorities by separate statutes, which can devolve functions outright or empower a minister to
allot functions at his discretion; (4) to treat local authorities as integral parts of the machinery of central government. In addition to performing functions devolved by statutes, local authorities are expected to carry out instructions from ministries; and (5) to contract with local authorities for the performance of certain services. For example, the dependence of local authorities on central grants induces them to enter into these contracts. Under these arrangements, functions may be allocated to all local authorities of a certain class or to individual local authorities. 80

Besides methods of devolution, the United Nations Working Group on Decentralization stressed channels of devolution to local authorities when this is not addressed directly by statute. From their study the writers agreed that there was no real need to centralize the issuance of instructions to local authorities; however, they contended, it is important

(a) To have a central office, such as the Ministry of Local Government [or the Ministry of Interior], review proposed legislation and warrants in order to ensure that what is proposed is reasonably consistent with the general practice and with existing relationships with the local authorities concerned;

(b) To ascertain that the local authorities will have the funds necessary to discharge adequately the duties it is proposed to devolve on them;

(c) To obtain the consent of the local authorities in cases where there is doubt about their financial or technical capability and especially where the proposed devolution will impose an extra financial burden on them; and

(d) to ensure that the subjects to be devolved and the extent of the devolution are set out in clear and single terms. 81
The Working Group recommended that

local authorities . . . be allowed to arrange by mutual agreement for joint administration of a service or for one authority to perform a function on behalf of another; but, as a general rule, local authorities should derive their authority directly from the central government and not by devolution or delegation from a local authority at a higher level.92

In summary, devolution may be best defined as the vesting of authority by the central or higher government unit in the territorial or lower level of government with autonomous status. There are two types of devolution as used here: (a) devolution by apparatuses; that is, the establishment of territorial government units: metropolitan and provincial, city and shire, town and district, or rural (village) government units; and (b) devolution by functions; that is, the delegation of certain tasks, such as planning and decision-making, and of certain affairs, such as social, educational, economic or agricultural affairs, to the devolved public apparatuses: government units and public agencies. The devolved public apparatuses should have autonomous status.

2. Deconcentration—With views similar to those of Maddick and the United Nations Division for Public Administration, Cheema and Rondinelli considered deconcentration as involving the redistribution of
administrative responsibilities only within the
central government, that is, for example, by shifting
of workload from the central government ministry or
agency headquarters to its own field staff located in
offices outside the nation's capital, without also
delegating to them the authority to make decisions or
to exercise discretion in carrying them out.\textsuperscript{83}

The writers offered examples of administrative arrange-
ments that can be established at the territorial level:

**Field Administration**—They contended that a
greater deconcentration can be achieved through field
administration, a system implying the delegation of some
decision making discretion to field staff, allowing them
latitude to plan, make decisions on routine work, and
adjust the implementation of central directives to
prefectoral, regional, local or rural conditions within
guidelines promulgated by the central ministry, usually
the Ministry of Interior or Home Affairs. In many
instances, field staff members are employees of a central
ministry who remain under its authority, discretion and
control; but there are also local employees who are
assigned to work in field administration.\textsuperscript{84} These
employees are more closely attached to the central
ministry than to the territorial government unit.

Field administration is what Sherwood and Fessler
called intraorganizational or intragovernmental decen-
tralization. In this method the central government
establishes its change agents at the territorial level and administers directly through them rather than through intermediation of provincial, regional, local or rural governments. Pesler described two basic patterns of field administration as practiced in France, the United Kingdom and the United States. These were the prefectoral system and the functional system, which respectively emphasize area and function as the basis of field organization as follows:

In a prefectoral system, such as that established by Napoleon, the national government divides the country into areas and places a prefect in charge of each. The prefect represents the whole government, and all specialized field agents in the area are under his supervision. The several ministries either directly or through a central agency issue instructions to the prefect, who then instructs his specialized subordinates, after adapting his instructions to the conditions of his area. Similarly, communications upward to the ministries flow through the prefect. Although it is convenient to refer to this as a prefectoral system, it had many precedents before Napoleon, both in Europe and in ancient empires. It has been widely adopted in recent times and has been the dominant pattern in colonial administration.

In a functional field service, such as that of the United States or the United Kingdom, each ministry (and sometimes many bureaus within ministries) establishes its own field arrangements, dividing the country into areas deemed suitable for the particular function and assigning its own staff members as field agents and directly supervising their work. No provision is made for a general representative of the government, such as a prefect, to supervise the totality of national activities in an area. In periods of national emergency an area coordinator, vested
with coordinating powers, may be temporarily provided for; and both in such periods and in less critical times, committees and other devices may be instituted to promote cooperation in an area among ministries' agents of matters of common interests.\textsuperscript{85}

**Local Administration**—Rondinelli and Cheema considered local administration "a form of deconcentration in which all subordinate levels of government within a country are agents of the central authority, usually the executive branch."\textsuperscript{86} Local administration, as used by Cheema and Rondinelli, is the same as "territorial administration" as used in this study. Local or territorial administrative units are provincial and metropolitan governments, city and shire governments, town and district governments and village governments; these are headed by leaders who are either appointed by or are responsible directly to a central government agency, usually a ministry of the interior or ministry of local government. Local functions are performed under the technical supervision and control of central ministries, and the heads of the local administrations serve at the pleasure of the nation's chief executive.\textsuperscript{87}

Cheema and Rondinelli identified two types of local administration found in most developing nation states: integrated local administration and unintegrated local administration. Integrated local administration is
a form of decentralization in which field staff of central ministries work within a local jurisdiction under the supervision or direction of a chief executive of that jurisdiction, who is appointed by and responsible to the central government. For example, in some African countries, the province commissioner has the authority to supervise and coordinate the work of various ministry staff working within the province.  

Unintegrated local administration is a governmental arrangement in which field staff of central ministries and administrative staff of local jurisdiction operate independently of each other. Each technical officer is responsible to his or her own ministry or department in the nation's capital, and the administrative staff of the local jurisdiction are supervised by its chief executive, who has little or no control over central ministry personnel. Coordination takes place informally if at all, and each technical officer operates in accordance with guidelines prepared by supervisors in the capital of the nation state.

3. Delegation

Another form of decentralization identified by Cheema and Rondinelli is delegation of decision making
and management authority for specific functions to organizations that are not under the direct control of government ministries. This kind of delegation is, in their view, a delegation to semi-autonomous or parastatal organizations. Often, the organizations to which functions are delegated have semi-independent authority, which means they might not even be located within the regular organizational structure of the government.

Delegation of functions from the central government to such organizations as public corporations, regional planning and area development authorities, multipurpose and single-purpose functional authorities, and special project implementation units represents a more extensive form of decentralization than administrative deconcentration. Delegation implies the transfer or creation of broad authority to plan and implement decisions concerning specific activities—or a variety of activities within specific spatial boundaries—to any organization that is technically and administratively capable of carrying them out without direct supervision by a higher administrative unit.⁹⁰

In the view of this researcher, delegation of authority as described by Cheema and Rondinelli is actually devolution of authority, simply because they define it as "delegation of decision making and management authority for specific functions to organizations that are not under the direct control of central government ministries."⁹¹ In its broadest legal sense this is what is meant by autonomy, as autonomy implies self-government,
self-management, self-control, self-decision making—in other words, independence, in Sherwood's terms. The word used to delineate authority decentralized to autonomous public apparatuses or "semi-autonomous or parastatal organizations" is "devolution," and devolution is used by its proponents, including Sherwood, "to describe an inter-organizational or intergovernmental pattern of power relationships with its operating based on 'system separateness.'" The terms used to clarify 'system separateness' are 'devolution' and 'autonomy.'

The core of devolution is autonomy. Because it is based on system separateness, devolution inevitably implies autonomy, which is the freedom to behave outside the constraint of direct control . . . . Autonomy implies system integrity in the sense that a system must have boundaries and therefore identity. To put it another way, there can be no autonomy if there are no boundaries.92

Thus, any public apparatus—prefectoral, regional, local or rural government unit, or public agency—that may manage and execute its functions, including making decisions on most of its organizational tasks and affairs without direct supervision and control from the central government or central public agency, is labeled an autonomous public apparatus; and the 'autonomy,' according to Sherwood and many others, "is the basis of devolution."

In this researcher's view, delegation of
authority within a public apparatus (interorganizational delegation, whether the central government or a subgovernment unit or public agency), in its narrow sense implies direct supervision and control from the higher level of public apparatus which has delegated the authority. In this context, delegation of authority can take place to deconcentrated and devolved public apparatuses or within such apparatuses.

On the other hand, devolution of authority does not imply direct supervision and control from the central public apparatus; this means, according to Cheema and Rondinelli, that "decision-making and management authority for specific functions" is conferred to organizations or public apparatuses that are not under direct control and supervision of central government ministries or of higher level administrative units. Therefore, any public affairs for which decisions may be made by lower-level autonomous administrative units ought to be clearly defined before decentralization by devolution takes place. Devolution implies the transfer or creation of broad authority to plan and implement decisions concerning specific activities—or a variety of activities within specific spatial boundaries—to any organization that is technically and administratively capable of carrying
them out without direct supervision by a higher administrative unit.\textsuperscript{93}

Sherwood concurred with this observation:

The idea of the local government as a system interacting with other systems in the nation demands recognition that autonomy is the basis of devolution. Essentially this means that the local unit is self-contained, has generally agreed-upon functional and real limits of activity, and is in transaction with an environment to which it provides outputs and from which it receives inputs. As an autonomous unit, it will have its own capabilities to receive messages from the environment, to process those demands, and to direct its outputs toward the functions it seeks to fulfill.\textsuperscript{94}

In MacMahon's words,

delegation . . . points to relations in which powers are formally conferred under law, as by the constitution itself, or by the legislative body to an executive agency, or by an administrator to a subordinate, or from one level of government to another.\textsuperscript{95}

The terms "delegation" and "decentralization" as used here can be clarified as follows. Delegation is a loose concept that embraces all the other terms: decentralization, devolution, deconcentration, conferment, transference, or vesting. Thus, delegation of authority can mean vesting of authority, conferring of authority, transferring of authority, or decentralization of authority, devolution of authority and deconcentration of authority. Delegation of authority generally takes place in two ways. The first is delegation of power and authority by the people and the country to the government,
universally the central government, and then from the central government to the territorial government by decentralization, whether by devolution or by deconcentration. The second is delegation of authority within a public apparatus, whether a government unit or a public agency, either a central public agency or a devolved public agency or a deconcentrated public agency at the territorial level.

Decentralization takes place only after the people have vested legal authority and power by delegation in the government, usually the central government. Then the central government decentralizes certain authority and power, along with responsibility and functions, to the territorial level, both by devolution and deconcentration. Legally, devolution of authority usually takes place before deconcentration of authority, because government units at the territorial level must be established before public agencies can be set up. Thus, decentralization as used here denotes simply devolution and deconcentration as described earlier.

An example of delegation of authority from the nation to the government is the delegation of power and authority enacted in a nation's constitution, as in the
United States and Indonesia. The Constitution of the United States of America states that

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States (Article I, Section 1).

The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America (Article II, Section 1).

The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme court (Article III, Section 1).

The 1945 Constitution of Indonesia provides that

The People's Congress shall enact the Constitution and lay down outlines of national policy (Article 3).

The President shall be vested with the power of government in accordance with the present Constitution (Article 4).

The President shall be vested with legislative power with the sanction of the Council of Representatives (Article 5, Section 1).

The President shall enact government ordinances for the proper execution of laws (Article 5, Section 2).

The Judiciary power shall be exercised by a Supreme Court and such other courts of law as shall be established by law (Article 24, Section 1).

The essential legal implication of delegation is that there is a center from which the delegated authority derives. That center will always be the highest locus of authority. It will then distribute authority and power through the entire nation and the governmental structure, make final decisions in times of national emergency, and
control the society as a whole. As Wilson put it, "there will always be a single dominant center of power in any system of government; and the government of a society will be controlled by that single center of power." The nation is the single dominant center of national authority and power vested in the government. However, in the practical process of governing, the central government representing the nation will always be the final authority and the single dominant center of power from which the lower levels of government derive their authority. This is accomplished through decentralization of authority both by devolution and by deconcentration. The central government is legally the final authority to make final decisions on behalf of the people and the country in times of war and national emergencies.

4. Transfer of Functions from Government to Nongovernment Institutions

Cheema and Rondinelli identified a fourth form of decentralization of authority, the "transfer of functions from government organizations to nongovernment organizations."

Decentralization takes place in many countries through the transfer of some planning and administrative responsibility, or of public functions, from government to voluntary, private, or nongovernment
institutions. In some cases, governments may transfer to "parallel organizations"—such as national industrial and trade associations, professional or ecclesiastical organizations, political parties, or cooperatives—the right to license, regulate, or supervise their members in performing functions that were previously controlled by the government. In other cases, governments may decentralize by shifting responsibility for producing goods or supplying services to private organizations, a process often called "privatization." In some countries, "self-management" arrangements have been created to allow workers in public enterprises or production cooperatives to plan and manage their own activities without strong central intervention and control.  

Cheema and Rondinelli found that governments transfer responsibilities to or share with such organizations as farmers' cooperatives, credit associations, mutual aid societies, village development organizations, trade unions, or even women's and youth clubs. Another way of decentralizing by transfer of functions is "debureaucratization" whereby the government allows decisions to be made through political processes that involve larger numbers of political interests, rather than by government through legislation, executive decree, or administrative regulation. It is the researcher's view that this form of decentralization—transfer of functions to nongovernment organizations, or through debureaucratization—is better defined as "devolution of authority or functions from the government to nongovernment organizations." The reason for this preference is that the transferred
functions are administered and executed by the nongovernment institutions without government supervision, control and intervention.

In conclusion, Cheema and Rondinelli commented that each of these forms of decentralization has different implications for organizational structure, the degree of power or authority to be transferred, the amount of citizen participation involved, preconditions for successful implementation, and advantages and disadvantages for different groups within society. But even though these forms of decentralization differ in their characteristics and implications, they are not mutually exclusive. In reality, all governments use some combination of these forms of decentralized planning, decision making, and administration. The highly centralized governments in developing countries have experimented with nearly all of these forms of decentralization in the past few years, with greater emphasis in most on decentralization and delegation. But they have had great difficulty in many cases even deconcentrating development planning and administrative functions, and where they have succeeded in setting up decentralized arrangements they have not always generated the intended benefits.99

2.2.2. The Rationale for Decentralization: Rational Goals and Critical Consequences

Proponents of decentralization have offered extensive reasons for and potential consequences of decentralization of authority to lower level governments, or to semi-autonomous and nonpublic institutions. This section is a discussion of these reasons in terms of
rational goals and critical consequences of decentralization of authority.

1. Rational Goals as Reasons for Decentralization

Rondinelli and Cheema, two of the major proponents of decentralization, have identified a series of rational goals that can be achieved through this process:

1. Decentralization can be a means of overcoming the severe limitations of centrally controlled national planning by delegating greater authority for development planning and management to officials who are working in the field, closer to the problems.

2. Decentralization could lead to the development of greater administrative capability among local governments and private institutions in the regions and provinces, thus expanding their capacities to take over functions that are not usually performed well by central ministries, such as the maintenance of roads and infrastructure investments in areas remote from the national capital. It could also give local officials the opportunity to develop their managerial and technical skills.

3. The efficiency of the central government could be increased through decentralization by relieving top management officials of routine tasks that could be more effectively performed by field staff or local officials.

4. Decentralization of development planning and management functions allows local leaders to locate services and facilities more effectively within communities, to integrate isolated or lagging areas into regional economies, and to monitor and evaluate the implementation of development projects more effectively than can be done by central planning agencies.
The necessity for decentralization in an emerging country was also stressed by the United Nations Division for Public Administration:

Decentralization is especially important in developing countries where rapid expansion of public services greatly increases the number of government transactions and consequently the hindrances and wasted effort resulting from over-centralization of controls.\(^{101}\)

In the view of the UNDPA writers, decentralization will encourage citizens to become more effective participants in the implementation of public programs:

The people will have a better understanding of what government proposes. Through this understanding they will be more likely to adopt the new ideas and practices, use the services offered, contribute their own effort and resources to the programmes, give vitality to new institutions and make constructive adjustments in their lives.\(^{102}\)

They also contended that decentralization by devolution will contribute to national unity:

giving local authorities a sense of participation in the formulation and execution of national development programmes can strengthen the identification of communities with the national government and with people elsewhere in the country.\(^{103}\)

Decentralization implies not only assumption or responsibility at the territorial level, but also management, execution and decision making. These functions are indispensable in implementing the programs which will enable the lower-level government units to respond
rapidly to the needs of the mass society.

2. Critical Consequences of Decentralization

The critical consequences of decentralization of authority are the outcomes that should be expected from decentralization which are not necessarily considered rational goals or causal factors.

1. Decentralization can cut through the enormous amounts of red tape and the highly structured procedures characteristic of central planning and management in developing nations that result in part from the overconcentration of authority, power, and resources at the center of the government in the national capital.

2. Decentralization might allow greater representation for various political, religious, ethnic, and tribal groups in development decision making that could lead to greater equity in the allocation of government resources and investment.

3. By creating alternative means of decision making, decentralization might offset the influence or control over development activities by entrenched local elites, who are often unsympathetic to national development policies and insensitive to the needs of the poorer groups in rural communities.104

The United Nations Division for Public Administration stated that

"Decongestion" of government in the nation's capital relieves members of the legislative and of the national executive from involvement in many purely local issues, frees key officials from onerous and detailed tasks and increases the speed and effectiveness of administration at all levels.105
Friedman, describing the decentralization situation in Chile, also identified certain consequences that should be expected:

The central ministries will have to give up some of their current powers over detailed program decisions, concentrating on the formulation of policy guidelines, the setting of performance standards, information gathering and dissemination, research and coordination. At the regional level, administrative councils will need to be activated, intendentes will have to be given wider authority for coordination of governmental programs as well as a more broadly defined role in the resolution of interest conflicts, and the Regional Planning Office of ODEPLAN will need to be assigned a key role in the preparation of technical planning and programming documents to guide decentralized development. The municipalities, long neglected and antiquated in their methods of administration, will have to strive for greater technical and administrative competence as their functions multiply. New instruments of financing local and regional development will have to be devised, among them, new forms of local taxation, municipal loan programs, systems of grants-in-aid, and loans for regional development.

Decentralization of authority can have positive consequences for enhancement of national development in the generally underdeveloped provincial and regional areas in which the majority of the population spend their lives. Furniss, another proponent, identified some of the positive consequences:

Decentralization may mean the transfer of authority over public enterprises from political officials to a relatively autonomous board, the development of regional economic inputs into national planning efforts; the transfer of administrative functions
either downward in the hierarchy, spatially, or by problem; the establishment of legislative units of smaller size; or the transfer of responsibility to subnational legislative bodies, the assumptions of control by more people within an economically productive enterprise, the hope for a better world to be achieved by more individual participation. 107

The importance of decentralization in local concerns was addressed by the Division for Public Administration of the United Nations:

The central government's development activities can be made more realistic by involving the people locally in important decisions. Fuller account will thereby be taken of local knowledge, needs and interests. Moreover, methods appropriate to the circumstances can more readily be devised for fulfilling local needs. . . . population participation increases the likelihood that services and amenities once established, will be maintained and even expanded . . . and . . . success in fulfilling a community need encourages people to try to meet others. 108

When local needs are met, the quality of life in the community will improve, thus contributing to a higher standard of living for the country as a whole.

The responsibility of government is too great to be discharged successfully by a central unit, assisted by a handful of public employees; decentralization is necessary to distribute the burden of managing and executing public functions through all layers of the national community so as to achieve the government's mission of national development.
2.2.3. The Types of Decentralization

Decentralization is not a single process; there are types of decentralization. Identifying these types and what should be decentralized is especially important for organizational effectiveness.

Furniss identified two major types of decentralization by functions. The first is economic decentralization, including industrial decentralization, regional economic planning decentralization, administrative/internal decentralization, administrative/spatial decentralization and administrative functional decentralization. The second is political decentralization, including legislative decentralization, corporate decentralization and millennial decentralization.

By economic decentralization, Furniss meant the intervention of the government in economic planning and development, with the ultimate goal of utilizing the country's resources fully for maximum, low inflationary outputs. By industrial decentralization, Furniss meant the devolution of operating authority over public enterprises from political ministries or officials to more autonomous managerial boards of directors. By regional economic planning decentralization, he meant the
development of regional economic planning inputs into national planning. This is to be realized through delegation of authority, both legal and financial, to the territorial government units or regional project management.

Administrative/internal decentralization was used by Furniss to indicate vertical decentralization of authority to special councils, boards (ad hoc boards), or bureaus. Administrative/spatial decentralization meant dispersion of authority on a geographic basis throughout the country, as a means of greater control and greater vesting of authority, responsibility and functions. Administrative/functional decentralization was used to indicate devolution of authority to autonomous administrative boards, councils, and agencies not organized into the routine government structure.¹⁰⁹

Furniss used the term "political decentralization" to denote greater individual citizen participation in the decision-making process in an attempt to provide more benefits to the society. By legislative decentralization he meant the transfer of powers from the central legislative bodies to existing or newly established legislative units of smaller size to relieve central
congestion and focus attention on local legislative problems; to permit greater administrative adjustment and flexibility; and to promote the accessibility and accountability of decision makers. By corporate decentralization Furniss meant the assumption of control by more people or workers within an economically productive enterprise with the goal of more economic and organizational efficiency, effectiveness and productivity. Finally, by millenial decentralization he meant broader access to decision-making power to enable more individual participation in which citizens have a meaningful voice in programs and activities that affect their everyday lives.\textsuperscript{110}

Types of decentralization play a crucial role in the achievement of organizational objectives and governmental goals. However, from his analysis of the two types of decentralization described earlier, Furniss concluded that many or all types of decentralization are unrewarding because they tend to impede one another in their implementation. From examining many unproductive results, Furniss concluded that decentralization does not emerge as a superior strategy for social change. There appears to be no alternative but to face the problems of the modern states in terms of substance, not process.\textellipsis One
must choose which type of decentralization is desired and pay the prices in other areas.

Because of his unsystematic choice of the types of decentralization, Furniss's conclusion is less than persuasive; however, it does provide an idea of what can be decentralized besides authority. Hypothetically, the more the types of decentralization there are, the higher will be the degree of decentralization, the greater the productivity and the services of the government, and the higher the degree of improvement of national quality of life.

2.2.4. Concluding Overview

Decentralization as used here is defined as the vesting of authority by the central or higher level of government in the territorial or lower levels of government, by both devolution and deconcentration.

Devolution describes interorganizational or intergovernmental power relationships that are nonhierarchical in the sense that the decentralized public apparatuses are autonomous self-governing public institutions. They are also part of the national governmental system, but they manage, execute and make decisions on most of their functions without supervision or
intervention from the central or higher level of government.

Besides devolution of authority and functions to public apparatuses, there is also devolution to semi-autonomous and nongovernment organizations. In this sense, devolution allows such institutions to administer the devolved functions, previously performed by the higher government, without strong intervention and control.

Deconcentration refers to the vesting of authority and functions by the central government in the territorial government units where the central government establishes its change agents in the provincial, regional, local or rural level as field administrative units. These agents administer tasks and affairs funded by the central government. In a deconcentrated system, most of the decisions on tasks and affairs are made by the central public apparatus, either by the Presidential Office or by the ministries concerned.

In order for the government to influence the direction of all aspects of social change, it must clarify the meanings of the concepts it uses, such as delegation, decentralization, devolution and deconcentration. As the terms authority and power are employed to
denote responsibility delegated to an institution—public, semi-public, or nonpublic—it is the responsibility of the government to define the quantity of authority delegated. Who is responsible for what, or what is the function of each unit must be determined before authority can be delegated or decentralized. When organizational units and the public employees working in them understand the decentralized responsibilities they are expected to assume, they can contribute substantially to the efficiency, effectiveness and productivity of the decentralized authority.

Decentralization of authority has reasons and consequences. Among these are improvement of efficiency in resource allocation and effectiveness in services provision, as well as improvement of the population's ability to be effective participants in the management and execution of public functions and in the decision-making process for national development.

For decentralization to occur as desired, it is important to clarify what is to be decentralized, and the responsibilities to be devolved or deconcentrated. Furseiss identified two major types of decentralization: economic decentralization and political decentralization.
Economic decentralization refers to the intervention of the government in economic planning and development with the ultimate goal of utilizing the country's resources fully for maximum, low inflationary outputs, with efficiency and economy. Political decentralization denotes greater individual citizen participation in the decision-making process and/or representative input into the decision-making structure in an attempt to provide more benefits to the society.

For purposes of this study, two major types are identified:

1. Decentralization of authority by apparatuses, and
2. Decentralization of authority by functions, tasks and affairs.

Decentralization of authority by apparatuses refers to the establishment of territorial government units, notably provincial and metropolitan governments, city and shire governments (regional), town and district governments (local), and village governments (rural), as well as public agencies, semi-public agencies and nonpublic agencies. Decentralization of authority by functions denotes (a) decentralization by tasks, such as making decisions, planning, managing and executing; and (b) decentralization by affairs such as governmental affairs.
(e.g., domestic and financial matters), societal affairs (e.g., educational and religious issues), economic affairs (e.g., agricultural and industrial issues), and physical affairs (e.g., public works and communication matters).

It is possible that decentralization of authority from a central government to a territorial government "may actually tighten centralized controls over local governments and district administrative offices."112 Although decentralization of authority has occurred, the governmental system remains one political entity, and the central government legally still has authority and power over all territorial government units. This means that the decentralized public apparatuses are morally and legally responsible to the central government which has the legal right and duty to control and coordinate them.

Finally, to be efficient and productive, the government must decentralize more authority and functions to the territorial levels. Hypothetically, the more apparatuses, functions and responsibilities that are decentralized, the greater will be the productivity and effectiveness of the government.
2.3. Review of Literature on Development

This section reviews observations of several major proponents of the term development. In one sense development is a continuing process toward modernization, an endeavor to change a society from its static mode to a growing and modern state. In this study, the terms development and modernization are used interchangeably.

The terms "modernization" and "development" are generally synonymous, the exception being that modernization refers to the progress of moving toward that idealized set of relationships posited as modern by various social theorists. Development refers to the process of achieving parity with the world's most economically developed states in the production of goods and services.

Development or modernization takes two forms: tangible (objective) development and intangible (subjective) development. Tangible development is defined as the improvement process (with which development administration deals) whose outcomes are visible or objective, such as agricultural production. Intangible development is the learning process (with which administration development is concerned) whose outputs are non-visible or subjective. This section is organized under the following subtitles:

2.3.1. Tangible (Objective) Development

1. The Concept of Development
2. The Concept of Modernization
3. The Concept of Characteristics of Underdevelopment
4. Economic, Social, and Physical Development
5. Political and Legal Development

2.3.2. Intangible (Subjective) Development
1. Administrative Development
2. Educational Development
3. Organizational Development

2.3.3. Concluding Overview

2.3.1. Tangible (Objective) Development

1. The Concept of Development

Bryant and White contended that development is one of the compelling concepts of our time. It provokes painful questions about values, techniques, and choices. It raises anew the classical query about the nature of the "good society," as well as the problem of who is to decide on society's content and course. Because these are large and difficult problems, it is easy to lose them in generalizations, using the term development as a euphemism for change, modernization, or growth.114

In the authors' view, development is in reality more complex than such words as change, modernization or growth. It is a normative concept implying "choices about goals for achieving what Gandhi called the 'realization of the human potential.'"115
Development, or specifically development action, is a dynamic process employed to define the progressive action of mankind to challenge and change the status quo of the current social reality into a desirable "good society." This kind of development has occurred since the first day of cultural civilization, leading to the scientific civilization of humankind. Because of the differences in time and period of cultural and scientific civilization, there are two polarized societies today: the developed and the less developed. Kautsky has called the development process of the developed societies "the politics of modernization from within," and of the underdeveloped societies "the trauma of modernization from without." By modernization from within, Kautsky meant "the gradual transformation of society . . . brought about by natives of that society and being in a sense organic to the society for a long time." He used the concept of modernization from without to denote "a rather sudden break with the hitherto traditional past [which] can be brought to a society either by foreigners or by some of its own natives, or both."\textsuperscript{116} This observation of development "from within" and "from without" can also be used to describe the polarized society--developed and undeveloped--characteristically
found within a developing nation. Stavenhagen described the characteristics of such a dual society:

[It is apparent] that these are dual societies with a modernized sector and a backward sector that has not yet caught up; that progress will be achieved by diffusion of the products of industrialism from modern and developed zones to backward and traditional zones . . . and that progress will be realized by means of an alliance between urban workers and the peasantry of the countryside.117

Bryant, White, Todaro, Biller and many other proponents of development viewed it as a process which "possesses interrelated political, economic, and social dimensions"118 as well as organizational, administrative and physical dimensions. Thus, development must be defined as a modernizing or change process. "Development can only be fully understood if it is concerned as a process in industrialized countries as well as in the third world."119 Todaro, quoted by Bryant and White, observed the term as implying several qualities challenging the societal reality, and concluded that

it [development] is a multidimensional process involving major changes in social structures, popular attitudes, and national institutions as well as the accelerating of economic growth, the reduction of inequality and the eradication of absolute poverty.120

For Biller, "development refers to an interactional process through which individuals associated in unit networks learn how to articulate and solve problems."121
These definitions indicate that the term "development" objectively implies an "improvement process"--a process whose outcomes are in tangible form. Subjectively it implies a "learning process," whose outputs are in intangible form, such as creation of ability, skills, knowledge to solve the problems facing mankind.

Development as an improvement and a learning process is dynamic. Thus, one can view it as change over time that brings about improvement of the national quality of life, especially for those living in underdeveloped societies that need to be modernized "from without" and "from within." In the language of Palmer,

Development implies a progression from one point to another. In terms of political, economic, and social development, the progression is away from societies organized along traditional tribal and village lines and toward an ideal-type modern society approximated but not fully achieved by the world's more industrialized states.122

In Esman's view,

Development denotes a major societal transformation, a change in system states, along the continuum from peasant and pastoral to industrial organization. The assimilation and institutionalization of modern physical and social technology are critical ingredients. These qualitative changes affect values, behavior, social structure, economic organization and political process.123

Development, then, is an objective improvement process to reshape the governmental, social, economic and
physical environment, transforming it into one whose citizens can enjoy a good life.

2. The Concept of Modernization

Along with the term development, many scholars identify another concept—modernization. According to Heady, this "refers to anything which has more or less recently replaced something which in the past was the accepted way of doing."\textsuperscript{124}

The notion of modernization is related in many ways to development; and many writers use these terms interchangeably. To Palmer, the term modern is used "to refer to an idealized pattern of social, economic, and political arrangements that is yet to be achieved."\textsuperscript{125}

Some scholars who attempt to give the term "modern" more specificity with reference to nation-state, have included as defining features of modernity such manifestations as "mass education, urbanization, industrialization, bureaucratization, and rapid communication and transportation."\textsuperscript{126}

Closely related is the word modernity. To Inkeles and Smith, modernity may be conceived of as

a form of civilization characteristic of our current historical epoch, much as feudalism or the classical
empires of antiquity were characteristic of earlier historic eras. 127...

Just as feudalism was not present in all the world in the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries, so modernity is not found everywhere on the globe. And just as feudalism did, so modernity varies in accordance with local conditions, the history of a given culture, and the period when it was introduced. Within these limits, however, there exists a syndrome of characteristics, readily recognized at both the national and international level, which marks the modern. 128

Modernization derives from the verb "to modernize," which, according to Webster's New World Dictionary, means "to make modern or to bring up to date in style, design and methods." 129 Thus, modernization can be defined as making modern or bringing up to date the status quo of the societal reality.

Whatever may be the hazards of defining modernization generally, there is much less uncertainty about what people who commonly refer to modernization actually do have in mind: the political systems and the inter-related economic and social systems, that are actually found in a limited number of nation-states. 130

In Diamant's view, "it should not be necessary to define precisely what is meant by modernization, except to say it is a sort of transformation." 131 To him, modernization is a "generic process of successfully sustaining new demands, goals, and organizations in a flexible manner." 132

The essentially important observation is by Heady
who pointed out that "modernization is in one sense the most comprehensive of these terms: development, modernization, change and growth, but it is also . . . the most culture and time bound."\textsuperscript{133} In other words, modernization is concerned with the change of the societal reality and its growing from time to time, from not-modern to modern. Such change of societal reality has to do with governmental, social, economic, and physical modernization through development. Lerner described modernization as "a systemic process involving complementary changes in the 'demographic, economic, political, communication, and cultural sectors' of a society."\textsuperscript{134}

Riggs, in speaking of modernization, referred broadly to all the processes of change, particularly cultural and social, as a consequence of the impact of more upon less advanced societies. He agreed that the term "advanced" carries a value loading, but the subjective evaluation by one society of another as "advanced" creates the phenomenon of modernization. This led him to contend that modernization then may refer not to a particular kind of change like "industrialization, Westernization, or Hellenization, but to a phenomenon of historical relativity, to the processes which result whenever a society or state launches--willingly or unwillingly---a chain of transformation designed to reduce the cultural, religious, military, or technological
gap between itself and some other society or state which it admires as more powerful, advanced or prestigious.\textsuperscript{135}

In Palmer's definition,

Modernization refers to the process of moving toward that idealized set of relationships posited as modern. . . . The term will be used to refer to an idealized pattern of social, economic, and political arrangements that is yet to be achieved.\textsuperscript{136}

This study uses the following broad definition: Development is a modernizing process taken by public apparatuses to change the contemporary societal reality--governmental, social, economic and physical, both tangible and intangible--from nonmodern to modern. It is an attempt to improve the capability of the public apparatuses to cope with the modernizing efforts and changing environment. It is an effort to improve the skills, knowledge, and understanding of individual citizens so that they can be effective partners in the governmental decision-making process and in the accomplishment of the government's mission of national development.

3. Characteristics of Underdevelopment

In any modernizing process the emerging society faces many challenges characteristic of an undeveloped nation. In assessing whether development is occurring, Sears asks the following questions:
"What has been happening to poverty? What has been happening to unemployment? What has been happening to inequality?" If all three of these have declined from high levels, then beyond doubt this has been a period of development of the country concerned. If one or two of these central problems have been growing worse, especially if all three have, it would be strange to call the result "development," even if per capita income doubled.137

Malady and Suhartono described the characteristics of underdevelopment as follows:

A state of underdevelopment may be regarded as a state of deficiencies: relatively low per capita income; lack of diversification in the economic activities; predominance of agriculture and the absence of insufficiency of industrial activities; relatively low labor productivity even in the agricultural sector; lack of technological, administrative, managerial, and organizational know-how to ensure a certain kind and level of economic performance and social well-being; vulnerability to the vagaries of international market conditions; small size of the monetized sector, a greater part of which may be owned and/or controlled by foreigners. Not the least important is the fact that the relative structural weaknesses may lead to the state of relative dependence on outside powers even in the determination of the course of national economic events.138

Other characteristics of underdevelopment are primitive, substandard housing, water supply, and electric and gas facilities; poor health care; poor transportation and communication facilities; a high rate of illiteracy; absolute poverty; widespread disease, and shortages of skilled and well-educated manpower.
In contrast, a developed society progresses through "the policies of modernization from within," and possesses a different set of characteristics:

It may be said that the developed economies possess a number of common characteristics by which they can be identified. To mention a few: relatively high per capita income; modern and industrialized production systems, where there exist numerous and significant intersectoral relationships; the economies are nationally integrated, flexible, and capable of self-generated and self-sustained growth; international trade may be important but not crucial; foreign ownership and control of the factors of production may exist, but may not be pervasive, so they have the relative strength and ability to determine the course of domestic economic events on their own terms and on the bases of their own national interests.\[139\]

Other characteristics of advanced societies are standard and modern housing units; availability of water supply, electricity and gas facilities; availability of good health care; modern transportation and communication facilities; a high rate of literacy; and an abundance of well-educated and skilled manpower as well as school facilities.

Modernization has to take place in all sectors of the society if the nation as a whole is to move into the ranks of the developed countries. Traditionally, however, when social scientists talk about development, they usually refer to political development and economic development. As Heady wrote, "More than in the case of
modernization, development tends not to be discussed in total societal terms, but be segmented into phases such as economic or political development.\textsuperscript{140} The next two sections will review some of the kinds of tangible development under the following subtitles: (a) Economic, Social and Physical Development, and (b) Political and Legal Development.

4. Economic, Social and Physical Development

Economic development, according to Braibanti and Spengler, is understood to entail

\textit{the diversion of a nation's scarce and productive powers to the augmentation of its stock of productive wealth and to the progressive enlargement of its gross and net national products of goods and services}.\textsuperscript{141}

Economic development in a broader sense includes many significant purposes, such as expansion of scope of exchange; increase of resource endowments; organizing of human, material, and financial resource flows; and the application of entrepreneurship, according to Uphoff and Ilchman. It is their view that "economic development requires \ldots structural changes such that aggregate production of goods and services is increased."\textsuperscript{142} The especially important observation they have made is to relate economic development directly to the economic
welfare of the mass of society:

What is or should be evident now is that attention must be given to more than increasing the supply of production inputs. The demand for and distribution of outputs is equally important. The whole structure of production—the structure of the economy at the macro level, and the structure of sectors, markets, and firms at the micro level—need to be changed over time so that they can more adequately and efficiently meet the needs of those participating (or wishing to participate) in the production process.  

Commenting on the interrelatedness of the process, John Montgomery saw development "as a seamless web without clear lines of distinction among its cultural, social, economic, and political strands." This study is concerned with governmental, societal, economic, and physical development, which are viewed as manifestations of a generic development process affecting levels of aggregate productivity.

5. Political and Legal Development

i. Political Development

Traditionally, political development involves the political system, process and policy changes, nation-building and sometimes institutional building. According to Heady,

In the teleological case, political development is defined as "movement toward one or more goals or states of being for the political system." The goals
may be single or multiple. If multiple, attainment of one may have to be at the cost of another.\textsuperscript{145}

Heady identified various goals of political development which can reflect value preferences of the political scientists who have selected them:

democracy, equality, stability, legitimacy, participation, mobilization, institutionalization, capability, identity, penetration, distribution, integration, rationalization, bureaucratization, security, welfare, justice, liberty.\textsuperscript{146}

Binder and his associates reduced the goals of political development to three key concepts: "(1) equality, (2) capacity, and (3) differentiation, which are collectively called the 'development syndrome.'"\textsuperscript{147}

Basic to the development syndrome are the contradictions among the rising demands for equality, which involves popular participation, adherence to universalistic laws, and respect for achievement performance; a greater need for capacity and for a more efficient and far-ranging governmental system; and an inexorable tendency toward greater differentiation as the divisions of labor and specialization of tasks become more widespread.\textsuperscript{148}

Coleman, a proponent of political development, viewed the development syndrome as "a continuous interaction among the processes of structural differentiation, the imperatives of equality, and the integrative, responsive, and adaptive capacity of a political system."\textsuperscript{149}

For Coleman, political development is

the acquisition by a political system of a
consciously sought, and a qualitatively new and enhanced political capacity as manifested in the successful institutionalization of (a) new patterns of integration and penetration regulating and containing the tensions and conflicts produced by increased differentiation, and (2) new patterns of participation and resource distribution adequately responsive to the demands generated by the imperatives of equality. The acquisition of such a performance capacity is, in turn, a decisive factor in the resolution of the problems of identity and legitimacy.  

(1). Differentiation

Coleman provided the following definition of differentiation, the first element of the development syndrome: "For our purposes differentiation refers to the process of progressive separation and specialization of roles, institutional spheres, and associations in societies undergoing modernization." In his study, he has found that the pattern of differentiation in the major industrial societies has not been uniform. In some cases, "economic development preceded political development," whereas in other instances "political development apparently has come before many kinds of economic and social development." In many other cases, political, economic, and social differentiation have occurred at relatively the same time. Commenting on the less developed nations, he said that "in most of the new states of Asia and Africa the process has not been synchronous."
His assumption is that "the more highly developed a political system becomes, the greater will be its structural complexity and the larger the number of explicit and functionally specific administrative and political structures it will have."\textsuperscript{152}

(2) Equality

The second component constituting the development syndrome is equality; in connection with political development, it has three significant elements: (a) national citizenship, (b) universalistic legal order, and (c) achievement norms. Concerning national citizenship, Coleman asserted that

\begin{quote}
  citizenship connotes that basic human equality derived from one's full membership in a national political community and embodied in equal formal rights possessed by all citizens. . . . Citizens are legitimately concerned with both the input (participation) and the output (distribution) functions of government.\textsuperscript{153}
\end{quote}

Coleman believed that "universalistic legal order is crucial for the realization of the equal rights of citizenship as defined above." Such an order not only dictates equality before the law and equal treatment in the application and adjudication of the law, but also the equal right to defend and assert as well as to guarantee and protect all other rights, including fundamental human rights and individual or group property rights.\textsuperscript{154} He
believed that achievement rather than ascriptive norms should be the predominant criterion in the allocation of political and bureaucratic roles within the government structure. In his view, achievement norms, coupled with the universal right to education, assure equality of initial opportunity. In sum, equality is necessary in national development to assure fairness in distribution claims and participant rights of citizens, in legal privileges and deprivations, and in initial opportunity. In Heady's terms,

Citizenship rights in the nation-state provide basic equality for members of the political community. Realization of the equal rights of citizenship in turn is dependent on the prevalence of universalistic over particularistic norms, which assure equality before the law as to both legal privileges and deprivations. Achievement norms must predominant over ascriptive norms in recruitment for and allocation to political and bureaucratic roles in the system, so that individuals will be assured of equality of initial opportunity and can then demonstrate their fitness for assignment to the more highly valued roles in the stratified society.

(3) Capacity

The third element of the development syndrome, especially important to political development, is capacity; this denotes attributes that are "integrative, responsive, adaptive, and innovative." For Coleman, capacity is "the ability of a living system not only to
overcome the decisions and manage the tensions created by increased differentiation, but to respond to or contain the participatory and distributive demands generated by the imperatives of equality; it is the ability "to innovate, and manage continuous change, and to adapt" to and cope with the environment. Coleman saw adaptation as the creative power or ability of a developing polity to plan, implement, and manipulate change as part of the process of achieving new goals. Such a creative capacity must include the main attributes of scope, effectiveness, and rationality. Scope is reflected in large volume and wide range of governmental decision making. Effectiveness is manifested not only in the ability to make decisions but also in the capacity to obtain the goals of the decisions made. Since scope and effectiveness depend heavily on rationality, the latter must predominate in governmental decision making and process. The rationality of governmental decision making is possible only by the differentiation of government processes from the influence, intervention, and control of private institutions including religious organizations. Historically, such rationalization of government has been achieved
through centralized civil bureaucracy staffed by personnel whose recruitment and status mobility are governed by achievement norms, and whose decisions reflect what Weber has termed "formal rationality" (i.e., procedural formalization and consistency of principle in decision making).

Coleman held that

The peculiarly modern feature of this development is not the existence of centralized bureaucracy. Rather it is the predominance, pervasiveness, and institutionalization of a rational-secular orientation in political and administrative processes. This orientation is an absolutely indispensable ingredient in the creative capacity of a developing society.

In tracing the contradictions and pressures basic to the development syndrome and their interactions with the fundamental requirement for building a nation, Binder et al. arrived at five significant crises which are components of political development: (a) identity, (b) legitimacy, (c) participation, (d) penetration, and (e) distribution. The identity crisis is used by Binder et al. to denote the subjective basis of membership in a political community, the tension between the culturally and psychologically determined sense of personal-group identity and the political definition of the society. In the modern governmental polity, both subjective and objective political identifications need to coincide. In Binder's view, the identity crisis is not the crisis of any country necessarily, but "a crisis
of great political events in our era.\textsuperscript{160}

The \textit{crisis of legitimacy} is used by Binder et al. to refer to the change in the nature of the ultimate authority to which political obligation is owed. The critical aspect of such a change of legitimacy is the essential tendency toward shifting from the transcendental to the imminent, a decline of the sacred characteristics of political legitimacy, and the spread of nation states' claims to legitimacy. The authors believed that

under modern conditions a legitimate government is elected by the people, or is trustee for the people, or works in the interest of the people, or is a reflection of certain qualities of the people, or reflects what the people will become in the future.\textsuperscript{162}

Speaking of the \textit{crisis of participation}, Binder contended that "the participation crisis represents the most apparent and ubiquitous form in which contemporary political change has occurred."\textsuperscript{163} In his view, the notion of participation refers to involvement in the political process, appearing in the increase in the number of citizens taking part in the political process; it is defined as organized activity aimed at giving normative precision to the governmental decisions made for the whole community or society. Participation of citizens in
the governmental decision-making process can be manifested by extension of suffrage, the growth of parties, the politicization of caste and ethnic groups, and political strikes and demonstrations. Binder cautioned, however, that there can be disadvantages of direct mass participation by those who have a limited capacity to take part knowledgeably and who can reduce the effectiveness of governmental operations. To avoid this, it is important to establish legislative bodies at all levels of decision making and eliminate any distinction between the government and the people. This can be attained by decentralization characterized by a minimal hierarchy of deliberative and legislative bodies. "The principle of autonomy," Binder argued, "or self-regulation expresses the ideal of democratic participation which is meaningful self-rule." 164

The penetration crisis concerns the relations between the political community and its environment, between the rulers and the ruled, between the government and the nation. It is universally characterized by extension of central political control into traditional structures that were previously insulated, and into the remote inaccessible regions of the national territories which had not previously been adequately included in the
governmental operations. The penetration of the governmental system, national ideology, and state policy is essential in accomplishing the government's mission of national development.165

The crisis of distribution, Binder asserted, "is associated with the rapid increase in the popular demand for material benefits from the government and with the contemporary belief that governments are responsible for the level of living in any given country."166 For Heady,

The crisis of distribution is linked to the so-called revolution of rising expectations, and to the demand for governmental intervention to accomplish increases in the standard of living and more equitable allocation of available transferable resources. Allocative responsibility of this sort obviously places severe requirements on the planning skills and structures of distribution of the political system.167

To enhance equal distribution of national benefits, resources and development, the distribution of the governmental system itself plays the decisive role. Equal allocation and effective distribution of responsibility can be achieved only through decentralization of authority.

Speaking of the five crises as experienced by both developed and less developed countries throughout the world, Binder et al. stated:

Countries that have clearly established their sense
of national identity and achieved a broad recognition of the legitimacy of their system of government before they are confronted with the demand for universal participation in public affairs are, for example, significantly different from countries in which popular participation precedes either the legitimation of public institutions or the penetration of the governmental system into the mass of society.\textsuperscript{168}

Pye believed that political development can be described as

the political prerequisite of economic development; the politics typical of industrial societies; political modernization; the operation of a nation-state; administrative and legal development; mass mobilization and participation; the building of democracy, stability and orderly change; mobilization and power; and one aspect of a multi-dimensional process of social change.\textsuperscript{169}

Pye held that all these descriptors have in common an emphasis on "the growth of equality, of the capacity of political systems, and of differentiation and specialization within systems." He also commented on the six crises of identity, contending that they may be met in different sequences, but must all be successfully dealt with for a society to become a modern nation-state.\textsuperscript{170}

Binder and his associates defined political development in terms of the functional requisites of a modernizing political system:

The idea of political development is that in modern systems identity will be politicized, legitimacy will
be based in part on performance, governments will be capable of mobilizing national resources, the majority of the adult population will be participant citizens, political access will be ubiquitous, and material allocations will be rational, principle, and public.171 . . .

Political development . . . refers to changes in the type and style of politics. It refers to the informal political process that must always be a challenge to the formal processes, and to the new requirements that are demanded of institutions if they are to maintain stability and cope responsibly with social conflict.172

Riggs referred to political development as the process of politicization: increasing participation or involvement of the citizens in state activities, in power calculations, and consequences. In the process of development the citizenry becomes progressively involved in matters of state, i.e., politicized. The politicization of a population by its progressive involvement in groups organized by the state as "transmission belts" (to use Joseph Stalin's colorful phrase) for policy implementation is a political matter, even if we label it an administrative development. But the fact that we do label such developments administrative blinds us to their political significance.173

Palmer saw the challenge of political development as creating a system of political institutions capable of controlling the state's population, of mobilizing the state's human and material resources toward the ends of economic and social modernization, and of coping with the strain of social, economic, and political change without abdicating its control and mobilization roles. States in which the political system has met this challenge over a substantial period of years will be considered politically developed.174

Viewing political development from both formal and
contemporary substantive aspects, Needler considered it "the process of transition from one stable equilibrium state of the polity to another, with stability conceived of as the regular functioning of the polity in accordance with the norms it posits for itself," and contemporarily as the "extension of the polity to include the maximum number of participants in political processes in terms of equality." Thus, the two essential dimensions for political development are the attainment of constitutional integrity and participation on terms of equality. 175

Jaguaribe considered political development to be political institutionalization. In this context he regarded the referents of "political institutionalization as political mobilization, political integration, and political representation," 176 while Pye, Karle W. Deutsch and Huntington similarly viewed it as "the institutionalization of political organization and procedures." According to Huntington, "Institutionalization and hence political development take place when the political process goes in the direction of adaptability, complexity, autonomy, and coherence, as against their polar opposites of rigidity, simplicity, subordination, and disunity." 177

Jaguaribe stressed the close relationship between
political modernization and political institutionalization, and noted that political development requires an appropriate balance between the two. He identified three essential aspects of political development: (a) development of the capability of the political system, with capability being the effectiveness of the polity as a subsystem of the social system; (b) development of the contribution of the political system to the overall development of the concerned society, thus dealing with the development of the whole society by political means; and (c) development of the responsiveness of the political system, that is, the system's capability to deal with the development of political consensus and social consensus by political means.¹⁷⁸

This study uses the term in a narrow sense, which is different from the traditional definition of political development. Here the term "governmental development" replaces "political development" as defined traditionally. This can be better understood from the following description by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations:

"Political development, which is part of the process of national development, has often been defined as modernization of the political system of a country or transformation of the policy from a traditional to a modern system. Before the First World War political
development meant the continuation of the efforts (which started in the sixteenth century) to build a sovereign nation-state, the strengthening of the power of the central government in place of that of feudal and local interests, the transfer of political power to a constitutional government or a representative form of government, the attainment of political equality, and the enhancement of government capacity to facilitate economic and other aspects of national development through maintenance of order and peace, modernization of the law, provision of infrastructure where necessary, and maintenance of freedom of trade and free competition in the market. . . . Structurally speaking, political development meant the building of an integrated government machinery for the making and execution of laws, which comprises various branches of government and their interrelations and different ministries or departments of the executive branch of government, as well as other public organizations. From the viewpoint of governmental capacity, political development meant the establishment of a legal-rational political authority, which may be defined as a legally established impersonal order in which public policy making is not based on superhuman or supernatural considerations and in which persons who obey commands obey only the law. . . . In this connection, political development also meant the strengthening of the administrative arm of government. To enhance the capacity of the administrative arm is an essential part of any attempt at improving the political capacity of a government. 179

In this study, the concept of political development is used in its narrow sense to mean only political institutionalization, such as establishment of political parties, participation of the mass population in national elections, education of the citizenry about national ideology, national integrity, political unification,
state policy, democratization, nationalism, and patriotism. The political system deals only with politics, or matters which are political rather than administrative, organizational, and legal. Governmental development means, in its narrow sense, organizational development, legal development, administrative development, and political development. In its broader meaning, it is used to denote the development of governmental affairs, justice and security affairs, foreign affairs, and financial affairs.

ii. Legal Development

Legal development can be defined as a process which provides for creation of good constitutional laws, operating rules, regulations, ordinances, executive orders, and instructions. These are procedures which can be used to establish a consistent legal system that can guarantee what Binder and others call "the legitimacy" of the established public apparatuses or organizations. In any governmental setting, the operation of public apparatuses is based on constitutional laws and the provisions of such laws. The goal of legal development is not only to enact laws but to make good laws. Good laws can lead to good management and effective execution of
developmental functions. A good law not only makes a
public apparatus an effective instrument of the nation
and the state, but also a powerful governmental tool.
As Lowi has put it,

No government is more powerful than one whose agen-
cies have good laws to implement. Much is spoken and
written of the problem of bureaucracy and how to keep
it under presidential control or to insure its effec-
tiveness and its responsibility, but nothing serves
better to direct bureaucracy than issuing it clear
orders along with powers.130

Legal development must be geared to creation of
good laws that in turn can create healthy, strong, power-
ful, and good government. This is essential in the
creation of a representative government that is effi-
cient, productive, accountable, and responsive in allo-
cating resources and providing services.

2.3.2. Intangible Development

Intangible development as used here is a compre-
hensive learning process that leads to improved leader-
ship, managerial and executive capability of public appa-
ratuses to perform public functions. It also results in
improved ability, skills, knowledge and understanding
among all citizens, enabling them to be effective par-
ticipants in the governmental decision-making process and
in national development. To achieve these ends, three
types of substantive development must occur:
1. Administrative development
2. Educational development
3. Organizational development

1. Administrative Development

Wilson, the father of Administrative Science, wrote in 1887 that "administration is as old as government itself." He believed that there should be a science of administration which shall seek to straighten the paths of government, to make its business less unbusinesslike, to strengthen and purify its organization, and to crown its duties with dutifulness. . . .

It is the object of administrative study to discover, first, what government can properly and successfully do, and secondly, how it can do these proper things with the most possible efficiency and at the least possible cost either of money or of energy. As a learning process, administrative development is geared toward creation of a government that is capable of managing and executing public functions with efficiency and economy. Thus, administrative development can be both: learning from studying administration, and learning from practicing administration. More than a century later in 1970, Riggs introduced two important interrelated concepts: the administration of development, and the development of administration. This study uses the term "development of administration" in the form "admin-
istrative development."

In Riggs' view,

First, development administration refers to the administration of development programs, to the methods used by large-scale organizations, notably governments, to implement policies and plans designed to meet their developmental objectives. A second meaning associated with the term "development administration," by implication rather than directly, involves the strengthening of administrative capabilities. Clearly, if development programs are successfully carried out, they will include changes in a policy's environment which may well, in turn, enhance its administrative capabilities. The improvement of education, for example, should increase the ability of a population to support good government and also identify its demand for better public services. ... Consequently, the improvement of administrative capabilities is an important means for achieving developmental goals in any economic sector.182

To Riggs and many others, development administration involves transformation of environmental conditions, raising of standards of education, improvement of public health, expansion of economic production, construction of roads, dams, power plants and irrigation works, and conservation and more effective utilization of natural resources. Development of administration has to do with the successful implementation of such programs, along with efficient allocation of resources for them. Development of administration thus deals with the administrative capability of a public apparatus administering those
kinds of development. Therefore, improving the administrative capability of such a public apparatus is a prerequisite to development. It appears thus, that administrative capability is a crucial factor in determining the success or failure of national development efforts.

Researchers in the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs stated that

development of administration [means] improvement of the administrative capability for development, administrative capability being the capacity to obtain intended results through organizations. Administrative capacity may refer to the management capacity of government or to the public sector as a whole, to the administrative capability of specific organizations or sets of organizations, or to the administrative feasibility of specific development projects or programmes.¹⁸³

In reference to the public sector as a whole, administrative capability can be defined as the ability of the administrative arms of government to perform, manage and execute public functions toward achieving overall organizational objectives. Administrative capability for national development, therefore, is the ability of the public apparatuses involved to achieve development objectives and goals.

Speaking to quantitative measuring of administrative capability, writers in the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs asserted that
administrative capability means the ability to mobilize inputs and increase their productivity or efficiency. For the country as a whole, the administrative capability for development is measured by the performance of the administrative arms of government in achieving maximum output, or the highest possible national product, or national product per capita through mobilization and the most efficient (or most productive) use of inputs (or resources). For an individual organization or project, the administrative capacity is similarly measured by the mobilization and utilization of inputs to produce output.  

Esman saw administrative development as involving the development of capability, not only in public apparatuses but also in the manpower working in those organizations.

Administrative development involves building the capabilities of human beings and of social institutions and reforming well-established practices—which means that time and sustained energies are needed to effect deliberate progress. . . . A 5 or 6 percent net increase in national income a year denotes growth, but not necessarily development. Far more important would be a comparable growth in administrative capabilities in any developing country, for this would demonstrate increased capacity to combine and use resources more effectively, to respond to new opportunities, and to distribute the benefits of growth more equitably.

Public apparatuses are means to achieve ends; therefore, if they are to be effective public instruments, the traditional practice of emphasizing control of them should be replaced by emphasis on the management and executive capacity of such public apparatuses to attain their organizational objectives. Esman believed that
emphasis on control of bureaucracy in the context of most of the developing countries is a dangerously misplaced priority, one that might seriously retard their rate of progress. We ought to be much more concerned with increasing the capacity of the bureaucracy to perform, and this we see as a function of greatly enhanced professional capability and operational autonomy rather than further controls. Palmer correctly identified the importance of a capable government structure:

Political and economic development cannot be achieved without a competent bureaucracy. Regardless of how lofty the goals of the regime or how adept it is at generating enthusiasm for its programs, policy decisions are not self-enforcing. It is the bureaucracy which must transform hope into a reality. In sum, administrative development or development of administration means the learning process for improving the management and executive capability necessary for obtaining intended results through organizations and manpower. Improvement of administrative capability is indispensable for accomplishing organizational activities.

The administrative capacity of public apparatuses is measured by the quantity of their outputs in terms of goods and services; it is also measured by their capability to serve and reshape the governmental, societal, economic and physical environment. Another measure is their capacity to increase the skills, knowledge and understanding of public employees and citizens, making
them more effective participants in national development. The latter point leads to the review of literature on educational development as a process for creation of a capable work force and responsible citizenry.

2. Educational Development

The scientific thinking that fosters competent performance of public functions and creative problem solving comes from education. Only education can create scientific and creative thinkers. The administrative capacity and the management and executive capability of public apparatuses depend on the ability of the public employees working in them. To generate a trained and responsible work force, educational development must occur. "The improvement of education . . . should increase the ability of a population to support good government and also intensify its demand for better public services."\textsuperscript{188}

From the standpoint of Public Administration, the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs used the term "education" to refer to pre-entry preparation in both general and specialized fields.\textsuperscript{189} Education in general thus starts with the home or the family, and extends through elementary and secondary schools to
undergraduate and graduate schools. Besides education, there is training after entry to public service. In their study, the United Nations experts used the term "training" to indicate the teaching-learning process at the point of entry and after entry\textsuperscript{190} into public service.

Training is necessary because no matter how well qualified a person may be at the time of recruitment (whether carried out through open competitive examination or through other means), he still has certain inadequacies and therefore much to learn before becoming a really effective civil servant. This is the reason why in some countries a person who is newly recruited into a service must first go through a period of training before being assigned to specific duties. . . .

Training of civil servants must be conceived in very broad terms. It is important to bear in mind that education and training in public administration are long-term processes. No single programme of education or training is able to cover all areas. Some must learn in education institutions, some in formal training programmes, some through apprenticeship and self-development. A public administrator must continuously learn and improve his administrative capability throughout his career. In a sense, his whole career is a learning process.\textsuperscript{191}

Traditionally, training of public servants has been geared to fostering honesty, integrity, and respect for laws, rules, regulations, and state policies. Since the Second World War, both by education and practice, public administrators have become involved in decision making, problem solving, and policy making. To be
effective public servants, public administrators in developing states must develop their individual potential to become leaders, managers, policy makers, policy executors, and public servants, all at the same time.

Training public administrators in the skills of decision making, problem solving, policy analysis and future studies (forecasting and projection) is one of the most important aspects of a programme of education and training in development administration, especially for senior administrators and those who will eventually reach the senior level. 92

The objective of educational development and training is to staff public apparatuses with well educated manpower who can effectively organize, plan and implement any public program, including the government program of decentralization of authority. Thus, well educated and well trained personnel can be enabling instruments for greater decentralization of authority to national territories, especially those underdeveloped areas which have shortages of skilled manpower.

Staffing is the most vital element of any program of decentralization for development purposes. A government may organize effectively for decentralization, mark out optimum areas for administration, allocate functions rationally between units at different levels and arrange for popular participation and representation in the program; but the success of the programme will, in the end, depend largely on the availability of qualified staff for sustained work in small towns and rural areas, the rapport between the staff and the people, the ability of staff members to work effectively together and the administrative as
well as technical support and supervision they receive. 

Emphasis must be placed on changes in manpower attitude, and leadership and managerial style. Motivation should become an important area of development for future public administrators.

3. Organizational Development

The capability of public apparatuses to achieve their missions cannot be limited to political development (e.g., wider mass participation in the decision-making process of government), legal development (e.g., creation of good laws), administrative development (e.g., creation of good management and execution of public functions), and educational development (e.g., creation of qualified and capable public employees). It must also involve organizational development, which refers to governmental arrangements or structures. The manner in which governmental units or public agencies are organized can facilitate or impede their organizational effectiveness.

The ultimate objective of organizational development is to rearrange existing governmental structures to fit the growing environment in which they operate. In Beer's terms,

Organizational Development (OD) may be seen as a
process for diagnosing organizational problems by looking for incongruencies between environment, structures, processes, and people. OD is a system-wide process of data collection, diagnosis, action planning, intervention, and evaluation aimed at (1) (1) enhancing congruence between organizational structure, process, strategy, people, and culture; (2) developing new and creative organizational solutions; and (3) developing the organization's self-renewing capacity. Beer identified other basic tenets of OD which he claimed were different from those of other approaches:

1. OD seeks to create self-directed change to which people are committed.

2. OD is a system-wide change effort.

3. OD typically places equal emphasis on solving immediate problems and long-term development of an adaptive organization.

4. OD places more emphasis than other approaches on a collaborative process of data collection, diagnosis and action for arriving at problem solutions.

5. OD often leads to new organizational arrangements and relationships that break with traditional bureaucratic patterns.

6. In OD efforts the change agent brings two types of competencies to the organization. He brings knowledge about organization design, management practices, and interpersonal dynamics. He also brings skills in working with individuals and groups.

In sum, organizational development offers public apparatuses and public employees the means to discover organizational solutions for incongruent structures and ineffective areas of public apparatuses. It tends to
move toward modernization of existing governmental, social, economic and physical systems and methods. It helps create better governmental arrangements or structures which then contribute to enlarged organizational capability to accomplish organizational objectives. This study dealt exclusively with organizational development toward restructuring and expanding governmental arrangements in a national territory—in this case, the Province of Irian Jaya—at the regional (city and shire) and local (town and district) levels.

2.3.3. Concluding Overview

From the preceding review, it appears that development is a modernizing process to change, reshape and transform the current societal reality. As a modernizing process, development implies two essential forms: tangible development and intangible development. Tangible development is an objective improvement process whose outputs are visible; intangible development is a subjective learning process whose outcomes are in a less concrete form. To be effective, tangible and intangible development must take place in all areas of development: (a) governmental, (b) societal, (c) economic, and (d) physical.
Tangible development is a subjective improvement process to modernize an underdeveloped society characterized by primitive and substandard housing facilities; poor water supply, electricity and gas facilities; poor health care and health facilities; poor transportation and communication facilities; a high rate of illiteracy; absolute poverty, widespread disease, and massive unemployment.

To enhance tangible development, intangible development, defined as a learning process, must occur at the same time. The purposes of intangible development are (a) to create capable and responsible public apparatuses with the capacity to achieve the objectives and goals of tangible development with efficiency and economy; and (b) to improve the understanding and competency of public employees in particular and citizens in general to become effective partners in national development. To achieve these aims, administrative, educational, and organizational development must take place in conjunction with political, legal, societal, economic and physical development. Administrative development is aimed at improving the managerial and executive capability of public apparatuses in the accomplishment of
their mission of national development. Educational development is aimed at improving the skills, knowledge and understanding of the citizenry. Organizational development is concerned with effective structuring and arranging of government settings and establishments throughout the country.

To enhance tangible and intangible development, differentiation of labor and equal distribution of responsibility must take place. Such an action can help to assure participation of all strata of the national community in the governmental decision-making process and, ultimately, in national development. All these steps will strengthen the national integrity and political unification of the nation as well as improve efficiency in allocation of resources and effectiveness in providing public services and goods. The ultimate objectives of tangible and intangible development are to improve the national quality of life, raise the standard of living of all citizens, and promote the welfare of the nation.

2.4. Analysis of the Association between Decentralization of Authority and National Development

For modernization to be realized, national development must take place; however, it cannot occur without formal arrangements that must be pursued by the
exercise of authority. Legal authority or legitimate power is delegated by the people to the government. This delegation of authority implies not only responsibility but also responsiveness of the government. Delegation creates a reciprocal relationship between the people from whom authority is derived, and the government to which authority is delegated. Under a system of delegation of authority, a public apparatus can be established to accomplish a defined mission, determined in advance and entrusted to it. A mission constitutes a public affair, which is an activity involved with development. In this study all public affairs that must be developed are grouped into four major categories, each of which is further divided into six sub-development fields:

I. **Governmental affairs:** (1) governing (i.e., interior, organizational, legal, administrative and political), (2) interior, (3) foreign, (4) justice, (5) security, and (6) financial.

II. **Societal affairs:** (7) educational and cultural, (8) social welfare, (9) religious, (10) health, (11) human services, and (12) labor and manpower.

III. **Economic affairs:** (13) economic and trade, (14) agriculture, (15) fishery, (16) forestry, (17) business
and industrial, (18) mineral resources and energy.

IV. Physical affairs: (19) housing, (20) public works, (21) agrarian affairs, (22) transportation (i.e., land, sea, air, lake, and river), and (23) communication (i.e., postal service, telephone, telegraph, television, radio, and mass media services), and (24) environmental (i.e., sanitation, conservation).

Development must occur in all 24 areas because they are independent from each other, even though their outputs are interrelated in achieving the goals of the government and the state. Also, development of the 24 areas must occur in all regions of the country and all levels of government--not only the central level but the territorial or lower governmental levels as well.

The outcomes of such national development must benefit all citizens--not only those living in the central regions, but also those in the prefectoral, regional, local, or rural areas. Therefore, the activities of development, both tangible and intangible, must be evenly distributed throughout the country as far as possible. Such nationwide distribution will allow the burden of national development to be borne by all its beneficiaries. Equal participation of all layers of society can enhance the development itself, and yield
more efficient outcomes in the following areas:

1. **Governmental**: improving the managerial and executive capacity of public apparatuses; improving the skills, knowledge, understanding and competency of citizens in general and public employees in particular; increasing participation of the masses in the governing process; providing universal suffrage; and modernizing governmental systems, methods, and public facilities.

2. **Societal**: eliminating illiteracy, improving school facilities, raising standards of education, improving housing facilities, strengthening the individual citizen's faith in God; eliminating disease; decreasing unemployment; improving public health and health care facilities, creating a healthy environment; improving social welfare, and creating a responsible work force of skilled and creative manpower.

3. **Economic**: eradicating absolute poverty, improving economic production; improving agricultural, fishery and forestry production; conserving natural resources; improving energy facilities and services; improving business and industrial production; modernizing irrigation, farming and fishing methods.

4. **Physical**: improving water supply, electricity and
gas facilities; improving transportation and communication facilities.

To achieve such tangible and intangible developments, organizational means and formal governmental arrangements must be established. This study has identified the organizational means as government units and public agencies, described earlier. The public agencies to be established consist of 23 units, each with a delineated area of public affairs as its mission. The establishment of these public apparatuses must occur throughout the entire nation state; in this way they can assume the responsibility of managing and executing public functions necessary for realization of the government mission of development nationwide.

The establishment of public apparatuses can be accomplished only through delegation of authority—first, by the people to the central government; second, by further delegation by this unit to territories within the nation. This will allow decentralization both by devolution and deconcentration to the lower levels of government.

In the actual practice of government, legal authority is exercised to enact laws that establish public apparatuses of both central and territorial governments.
as well as public agencies for the purpose of allocating human, material, and financial resources. Based on the provisions of those national laws, the established public apparatuses have the authority and obligation to accomplish the government mission of development nationwide. To enable public apparatuses to accomplish this development, national resources must be allocated.

For the government to be efficient and productive, public apparatuses, public functions and national resources must be decentralized on a geographic basis. Public apparatuses decentralized by devolution are provincial government units—provincial or metropolitan; regional government units—city or shire; local government units—town or district; and rural government units—village. In this study, the twenty-three public agencies to be decentralized, both by devolution and deconcentration are (1) governmental affairs, (2) interior affairs, (3) justice affairs, (4) security affairs, (5) financial affairs, (6) educational and cultural affairs, (7) social welfare affairs, (8) religious affairs, (9) health affairs, (10) human service affairs, (11) labor and manpower affairs, (12) economic and trade affairs, (13) agriculture affairs, (14) fishery affairs,
(15) forestry affairs, (16) business and industrial affairs, (17) mineral resources and energy affairs, (18) housing affairs, (19) public works affairs, (20) agrarian and environmental affairs, (21) transportation affairs, (22) communication affairs, and (23) mass communication affairs.

Besides decentralization of public apparatuses, decentralization of public functions—both tasks and affairs—must occur. The twenty-three public agencies listed above define the public affairs that must be decentralized to the territorial and lower levels. These twenty-three together constitute the activities that must be implemented to achieve national development.

The tasks that must be decentralized are of two kinds: management and execution. Management is the task of the public employee holding a leadership position, and execution is the task of the public employee who is a staff member, or subordinate. Without decentralization of these two functions or tasks, the decentralized public apparatuses cannot carry out the work of decentralized public affairs to achieve national development.

The tasks constituting management are to direct, to make decisions, to staff (i.e., recruit, select and place), to communicate, to assign tasks, to allocate
resources, to provide services and goods, to assume routine responsibilities, to supervise, to monitor, and generally to control public organizational units and public employees under the direct chain of management to execute public tasks and affairs.

The tasks of execution are to plan, to organize, to budget, to collect data and information, to analyze data collected, to communicate, to report, to make recommendations and suggestions, to participate in the organizational decision-making process, to implement decisions made, and to perform all other organizational routines.

Operationalization of public functions, for example, can occur as follows: governmental, societal economic and physical development must be planned and budgeted. Decisions must be made on the planned, budgeted affairs before their implementation. The planning and budgeting process must be managed and executed according to operating rules and regulations. This is what is meant by exercising delegated or decentralized authority.

Besides decentralization of public apparatuses and public functions, decentralization of national resources must also take place. Without allocation of
resources to be converted into goods and services, national development cannot be implemented. This decentralization must be done on a geographic basis country-wide, to provide for equal improvement of quality of life for all citizens.

In many developing nation states, development has been uneven, resulting in underdeveloped regions scattered throughout the nation. These regions are underdeveloped because they lack the public apparatuses that can directly assume responsibilities for planning for development or which can enable allocation of resources for development. The areas are too large for developmental activities to be administered in them successfully by a single decentralized unit. Thus, more decentralization of authority needs to occur, from the territorial to regional or local units of government; this will allow more decentralization of resources and the enhancement of the development process. Hypothetically, the smaller the shire or the district, the higher will be the degree of development and the faster the improvement in quality of life of the people. When the regional or local government jurisdiction is small, coordination and communication are easier and more effective. In a small area, problems can be identified more easily; and under a
decentralized local unit of government, these problems can be dealt with in a much more timely fashion.

2.5. Concluding Overview

The review of literature on authority, decentralization and development, as well as analysis of the association between decentralization of authority and national development have shown that these concepts have an inseparable, reciprocating relationship binding them in an interdependent system to accomplish defined objectives and goals. The legal authority clarifies and justifies the right to decentralize public apparatuses, along with public functions and national resources, while decentralization itself is a subjective means to vest authority in the territorial or prefectural, regional, local and rural levels throughout the entire nation state. The goal of delegation and decentralization of authority by apparatuses and by functions is to enable national development, tangible and intangible.

For national development to be achieved, authority must be delegated and decentralized to establish public apparatuses which can execute all public functions related to national development. Further, delegation of authority allows the established public
apparatuses—both government units and public agencies—to allocate national resources to enhance development.

Through decentralization of authority, national development can be distributed equally nationwide. This distribution will allow all layers of the society to participate in and share the substantial burden of managing and executing the activities of development.

Developing nation states must learn to differentiate and distribute the work of development equally throughout the entire country, if possible. The tasks and affairs are so many and so great they they can be managed with efficiency and economy only through more and greater decentralization of authority by apparatuses and by functions.

Finally, to achieve the ultimate goals of development—to improve the national quality of life, to raise the standard of living of all individual citizens, and to promote the general welfare of the nation—development must take place nationwide in all the interrelated areas: governmental, economic, social, and physical. Development can be achieved most efficiently and productively through decentralization of authority to smaller regional or local government units.
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CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The methodology of any science, whose goal is to develop a valid practice and verified general theory, involves its rule of interpretation and criteria for admissible explanation, as well as the research designs, data collection techniques, and data processing routines which have been developed from these rules and criteria.¹

The research methodology of this study is organized as follows:

3.1. Research Model
2. Research Design
3. Research Hypothesis of the Study
4. Data Gathering Methods
5. Reliability and Validity of Research Method and Data Collected
6. Samples as Units of Analysis and their Selection Procedure

3.1. Research Model

The research model used to explain the factors relating to the research problem—decentralization of authority for national development—has three interdependent elements as variables: (a) control elements, (b) structural aspects of decentralization of authority, and (c) consequence of decentralization of authority. A graphic presentation of this research model appears below:
3.1.1. Control Elements and Consequence of Decentralization of Authority

Control elements are indispensable third factors which, in the practical conduct of government and development, enlarge the association between decentralization of authority and the consequence of this decentralization, or the output of development. Such controlling factors are human resources, natural resources, material resources, financial resources, gross national product, and gross national product per capita. These third factors can be used to explain the relationship between decentralization of authority and its consequence, or the output of development. Control elements are the control or third variables in the study. For purposes of this research, only the third variable, GNP per capita is used. This is because of data availability and the probable strong association of this variable with other
exogenous factors.

3.1.2. Structural Aspects of Decentralization of Authority

In this study, the term "structural aspects of decentralization of authority" indicates decentralization of authority by apparatuses, both subgovernments and public agencies, and by functions, both public affairs (i.e., governmental, societal, economic and physical) and public tasks (i.e., the task of management and the task of execution). Examples of structural aspects of decentralization of authority are subgovernment units (i.e., prefectural, regional, local and rural), number of public agencies, volume of public functions as well as average size of governing area per prefecture in square miles, prefectoral government units per million population, territorial government unit density in square miles, and average size of population per prefecture. These are indicators of decentralization of authority which can be used to measure the degree of such decentralization. They are the independent variables (Dv) in this study.

3.1.3. Consequence of Decentralization of Authority

In this study the term "consequence of decentralization of authority" means development output, both
tangible and intangible. Such outputs are the result of (a) societal affairs development, (b) economic affairs development, and (3) physical affairs development. Consequence of decentralization of authority is the dependent variable (Cv) in this study.

3.2. Research Design

There are several types of research designs, along with their research methods or techniques, from which the researcher can select the one most applicable for his or her study.

Selection of research design depends on such issues as (1) the kinds of information it provides, (2) how clean or pure the data are—that is, how confident the researcher can be about inferences made about the findings, (3) the amount of time required and available to perform the research, and (4) what kinds of resources are needed by the researcher and organization to use the design.  

The research design of this study is nonexperimental; it consists solely of the "observation of naturally occurring phenomena without any attempt to manipulate them so as to permit clearer comparisons to be made." This type of nonexperimental design is called static-group comparison; it is concerned with causal comparative studies that may be conducted when experimental designs cannot be employed. The method involves
a comparison between two situations: treatment versus no treatment, or experienced versus non-experienced, or decentralization versus no decentralization. The design is diagrammed as follows:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
  \times \\
  \hline \\
  0_1 \\
  \hline \\
  0_2 \\
\end{array} \]

In this design, there is a comparison of a group which has experienced X with a group which has not, for the purpose of establishing the effects of X.\(^5\) The broken line between the groups indicates that they are intact-groups, or static-groups.\(^6\) According to Campbell and Stanley, the absence indicated in the diagram by the broken lines separating the two groups provides the next factor needing control, i.e., selection. Thus, it is important to stress that in this design "there is no means of certifying that the groups were equivalent at some prior time."\(^7\) To put it another way,

the comparison being made is not between two groups controlled by sorting or assigning individuals before treatment began, but rather on the basis of an attempt to find a comparison group that matches the naturally selected treatment as closely as possible in terms of key characteristics.\(^8\)

When the researcher observes an empirical relationship between two variables and then simply suggests a reason for that relationship, this is sometimes called ex post facto (from after the fact)
hypothesizing. He has generated an hypothesis linking two variables after their relationship is already known.*

"Thus, the designation ex post facto, Latin for 'from after the fact,' serves to indicate that the research in question is conducted after variations in the independent variable have already been determined in the natural course of events." Kerlinger defined ex post facto research as

systematic empirical inquiry in which the scientist does not have direct control of independent variables because their manifestations have already occurred or because they are inherently not manipulable. Inferences about relations among variables are made, without direct intervention, from concomitant variation of independent and dependent variables.11

This study dealt with decentralization as an attributive independent variable; in such a nonexperimental investigation, i.e., an ex post facto study or explanatory descriptive study, it can be hypothesized that Dv, decentralization of authority, is related to and presumably a determiner of Cv, consequence of decentralization of authority, i.e., development. This can be presented in a diagram using the static-group comparison design as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
Dv \\
\hline
\text{Cv}_1 \\
\text{Cv}_2 
\end{array}
\]
Thus, if in his or her study the researcher observes that a relationship exists between Dv, decentralization of authority (independent variable) and Cv, consequence of decentralization of authority, then his or her hypothesis will be that the higher the degree of decentralization of authority, the greater will be the amount of consequence or output of development.

Further, in order for the researcher to gain a better understanding of the original relationship between Dv and Cv, he or she should introduce a third variable, defined as a control variable or test factor, into his or her study analysis. This methodological procedure is called process of elaboration by proponents of the subject. The aim of such analysis is to determine whether or not the association between Dv (independent variable) and Cv (dependent variable) is due to Rv (control variable). This process of elaboration can be diagrammed using ex post facto design as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rv (Control Variable)</th>
<th>Dv (Independent Variable)</th>
<th>Cv (Dependent Variable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Elements</td>
<td>Decentralization of Authority</td>
<td>Consequence of Decentralization of Authority: Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therefore, in this study, to say that the relationship between Dv and Cv is due to Rv indicates that were it not for Rv, there would be almost no relationship between Dv and Cv. The notion, "were it not for" Rv, which has a procedural aspect, is used to mean "to control" the test factor (control variable), thereby eliminating its influence on the (original) relationship between Dv and Cv. This can be done by utilizing a technique called "subgroup classification" (i.e., stratification of the test or control variable, Rv), a research technique that does not involve statistics. In this type of analysis, the data on Rv, Dv, and Cv can be presented in tables or graphs, usually in percentages and/or frequencies. In this case it is presumed that countries having a lower degree of decentralization of authority are less likely to develop than are countries having a higher degree of decentralization of authority. This observation is depicted in the hypothetical Table 3.1. In seeking reasons for the situation shown in this table, one might consider the factor of resources; i.e., were countries with a lower degree of decentralization not poor in or short of resources, they would not be less developed.
TABLE 3.1
DECENTRALIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT
(HYPOTHETICAL CASE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Less Centralized Countries</th>
<th>More Decentralized Countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next task is to rule out the influence of resources by comparing less and more decentralized countries possessing equal or similar resources. Thus, one compares the value of resources of the countries that are resource-poor and those that are resource-rich, as depicted in the hypothetical Table 3.2.

The example in the table suggests that among countries that are rich in resources, the ones with greater decentralization are more likely to have advanced development programs than are the resource-rich countries with less decentralization. The same pattern can be expected in resource-poor countries. There is, thus, a relationship between decentralization (Dv) and
### TABLE 3.2
DECENTRALIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT, BY RESOURCES (HYPOTHETICAL CASE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Rich Resources</th>
<th>Poor Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less decentralized countries</td>
<td>More decentralized countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

devolution (Cv) regardless of the level of resources.\(^{17}\)

This suggests that countries with a higher degree of decentralization of authority are more likely to develop, even with differences in resources.

The above observation can be presented in a diagram using ex post facto design according to the factors—control, independent, and dependent variables—used in this study:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rv (Control Variable)</th>
<th>Dv (Independent Variable)</th>
<th>Cv (Dependent Variable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controlling Element</strong></td>
<td><strong>Decentralization of Authority</strong></td>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
<td><strong>Degree</strong></td>
<td><strong>Amount of output of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross National Product per Capita in U.S. dollars</strong></td>
<td><strong>1. Prefectural government units per million population</strong></td>
<td><strong>A. Societal Affairs Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2. Average size of governing area per prefecture in square miles (kilometers)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1. Literacy rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3. Average size of population per prefecture</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Enrollment in higher education per million population</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The degree of decentralization of authority in the twelve countries was measured by (1) average size of the governing areas per province in square miles, (2) provincial government units per million population, and (3) average size of population per province. The author fully recognizes the limitation of these measures, but it is not implausible to assume they are indirect although general indicators of decentralization. Better indicators can easily be conceptualized, but unfortunately, the data for these indicators is not available from accessible sources.

3.3. Hypothesis of the Study

A hypothesis is a statement about the relationship between one or more variables. It asserts that a particular characteristic or occurrence of one of the factors (independent variable) determines the characteristic or occurrence of another factor (dependent variable).  

The research hypothesis of this study is the following:

The degree of decentralization of authority positively influences development when the GNP of countries is similar.

3.4. Data Gathering Methods

Methods are techniques sufficiently general to be common to all sciences, or to a significant part of
them. Methods, thus, include such procedures as forming concepts and hypotheses, making observations and measurements, performing experiments, building models and theories, providing explanations, and making predictions. . . .

Techniques of a science [are] the ways of doing the work of that science which are regarded, for more or less compelling reasons, as being acceptable. Scientific training is to a significant extent the mastery of techniques. In a sense, techniques are the specific procedures used in a given science, or in particular contexts of inquiry in that science. For example, there are certain techniques associated with the use of the Rorscharch test, or with a mass opinion survey; there are statistical techniques, like those involved in factor analysis, techniques for conducting an interview or for running a rat through a maze; techniques of carbon dating and of deciphering unknown inscriptions, etc.19

Hellriegel and Slocum, among others, have identified four research methods for data collection: (1) secondary source examination, (2) interviews, (3) questionnaires, and (4) observations.20 The application of these research methods is heavily dependent upon the subject under investigation and the way the researcher wants to pursue his or her study.

The method of data gathering plays a crucial role in the successful implementation of the study. It depends on many decisive factors: (a) the subject matter under investigation; (b) the ability of the researcher to apply such a research method; (c) the time needed for accomplishing the study; (d) the availability of research
funds, and (e) the availability of the data themselves. Because of these five and other factors, the research method of data gathering chosen for this study was secondary source examination.

As opposed to primary data, which refers to original data gathered by the researcher himself through personal interviews, questionnaires, and/or personal observations,

secondary data are data that are already in existence and collected intact by the researcher or compiled by him for use in his own analysis. This includes not only published data sets, but any data that have been developed through institutional record-keeping, routine program operation and monitoring, or other research process.

The secondary data obtained and used in this study are from the following sources: (a) literature on decentralization and development; and (b) literature on decentralization and state of development in the twelve sample countries.

3.5. Reliability and Validity of Research Method and Data Collected

A good data collection method must meet two important criteria: (1) reliability, and (2) validity. Hellriegel and Slocum believed that among the four data collection methods—the secondary source method is the most reliable data gathering method. "It is not affected
by random changes in the subject (fatigue, distraction, emotional strain)\textsuperscript{23} as are the other three methods. Secondary sources represent data others have compiled; in some, if not all cases, these may be more reliable and accurate than those obtained directly through personal interviewing, using questionnaires, or observing. For example, literature on decentralization of authority in India, Sudan, Brazil, Malaysia, or Egypt may yield greater reliability and accuracy than would direct interviews or questionnaire responses from individual citizens in these countries.

"Validity is the degree to which a data collection method actually measures what it claims to measure."\textsuperscript{24} The method of secondary source examination may be reliable, but it does not automatically ensure that the secondary data are valid. The obtained literature may be misleading or wrong, because the authors were not accurate in their original research about decentralization of authority in the countries examined.

In the secondary sources method, the chief limitation is that the current researcher has no control over how data regarding decentralization of authority in the subject countries was developed. Thus, "if there would
be any doubt about the original measuring procedures,” Poister cautioned that "the researcher should make every effort to determine how the data were generated so that he can evaluate their reliability,"\(^{25}\) which then would determine their validity. He added, "The temptation of available data should not outweigh the need for valid measures."\(^{26}\)

Although secondary data may be perfectly suited for some studies, others will require the gathering of primary data to provide reliable and valid research information. In the case of studies on decentralization of authority, however, many studies have been conducted which can be presumed to be reliable and valid. Additionally, the time, money and energy involved in collecting primary data for a study of this kind would be prohibitive.

3.6. Samples as Units of Analysis and Their Selection Procedure

A sample is a limited number of observations from\(^{27}\) or a small-scale representation of a population from which the sample is selected.\(^{28}\) In Poister's words, a sample is a subset of cases in the population.\(^{29}\) Usually the researcher is interested in obtaining a representative sample, one that includes a cross-section of
cases from the population. A sample is generally selected because of its characteristics related to the study purposes, and its applicability to the subject under investigation. For this study, the sample was required to have characteristics related to decentralization of authority.

Poister has identified three categories into which all samples can fit: (a) probability samples, (b) judgment samples, and (c) chunks. As the research method for this study was examination of secondary sources and the research design was a nonexperimental design using the case study, the most appropriate sample category was chunks. Chunks are samples used as case studies which are collected from cases already available. Although chunks are clearly inappropriate for generalizing conclusions with any degree of confidence beyond the sample itself, they may provide interesting case studies or allow purely exploratory analysis aimed at identifying likely research issues rather than testing hypotheses.

In this study twelve nation states were selected from the less developed countries. To a certain extent, these twelve have been pursuing national development
through decentralization of authority at the territorial level, specifically at the provincial level. The countries, representing Latin America, the Middle East, Africa, and Asia are (1) Brazil, (2) Egypt, (3) Indonesia, (4) the Philippines, (5) India, (6) Burma, (7) Morocco, (8) Sudan, (9) Malaysia, (10) Nigeria, (11) Kenya, and (12) Tanzania. The criteria for their selection were the following:

1. They have characteristics that are similar to each other and to Indonesia, the population to which the results of the study will be applied, such as small or large gross national product per capita in U.S. dollars.

2. They have, to some extent, practiced decentralization of authority for national development at the territorial level.

3. Data on decentralization of authority and development in these twelve countries were available.
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CHAPTER IV

DECENTRALIZATION OF AUTHORITY AND DEVELOPMENT IN PRACTICE: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE IMPACT OF DECENTRALIZATION OF AUTHORITY ON DEVELOPMENT IN THE SELECTED NATION STATES

This chapter presents the results of comparative analysis of decentralization of authority and its impact on national development in the nation states used as a sample in this study.

The chapter is organized under the following subtitles:

1. Independent Variable: Degree of Decentralization of Authority in the Twelve Selected Nation States

2. Dependent Variable: Output of Development as it Compares with Decentralization

3. Decentralization of Authority and Development: A Comparative Analysis as to How the Decentralization of Authority Compares with Development in the Twelve Selected Nation States

4. Summary and Conclusions

4.1. Independent Variable: Degree of Decentralization of Authority in the Selected Nation States

Subgovernment units—i.e., provinces (states, regions, or republics), regional units (counties, shires
or cities), local units (districts and towns), and rural units (villages), established public functions performed, and the direct participation of the citizenry in the governmental decision-making process can be used to assess decentralization: here (1) the average size of the governing areas in square miles per province, (2) the provincial government units per million population, and (3) the average size of population per province. The limitations of these measures have been noted above.

To rank the twelve nation states according to degree of decentralization, it was assumed that greater decentralization would be found among those nations with a smaller average size of governing area per province, more provincial government units per million population, and a smaller average population per province. Within this context, the twelve nations were divided into two categories: (a) the more decentralized nation states, and (b) the less decentralized nation states. Placement of the sample countries in these two categories was made on the following assumptions: Greater decentralization, i.e., more authority for national territories, is found in nations which have (1) provincial governing areas smaller in average size than 16,000 square miles; (2) a frequency of provincial government units per million
population greater than 0.50 per million; and (3) an average population per province smaller than 2,000,000 persons.

The twelve nations were ranked according to degree of decentralization of authority in the following manner. First, the average size of governing area per province was computed by dividing the total governing area of a country by its total provincial government units. Then the nations were ranked, from the one with the smallest average size of provincial governing area (the Philippines) to the one with the largest average size (Brazil). The countries with smaller-sized governing areas per province were assumed to be more decentralized and to have vested a higher level of authority in their national territories than those with larger-sized governing areas per province. The rank of the twelve nations is shown in Table 4.1.a., with the greatest decentralization attributed to the Philippines and the least to Brazil.

The second step was to determine the degree of decentralization based on the number of provincial government units per million population. This was done by dividing the total provincial government units of a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Average size of Governing Area per Province in Square Miles</th>
<th>Governing Area in Square Miles</th>
<th>Unit of Provincial Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>115,830</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>5,406</td>
<td>172,414</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>9,071</td>
<td>127,347</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>14,596</td>
<td>364,900</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>15,480</td>
<td>386,660</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>17,850</td>
<td>356,669</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>18,643</td>
<td>261,218</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>23,125</td>
<td>224,961</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>782,662</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>40,934</td>
<td>1,269,346</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>107,556</td>
<td>967,500</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>121,722</td>
<td>3,286,488</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1,2: The rank numbers 1-12 were based on the average size in square miles of governing areas per province; this was computed by dividing the governing area by the units of provincial government.

3,4: Source: Bram et al., *New Encyclopedia*. 
country by its total population per million persons. The countries were then ranked, from the country with the largest number of provincial government units per million population (the Philippines) to the one with the smallest number (India). Those countries with more provincial government units per million persons were assumed to have placed greater authority in their national territories than those with a smaller number of prefectural government units. This ranking is shown in Table 4.1.b. Hypothetically, the more provincial government units a country has per million persons, the greater will be its degree of decentralization of authority, and the higher its rank.

The third step was to compute the average size of population per province. This was accomplished by dividing the total population by the total provincial government units of a country. The nations were then ranked, from the one with the smallest average population per province (the Philippines) to the one with the largest population per province (India). It was anticipated that the smaller the average size of population per province, the greater should be the degree of decentralization of authority, and thus, the higher the rank of a country based on this indicator.
### TABLE 4.1.b.

DEGREE OF DECENTRALIZATION OF AUTHORITY BASED ON NUMBER OF PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT UNITS PER MILLION POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Provincial Government Units per Million Population</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Units of Provincial Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>47,914,017</td>
<td>1980 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>20,650,000</td>
<td>1981 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>17,527,500</td>
<td>1981 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13,435,508</td>
<td>1980 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>42,400,000</td>
<td>1980 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>18,900,000</td>
<td>1980 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>16,470,000</td>
<td>1981 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>35,300,000</td>
<td>1980 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>79,680,000</td>
<td>1981 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>119,061,470</td>
<td>1981 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>147,490,298</td>
<td>1980 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>683,810,051</td>
<td>1981 31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The rank numbers were based on the provincial government units per million population.

2. The provincial government units per million population was computed by dividing the total provincial government units by the total population which had been divided by 1 million.

Table 4.1.c. shows the countries ranked by this indicator of decentralization.

The total degree of decentralization of authority was determined for each country, using the results shown in Tables 4.1.a., 4.1.b., and 4.1.c. The resulting profile is shown in Table 4.1.d. under the column heading "Total Rank Across the Three Indicators." Based on this total the twelve nations were ranked, from the country with the smallest total rank (the Philippines) to the country with the largest total rank (India).

In computing the totals it was found that Sudan and Nigeria had the same total ranking across the three indicators. To determine which of these two countries was more decentralized, the decision was made to assign highest overall ranking to the country with the higher ranking in two of the three indicators. Sudan ranked higher on two: number of provincial government units per million population, and average size of population per province, indicating that Sudan was the more decentralized of the two. Accordingly, in the overall ranking, Sudan was ranked in eighth place and Nigeria in ninth.
TABLE 4.1.c.

DEGREE OF DECENTRALIZATION OF AUTHORITY BASED ON AVERAGE SIZE OF POPULATION PER PROVINCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Average Size of Population per Province</th>
<th>Total Population&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Units of Provincial Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>638,853</td>
<td>47,914,017</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>648,720</td>
<td>20,650,000</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>701,100</td>
<td>17,527,500</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>970,526</td>
<td>13,435,508</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>1,688,800</td>
<td>42,200,000</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>2,053,125</td>
<td>16,470,000</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>2,097,342</td>
<td>18,900,000</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>2,521,427</td>
<td>35,300,000</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>3,680,550</td>
<td>79,680,000</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>4,381,992</td>
<td>119,061,470</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>5,462,603</td>
<td>147,490,298</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>22,063,426</td>
<td>683,810,051</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>The rank numbers 1-12 were determined from the average size of population per province.

<sup>2</sup>The average size of population was computed by dividing the total population by the provincial government units of a country.

<sup>3, 4</sup>Source: Bram et al., New Encyclopedia.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank/Country</th>
<th>Average size of governing area per prefecture in square miles</th>
<th>Prefectoral governmental units per million population</th>
<th>Average size of population per prefecture</th>
<th>Total rank across the three indicators</th>
<th>Average size of population per mile of provincial government units</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Philippines</td>
<td>1,543 (1)</td>
<td>1.56 (1)</td>
<td>638,053 (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Morocco</td>
<td>5,406 (2)</td>
<td>1.52 (2)</td>
<td>648,720 (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tanzania</td>
<td>14,696 (4)</td>
<td>1.39 (3)</td>
<td>701,100 (3)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Malaysia</td>
<td>9,071 (3)</td>
<td>1.00 (4)</td>
<td>970,526 (4)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Egypt</td>
<td>15,880 (5)</td>
<td>0.59 (5)</td>
<td>1,687,320 (5)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Kenya</td>
<td>23,125 (8)</td>
<td>0.44 (7)</td>
<td>2,053,125 (6)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Burma</td>
<td>16,663 (7)</td>
<td>0.40 (8)</td>
<td>2,521,427 (8)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sudan</td>
<td>107,556 (11)</td>
<td>0.47 (6)</td>
<td>2,097,342 (7)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Nigeria</td>
<td>17,850 (6)</td>
<td>0.25 (9)</td>
<td>3,680,550 (9)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indonesia</td>
<td>29,000 (9)</td>
<td>0.16 (11)</td>
<td>5,862,003 (11)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Brazil</td>
<td>121,722 (12)</td>
<td>0.23 (10)</td>
<td>4,381,992 (10)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. India</td>
<td>40,934 (10)</td>
<td>0.05 (12)</td>
<td>22,063,426 (12)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All nation states listed above the broken line were considered more decentralized than those below it. Thus, the countries ranked 1-5 were assumed to be more decentralized overall than those ranked 6-12.

In computing rank across the three indicators, Sudan and Nigeria had the same totals. To determine overall ranking, the higher rank was assigned to Sudan as it ranked higher than Nigeria in two of the three indicators: number of provincial government units and average size of population per province.
Based on the results of this examination, greater decentralization was attributed to those countries with an average size of governing area per province smaller than 16,000 square miles, with a frequency of provincial government units greater than 0.50 per million persons, and an average size population per province smaller than 2,000,000 persons. Using these criteria, five countries—the Philippines, Morocco, Tanzania, Malaysia, and Egypt—were considered to be more decentralized than the remaining seven—Kenya, Burma, Sudan, Nigeria, Indonesia, Brazil and India.

The nation states that were ranked high in Table 4.1.d. were assumed to have transferred greater authority to their provinces than had those countries ranking lower. Thus, these countries appeared to have established more units of subgovernment and public agencies in their national territories than those countries ranking lower. More decentralization of units is associated with development.

4.2. Dependent Variable: Outputs of Development as They Compare to Decentralization of Authority

The outputs of development, which in this study are associated with the decentralization of authority,
include (a) governmental affairs development, (b) societal affairs development, (c) economic affairs development, and (d) physical affairs development—both tangible and intangible. The outputs of governmental affairs development are usually the products of governing affairs (i.e., organizational, legal, administrative and political matters), home affairs (i.e., provincial, regional, local and rural government areas), judicial affairs, security affairs, and financial affairs.

The outputs of societal affairs development usually involve the areas of education and culture, social welfare, religion, human services, health, manpower and labor.

The outputs of economic affairs development usually consist of the products of economy and trade, agriculture, forestry, fishery, animal husbandry, business and industry, mineral resources and energy.

The outputs of physical affairs development usually involve the areas of housing, public works, (i.e., water, electricity, and gas supply), agrarian matters (i.e., lands, zoning, geography), environment (i.e., conservation, sanitation, drainage, sewerage), mass communication (i.e., information, radio, television, newspapers or mass media), transportation (i.e., land,
sea, air, lakes and rivers, roads, harbors, airports), telecommunications (i.e., postal services, telephones, and telegraph services), and planning and development (i.e., provincial, regional, local and rural planning and development matters).

To measure the amount of output of development, selected tangible outputs of the recent societal, economic and physical affairs development in the twelve selected countries were used, based on the data available. They are the following: Outputs of societal affairs development—(1) rate of literacy, (2) enrollment in higher education per million population; outputs of economic affairs development—(3) energy consumption per capita in kilograms; outputs of physical affairs development—(4) road and railway density per square kilometer, (5) telephones per thousand population, and (6) urbanization as a percentage of total population living in cities of 100,000 people or more. These six outputs of societal, economic and physical affairs development are summarized in Tables 4.2.a., b., c., d., e., and f.

The outputs of societal, economic and physical affairs development displayed in these tables are some of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Rank is based on the literacy rate of the twelve nation states, with 1 indicating highest literacy rate.

### TABLE 4.2.b

**ENROLLMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION PER MILLION POPULATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Enrollment in Higher Education</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>17209.2</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>12122.0</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>9931.7</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>5590.4</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>3370.1</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>2589.2</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>2044.9</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>1795.2</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>1168.3</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>856.6</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>522.9</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>199.1</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. Rank is based on the rate of enrollment in higher education per million population, with 1 indicating the highest rate of enrollment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2Rank is based on the rate of energy consumption per capita of the twelve countries, with 1 indicating highest consumption.
### TABLE 4.2.d.
ROAD AND RAILWAY KILOMETERS PER SQUARE KILOMETER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Source: Data for roads and railways were taken from Bram et al., New Encyclopedia. The density was computed by dividing the total kilometers of roads and railways by the land area of the country.

2Rank was based on the rate of road and railway density per square kilometer, with 1 indicating greatest density.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Telephones per Thousand</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1970</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Source: Taylor and Jodice, World Handbook, pp. 188-190.

2Rank was based on the number of telephones per thousand population, with 1 indicating greatest number.
TABLE 4.2.f.

URBANIZATION: PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL POPULATION LIVING IN CITIES OF 100,000 OR MORE PEOPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Average Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\[2\] Average rank was based on the percentage rate of urbanization, with 1 indicating highest rank.
the consequences of decentralization of authority. They are used as indicators to measure the impact of decentralization of authority on development in the selected nation states, as discussed in the next section.

In the overall development, as depicted in Table 4.2.g., Brazil averaged the greatest output in societal, economic and physical development, and thus ranks number one. It is followed in order by the Philippines, Malaysia, Egypt, Morocco, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Burma, Tanzania, and Nigeria. Last is the Sudan which had the smallest overall amount of output of development.

It should be noted that of the twelve countries, Brazil has the longest history of independence—about 160 years (from 1822 to 1982, the year the data were collected). It is followed by Egypt, whose independent government was established sixty years ago (1922). The length of time the remaining countries have been independent and the year independence was gained is shown below (length of time is measured up to 1982, the year the data were collected):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>37 years</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>36 years</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>35 Years</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>34 years</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>26 years</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>26 years</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank/Country</td>
<td>Total rank across six indicators</td>
<td>Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Brazil</td>
<td>12 (1)</td>
<td>66 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Philippines</td>
<td>15 (2)</td>
<td>83 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Malaysia</td>
<td>26 (3)</td>
<td>59 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Egypt</td>
<td>29 (4)</td>
<td>44 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Morocco</td>
<td>32 (5)</td>
<td>21 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. India</td>
<td>36 (6)</td>
<td>36 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Indonesia</td>
<td>42 (7)</td>
<td>62 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Kenya</td>
<td>46 (8)</td>
<td>40 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Burma</td>
<td>50 (9)</td>
<td>67 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Tanzania</td>
<td>51 (10)</td>
<td>66 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Nigeria</td>
<td>53 (11)</td>
<td>15 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sudan</td>
<td>57 (12)</td>
<td>20 (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average rank was based on total rank across the six types of output of development.
Malaysia  25 years  1957
Nigeria    22 years  1960
Kenya      19 years  1963
Tanzania   18 years  1964

The length of time that a country has had an independent government and that development could have been occurring affects the amount of output of the governmental, societal, economic and physical sectors in each nation. This is supported by the ranking of Brazil. Among the twelve nation states, it ranks number one in the overall average rate of outputs of societal, economic and physical development.

4.3. Decentralization of Authority and Development:
A Comparative Analysis as to How Decentralization Measures Compare to Measures of Development in the Selected Nation States

Next, the study examined the degree of decentralization of authority (independent variable) as it compares with the indicators of development (dependent variable). It is anticipated that the greater the degree of decentralization of authority, the greater will be the output of development. To test this, a comparative analysis was made to show the association of decentralization of authority with development in the twelve selected nation states. This analysis employed two methods: First, the average rates of the six tangible
outputs of societal, economic and physical affairs development of the five more decentralized countries (the Philippines, Morocco, Tanzania, Malaysia, and Egypt) were compared with those of the seven less decentralized countries (Kenya, Burma, Sudan, Nigeria, Indonesia, Brazil, and India).

Second, the average rates of the same six outputs were compared among less decentralized countries of high and low GNP per capita. In this analysis, GNP per capita was used as a test factor. The twelve countries were classified into two subgroups: high GNP per capita countries and low GNP per capita countries. The first subgroup consists of the more decentralized countries—the Philippines, Morocco, Malaysia and Egypt—and the less decentralized Nigeria and Brazil. The second subgroup consists of the more decentralized Tanzania, and the less decentralized Kenya, Burma, Sudan, Indonesia, and India.

This comparative analysis is presented under the following subtitles:

4.3.1. Decentralization of Authority and Development: Comparative Analysis without Test Factor

4.3.2. Decentralization of Authority and Development: A Comparative Analysis with a Test Factor
4.3.1. Decentralization of Authority and Development: Comparative Analysis without Test Factor

This section presents a comparison of decentralization of authority to the societal, economic and physical affairs development in the more decentralized Philippines, Morocco, Tanzania, Malaysia and Egypt with that of the less decentralized Kenya, Burma, Sudan, Nigeria, Indonesia, Brazil, and India. This analysis examined the average rates of the six tangible outputs of societal, economic and physical affairs development in the twelve selected nations as they compare to the decentralization of authority. The tangible outputs examined were (a) literacy, (b) enrollment in higher education per million population, (c) energy consumption per capita in kilograms, (d) road and railway density (e) telephones per thousand people, and (f) urbanization as a percentage of total population living in cities of 100,000 or more people.

Concerning literacy, the more decentralized nation states apparently had a greater average percentage of literacy (55%) than did the less decentralized ones (44%) (see Table 4.3.a.).

For enrollment in higher education (Table 4.3.b.), the more decentralized nation states had a
### TABLE 4.3.a

**OUTPUT OF SOCIETAL AFFAIRS DEVELOPMENT: LITERACY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development:</th>
<th>Less Decentralized Countries:</th>
<th>More Decentralized Countries:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sudan</td>
<td>c. Tanzania</td>
<td>d. Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Nigeria</td>
<td>e. Indonesia</td>
<td>f. Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td>g. India</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>44%</th>
<th>55%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total per cent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development: Enrollment in higher education per million population</th>
<th>Less Decentralized Countries:</th>
<th>More Decentralized Countries:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Kenya</td>
<td>a. Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Burma</td>
<td>b. Morocco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Sudan</td>
<td>c. Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Nigeria</td>
<td>d. Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Indonesia</td>
<td>e. Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Brazil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>3130.0</td>
<td>7097.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
greater average rate (7097.9 students per million population) than did the less decentralized nation states (3130.0 students per million population). Concerning energy consumption per capita in kilograms (Table 4.3.c.), the more decentralized nation states had a greater average rate of energy consumption per capita (326 kilograms) than did the less decentralized nations (213 kilograms).

Regarding road and railway density (Table 4.3.d.), the more decentralized nation states had a greater average rate of density (0.16 kilometers of roads per square kilometer of land) than did the less decentralized nations (0.14 per square kilometer). In the case of telephones per thousand people (Table 4.3.e.), again the more decentralized nations had a greater average rate (12.4 telephones per thousand people) than did the less decentralized nations (7.3 telephones per thousand). Concerning urbanization (Table 4.3.f.), the more decentralized nations had a greater average percentage of total population living in cities of 100,000 or more (19.8%) than did the less decentralized nations (14.15%).

These results indicate that the degree of decentralization can substantially affect the output of development of a country. The findings thus clearly support
### TABLE 4.3.c

**OUTPUT OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS DEVELOPMENT: ENERGY CONSUMPTION PER CAPITA IN KILOGRAMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development: Energy consumption per capita in kilograms</th>
<th>Less Decentralized Countries:</th>
<th>More Decentralized Countries:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Kenya</td>
<td>a. Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Burma</td>
<td>b. Morocco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Sudan</td>
<td>c. Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Nigeria</td>
<td>d. Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Indonesia</td>
<td>e. Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Brazil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rate | 213 | 326 |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development:</th>
<th>Less Decentralized Countries:</th>
<th>More Decentralized Countries:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road and Railway Density per Square Kilometer</td>
<td>a. Kenya</td>
<td>a. Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Burma</td>
<td>b. Morocco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Sudan</td>
<td>c. Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Nigeria</td>
<td>d. Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Indonesia</td>
<td>e. Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Brazil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 4.3.e

OUTPUT OF PHYSICAL AFFAIRS DEVELOPMENT: TELEPHONES PER THOUSAND PEOPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development: Telephones per thousand people</th>
<th>Less Decentralized Countries:</th>
<th>More Decentralized Countries:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Kenya</td>
<td>a. Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Burma</td>
<td>b. Morocco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Sudan</td>
<td>c. Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Nigeria</td>
<td>d. Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Indonesia</td>
<td>e. Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Brazil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rate | 7.3  | 12.4 |


TABLE 4.3.f

OUTPUT OF PHYSICAL AFFAIRS DEVELOPMENT:
URBANIZATION--PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION
IN CITIES OF 100,000 OR MORE PEOPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development:</th>
<th>Less Decentralized Countries:</th>
<th>More Decentralized Countries:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000 or more</td>
<td>c. Sudan</td>
<td>c. Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Nigeria</td>
<td>d. Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Indonesia</td>
<td>e. Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Brazil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>14.15%</th>
<th>19.8%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85.85%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total percentage</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the research hypothesis of this study—that the degree of
decentralization of authority can influence the amount of
output of development in a country. A positive inherent
relationship.\(^1\) seems to exist in any country between the
decentralization of authority and development—governmental, societal, economic and physical; this includes the
twelve countries used as a sample in this study.

It can be argued that the relationship between
decentralization of authority and development could have
been influenced by a third variable, such as human,
natural, material, and/or financial resources. This
argument is examined in the next section.

4.3.2. Decentralization of Authority and Development:
A Comparative Analysis Using the Test Factor
GNP per Capita

This subsection presents an examination of the
impact of decentralization of authority on development in
the twelve sample nations, with the assumption that the
development is associated with the
third variable: GNP per capita.

In order to prove that the association between
decentralization of authority and development is an in-
herent one and not due to the third factor of GNP per
capita, it was necessary to eliminate the influence of
this third factor by comparing less and more decentralized nation states of high GNP per capita and of low GNP per capita. This comparison was based on the average rates of tangible outputs of societal, economic and physical affairs development in the twelve nation states. Countries with high GNP per capita are the more decentralized Philippines, Morocco, and Malaysia, and the less decentralized Nigeria and Brazil. Countries of low GNP per capita are the more decentralized Tanzania and Egypt, and the less decentralized Kenya, Burma, Sudan, Indonesia, and India. To determine the groupings of countries by high or low GNP per capita, the criterion level used was 500 kilograms. Countries with a rate smaller than 500 kilograms were considered low GNP per capita countries; those with a GNP per capita rate greater than 500 kilograms were regarded as high GNP per capita countries (See Table 4.3.g.).

i. Decentralization of Authority and Development, by GNP per Capita: Literacy as an Output of Societal Affairs Development and Government

Rate of literacy as an output of societal affairs development is shown in Table 4.3.h. Among the nation states of high GNP per capita, the more decentralized
### TABLE 4.3.g.
CONTROLLING ELEMENT: GNP PER CAPITA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNP per capita in U.S. Dollars&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>GNP in million U.S. Dollars&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>15,270</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>12,890</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>48,100</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>24,410</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>16,830</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>5,180</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>45,780</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>4,130</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>117,520</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>4,480</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup>Rank is determined on the rate of GNP per capita of the twelve nation states, with 1 indicating the greatest GNP per capita.

### TABLE 4.3.h.

DECENTRALIZATION OF AUTHORITY AND DEVELOPMENT, BY GNP PER CAPITA: RATE OF LITERACY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development:</th>
<th>High GNP per capita</th>
<th>Low GNP per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Decentralized Countries</td>
<td>More Decentralized Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Brazil</td>
<td>b. Morocco</td>
<td>b. Burma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Yes | 40.5% | 54.33% | 45% | 55% |
| No  | 59.5  | 45.67  | 55  | 45  |

**Total percent** | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
Philippines, Morocco and Malaysia had a greater average rate of literacy (54.33%) than did the less decentralized Nigeria and Brazil (40.5%). Among low GNP per capita countries the more decentralized Tanzania and Egypt had a greater average rate of literacy (55%) that did the less decentralized Kenya, Burma, Sudan, Indonesia, and India (45%).

ii. Decentralization of Authority and Development, by GNP per Capita: Enrollment in Higher Education as an Output of Societal Affairs Development and Government

Enrollment in higher education as an output of societal affairs development and government is shown in Table 4.3.i. Among high GNP per capita countries, the more decentralized Philippines, Morocco and Malaysia had a greater average rate of enrollment in higher education than did the less decentralized Nigeria and Brazil: 7722.8 students per million population compared to 5227.3 students per million. Among low GNP per capita nations, the more decentralized Tanzania and Egypt had more students in higher education than did the less decentralized Kenya, Burma, Sudan, Indonesia, and India: 6160.5 students per million for the first group compared with 2291.1 students for the latter.
### TABLE 4.3.i.

DECENTRALIZATION OF AUTHORITY AND DEVELOPMENT, BY GNP PER CAPITA:
ENROLLMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development:</th>
<th>High GNP per capita</th>
<th>Low GNP per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment in Higher Education per Million Population</td>
<td>Less Decentralized Countries</td>
<td>Less Decentralized Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Brazil</td>
<td>b. Morocco</td>
<td>b. Burma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rate | 5227.3 | 7722.8 | 2291.1 | 6160.5 |
The resulting conclusion is that the association between decentralization of authority and development holds regardless of the GNP level. The implication is that the greater the degree of decentralization of authority in a country, the greater will be the output of its governmental, societal, economic, and physical affairs development.

iii. Decentralization of Authority and Development, by GNP per Capita: Energy Consumption per Capita as an Output of Economic Affairs Development and Government

Energy consumption per capita as an output of economic affairs development and government is shown in Table 4.3.j. Among the high GNP per capita countries, the more decentralized Philippines, Morocco, and Malaysia had a greater average rate of energy consumption per capita—380 kilograms—than did the less decentralized Nigeria and Brazil—377 kilograms. The same is true among low GNP per capita nation states. Among the countries of low GNP per capita, the more decentralized Tanzania and Egypt had a greater rate of energy consumption per capita—244 kilograms—than did the less decentralized Kenya, Burma, Sudan, Indonesia, and India—148 kilograms.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development: Energy Consumption per Capita in Kilograms</th>
<th>High GNP per Capita</th>
<th>Low GNP per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Consumption per Capita</td>
<td>Less Decentralized Countries</td>
<td>More Decentralized Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Brazil</td>
<td>b. Morocco</td>
<td>b. Burma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Malaysia</td>
<td>d. Indonesia</td>
<td>c. Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. India</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>377 kg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears that irrespective of the influence of the test factor, GNP per capita, on the association between decentralization of authority and development, the more decentralized nation states achieved a greater rate of energy consumption per capita as an output of economic affairs development than did the less decentralized nation states.

iv. Decentralization of Authority and Development, by GNP per Capita: Road and Railway Density in Square Kilometers as an Output of Physical Affairs Development and Government

Road and railway density as an output of physical affairs development is shown in Table 4.3.k. Among high GNP per capita countries, the more decentralized Philippines, Morocco and Malaysia had a greater average density of roads and railways than did the less decentralized Nigeria and Brazil—0.25 kilometers per square kilometer compared to 0.14 kilometer per square kilometer. The same was not true among the low GNP per capita countries, however. Among these, the more decentralized Tanzania and Egypt had a smaller average density of roads and railways (0.04 per square kilometer) than did the less decentralized Kenya, Burma, Sudan, Indonesia, and India (0.14 per square kilometer).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development:</th>
<th>High GNP per capita</th>
<th>Low GNP per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road and Railway Density per Square Kilometer</td>
<td>Less Decentralized Countries</td>
<td>More Decentralized Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Brazil</td>
<td>b. Morocco</td>
<td>b. Burma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Malaysia</td>
<td>c. Sudan</td>
<td>d. Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the comparative analysis of road and railway density, results from the high GNP per capita countries support the hypothesis of the study, but results from low GNP per capita countries do not.

Because of the anomaly presented by these results, the following question had to be examined: Why, using GNP per capita as the control variable, did the less decentralized Kenya, Burma, Sudan, Indonesia, and India show a greater rate of road and railway density per square kilometer than did the more decentralized Tanzania and Egypt among the low GNP per capita countries? In the actual practice of government and development, the impact of decentralization of authority on national development is contingent upon many third factors, such as equal allocation of resources to the development of all areas, availability of qualified personnel for all areas of development, equal development of all public affairs, and government preference in giving priority to all areas of development at the same time.

The answer may be that the more decentralized Tanzania and Egypt, for example, assigned a lower priority to the development of roads and railways, placing more emphasis on development of the water system. This could have resulted from a lack of qualified personnel
needed for the development of roads and railways at that time. A shortage of the qualified manpower required for development in any area can inevitably impede the government's plans for equal development of all areas, equal allocation of resources to the development of all areas, and equal distribution of development through the country at the same time.

v. Decentralization of Authority and Development, by GNP per Capita: Telephones per Thousand Population as an Output of Physical Affairs Development

The rate of telephones per thousand population as an output of physical affairs development is shown in Table 4.3.1. Among high GNP per capita countries, the more decentralized Philippines, Morocco and Malaysia had a smaller average rate of telephones per thousand population than did the less decentralized Nigeria and Brazil--14.9 compared to 16.3. Among low GNP per capita countries, however, the finding was as expected, with the more decentralized Tanzania and Egypt having a greater average rate of telephones per thousand than that found in the less decentralized Kenya, Burma, Sudan, Indonesia, and India--8.8 compared to 3.7.

As with density of roads and railways discussed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development: Telephones per Thousand Population</th>
<th>High GNP per capita</th>
<th>Low GNP per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less Decentralized Countries</td>
<td>More Decentralized Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Brazil</td>
<td>b. Morocco</td>
<td>b. Burma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Malaysia</td>
<td>c. Sudan</td>
<td>b. Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Indonesia</td>
<td>e. India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output (Rate)</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
earlier, among high GNP per capita countries, the more
decentralized Philippines, Morocco and Malaysia might
have given less priority to the development of telephone
systems than did the less decentralized Nigeria and
Brazil.

vi. Decentralization of Authority
and Development, by GNP per Capita:
Urbanization as an Output of
Physical Affairs Development

Urbanization, expressed as the percentage of the
total population living in cities exceeding 100,000
people, is shown in Table 4.3.m. Among high GNP per
capita countries, the more decentralized Philippines,
Morocco and Malaysia had a smaller average rate of
urbanization than did the less decentralized Nigeria and
Brazil—21% of the total population in cities of 100,000
or more for the decentralized countries compared with 27%
for the latter group. The same was not true of the low
GNP per capita countries. In these nations the more
decentralized Tanzania and Egypt had a higher average
rate of urbanization (18.5%) than did the less decen-
tralized Kenya, Burma, Suydan, Indonesia and India (9%).

As with road and railway density, and availa-
bility of telephones, the more decentralized Philippines,
Morocco and Malaysia might have laid less emphasis on the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development:</th>
<th>High GNP per capita</th>
<th>Low GNP per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urbanization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as percentage of population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>living in cities of 100,000+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Decentralized</td>
<td>Less Decentralized</td>
<td>Less Decentralized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>More Decentralized</td>
<td>Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Countries</td>
<td>Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Brazil</td>
<td>b. Morocco</td>
<td>b. Burma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Malaysia</td>
<td>c. Sudan</td>
<td>c. Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Indonesia</td>
<td>d. Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. India</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percent</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development of large cities. This could occur if the policy of a nation discouraged development of large urban areas.

4.4. Summary and Conclusions

This chapter has reported the results of the comparative analysis of the impact of decentralization of authority on development in the twelve nation states used as a sample in this study. The analysis was based on the research hypothesis that the degree of decentralization of authority is positively associated with development when the Gross National Product of countries is similar.

For purposes of comparative analysis, twelve developing nation states were grouped into two subcategories: (a) the more decentralized nation states and (b) the less decentralized ones. The more decentralized countries met the following criteria: In each country (a) the average size of the governing area was smaller than 16,000 square miles per province; (b) the frequency of provincial government units per million population was greater than 0.50; and (c) the average population per province was smaller than 2,000,000. Based on these three criteria, the more decentralized nations states were the Philippines, Morocco, Tanzania, Malaysia
and Egypt; the less decentralized ones were Nigeria, Burma, Kenya, Indonesia, India, Sudan, and Brazil.

Also for the purpose of comparative analysis, the twelve nations were classified into two subgroups based on their respective GNP per capita, which was used as an extraneous test factor. The countries with a high GNP per capita were determined to be the Philippines, Nigeria, Morocco, Malaysia, and Brazil; those with a low GNP per capita were Burma, India, Tanzania, Sudan, Indonesia, Kenya, and Egypt.

Six different tangible outputs of societal, economic, and physical development were also used in the analysis: outputs of societal affairs development--(1) literacy, and (2) enrollment in higher education per million people; outputs of economic affairs development--(3) energy consumption per capita in kilograms; outputs of physical affairs development--(4) road and railway density per square kilometer, (5) telephones per thousand people, and (6) urbanization expressed as a percentage of the total population living in cities of 100,000 or more. These six tangible outputs of development were used as indicators to measure the impact of decentralization of authority on development in the twelve sample nation states.
Two methods were used to analyze the impact of decentralization of authority on development in the twelve sample nations. The first was by comparing six tangible outputs of societal, economic, and physical affairs development of the more decentralized countries with those of the less decentralized ones. In this method, comparative analysis was done without using a test factor. The second method was by comparing the six tangible outputs of development in the twelve sample countries, with the countries grouped by degree of decentralization of authority and by high or low GNP per capita. In the second method, GNP per capita was used as a test factor. When the output of development in the more decentralized nation states was greater than that of the less decentralized nations, the analysis indicates that a positive relationship existed between decentralization of authority and development. Alternatively, when the output of development in the less decentralized nation states was greater than that of the more decentralized nation states, the relationship between decentralization and development was influenced by the test factor (GNP per capita).

The first method of analysis, which used only the
six tangible outputs as indicators, showed that the more decentralized Philippines, Morocco, Tanzania, Malaysia and Egypt had greater outputs of development than were found in the less decentralized Kenya, Burma, Sudan, Indonesia, India, Nigeria and Brazil. This finding supports the hypothesis of the study—that the degree of decentralization of authority positively influences the output of development, when the level of influence of a third factor is controlled.

The second method of analysis used the six tangible outputs of development with the addition of the test factor—GNP per capita—to test the relationship between decentralization of authority and development. The results showed that among high GNP per capita countries, the more decentralized Philippines, Morocco and Malaysia had greater outputs of development in four of the six areas; among the low GNP per capita countries, the more decentralized Tanzania and Egypt had greater outputs of development in five of the six areas. Analysis using GNP per capita as a test factor showed that the positive relationship between decentralization of authority and development could be influenced by a third factor, such as human, natural, material and financial resources; shortage of qualified personnel needed
for development in certain areas; state policy that gives lower priority to development in certain areas; and/or inequality in the development of all areas at the same time. As a consequence, the less decentralized nations might have greater output of development in certain areas than the more decentralized ones, as was the case here. It should be noted, however, that among both the high and low GNP per capita countries, the more decentralized nations overall had greater output of development than did the less decentralized ones. These results strongly support the hypothesis of this study—that the degree of decentralization of authority positively influences the output of development, holding constant the level of influence of GNP.

The analysis led to the following conclusions:

1. A positive association exists between decentralization of authority and development, including governmental, societal, economic and physical affairs development.

2. Establishment of more provincial government units in the national territories may lead to substantially greater development of governmental, social, economic and physical affairs, thus enhancing and accel-
erating development in these territories.

3. Greater mobilization of national resources—human, natural, material, and financial—in both more and less decentralized nation states can enlarge the association between decentralization of authority and development, thus bringing about greater development of governmental, societal, economic and physical affairs.

4. The function of planning, which is centralized in most developing nations as a means of control, should be a routine task at all levels of government and in all decentralized public agencies; such a shift can accelerate the planning process, and subsequently speed up development in the entire nation.
Notes

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the study, conclusions, recommendations for restructuring the current provincial governmental arrangements in developing nation states, and suggestions for future study of decentralization of authority.

5.1. Summary
5.1.1. The Research Problem

This study was concerned with decentralization of authority for national development in emerging nation states. The objective of the study was to examine the association between decentralization of authority and national development within the areas of governmental, societal, economic and physical affairs. Comparative analysis was made of the impact of decentralization of authority on societal, economic and physical affairs development in the twelve selected nations used as a sample in the study: the Philippines, Morocco, Tanzania, Malaysia, Egypt, Kenya, Nigeria, Burma, Indonesia, Sudan, India, and Brazil.
5.1.2. Research Methodology

The research methodology of this study consists of the elements explained below.

i. The Research Model. The model consists of three elements: (a) the control element: GNP per capita; (b) the structural element: degree of decentralization of authority; and (c) the consequential element: output of development in the areas of governmental, societal, economic and physical affairs.

ii. Research Designs. Used in this study were the non-experimental research designs known as Static-Group Comparison\(^1\) and ex post facto design.\(^2\) These were used to explain the relationship between decentralization of authority and development. To test the relationship, the methodological procedure called "process of elaboration" was employed.\(^3\)

iii. Research Hypothesis. The following hypothesis was tested in this study: The degree of decentralization of authority is positively associated with development when the Gross National Product of countries is similar. Hypothetically, the greater the degree of decentralization of authority, the greater should be
the output of development—governmental, societal, economic and physical—regardless of the influence of a third factor.

iv. Data Gathering Methods. The study employed the research method of secondary data examination. The secondary data obtained and used consisted of general literature on authority, decentralization of authority and development, as well as specific literature on decentralization of authority and development in the selected nation states used as the sample.

v. Reliability and Validity of Research Method and Data Collected. For this study, it was assumed that the research method of secondary sources examination, and the data obtained from these sources and used in the study were reliable and valid.

vi. Samples as Units of Analysis and Their Selection Procedure. Twelve nation states were selected from among the developing countries to be used as a sample, with each country serving as a unit of analysis. The twelve were Brazil from Latin America; Egypt from the Middle-East; Indonesia, the Philippines, India, Burma, and Malaysia from Asia; Morocco, Sudan, Nigeria,
Kenya and Tanzania from Africa.

The following criteria were used to select these countries: (1) they had characteristics similar to each other; (2) to some degree they had been practicing decentralization of authority for national development at the territorial levels; and (3) data were available on decentralization of authority and development in these twelve nation states.

5.1.3. Decentralization of Authority and Development in Theory

Authority, decentralization, and development are three concepts which are highly interdependent and interrelated. They are briefly summarized below.

i. Authority

In the actual conduct of government and development there are three types of legitimate authority: (1) traditional authority, (2) charismatic authority, and (3) legal (or rational) authority. This study was concerned with the third type of authority, legal authority, which is further defined as follows:

(1) Conceptually, the term legal authority can be defined as legitimate power, delegated by the people and the country to the government. The delegated legal
authority is enacted in the Constitution of the nation state—for example, the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Once the authority is vested in the government, it remains with the government and public agencies and is executed through public employees and their responsibilities.8

(2) Legally, legal authority can be defined as a right to give orders and instructions,9 to influence and/or command thought, opinion and behavior,10 to make decisions,11 to require actions of others or to take action and accomplish organizational objectives,12 as well as the right or power to exact or enforce obedience.13

(3) Authoritatively, legal authority rests with the people and the country, and is exercised by them to establish public apparatuses—both government units and public agencies. Once public apparatuses exist, legal authority is delegated to them by the people and the country, using constitutional laws; the authority then rests with the official offices or apparatuses,14 and remains with the official jobs assigned to them.15 The legal authority, therefore, belongs to the official public apparatuses; it is not vested in the person, and does not belong to public employees working in the public
apparatuses.

(4) Organizationally, legal authority is rela-
tional\textsuperscript{16} in that it can be used as a coordinating means\textsuperscript{17} to bind together all organizational units and public em-
ployees in an official obligatory relationship to accom-
plish the missions which the public apparatuses were
established to complete (in this study, the government
mission of national development). In this context, all
public employees are required to obey organizational
operating rules and regulations, and commit themselves to
fulfilling all the tasks and affairs of the nation for
which they were recruited and are paid to perform.\textsuperscript{18}

(5) Functionally, legal authority is to be exercised and
shared by all public apparatuses and public employees
(Rousseau, Dewey, Bennis in Cutchin, 1981) to carry out
public functions assigned to them. Specifically, it is
exercised and shared by public employees holding mana-
gerial positions to perform the tasks of directing, mak-
ing decisions, staffing, communicating, assigning tasks,
allocating resources—human, material, and financial,
providing services and goods, assuming responsibilities,
supervising, and monitoring and controlling public orga-
nizations and public employees under their direct chain
of management to accomplish organizational activities, affairs and tasks.

Legal authority is also exercised and shared by subordinates or routine staff members in executing tasks assigned to them, such as planning, organizing, budgeting, collecting data and information, analyzing data, communicating, reporting, making recommendations and suggestions, taking part in the governmental decision-making process, implementing decisions, transforming these into plans and programs, as well as performing all other organizational routines in endeavoring to accomplish the missions of the public apparatuses in particular, and the government mission of national development in general.

Furthermore, the quantity of legal authority and power vested in the public apparatuses depends totally on the size of their missions. Hypothetically, the larger the mission of the public apparatus, the greater will be the amount of the legal authority vested in it, the more authority it will exercise, and the more responsible it will become. Conversely, the smaller the mission of the public apparatus, the smaller will be the legal authority vested in it, the amount of authority it will exercise, and the responsibility it will assume. For example, the
Indonesian Service of Public Works and Agrarian Affairs has a very large mission measured in terms of the fifteen organizational units which constitute it, the 5,000 personnel who work in it, and the size of its operating budget. On the contrary, the Service of Financial Affairs has a smaller mission, measured by the organizational units which constitute it, the 1,200 staff members working for it, and its operating budget.

Similarly, the higher the status of the public apparatus in the government's structural hierarchy, the greater will be the legal authority vested in it, the more authority it will exercise, and the more responsible it will become. Conversely, the lower the status of the public apparatus in the government hierarchy, the smaller will be its legal authority and responsibility. For example, the provincial government possesses a higher status in the territorial government hierarchy than does the city or shire government. The latter possesses a higher status than do the town and district government units, which are on a higher level than the rural or village governments. The degree of authority is higher for the Service of Public Works and Agrarian Affairs at the provincial level than for the Bureau of Public Works.
and Agrarian Affairs at the city or shire level. The same is true of the status of the Bureau of Financial Affairs at the city or shire level compared to the status of the Division of Financial Affairs at the town or district level. Likewise, the Division of Public Works and Agrarian Affairs at the town or district level has greater status than the Section of Public Works and Agrarian Affairs at the village level.

The important research question related to the analysis of the association between decentralization of authority and national development is the following: What is delegation of authority? Hypothetically, delegation of authority implies reciprocating action, in the sense that there must be a response to or repayment of the value of authority delegated by the people and country to the government or public apparatuses.

ii. Decentralization

The authority vested in the government, usually the central government, as the final dominant center of power and authority in the actual practice of government, must be distributed throughout the entire nation state if the government is to be efficient, effective and productive in accomplishing its crucial mission of national
development. The central government cannot perform all public functions or tasks and affairs with efficiency and economy without decentralizing some of its tasks and duties. In Furniss's terms, "The tasks of government today are so great that the powers of the center can only be exercised by decentralization."\textsuperscript{20}

Legally, the action taken to spread legal authority and power throughout the country is labeled "decentralization." Organizationally and administratively, according to Maddick and others, decentralization embraces processes of both devolution and deconcentration. Devolution is "the legal conferring of powers to discharge specified or residual functions upon formally constituted local authorities"; deconcentration is "the delegation of authority adequate for the discharge of specified functions to staff of a central department who are situated outside the headquarters."\textsuperscript{21} According to the Division for Public Administration of the United Nations, "The term decentralization . . . refers to the transfer of authority on a geographic basis, whether by devolution of authority to local government units or special statutory body, or by deconcentration (i.e., delegation) of authority to field units of the same department or level of government."\textsuperscript{22} White saw the
process of decentralization as a transfer of authority—legislative, judicial and/or administrative (executive)—from a higher level of government to a lower. Thus, decentralization of authority, and decentralization of public apparatuses and of public functions—both tasks and affairs—is not only to the executive branch of government at the territorial level but also to the legislative and judicial branches. It is important to note that devolved public functions and public agencies are fully under the authority of, responsible to, and funded by the territorial governments; deconcentrated public functions and public agencies are fully under the authority of, responsible to, and funded by the central government.

Besides decentralization of authority by devolution and deconcentration, there is also semi-vertical decentralization of authority which involves public agencies under the authority of, responsible to, and funded by both central and territorial sub-governments. The function most often decentralized semi-vertically in many less developed nations, including the twelve used as a sample in this study, is the function of planning. Generally, budgeted plans or programs that have been
approved by territorial governments are subject to approval by the central government. As explained in Appendix B, the function of planning is semi-vertically decentralized in both federated and unitary nation states, with authority generally resting with the central governments of these countries to make final decisions on the plans or programs budgeted and approved by territorial governments.

The planning function is used by these twelve nations and many other less developed countries as a legal means by which to control and coordinate allocation of national resources throughout the entire country. This policy is understandable because of the shortage of skilled and well-educated manpower able to make rational decisions on the deployment of national resources in the emerging nations.

1. Types of Decentralization. Decentralization of authority takes two forms: (1) decentralization of authority by apparatuses—that is, authority to establish public apparatuses, both government units and public agencies; and (2) decentralization of authority by functions—that is, authority to manage and execute tasks and affairs on the territorial or prefectural, regional,
local, and rural levels.

The decentralized public apparatuses as used in this study are (a) devolved government units, notably (1) metropolitan and provincial government units at the provincial level, (2) city and shire government units at the regional level, (3) town and district government units at the local level, and (4) village government units at the rural level; and (b) (1) devolved public agencies that have autonomous status and are directly under managerial and leadership authority of the devolved government units, and (2) deconcentrated public agencies that have no autonomous status and are directly under the leadership and managerial authority of the central government or central public agency concerned. Both devolved public apparatuses and deconcentrated public agencies are part of the national governmental system.

In a devolved public apparatus, governmental decisions are made without control or intervention from the central government or central public apparatuses. In a deconcentrated public agency, the central public apparatus, especially the central public agency concerned, directly controls and intervenes at the territorial level with governmental decisions implemented and executed by governmental representatives. Decisions on certain
routine matters are largely made by the deconcentrated public agencies; usually the provincial government, as a public apparatus representing the central government at the territorial level, has the authority and power to coordinate activities directly and indirectly, and also to control the everyday operations of the deconcentrated public agencies established at the territorial level. In this study, devolved public apparatuses are called territorial administrative units; these have been labeled by many proponents "local administrative units." The deconcentrated public agencies are called field administrative units; proponents in the United States and the United Kingdom refer to these as "functional field services."

The second type of decentralization is decentralization of authority by functions, that is, by tasks and by affairs as used here. Thus there are two kinds of functions that have to be decentralized both by devolution and by deconcentration: (1) public tasks, and (2) public affairs.

According to Cheema and Rondinelli, decentralization is defined broadly... to mean the transfer of planning, decision-making, or administrative authority from the central government or its field organizations, local administrative units, semi-autonomous and parastatal organizations, local governments, or nongovernmental organizations...
Different forms of decentralization can be distinguished primarily by the extent to which authority to plan, decide and manage is transferred from the central government to other organizations and the amount of authority the decentralized organizations achieve in carrying out their tasks.23

The amount or quantity of authority decentralized to a public apparatus, as pointed out earlier in this study, is always commensurate with the mission of the public apparatus concerned. Specifically, the amount of authority is determined and measured by the status and the mission of the public apparatus within the governmental structure and system.

(2) Decentralization of Authority by Tasks.

Cheema and Rondinelli defined decentralization as the transfer of authority to plan, to make decisions, to administer, and to manage. For the purposes of this study, two types of public tasks have been identified which must be decentralized, no matter what the mission of the public apparatus: (a) the task of management, and (b) the task of executing public affairs decentralized to the territorial government units. The tasks of management that must be decentralized are directing, making decisions, staffing, communicating, assigning tasks, coordinating, assuming responsibility, supervising, monitoring, allocating resources, providing services and
goods, and controlling public apparatuses in general and organizational units in particular. The tasks of execution that must be decentralized are planning, organizing, budgeting, gathering data and information, analyzing data, communicating, reporting, making recommendations and suggestions, participating in the governmental decision-making process, implementing the decisions made, and performing all other organizational routines.

In the actual conduct of government, the task of management as defined here is the responsibility of managers or superiors holding leadership or managerial positions in a formal public apparatus; the task of execution is the responsibility of subordinates, that is, of public employees not holding managerial or leadership positions. These two functions must be decentralized regardless of the size and kind of the mission of the public apparatus concerned.

(3) Decentralization of Authority by Affairs.
Besides the tasks to be decentralized, decentralization must also occur for the affairs to be executed by public apparatuses and public employees. For purposes of this study, the public affairs that should be decentralized have been organized into four major developmental fields,
each of which is further subdivided into six sub-fields:

(i) **Governmental affairs**, which are subdivided into (1) governing affairs (i.e., organizational, legal, administrative and political affairs), (2) home affairs (i.e., central, prefectural, regional, local, and rural government unit affairs), (3) foreign affairs, (4) justice affairs, (5) security affairs, and (6) financial affairs;

(ii) **Societal affairs**, which are further categorized into (1) educational and cultural affairs, (2) social welfare affairs, (3) human services affairs, (4) health affairs, (5) religious affairs, and (6) manpower and labour affairs;

(iii) **Economic affairs**, subdivided into (1) economic and trade affairs, (2) agricultural affairs, (3) forestry affairs, (4) animal husbandry and fishery affairs, (5) business and industrial affairs, and (6) mineral resources and energy affairs;

(iv) **Physical affairs**, categorized into (1) public works affairs, (2) housing affairs, (3) agrarian and environmental affairs, (4) mass communication affairs, (5) transportation affairs, and (6) telecommunication affairs.
To execute the decentralized public affairs, public agencies must be established. These are automatically or legally decentralized public apparatuses, either by devolution, deconcentration or semi-vertical decentralization. With the exception of foreign affairs, about twenty-four subcategories of public affairs can be identified; therefore, twenty-four public agencies must be established, each of which has one affair (field) as its mission. For example, within the subcategory of governmental affairs, a public agency should be established to manage and execute governing affairs; this agency could be called the Service of Governing Affairs. The mission of this public agency would be to pursue all activities related to governing affairs, including organizational activities, legal activities, administrative activities and political activities. In this context the Service of Governing Affairs can be further departmentalized into the Bureaus of (1) Organizational Affairs, (2) Legal Affairs, (3) Administrative Affairs, and (4) Political Affairs. Bureaus can be further divided into divisions.

(4) Rational Goals and Objectives of Decentralization of Authority. Many rational objectives and goals
can be achieved through decentralization of authority to national territories, including the following: (1) enhancing national development throughout the entire country or at the prefectural areas, regional areas, local areas and rural areas, especially in those regions or areas which are under- or undeveloped; (2) enabling equal sharing of responsibility for the nation and the state, and equal bearing of the national burden of managing and executing public functions related to national development; (3) enabling equal participation of all layers of the national community so that public employees and all individual citizens may participate in the governmental decision-making process in national development; (4) enlarging governmental capability and capacity to serve the nation and state as well as enriching the knowledge, skills, ability and competence of public employees.

The essential research question for analysis of the relationship between decentralization of authority and national development is "What is decentralization of authority?" Decentralization of authority must take place because there is a goal to accomplish a mission that directly affects the life of the nation and the state. The answer is that decentralization is a means to
advance and enhance national development to fulfill national interests, public demands and societal needs.

iii. Development

Development is viewed by its proponents such as Bryant and White as a process, which according to Palmer "possesses interrelated political, economic, and social dimensions." This implies interrelated and interdependent governmental, social, economic and physical dimensions. It is a modernizing or change process designed to transform the current development from a process occurring from without to one occurring from within. White and Bryant explained: "Development can only be fully understood if it is concerned as a process in industrialized countries as well as in the third world." Todaro made the view clearer:

[Development] is a multidimensional process involving major changes in social structure, popular attitudes and national institutions as well as the acceleration of economic growth, the reduction of inequality and the eradication of absolute poverty.

Similarly, Biller saw that "development refers to the interactional process through which individuals associated in unit networks learn how to articulate and solve problems."

The review of literature on development leads to
the conclusion that the term development (1) objectively implies a comprehensive improvement process whose outcomes are in tangible form; (2) subjectively implies a comprehensive learning process whose outcomes are in intangible form. As examples, several tangible and intangible development outputs have been identified. The following are examples of tangible development outcomes:

1. **Political development** produces tangible outcomes such as establishment of political parties, participation of the mass population directly in national elections, education of the mass of society in national ideology and state policy, strengthening national integrity and political unification, and modernizing political development systems and methods.

2. **Legal development** produces such tangible outcomes as good laws, good operating rules and regulations that can be enforced throughout the entire nation to guarantee national development in all areas, as well as modernization of legal systems and methods.

3. **Societal development** results in skilled manpower, good health facilities, a healthful environment, elimination of disease and massive unemployment, improvement of primitive and substandard housing facilities,
creation of job opportunities, and modernization of social systems and methods.

(4) Economic development creates more agricultural, fishery and forestry products, more exports, more business and industrial undertakings, conversion of natural resources for enhancement of national development, and improvement of energy production, as well as modernization of economic systems and methods.

(5) Physical development results in construction of water supply, electricity and gas facilities, construction and improvement of transportation and communication facilities, and modernization of physical systems and methods.

The following are examples of intangible development and outputs:

(1) Administrative development produces such intangible outcomes as improvement of managerial and executive capability in public apparatuses, which is necessary for successful implementation of national development.

(2) Educational development produces improvement in the ability, skills, knowledge, understanding and competence of public employees in particular and individual citizens in general, enabling them to perform
public tasks with efficiency as well as to take part in the governmental decision-making process. Improvement in the skills, knowledge, and competence of public employees and citizens cannot be separated from improvement in the capability of public apparatuses to execute public functions. The ultimate objective of educational development is to create the scientific and creative thinkers as well as the responsible manpower necessary for improvement in government productivity.

(3) **Organizational development** refers to a comprehensive improvement and learning process that leads to correcting incongruence in governmental arrangements, discovering creative organizational solutions, and creating self-renewing capability in public apparatuses. The ultimate objective of organizational development is to enlarge the government's capacity to accomplish national development with efficiency and economy.

iv. The Relationship between Decentralization of Authority and Development

The analysis of the relationship between decentralization of authority and development has shown that at the territorial levels these two have a reciprocating association that binds them tightly together in an
interdependent system to accomplish predetermined objectives and goals. Legitimate indicators of decentralization of authority are establishment of prefectural, regional, local and rural government units, establishment of public agencies, and performance of public functions—both affairs and tasks. The public task also includes the tasks of management and execution of public affairs, as defined in this study. In the actual conduct of government and development, public affairs must be managed or planned and implemented to be transformed into goods and services. Such goods and services are outputs of development as the ultimate consequence of delegation and decentralization of authority.

There are four major categories of public affairs: (i) governmental affairs, (ii) societal affairs, (iii) economic affairs, and (iv) physical affairs, each of which is further subdivided into six or seven subcategories. With the exception of foreign affairs, all subcategories of public affairs must be decentralized, and a public agency established for each. The decentralized public affairs consist of devolved public affairs, deconcentrated public affairs, and semi-vertical public affairs.

Decentralization of authority is thus a legal
means used to distribute authority throughout the entire country, either by establishment of public apparatuses, i.e., subgovernment units and public agencies, and performance of public functions, i.e., public affairs and public tasks. Public tasks are composed of the task of management, which is the responsibility of the chief executive, and the task of execution, which is the responsibility of the subordinate.

Public affairs must be managed, administered and executed to be transformed into goods and services for the society for which authority has been delegated and decentralized. For efficiency and productivity in all areas of national development—governmental, societal, economic, and physical—differentiation of labour (functions) must be made among all layers of society and all individual citizens forming the national labour force. This action, which is crucial, can be accomplished through decentralization of authority.

In short, the ultimate goal of delegation of authority to the central public apparatuses, and decentralization of authority by the central public apparatuses to national territories is to authorize the central and territorial public apparatuses to carry out all
types of development: governmental, societal, economic and physical. The purpose is to attempt to raise the standard of living of all citizens, to improve the national quality of life, and to promote the general welfare of the nation.

5.1.4. Decentralization of Authority and Development in Practice: A Comparative Analysis

The association of decentralization of authority with development has been analyzed comparatively among the twelve nations used as the sample in this study; the basis for the comparison was the study hypothesis that the degree of decentralization of authority is positively associated with development when the GNP of countries is similar. Before the analysis was made, the degree and rank of decentralization of authority was determined for the twelve sample countries. They were then categorized into two subgroups: (1) more decentralized and (2) less decentralized nations.

The degree of decentralization of authority for a country can be determined by indicators such as the number of established subgovernment units and public agencies, the public functions performed, the average size in square miles or kilometers of the governing area
per province, the density of provincial government units in square miles or kilometers, provincial government units in square miles or kilometers, provincial government units per million population, and average size of population per province. For the twelve sample countries, reliable data on these indicators were limited. Because reliability of data can substantially affect the validity and legitimacy of the determined degree of decentralization of authority, only the three indicators for which reliable data could be obtained were used: (1) average size in square miles of governing areas per province, (2) the number of provincial government units per million population, and (3) the average size of population per province. On the basis of these indicators, the degree and rank of decentralization of authority among the twelve nations states was determined.

The specific criteria used to determine the rank of each of the twelve nations were the following: all nation states that had (1) an average size of governing area per province smaller than 16,000 square miles, (2) more than 0.50 provincial government units per million population, and (3) an average size of population per province less than 2 million persons, were considered to have decentralized a greater amount and a higher level
of authority to their national territories. These criteria confirm the normative definition of the term "decentralization of authority" as used in this study:

Decentralization of authority is defined as vesting of authority by central public apparatuses in the hands of national territories on a geographic basis both by devolution and deconcentration as well as semi-vertical decentralization for the discharge of specified or residual functions.29

Among the twelve sample nations, the more decentralized were the Philippines, Morocco, Tanzania, Malaysia, and Egypt; the less decentralized countries were Nigeria, Burma, Kenya, Indonesia, India, Sudan and Brazil. It should be noted that the assumption that federal governments are more decentralized than unitary governments does not hold here. This observation is true in the sense that decentralization of authority is a legal method used to vest authority in the national territories, using constitutional laws. The law, not a system of government, determines how much and what kind of authority should be decentralized to national territories.

For purposes of analysis, the twelve nations were classified into two subgroups using GNP per capita as a test factor. The groups were (1) countries of high GNP per capita and (2) countries of low GNP per capita. In
establishing the two subgroups, all countries with a GNP per capita less than 500 U.S. dollars were considered poor countries, and those with a GNP per capita greater than 500 U.S. dollars were considered rich. In this study, the high GNP per capita countries are the Philippines, Morocco, Malaysia, Nigeria and Brazil; the low GNP per capita countries are Tanzania, Egypt, Kenya, Burma, Sudan, Indonesia and India.

Six different tangible outputs of societal, economic and physical affairs development were used as indicators of the impact of decentralization of authority on national development. These are (1) literacy and (2) enrollment in higher education per million population—as outputs of societal affairs development; (3) energy consumption per capita in kilograms—as an output of economic affairs development; (4) road and railway density per square kilometer, (5) telephones per thousand population, and (6) urbanization expressed as a percentage of total population living in cities of 100,000 or more people—as outputs of physical affairs development. With the use of these six tangible outputs of development to measure the impact of decentralization of authority on national development in the twelve sample countries, it
appears that overall, the more decentralized nations have greater outputs of societal, economic and physical affairs development than do the less decentralized ones. This finding clearly supports the hypothesis of the study, that the degree of decentralization of authority positively influences the output of development.

5.2. Conclusions

1. A positive association exists between decentralization of authority and development, including governmental, societal, economic and physical affairs development.

2. Establishment of more provincial government units in the national territories may lead to substantially greater development of governmental, social, economic and physical affairs, thus enhancing and accelerating development in these territories.

5.3. Recommendations and Suggestions

5.3.1. Recommendations for Restructuring the Prefectoral Government Arrangements in Less Developed Nations

From this examination, as well as observation of the actual practice of government, it is evident that authority for managing and executing public functions at the territorial level has been decentralized, with the
exception of the authority to make final decisions on the semi-vertically decentralized function of planning. In the twelve nations used as the sample in this study, the authority to make final decisions on the plans or programs that have been approved by the provincial government is centralized in the national capital. All plans or programs approved by regional, local, and/or rural governments must be approved by the provincial government before submission to the central government for final approval.

With this exception, the provincial governments in the twelve countries have authority over all other territorial governments: regional, local and rural. The examination for this study has shown that greater decentralization of authority occurs in the nation states which (a) have an average size of governing area smaller than 16,000 square miles per province, (2) have more than 0.50 provincial government units per million population, and (3) have an average population of less than 2,000,000 persons per province. These more decentralized nations have greater outputs of development than do the less decentralized countries, irrespective of the influence of third variables upon the relationship
between decentralization of authority and development.

The study showed that in most of the emerging nations the planning and budgeting process is used as a legitimate means to control the allocation of national resources through the entire nation. In response to this finding, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. In less developed nations whose territories are highly underdeveloped, it seems necessary to establish more prefectural government units to be vested with a greater and higher level of authority to make decisions.

2. Greater attention should be given to human resources development. This, in turn, will allow more decentralization of authority to national territories, resulting in increased outputs of overall development.

5.3.2. Suggestions for Future Study of Decentralization of Authority

To allow better understanding of the legal meaning of decentralization of authority and its practical applications in the actual conduct of government and national development, it is suggested that studies be made of the following topics:

1. When—legally, organizationally and functionally—can decentralization of authority be said to occur?
2. What are the structural aspects of decentralization of authority which can be used as its legitimate indicators?

3. Is there an association between a system of government—for example, federal or unitary systems—and decentralization of authority?

These three suggestions must be studied within the definition of decentralization of authority used in this study:

Decentralization of authority is defined as vesting of authority by central public apparatuses in the hands of national territories on a geographic basis country-wide, both by devolution, deconcentration and semi-vertical decentralization, for the discharge of specified or residual functions.
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APPENDIX A

DEFINITIONS OF KEY CONCEPTS AS USED IN THIS STUDY
Definitions of Key Concepts as Used in this Study

Authority—legitimate power exercised to accomplish organizational objectives and goals.

Decentralization of authority—vesting of authority in national territories on a geographic basis, both by devolution and deconcentration as well as by semi-vertical decentralization for the discharge of specified or residual functions.

Devolution of authority—decentralization of authority to public apparatuses with autonomous status at the national territory level.

Deconcentration of authority—decentralization of authority to central public agencies or central administrative field offices established in the national territories.

Semi-vertical decentralization of authority—vesting of authority in public agencies which are responsible to both central and territorial governments.

Development—a comprehensive improvement process involving continuing efforts by the government and its governmental organs to change, enhance and modernize the current societal reality. Also a comprehensive learning process involving continuing efforts by the government.
and its governmental organs to expand, increase and improve the government's capability and capacity to manage and execute public functions—both public affairs and public tasks—as well as the ability, skills, knowledge, understanding and competency of public employees and citizens to take part as productive partners in the governmental decision-making process and in national development.

**Public function**—public affairs and public tasks performed by decentralized public apparatuses.

**Public affairs**—governmental affairs, societal affairs, economic affairs and physical affairs.

**Governmental affairs**—governing affairs (i.e., organizational, legal, administrative and political affairs), home affairs (i.e., prefectural, regional, local and rural government affairs), financial affairs, judicial affairs and security or defense affairs.

**Societal affairs**—educational and cultural affairs, social welfare affairs, religious affairs, human service affairs, health affairs, labour and manpower affairs.

**Economic affairs**—economic and trade affairs, agricultural affairs, forestry affairs, fishery affairs, animal affairs, business and industrial affairs, mineral resources and energy affairs.
Physical affairs—public housing affairs, public works affairs, agrarian affairs, environmental affairs, mass communication affairs, transportation affairs, and telecommunication affairs.

Public tasks—the task of management and the task of execution of public functions.

Management task—the task of directing, making decisions, assigning tasks, communicating, staffing (i.e., recruiting, selecting and placing), assuming regular responsibilities, monitoring, supervising, coordinating and controlling public functions.

Execution task—the task of organizing, planning, budgeting, data gathering, data analyzing, reporting, taking part in the governmental decision-making process, implementing decisions made, and performing all other organizational routines.

Public apparatuses—subgovernment units and public agencies established at the national territories.

Subgovernment units—prefectoral government units, regional government units, local government units and rural government units.

Regional government units—shire and city or municipal governments.
Local government units--town and district or com-
munal governments.

Rural government units--village or block or sec-
tion governments.

Control elements--human, natural, material and
financial resources used to test the influence of the
relationship between decentralization of authority and
development.

Structural aspects of decentralization of
authority--legitimate indicators of decentralization of
authority, namely, established subgovernment units, es-
tablished public agencies and performed public functions
at the national territories.

Output of development--the outputs of governmen-
tal, societal, economic and physical affairs development.
APPENDIX B

DECENTRALIZATION OF AUTHORITY AND DEVELOPMENT IN PRACTICE

IN THE TWELVE SELECTED NATION STATES
Decentralization of Authority and Development
in Practice in the Twelve Selected
Nation States

Nowhere in the Third World—in Latin America, the Middle East, Africa or Asia—did decentralization of authority for national development become a specifically important policy objective until the 1970s and 1980s, as governments in the Third World (to use Rondinelli's phrase)
sought to create more socially equitable patterns of economic growth and to meet the basic needs of the poor; some policy analysts contend that decentralization is necessary to accelerate economic growth and to spread its benefits to those groups traditionally bypassed by economic progress.

A. Decentralization Policy in the Twelve Selected Nation States

Decentralization policy in this study is defined as a state "standing decision" for decentralization of authority to national territories to implement and enhance national development at the territorial levels throughout the entire country. It is to be implemented for the benefit of both the nation and the state. In the actual conduct of government, state or public policies which are usually initiated by policy-makers in the context of official public documents such as the Constitution and other constitutional laws, provide general guidance for action to be taken by the government. This is also true of state policy for decentralization of authority in governments of independent nation states worldwide. A good example of constitutional provision for decentralization of authority to national territories is the provision of Article 10 of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia:

The division of Indonesia's territory into larger and smaller units, and the forms of their administration shall be laid down by law, with due regard to and
observance of the principle of consultative right in the special areas.

Following are some of the important recent trends of decentralization of authority in the twelve selected nation states:

i. **In Latin America: Brazil**

Harris described the decentralization policy in Latin American countries as follows:

Both centralizing and decentralizing tendencies coexist in the governments of contemporary Latin American countries. Decentralization, where it exists, has taken other, more subtle forms, such as indirect administration and regionalization. Recent administrative reforms in Latin America have emphasized regional deconcentration of both traditional ministries and autonomous administrative entities. Devolution of power from central and intermediary levels to local units of government has not been a major feature of contemporary administrative reforms in Latin America. In Brazil and Mexico the primary thrust of regionalization is the deconcentration of federal administrative agencies from the capital to major regional centers. However, some effort has also been made to coordinate the activities of the government agencies operating in the states and regions.

**In Brazil, as elsewhere in other Latin American countries, centralization manifests itself in both the overconcentration of decision-making at the top of central government ministries and in efforts aimed at coordinating and consolidating the many public organizations that have mushroomed at the central government level. Decentralization, on the other hand, manifests itself in the creation of relatively autonomous agencies and enterprises that can carry out specific functions with greater flexibility and speed than the traditional ministries.**

ii. **In the Middle-East: Egypt**

The UNDPA experts have described the decentralization policy in Egypt as follows:
The evolution of the local government pattern in the United Arab Republic had its beginnings in 1882, when Britain occupied Egypt. Since 1952, the local system has passed through two phases. The first, which continued up to 1960, was the preparatory stage of large scale deconcentration. The law of 1960 brought into effect full-fledged decentralization. The first phase began after the republican government came into being in 1952. The Government realized that in order to implement development it was necessary to deconcentrate the energies dormant in central ministries, to multiply and expand their agencies and to establish field units to handle locally ministerial functions serving the local areas. As a consequence of this effort, a prodigious expansion of all essential services took place. Schools, hospitals, adult literacy centres, maternity welfare centres and other economic projects increased.

iii. In East Africa: Tanzania, Kenya and Sudan

According to Rondinelli,
decentralization policies were promulgated widely in East Africa during the 1970s. Among the most notable experiments were those in Tanzania, Kenya and Sudan. In these three countries attempts were made to deconcentrate authority by creating field agencies of central ministries or by reassigning officials to province or district levels.

In Tanzania, in general, some of the central functions were delegated to regional and district planning organizations and tied to a limited form of devolution by creating ujama villages. The Decentralization of Government Act of 1972 abolished local governments by transferring many of the functions previously performed by national ministries to regions and districts where former local officials and technical officers continued to serve as members of the national civil service. The central ministries retained responsibility for national planning and development activities and for managing large-scale projects. The reorganization was based on principles that rural development be locally managed, with widespread population participation, but coordinated from the center.
In Kenya, although some functions were delegated to provincial and district planning committees, decentralization policies there rarely went far beyond deconcentration. Reforms were made in 1970, when the Government of Kenya embarked on an extensive governmental reorganization that would place provinces and districts at the center of rural development planning. The government began to decentralize or deconcentrate responsibilities for development planning and administration to provinces and districts. Officially, decentralization was described as an essential component of the government's plan to give new meaning to the phase of rural development, so that the principles of African socialism involving the equitable distribution of the benefits of prosperity can be given greater reality. Responsibility for rural development planning was initially delegated to the provinces. Provincial Development Committees (PDCs) were established to review district project proposals, coordinate provincial plans and monitor their implementation.  

In the Sudan, in general, political leaders initially delegated some functions to provinces and later devolved more provincial, regional and local administrative units. Administrative decentralization and widespread participation in public decision making were basic principles in the socialist philosophy of leaders who staged the 1969 May Revolution in the Sudan. The revolutionary government's commitment to decentralization was most clearly reflected in the People's Local Government Act of 1971. The major thrust of decentralization was to strengthen the authority and decision-making powers of the provinces and to expand participation in local planning and administration. The most extensive program of decentralization thus was undertaken in 1971 in the Sudan where the Local Government Act expanded the duties of Provincial Commissioners and created province executive councils to coordinate the work of local officials and central ministry representatives in the Provinces. Plans were also made to grant administrative autonomy to regional governments and devolve nearly all domestic administrative responsibilities to regions and provinces.
iv. In North and South Africa: Morocco and Nigeria

John R. Nellis described decentralization policies in four North African countries as follows:

The four North African states, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Libya, are moving to deconcentrate and decentralize their modes of government and administration. These countries' governments claim that cautious, step-by-step implementation is natural and necessary, given the social context and human resource levels with which they are working. Repeatedly they imply that time is needed to build up skills and competencies, to change attitudes, and to perfect new patterns of administration and behavior. They point to the fact that, though local governments are legally empowered to take action in many fields, they frequently fail to do so because of their own timidity and ignorance, not because of central government control.

Specifically regarding Morocco, Nellis stated that during the first twenty years of independence the crucial power(s) of fiscal control and policy initiation were consistently retained at the center of government. In line with developments in the rest of the regions, it was in the mid-1970s that the first official announcements were through a revitalization of the local government system. . . . In June 1975, King Hassan announced an intention "to enlarge to the maximum the attributions and the responsibilities of elected representatives and to accord to them in the future the means giving them the power to control local efforts."9

Brian C. Smith described decentralization in Nigeria as follows:

A central objective in the 1976 reform of local government throughout Nigeria was to ensure that significant functions were decentralized to the local level. Appropriate services and importantly, development activities were to be made responsible to local wishes and initiatives by devolving or delegating them to local representative bodies. The
devolution of power would give local councils "substantial control over local affairs."  

v. In Asia: India, Malaysia, the Philippines, Burma and Indonesia

Kuldeep Mathur, Harry J. Friedman and UNDPA experts in the field have described the dominant trends of decentralization of authority (policies) in some Asian countries as follows:

In general, the response of most governments in Asia has been to pay greater attention to regional development by decentralizing development administration and planning. Administrative decentralization came about, in part, as a response to the different ways regional development was being pursued and to how governments in each Asian nation perceive regional demands.

In India, during its colonial period, the emphasis was on administration of local areas by centrally recruited and trained personnel, a form that eventually displaced traditional village governance, particularly councils of elders. Gradually, modifications and additions were introduced to encourage limited self-government in local affairs, although most of the emphasis seemed to be on decentralization of administrative functions rather than on democratization. Thus, there is now increasing reliance on centrally directed administrative institutions, not on local governments to plan and implement development programs. Moreover, according to the UNDPA, decentralization of authority in India is being effected in two ways: through legislation and statutory rules and through delegation of powers by the State Governments and/or higher territorial authorities. The Panchayati Raj regulations and rules issued thereunder by the State give a detailed description of powers and responsibilities transferred to the various institutions. Provision also exists for further delegation of powers to field administrative units at various levels of government. The details of such deconcentration vary widely from State to State.
In Malaysia, the country intended to move toward a system of local autonomy, although subsequent events altered original plans. As in India, constitutionally, local government in Malaysia is the responsibility of state governments.\textsuperscript{14} It is worthy of note that "decentralization in Malaysia is more concerned with project planning and management than with administrative reorganization."\textsuperscript{15} It was not long after independence (1957) that the idea of fully elected and autonomous local government was discarded. What followed was a bureaucratic dominant type of local government under which many Councils functioned in practice as government departments. The system of local government as envisioned by the Local Government Act of 1976 seems to be a synthesis of two approaches and is likely to substantially determine the future pattern of the development of local government in Malaysia. By virtue of the new Constitutional arrangements, local government affairs have to become primarily the responsibility of the State Government, but the central government retains the power and authority to legislate on local government matters for the sake of uniformity of law and policy.\textsuperscript{16} The current practice of relying heavily on central projects for local needs, however, indicates the likelihood of continued dependence on the Central Government.\textsuperscript{17}

In the Philippines, before martial law, the country had constitutionally differentiated provincial government and a variety of elected, governing bodies and officials, primarily at the municipal and barrio levels, covering both urban and rural sectors of society. Under the present regime, numerous and frequent changes in local government have been accompanied by the rhetoric of increasing self-government but appear to be a tightening of central control through technocratic bureaucratization.\textsuperscript{18} In 1972, regional development strategy was established. The objective of the regionalization plan was to decentralize policymaking and implementation to regional levels with line agency activities coordinated by the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA). Administrative reorganization was therefore inherent in the regionalization plan, which attempted to provide spatial or area dimensions to national development planning. In essence, in the Philippines, there
has been a rather extensive revamping of some aspects of local government in recent years, much of it accompanied by rhetoric of decentralization, participation, and even democratization.19

In Burma, the Rural Self-Government Act of 1921 created District Councils of partially elected bodies to be responsible mainly for such matters as vernacular education, health, sanitation and vaccination, maintenance of dispensaries and veterinary facilities. Under the Local Authorities (Suspension) Act of 1946, the Deputy Commissioner was invested with all the rights, privileges, duties, powers, and functions vested in or exerciseable by the District Council concerned. After independence was gained in 1948, the Constitution of the Union of Burma envisaged the conferring of administrative, cultural and economic matters to regional representative bodies on the basis of "principles of regional autonomy." The result was the passage of the Democratic Local Government Act of 1953, which provided for a multi-level local authority in each district; viz., village councils, urban councils, township councils and district councils.20

In Indonesia, decentralization policies are initiated and formulated based on the provision of Article 18 of the 1945 Constitution of the country as quoted earlier. The formulated policies for decentralization of authority to national territories is legislated in constitutional laws, one of which is the Constitutional Law of 1974, No. 5, whose important provisions are the following:

in order to carry out the principle of decentralization, prefectures (Division One) and Regions (Division Two) have to be established and structured; and their further development and upbuilding autonomy should be based on political, economic, socio-cultural as well as defense and security conditions. (Article 3)

Article 7 of the law stipulates the following rights and obligations:

National territories have the right and authority, and are obliged to regulate and organize their
household themselves according to the provisions of the existing effective constitutional laws. Additional decentralization of governmental arrangement to national territories is determined by governing regulations. Such decentralization must also be manned with equipment, implementation materials and sources of expenditures.

ii. Central Public Apparatuses

Central public apparatuses are public instruments holding the highest authority and power delegated by the people and country. They are composed of central government and central public agencies, traditionally called ministries or departments or states. Central public apparatuses are governmentally, to use Wilson's words (1887), the centre of power and authority, from which lower public apparatuses derive their power and authority. The legal action taken to vest authority and power in the hands of lower public apparatuses in an independent nation state is labeled "decentralization."

Central government in most democratic nation states, federated or unitary, is made up of three branches of government: the legislative, which exercises legislative power and authority to enact laws, the executive which exercise executive power and authority to implement the enacted laws, and the judiciary, which exercises the judicial power and authority to see that enacted laws are implemented in letters and spirit without distortion or violation. Systems of government are presumably different, but the way both systems are applied is similar in the sense that distribution of authority and power throughout the entire nation state is the same in both systems of government. To put it another way, either countries using the federal system or countries using the unitary system of government, are governmentally structured into four or five or six tiers of government. Such governmental structuring usually depends on the policy of a nation state and not because of the federal or unitary system of government. This observation is based on the definition of decentralization of authority:

decentralization of authority is vesting of authority by central public apparatuses in the hands of territorial public apparatuses on a
geographic basis countrywide for the discharge of specified or residual functions.

The following summarize the central public apparatuses—both central government, three branches, and central public agencies—based on data available.

B. Central Public Apparatuses

1. BRAZIL

Brazil is a Republic with a federal system of government, structured into three tiers of government: the Central Government, the State Governments and the Municipal Governments.

I. The Central Government

The Central Government of Brazil is composed of the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary.

i. The Legislature. The bicameral Brazilian national congress consists of a Senate of 66 members (three from each state) elected to 8-year terms and a Chamber of Deputies with 420 members elected for 4-year terms. The deputies are allocated among the states based on population and each territory has the right to elect one deputy. Voting is by secret ballot and is compulsory for all literate Brazilian citizens between the ages of 18 and 65.

ii. The Executive. Executive authority is delegated to a President who is elected for a nonrenewable 6-year term by an electoral college which is composed of members of the Federal Legislature and Representatives of the States. The president can exercise the executive authority vested in the presidency to declare a state of siege, to rule by decree, and to intervene in any state without consulting Congress if he decides conditions warrant it. Moreover, under the 1969 Constitution, the government has wide latitude in making social and economic changes that conform to the principles of social justice, conciliating free enterprise with appreciation for the dignity of human labor. Only limited freedom of speech and of the press is guaranteed; such activities
as propagandizing for war, disseminating race or class prejudices, and teaching subversive doctrines are prohibited.

iii. **The Judiciary.** In the present Brazilian judicial system, a supreme federal tribunal, composed of 11 judges, meets in Brasilia. Federal courts are established in each state, in each of the territories and in the Federal District. Other courts are federal electoral tribunals, whose function is to protect elections. Federal judges are appointed by the president for life. Justice in the states is administered in accordance with state laws in state courts. 21

II. **Central Public Agencies.** There are thirteen central public agencies called ministries. These are the Ministries of (1) Justice and Internal Affairs, (2) Foreign Affairs, (3) Finance, (4) Agriculture, (5) Health, (6) Public Works, (7) Education, (8) Mining and Energy, (9) Labour and Social Security, (10) Industry and Commerce, (11) War, (12) the Navy, (13) Aeronautics. A ministry is further departmentalized into services and departments, which are organized into divisions. If the ministry is a technical service agency like the Ministry of Agriculture, then it is further structured into regional offices established at the territorial level.

2. **EGYPT**

The United Arab Republic of Egypt is governed under the Constitution promulgated on September 11, 1971, and is governmentally structured into four tiers of government: the Central Government, the Governorate (Provincial) Governments, the Town Governments, and the Village Governments.

I. **The Central Government.** The central government of Egypt is composed of the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary.

i. **The Legislature.** Legislative authority in Egypt is vested in the unicameral People's Assembly; 382 of its members are elected for 5-year
terms, and half of them are always from the worker and farmer groups. In addition, 10 members of the Coptic community are appointed by the president. The People's Assembly is empowered to approve the budget, make investigations, levy taxes, and approve government programs or withdraw confidence from the cabinet or any of its members.

ii. The Executive. The head of state is the president of the republic, who is nominated by the People's Assembly and elected by popular referendum. The president is elected for a 6-year term and has the power to formulate general state policy and supervise its execution. He can dissolve the People's Assembly, appoint and dismiss cabinet ministers, attend cabinet meetings, and issue decrees during emergencies, but such measures must be approved by referendum within 60 days. Also, the president declares war after approval by the People's Assembly, ratifies treaties, commutes penalties, orders plebiscites, and acts as commander in chief of the armed forces.

iii. The Judiciary. Judicial authority in Egypt is vested in an independent judicial system, which is based on elements of Muslim, English and French law. The courts are divided into four categories. The supreme constitutional court is the highest judicial body. The court of cassation renders final judgments in civil and criminal matters and is composed of a president, 15 vice-presidents, and 80 justices. Below the court of cassation are seven courts of appeal situated in the important governorates. In each governorate is a primary tribunal that hears both civil and criminal cases. At the lowest level are summary tribunals, which are branches of the primary tribunals in various districts headed by a single judge.

II. Central Public Agencies. The central public agencies are ministries. These are the Ministry of (1) Al-Azhar Affairs, (2) Foreign Affairs, (3) Production, (4) Services, (5) Petroleum, (6) Local Government, (7) Economic and Financial Affairs, (8) International Investment and

3. **THE PHILIPPINES** (1946, Date of Independence)

The Republic of the Philippines is structured into five tiers of government: the Central Government, the Province Governments, the Sub-province Governments, the City Governments, the Municipal Governments (Towns) and the Barrios Governments.

I. The Central Government. The Philippines, which is governed under the 1973 Constitution (amended in 1981), is composed of the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary.

i. The Legislature. The legislature of the Philippines is the National Assembly. It is made up of 200 members serving terms of up to 6 years; 165 members are directly elected, 14 are indirectly elected by economic and youth groups, and 21 seats are reserved for the country's president and 20 members of the cabinet.

ii. The Executive. The head of state and chief executive of the Philippines is a president who is popularly elected to a 6-year term. The
president, who has wide-ranging powers, is assisted by a cabinet headed by a prime minister.

iii. The Judiciary. The highest tribunal in the Philippines is the supreme court, made up of a chief justice and 14 associate justices, all appointed by the country's president. Other judicial bodies include a court of appeals, courts of the first instance, and municipal courts.²⁴

4. INDIA (1947, Date of Independence)

The Union of India is governed according to the provisions of a constitution adopted in 1949, which incorporates various features of the constitutional systems of Great Britain, the U.S., and other Western nation states. The Union is governmentally structured into six tiers of government: the Central Government, the State Governments, the District Governments, the Subdivisional Governments, the Tehsil and Block Governments and the Village Governments.

I. The Central Government. India is a union of states, but its government is more highly centralized than that of the United States, and the rights of the States and Territories are rigidly limited. The government consists of the Legislature, the Executive, and the Judiciary.

i. The Legislature. The Constitution vests national legislative power and authority in India in a bicameral parliament consisting of the House of the People, which is composed of not more than 544 members elected directly by the people of the states on the basis of franchise and not more than 17 to represent the union territories, and the Council of States which is composed of not more than 250 members. Members of the House of the People normally serve for five years, and members of the Council of States are elected by the elected members of the state legislative assemblies except for 12 who are appointed by the president.
ii. The Executive. The chief executive and head of state of India is the president, whose role in government is largely nominal and ceremonial. Actual executive power resides in a council of ministers responsible to the parliament. The President is elected for a 5-year term by an electoral college consisting of the elected members of the national and state legislatures and is eligible for successive terms. The council of ministers or cabinet is headed by a prime minister. Each of the ministers is the head of an administrative department of the central government.

iii. The Judiciary. Judicial authority in India is exercised through a system of national courts administering the laws of the republic and the states. All judges are appointees of the executive branch of the government, but their independence is guaranteed by a variety of safeguards. Noteworthy among the latter is a provision requiring a two-thirds vote of the national legislature to effect removal from office. At the apex of the judicial system is a supreme court, consisting of up to 17 members. Next in authority are the high courts and subordinate courts in each state. 23

5. BURMA (Date of Independence: 1948)

The Socialist Republic of Burma, which is governed under the new 1974 Constitution, is governmentally structured into five tiers of government: the Central Government, the State Governments or the Divisional Governments, the Township Governments and the Village Governments. Its Constitution is federal in the sense that the Union of Burma is composed of proper and constituent states, but the Constitution contemplates a strong centralized government. Although certain legislative powers have been conferred on the states, the Union is vested with residuary powers.

I. The Central Government. Under the 1974 Constitution the Central Government of Burma is
made up of the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary.

i. The Executive. The President of the Union is the titular head of the nation state; he wields no real power. The government of the day is formed by the party commanding the majority in the lower house. The President is chairman of the 29-member State Council. The State Council and the Council of Ministers, which is headed by the Prime Minister, are chosen by the People's Assembly.

ii. The Legislature. Burma has a parliamentary form of government, with a bicameral legislature. The People's Assembly is Burma's principal legislative body, which is made of 464 members elected to 4-year terms.

iii. The Judiciary. The Burmese judiciary system is highly centralized. The highest court in the land is the Council of People's Justices, which is elected by the People's Assembly. Lesser courts include state, divisional and township courts.26

7. MOROCCO

Morocco is a hereditary monarchy with traditional authority, governed under the 1972 Constitution as amended. The monarchy of Morocco is governmentally structured into four tiers of government: the Central Government, the Province Governments, the Cercle (District) Governments, and the Conscription or Commune Governments.

I. The Central Government. The Central Government of Morocco consists of the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary.

i. The Legislature. Under the Constitution of 1972, Morocco has a unicameral legislature called the Chamber of Representatives. Its 264 members serve 6-year terms. Deputies for two-thirds of the seats are chosen by direct universal suffrage; deputies for the remaining seats are named by local political and economic groups.
ii. The Executive. The monarch who, according to the Constitution, must be male, is the head of state of Morocco. He appoints the prime minister and cabinet members. He also has power to call for a reconsideration of legislative measures and to dissolve the Legislature. The monarch is commander-in-chief of the country’s armed forces.

iii. The Judiciary. The highest tribunal in Morocco is the supreme court, which sits in Rabat. The country also has nine courts of appeal. Cases involving small sums of money are heard by Sadad tribunals, and more important cases are initiated in regional tribunals. In addition, the country has 14 labor tribunals.\textsuperscript{27}


7. Sudan

The Sudan is a democratic republic and sovereignty is vested in the people. The Democratic Republic of Sudan, which is governed under the 1973 Constitution, is governmentally structured into four tiers of government: the Central Government, the Governorate Governments, the District Governments, and the Village Governments.

I. The Central Government. The central government is made of the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary.
i. The Legislature. National legislative power in Sudan is vested in the unicameral National People's Assembly. It is made up of 138 members popularly elected to 4-year terms plus 13 members chosen by the country's president.

ii. The Executive. The head of state and chief executive of Sudan is a president, who is chosen by the Sudanese Socialist Union, the country's only legal political organization. The president appoints a cabinet of ministers who run various government departments.29

iii. The Judiciary. Sudan's judicial system is divided into two major branches, a civil branch handling most cases and the Sharia courts handling personal matters among Muslims. The civil branch includes a supreme court, courts of appeal, major courts, and magistrates courts.


8. TANZANIA (1964: Date of Independence)

The United Republic of Tanzania was formed in 1964 by the adoption of an Act of Union between Tanganyika and Zanzibar. The nation is governed under the 1977 Constitution, as amended. The internal affairs of Zanzibar are administered under the constitution of 1979. The country is governmentally structured into five tiers of government: the Central Government, the Region (Provincial) Governments, the District Governments, the Ward Governments and the Village Government and/or Ujamaa Village Governments.
I. The Central Government. The central government of Tanzania consists of the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary.

i. The Legislature. The Legislature of Tanzania is the unicameral National Assembly. It has 239 members, 111 of whom (101 from Tanganyika and 10 from Zanzibar) are popularly elected to terms of up to five years. Most of the rest of the members are either appointed, represent statutory organizations, or sit by virtue of being commissioners of the country's regions.

ii. The Executive. The chief executive of Tanzania is a president, popularly elected to a 5-year term. The president appoints a vice-president (who must represent Zanzibar if the president comes from Tanganyika, and vice versa) and a prime minister and cabinet members.

iii. The Judiciary. The highest tribunals in Tanzania are the court of appeal and the high court. Lesser courts include district and primary courts. People's courts function in Zanzibar.


9. MALAYSIA (Date of Independence: 1957)

Malaysia, a constitutional monarchy, has a federal form of government based on the 1957 Constitution of the former Federation of Malay. The country is governmentally structured into five tiers of Government: the Central Government, the
State Governments, the District Governments (for all states in Peninsular Malaya) or Division Governments (for States in Sarawak) and Residency Governments (for States in Sabah), and the Mukim and the Kampung Governments.

I. The Central Government. The Kerajaan (Monarchy) of Malaysia's Central Government is composed of the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary.

i. The Legislature. Both the prime minister and cabinet are responsible to the Parliament, which includes a House of Representatives (Dewan Rakyat) of 154 members and a Senate (Dewan Negara) of 58 members. Representatives of the lower house are popularly elected for 5-year terms. Legislative power is divided between the federal and state legislatures. Senators serve for six years. Two senators are elected by each state legislature, and the rest are appointed by the head of state.

ii. The Executive. The head of state is the Yang Di-per Tuan Agong or supreme head of the federation, who is elected by and from among the nine hereditary rulers of the Malay states and serves a 5-year term. Executive power is exercised by the prime minister, who is the leader of the majority party or coalition in the house of representatives and is appointed by the head of state.

iii. The Judiciary. Judicial authority is vested in the separate High Courts of West and East Malaysia, with subordinate courts in the chief centres of population. The very large majority of cases, criminal and civil, are disposed of by sessions and magistrates' courts. Final appeal is the Privy Council in London, which tenders advice to the crown. In capital cases trial is by jury and the accused receives free legal aid. In West Malaysia there are also Islamic religious courts, the jurisdiction of which includes matrimonial affairs.

II. Central Public Agencies. There are central public agencies. These are the Ministries of (1)

10. NIGERIA (Date of Independence: 1960)

The Federal Republic of Nigeria, under the 1978 Constitution, is governmentally structured into five tiers of government: the Central (Federal) Government; the State Governments, the Province Governments, the Divisional Governments, the District Governments, and the Location Governments.\textsuperscript{36}

I. The Central Government. The Central Government of Nigeria is made up of the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary.

i. The Legislature. The National Assembly, made up of a Senate of 95 members and a House of Representatives of 449 members, is the national legislative body of Nigeria. Senators and representatives are elected to 4-year terms by direct popular vote.

ii. The Executive. Under the 1978 Constitution of Nigeria, the country's president who is elected for a 4-year term by direct popular vote, is both head of state and head of the government.

iii. The Judiciary. The highest tribunal of Nigeria is the supreme court. It is made up of a chief justice and up to 15 other judges, all appointed by the country's president. Other important courts include the federal court of appeal, the federal high court, and a high court in each state. In addition, some states have Islamic courts, and courts based on traditional law.\textsuperscript{37}

II. KENYA

Kenya is governed under the Constitution of 1963, as amended. Amendments enacted in 1964 made the country a republic within the Commonwealth of Nations. It has a modified parliamentary form of Government, and is governmentally structured into six tiers of government: the Central Government, the Provincial Governments, the District Governments, the Divisional Governments, the Location Governments and the Sub-location Governments.

I. The Central Government. The central government of Kenya is composed of the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary.

i. The Legislature. The legislative branch of government of Kenya is the National Assembly. The National Assembly consists of 158 directly elected members, 12 members who are nominated by the president, and 2 ex officio members, the attorney general and the Speaker, who has a casting vote.

ii. The Executive. Executive authority in Kenya is exercised by a president, elected for a 5-year term by popular vote. A vice-president and a cabinet are appointed by the president from members of the National Assembly.

iii. The Judiciary. The Kenyan Judicial system consists of two major courts and several lesser
tribunals. The major courts are the Kenya court of appeal, with a chief justice and four associate judges; and the high court of Kenya with seven puisne judges. The lesser tribunals include the resident magistrates' courts, the district magistrates' courts, and the qadi courts, which determine questions of Muslim law.


12. INDONESIA

Indonesia is a unitary Republic, governed under and by the 1945 Constitution. Under the provision of Article 18 of the 1945 Constitution, the country is structured into six tiers of government: the Central Government, the Provincial Governments, the Shire and Municipal Governments, the District and Town Governments, the Desa Governments, and the Village Government.

I. Central Public Apparatuses. The central public apparatuses consist of central government and central public agencies or ministries.

i. Central Government. The Central Government of Indonesia is made up of (i) the Legislative, (ii) the Executive, and (iii) the Judiciary Branch of Government.

(i) The Legislature. The Legislature of Indonesia consists of the Dewan Perwaikilan
Rakyat (People's Council of Representatives), and the Majalis Permusyawaratan Rakyat (People's Consultative Assembly). The Legislative power in Indonesia is vested in the People's Council of Representatives which is made up of 360 directly elected and 100 appointed members, which must approve all statutes and has the right to submit draft bills for ratification by the President. The People's Consultative Assembly is composed of all the members of the country's territories (regions). The main functions of the assembly are to elect the president and vice-president and to determine the broad lines of state and government policy. The constitution requires that the Assembly meet at least every five years and that the council convene once a year.

(ii) The Executive. Under the 1945 Constitution, the chief executive of Indonesia is a president, elected to a 5-year term by the People's Consultative Assembly, which includes the nation state's parliament. The president who may serve any number of terms, has considerable power and can govern by decree in emergencies. The president appoints, and presides over a cabinet of ministers.

(iii). The Judiciary. The highest tribunal in Indonesia is the Mahkamah Agung (Supreme Court). Other judicial bodies are High Courts and District Courts, which are established throughout the nation state.41

Besides these ministries there are also (a) Coordinating Ministers, (2) State Ministers without Portfolio, and (c) State Ministers/Junior Ministers. There are three coordinating ministers, namely, coordinating minister for political affairs and security, coordinating minister for the economy, finance, industry and development supervision, and the coordinating minister for public welfare. There are eight state ministers without portfolio, namely minister/state secretary, minister for national development planning (currently Chairman of National Development Planning Board: BAPPENAS), state minister of research and technology (concurrently Chairman of the Board for the Study and Application of Technology), state minister for population affairs and the environment, state minister for housing, state minister for youth affairs and sports, state minister for efficient utilization of the state apparatus, and state minister for women's affairs. There are five state ministers/junior ministers, namely junior minister/cabinet secretary, junior minister for promotion of the use of domestic products, junior minister for development of food produce, junior minister for development of hard crops, and junior minister for development of fisheries and animal husbandry products.42

C. Decentralized Public Apparatuses

The decentralized public apparatuses, which are established at the territorial levels, consist of prefectoral, regional, local, and rural government units, public agencies and councils. The decentralized public apparatuses are further made of devolved subgovernments, i.e., prefectoral, regional, local and rural, devolved public agencies, deconcentrated public agencies and semi-vertical public agencies and territorial councils. Prefectoral governments are called state governments in the federated nation states and provincial governments in the unitary nation states. Regional governments are made up of shires or counties or cities or municipalities for certain nation states. Local governments are made up of
towns or cities or districts and/or municipalitiss and/or sometimes village governments in certain nation states that have only four tiers of government. Prefectoral government is the second tier of government, regional government is the third, local government is the fourth and village government is the fifth tier. Some nation states like Nigeria, Kenya, India and Indonesia, have structured their nation state into six tiers of government, while Egypt and Sudan have used four tiers. The tiers of government designate the level of authority in any country's system of government. A higher tier has higher authority. Hypothetically speaking, the higher the tier of government, the higher the level of authority such government possesses. Thus, the prefectoral government as the second tier to the Central Government, the highest tier in the national government system, legally holds the highest level of authority at the territorial level. Next is the third tier of government followed by the fourth, the fifth and the sixth tier of government.

Devolved public agencies are fully under authority of the territorial governments and are funded by them and responsible to them. Deconcentrated public agencies are fully under authority of and responsible to and funded by central public apparatuses or central government and central public agencies directly concerned. Semi-vertical public agencies are under authority of and responsible to and funded by both central public apparatuses and territorial governments, especially prefectoral governments in certain nation states. Because of lack of data, we are only reviewing decentralized public agencies of the nation states that are available. There are five countries that have data on devolved public agencies, namely Brazil, Sudan, Nigeria, and Indonesia, and five countries have data on deconcentrated public agencies, notably Brazil, Nigeria, Malaysia, the Philippines and Indonesia. These data on public agencies in these nation states, with the exception of Indonesia, are far less complete. Indonesia has data on some semi-vertical public agencies.

The territorial councils are legislative bodies at all levels of territorial government: there are rural (village) councils, local (town or district or municipal) councils, regional (shire or county or city or municipal) councils, and prefectoral (state assemblies or Provincial
House of Representatives, or Provincial or Regional) councils.

Following is a summary of the decentralized public apparatuses in the twelve nations states based on the available data.

D.1. Territorial Government

1. BRAZIL

In the Brazilian federal system of government, the nation state is governmentally divided into twenty-two States, one Federal District, and four Federal Territories. Each State is governed by its own constitution and by laws voted by the state legislature. The territories are administered by the Federal Government. Both the states and the territories are divided into municipalities (municipios), which are the units of local government in Brazil. As of 1967 there were about 4,000 municipalities and by the end of 1975 there were about 4,300 units of local government.43

2. EGYPT

The Arab Republic of Egypt (1957) is divided into twenty-five Governorates, of which twenty-two are in the Nile Valley and three in the desert area. Governorates are further subdivided into towns and towns into villages. When villages become more industrialized, they are converted into towns.44

3. THE PHILIPPINES

The Republic of the Philippines is governmentally divided into seventy-four (74) Provinces, plus the national capital region. The provinces, each of which is headed by a governor and assisted by a vice-governor, are further subdivided into a total of sixty cities and about 1485 other municipalities (towns), each headed and governed by an elected mayor and a council. In addition, there are about 42,000 barangays (villages which are governed by barrio Captains and Councils elected by the members of each community concerned).45
4. **INDIA**

The form of the prefectoral governments of India is modeled after that of the central government. The Union of India is governmentally divided into twenty-two states (15 in 1962) and nine (8 in 1962) federally administered territories. States are further subdivided into districts, districts into subdivisions, and subdivisions into tehsils (basic units) and blocks, and tehsils and blocks into villages. There are about 3,250 cities and towns, and approximately 567,000 farm villages, and about 5,200 blocks. 46

5. **BURMA**

Under the 1974 Constitution Burma is governmentally divided into seven Divisions that constitute Burma proper and seven States. Divisions and States are further divided into subdivisions and districts, and subdivisions and districts into townships and townships into villages (village-tracks). There are about 100 Districts and Subdivisions, 200 townships and 50,000 villages. 47

6. **MOROCCO**

The monarchy of Morocco is governmentally divided into 32 prefectoral administrative divisions, which are composed of 30 provinces and two Prefectures. They are further subdivided into Circles (Districts), and Circles into Conscriptions or communes. There are 45 urban communes, 40 autonomous communes or semi-urban communes and 761 rural communes. 49

6. **SUDAN**

Until the end of 1980, Sudan was governmentally divided into nine Provinces or Governorates. Administrative changes intended to decentralize more authority were approved in 1980. Under the reorganization plan of 1980, Sudan was to be reorganized into six Regions plus the City of Khartoum. The regions, each to be administered by a governor and an elected assembly, were designed to have considerable autonomy. The Governorates are further subdivided into Districts, and Districts into Villages. 50
8. **TANZANIA**

The Republic of Tanzania is governmentally divided into twenty-five Regions. Each region is headed by a Regional Commissioner. Regions are further subdivided into districts and districts into wards and wards into villages or ujamaa villages.51

9. **MALAYSIA**

The monarchical Federation of Malaysia is governmentally subdivided into fourteen prefectural administrative divisions, consisting of thirteen States and one Federal Territory (i.e., the Capital of Kuala Lumpur). These prefectures are further subdivided into districts or divisions or residencies, and districts and divisions and residencies into mukims, and mukims into kampongs (villages). Nine of Malaysia's fourteen States are headed by hereditary Malay Sultans, and the other five prefectures by governors appointed by the King and thus selected by the Prime Minister.52

10. **NIGERIA**

The Federation of Nigeria is governmentally, under the 1978 Constitution, divided into twenty prefectural administrative divisions, made up of nine States and one Federal Capital Territory. These prefectural administrative divisions are further divided into provinces, and provinces into divisions, and divisions into districts, and districts into locations and locations into villages. Each State is headed by a governor.53

11. **KENYA**

Kenya is governmentally divided into eight prefec-toral administrative divisions, composed of seven Pro-vinces and one Central District (i.e., Nairobi). Prefec-tures are further subdivided into districts and districts into divisions and divisions into locations and locations into sublocations. Each Province is headed by a Provin-cial Commissioner, a District by a District Commissioner, a Division by a Divisional Officer, and Locations and Sublocations respectively by Chiefs and Assistant Chiefs.54
12. INDONESIA

The unitary Republic of Indonesia is governmentally divided into 27 prefectural administrative divisions, consisting of 26 Provinces and one Central Territory (i.e., Special Territory of Greater Jakarta). Prefectures are further divided into shires and cities, and shires and cities into towns and districts, and towns and districts into desas (incorporated villages) and desas into villages. Currently there are 246 Kabupatens (Shires or Regencies), 54 Kotamadyas (Municipalities), 3,349 Kecamatans and Kotakecils (Districts and Towns) and 64,720 Desas—the lowest government of the Indonesian unitary system of government. Prefectures or Provinces are headed by Governors or Bugernurs, Kabupatens by Bupatis, Kotamadyas by Wali-kotamadyas, Kecamatans by Camats, and Desas by Lurahs, while Kotakecils are headed by Wali-kotas.33

D.2.--Decentralized Public Agencies

The decentralized public agencies are agencies established at the territorial levels, universally made up of (i.i.1) devolved public agencies, which have autonomous status but under the hierarchical authority of the territorial governments (i.e., prefectural, regional, local, and rural), (i.i.2) deconcentrated public agencies which have no autonomous status and are under the hierarchical authority of the central public apparatuses, and (i.i.3) semi-vertical public agencies, which are under authority of both central and territorial governments.

(i.i.1) Devolved Public Agencies

From the thirteen nation states used as chunks in this study, there are only five countries that have data on devolved public agencies at the territorial levels, namely Brazil, Sudan, Nigeria, and Indonesia. They are as follows:

1. BRAZIL

Brazil has data on devolved public agencies at both prefectural (State) and regional (Municipal) levels as follows:


2. SUDAN

The Sudan has data on devolved public agencies at the Prefectoral (Provincial) level as follows:


3. NIGERIA

Nigeria also has data on devolved public agencies at the prefectural (State) level as follows:

A. At the Prefectoral (State) Level. Ministries of (1) Treasury, (2) Agriculture, (3) Natural Resources, (4)

4. **INDONESIA**

Indonesia has data on devolved public agencies at both Prefectural (Provincial) and regional (Shire and City) levels as follows:


**D.3. Deconcentrated Public Agencies**

Five of the thirteen nation states used in this study as the sample population have data on deconcentrated public agencies at the prefectural level, namely Brazil, the Philippines, Malaysia, Nigeria, and Indonesia. These are the following:

1. **BRAZIL**

Some of the deconcentrated public agencies as representative offices of central public agencies at the territorial level in Brazil are the Departments of (1)
Finance, (2) Public Works, (3) Social Security, (4) Labour. 50

2. THE PHILIPPINES


3. MALAYSIA

The deconcentrated public agencies in Malaysia include (1) the Office of Police, (2) the Office of Health, (3) the Office of Education, (4) the Office of Telecommunication, and (4) MARA (Council for the Benefit of Indigenous Peoples). 62

4. NIGERIA

Some of the deconcentrated public agencies in Nigeria are the (1) Agricultural Extension Service, (2) Medical and Health Field Services, and (3) Education Service. 63

5. INDONESIA

D.4 Semi-Vertical Public Agencies

Semi-vertical public agencies can be defined as devolved-deconcentrated public agencies established at the territorial levels, that are fully under the authority of and responsible to and funded by both central public apparatuses and territorial governments. Following are some of the semi-vertical public agencies from the Republic of Indonesia:

1. Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah: BAPPEDA (Regional Development Planning Board or Agency)

2. Direktorat Pembangunan Desa (Directorate of Village Development)

3. Direktorate Urusan Agraria (Directorate of Agrarian Affairs)

4. Direktorate Sosial Politik (Directorate of Socio-Political Affairs)

5. Bank Pembangunan Daerah (Regional Development Bank)

D.5 Territorial Councils

Besides territorial government units and decentralized public agencies, there are also decentralized public apparatuses called Councils. Territorial councils are legislative bodies at all levels of territorial government, each of which should make decisions or approve, for example, a plan or program, before it is submitted to higher authority for scrutiny and approval. There are rural (village), there are local (town or district, or municipal), there are regional (shire or county or municipal, or city) and there are prefectoral (i.e., State Assemblies, Provincial House of Representatives or Councils) councils in each of the thirteen nation states used in this study as a sample population. Following are reviews of some of the territorial councils in these twelve nations states based on the data available.

1. BRAZIL

All Brazilian municipalities have municipal councils.
Each Council is divided into several committees. The most common are the following: Executive Committee (made up of the speaker or president of the council, one to three vice-presidents, a secretary, and one or more vice-secretaries); the Budget and Finance Committee; the Public Works Committee; the Legislative and Justice Committee; the Committee of Accounts; the Education, Public Health and Social Assistance Committee; and the Agriculture and Development Committee.

The Functions of Councils. As the legislative or policy-making branch of the municipal government, the most important function of the Council is to pass ordinances on matters pertaining to the competence or the peculiar interest of the municipality. A vote of the council is required, among other things, in the following matters: taxation; approval of the budget proposed by the major; concession of tax exemptions and other fiscal favors, as well as of any privileges; concession of public utility franchises; approval of agreements and compacts in which the municipality is a part; sale or lease of municipal real estate; creation and organization of municipal services; borrowing; position classification and salary scales; basic municipal codes, such as the building code, the sanitary code and other regulatory ordinances; and adoption of master plans, zoning and subdivision regulation. The council also has inspection and control powers in relation to the municipal executive. These powers are to impeach the mayor; to audit the mayor's annual report on the execution of the budget; and in a few states to review, on appeal, mayoral decisions in such matters as personnel and tax assessment. The council has no administrative functions except in relation to its internal organization.

2. EGYPT

The territorial councils in Egypt are (1) Provincial Councils, (2) Town Councils and (3) Village Councils. Besides these councils, there are other representative bodies: the National Union and Combined Units.

The Functions of Territorial Councils. The policy adopted on the basis of the local government law is to delegate to local authorities all functions which, by their nature, are predominantly local, such as local utilities, and town planning. With respect to functions
of national interest, the policy is to delegate responsibility for those aspects requiring adaptation of method of operation to local needs and aptitudes. Some of these are problems relating to technical education, medical services and economic projects. Further, the local government law specifies the jurisdiction of the various local government units with respect to various services.68

3. THE PHILIPPINES

The territorial councils in the Philippine are (1) the Provincial Councils, (2) the Municipal Councils, (3) the City Councils, (4) the Barrio Councils.

Legislative Bodies. Local legislative bodies are usually to enact the budget, appropriate money for specific purposes, construct and maintain public works and to pass other measures to maintain peace and order, protect health, and promote the general welfare of the local constituents. City and Municipal Councils may also adopt zoning, subdivision, and building regulations. Like cities, provinces may assess real property for taxation purposes.69

4. INDIA

There are State Legislatures, which are bicameral (i.e., an Upper House and a Lower House), Zila Parishads (District Councils), Panchayat Samitis (Block Councils) and Village Panchatas (Village Councils).

The Functions of Territorial Councils or Local Authorities. The local authorities or territorial councils are conceived as planning and implementation agencies for development programmes within their jurisdiction. The functions allotted at any level of territorial government are based on this conception and on the overall needs of the National Plan. The Village Panchayat is responsible for all programmes that are best planned and implemented at the village level. It also acts as an agent for the block council in respect to programmes of the latter that are to be worked within the jurisdiction of the panchayat. The Panchayat Samiti (Block Council) performs similar functions at its level. The Zila Parishad (District Council) is generally a coordinating, supervisory and advisory body with no executive functions. The
gravitational centre of local Government below the State Government tends to be the block council in these arrangements.

5. SUDAN

There are Province Councils, Municipal Councils and Rural Councils. Before the Local Government Act of 1971, territorial councils had the following authority and responsibilities:

Province Councils. The powers granted to province councils cover a wide field of activities, including provision for and promotion of education, culture, social welfare, agriculture, public health, animal resources and public works. In addition to these tasks, province councils are competent to (1) make decisions on policy and issue local orders; (2) formulate and recommend to the appropriate ministers development schemes for the province; (3) consider local problems of importance to the province in all branches of administration and make suggestions for development, improvement and general advancement; (4) advise the Central Government on legislation and other matters referred to it for such advice by the Council of Ministers; (5) assume general responsibility for promoting local government in the province and ensuring that services performed by local government councils are in the best interests of the inhabitants of the province, are of the highest possible standards, and are in keeping with the national policy determined by the Government, and (6) pass budgets of local government councils.

6. NIGERIA

There are State Legislatures, Divisional Councils, District Councils, Local Councils and Area Committees.

The Functions of Territorial Councils. The UNDPA experts have described the functions of territorial councils in Nigeria before governmental reform in 1976 as follows:

The local council is created by a legal instrument which lays down its composition and functions. Some of the functions are obligatory, others are permissive; they include maintenance of roads, control of
markets and motor parks, maintenance of traditional offices of chiefs and disposal of refuse. A local council, as a rule, is not a rating authority but is associated with either an all-purpose district council or a divisional council which is empowered to collect rates. Moreover, local councils vary in size, but they usually cover a desire to carry on local government as a distinct body.

The District Council is the most typical council. It can be an all-purpose council, in which case it will be a competent authority for a long list of functions enumerated in the Local Government Law, including rating, education, water supply, maintenance of roads and bridges, health and customary courts. A district council can also be one with limited functions, in which case it joins with other district councils or local councils to form a divisional council, with responsibility for performing the functions not assigned to the constituent councils.

The Divisional Council, which is the largest unit, is usually given the power to levy rates and to allocate agreed proportions to its members.

6. BURMA

There are State Councils, District Councils, Township Councils, Urban Councils and Village Councils.

7. MOROCCO

There are Provincial Councils, Municipal Councils, Urban Communal Councils, Autonomous or Semi-Urban Communal Councils and Rural Communal Councils.

8. TANZANIA

There are Regional Councils, District Councils, Ward Councils, and Village Councils.

9. MALAYSIA

There are State Legislative Assemblies, District (and/or Divisional and/or Residence) Councils, Town Councils and Town Boards.
11. KENYA

There are Regional Assemblies, Local Native Councils, African District Councils, County Councils, Urban Councils and Area Councils.\textsuperscript{77}

12. INDONESIA

There are Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah Tingkat 1 (Division 1 Territorial House of Representatives), Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah Tingkat 2 (Division 2 Territorial House of Representatives) and Badan Musyawarah Dasa (Village Consultative Board).\textsuperscript{78}

E.1. Devolved Public Functions

Devolved public functions, which consist of public affairs and public tasks, are activities that are performed by devolved public apparatuses, both territorial governments and public agencies. The devolved public functions are fully under the authority of and the responsibility of the devolved public apparatuses or territorial governments and public agencies. They are funded by these agencies. Following are some of the devolved public affairs of the twelve nation states.

1. BRAZIL

The public affairs devolved to the territorial levels in Brazil are as follows:

A. At the Prefectoral (State) Level: legal affairs, general administration, finance, Interior affairs, justice, social services, statistics, education, health, library, agriculture, industry, commerce, labour, public works, water, electricity, public safety and information.

B. At the Regional (Municipal Level: administration, accounting, technical education, economics, commerce, lands, forestry, industrial development, animal production, vegetal production, and industrial technology, sewers, social and cultural affairs, sanitation, housing, urban roads and street construction.\textsuperscript{79}
3. **EGYPT**

Some of the public functions being devolved to the territorial governments in Egypt are as follows:

A. **At the Prefectoral (Governorate) Level:**
Education, culture, public health, social welfare, youth welfare, labour, cooperatives, economic affairs, agriculture, irrigation, rural industries, supply, public utilities, housing, transportation, and communication affairs.

The Role of the Ministry of Local Government: The Ministry of Local Government was created in 1960, pursuant to the basic local government law, to expedite action by technical ministries on requests from local authorities, to oversee relationships with and helpfully supervise local authorities and to distribute grants-in-aid and provincial shares in the Common Fund. The Ministry has a consultative committee. It also has a small staff which is organized on the following basis: legal division, rural councils, town councils and provincial councils. The Ministry of Local Government has an important role since it serves as an instrument not only of control, but also for coordinating programme planning and allocating financial resources to local authorities. The supervisory competence of the Vice-President of Local Government covers all the ministries concerned with functions delegated to local councils.90

3. **THE PHILIPPINES**

Most of the essential public services or public affairs have been decentralized to the territorial governments. Campo and others have described such decentralized public affairs and tasks as follows:

Generally, local governments perform the following functions and services: general administrative functions, local personnel, local revenue administration, protective services, education, health and welfare, agriculture, public works, community development and local planning.91

4. **INDIA**

Some public affairs being devolved to the territorial
governments are education, social education, health services, rural social services, agriculture, animal husbandry, cooperatives, engineering industries, and rural infrastructure. \(^{82}\)

7. SUDAN

Some public affairs being devolved to the territorial governments in Sudan are cooperation, rural development, finance, economic planning, health, social welfare, wildlife, conservation, tourism, culture, information, education, legal affairs, coordination, agriculture, natural resources, mining, industry, housing, public utilities, public services, manpower, transport, and communication (Middle East and North Africa, 1981-1984). \(^{83}\)

The Ministry of Local Government. The Minister of Local Government is responsible for the supervision, promotion and development of territorial governments in the country. He approves the taxation levels of all local government areas to ensure uniformity and justice to all residents, and he plays an important role in local government finance and its control. He retains the ultimate authority of appointing fit persons to supervise and inspect performances of councils and auditors to audit the accounts and certify the annual balance sheets. As regards province councils, the Minister of Local Government and other Ministers have the power of appointing fit persons under the Provincial Administration Act of 1960 to supervise the fulfillment by the province councils and province authorities of functions pertaining to their ministries. \(^{84}\)

10. NIGERIA

Some of the public affairs being devolved to the territorial governments are treasury, agriculture, natural resources, chieftancy affairs, home affairs, justice, economic planning, community development, health, social welfare, public works and transport, lands, housing, labour, trade, industry, education, information.
11. **INDONESIA**

Some of the devolved public functions in Indonesia are general administration, public relations, protocol, territorial government affairs, law, organization, finance, welfare, religious affairs, personnel and training, economic affairs, mineral affairs, regional development, regional revenue, education, culture, social welfare, health, agriculture, forestry, animal husbandry, fishery, public works, housing, information, postal services, telephone service, telegraph services.

**E.2. Deconcentrated Public Functions**

1. **BRAZIL**

According to the UNDP experts, much cooperation between the three levels of government takes place without the signing of a formal agreement. The federal and state field agencies are at a great liberty to operate independently, that is, without the need to consult or act in accordance with any of the other government levels. Some ministries and authorities have regional offices covering a few municipalities and reporting directly to headquarters. Besides central deconcentrated public functions, there are also deconcentrated public functions from the prefectural (State) level to the regional (municipality) level.

**Control Power and Authority of Deconcentrated Field Agencies.** The field agencies are given power and authority to control the application of grants-in-aid and subsidies to local self-governing authorities, or any authority of a lower governmental level, as well as to private and semi-public organizations. The same occurs when a project is being carried out by an agreement between the Governments involved. The application by the state and local governments of their shares of certain federal taxes is also controlled by regional field offices of the Federal Government, a good example of this being the technical and financial control exercised by the Federal Highway Department over the state highway departments.
2. **THE PHILIPPINES**

The administrative deconcentration of central public functions is expected to be materialized through the establishment of field agencies or offices with increased decentralization of authority at the territorial level. Each territorial office is to be managerially responsible for all field offices and their activities in its area. In the Philippines, Guzman et al. have described deconcentrated functions as follows:

The reorganization of various departments and bureaus immediately after the approval of the Government Survey and Reorganization Commission (GSRC) plans in 1956 sought to implement recommendations made by the GSRC such as the decentralization of government operations and the dispersal of personnel as well as the development and strengthening of field offices in a coordinated and coherent pattern in order to bring the public services as close as possible to the people in the most efficient and effective way.

At the territorial level, headquarters offices of field operations were established in the following agencies: (1) Department of Labour, (2) Civil Service Commission, (3) Government Service Insurance System, (4) Presidential Arm on Community Development, (5) Bureau of Public Works, (6) Bureau of Public Highways, (7) Bureau of Public Schools, (8) Department of Health, (9) Agricultural Productivity Commission, and (10) Bureau of Internal Revenue.

3. **INDIA**

In the federal governmental system of the Union of India, in some states the districts are grouped into a number of divisions for purposes of supervision and coordination. Technical and administrative services of central public agencies develop their field administrative units broadly according to the divisions mentioned above. The exact arrangement in any technical service, is, however, dependent on the amount and intensity of work. Thus, a technical service need not necessarily have a field unit at every one
of the levels mentioned above; and a technical service dealing with a special project may have its field units functioning across these administrative divisions.89

4. BURMA

According to the UNDP’s experts, in the districts in India there are also field representative offices of the various central departments. There were seventy-four such functional departments (1962) such as agriculture, cooperatives, education, forests, health, highways, irrigation, judicial and veterinary. These deconcentrated field agencies work under the supervision and control of the head of their respective departments in the national capital, Rangoon. They are not employed by local government but are answerable only to the central government for their stewardship.90

5. SUDAN

According to the UNDP, different technical services have common areas within the province, and every ministry has its official representative who is a member of the Central Civil Service. The Provincial Administration Act has provided for the coordination of the work of different ministries within the same province. Their heads are directly answerable to the province councils and are jointly and severally responsible for the execution of their decisions. They are also responsible to their ministries in matters pertaining to their ministries which have not been devolved to the province councils or province authorities. Services such as hospitals, secondary education and public security have to be operated by Central Government in view of the fact that a minimum standard should be maintained and Central Government organs in this case are most fit and more properly equipped to deal with them.

Further, coordination is fully maintained through the province authority in which all ministries at the provincial level are represented and are responsible for the discharge of their functions collectively. Members of the Province authority are also members of the Province Council and play an important role in
the planning of service in addition to their responsibilities for the execution of services decentralized. 91

6. MALAYSIA

Parallel to the state secretaries and state departments were the state offices of agencies run directly by the Federal Government, such as Police, Health, Education, MARA (Council for the Benefit of Indigenous Peoples) and Telecommunications. In some cases their clerks were assigned by the State Governments, though their salaries were paid by the Federal Government. Coordination among the state offices of these departments and between them and the state departments and the secretariats was informal, infrequent, and ad hoc, except for "development" activities. Unique communicating and coordinating instruments for development projects were the state development committees headed by the chief minister or menteri besar and assisted by the aforementioned state department officers. 92

7. NIGERIA

Before ministerial government was introduced in 1951, the field work of the central government agencies was carried out in common areas as provinces and divisions. There was a senior administrative officer in charge of a division and a resident in charge of a province. The resident coordinated all administrative and technical services in his area and was also responsible for the proper functioning of local government.

Since the introduction of ministerial government, this pattern of decentralization has changed. The post of resident has been abolished and each ministry organizes its field services into areas best suited to it. Although the old units called divisions and provinces are still referred to, they no longer form the basis of organization and any coordination which is necessary is done at headquarters rather than at the local level. The distinctive areas of the field organization of some of the ministries are (1) agricultural extension service, (2) medical and health field services, and (3) education services. Depart-
ments within the same ministry use common areas, e.g., Medical Service and Health Service, Education Administration and Education Inspectorate. Senior officers are, without exception, career officers who are liable to be posted from one area to another or to headquarters.93

8. INDONESIA

Some of the deconcentrated public functions or public affairs in Indonesia are finance-revenue, state treasury, provincial budget, taxes and customs, judicial affairs, immigration, civil defense, education, culture, religious affairs, census, statistics, manpower affairs, socialization, family planning, trade, cooperatives, industry, mining, energy, domestic logistics, transmigration, information, telecommunication, motor transportation, navigation, meteorology, geophysics, mass communication (radio, television, newspapers).94

a. Bureau of Internal Revenue. In the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the revenue operations heads (functional experts) play the dual role of functional experts and line administrators. The central office staff assists not only in planning, evaluating and controlling, but they also perform direct administrative functions for the implementation of programs which should properly devolve on the regional directors. Limitations in the amount of taxes are set on matters that can be given final decision at the regional level beyond which amounts the cases have to be referred to the central office for processing, review and approval. Aside from functional control over field activities, the central office staff engage in direct production work and have line responsibilities.

b. Civil Service Commission. In the Civil Service Commission, the central office still remains the agency's main operations base while only the relatively routine functions are performed in the field. The operation of the field office has been confined primarily to processing of appointments. The CSC has not fully vested these offices with other functions which are part and parcel of public personnel administration, such as the administration of
examinations, in-service training, and inspection and audit. It has been observed that the regional and
district (local) offices are, at best, extensions not
of the Commission as a whole, but only of its Person-
nel Transctions Division.

(c) Department of Health. In the Department of
Health, the Bureau of Directors, before decentraliza-
tion (deconcentration) had line authority and control
over the field health units. Under the decentralized
structure, they assumed advisory roles or staff func-
tions. Under the GSC plans, they would exercise
technical supervision over the activities of the
field units. A study conducted by the Department of
Health, however, revealed that bureau directors had
line authority over field units in the former struc-
ture, and that they tend to hold on to this function
in the present.

Finally, noteworthy are the Presidential Arm on Com-
munity Development, the Bureau of Public Schools, and
the Agricultural Productivity Commission agencies
which follow the integrated field service model
structurally and functionally. Central staff offi-
cials do not engage in line work and regional offices
implement fully agency programs and objectives.

**Semi-Vertical Public Function: The Task of Planning
for National Development in the Selected Nations**

Semi-vertical public function is a function under
authority and responsibility of, and funded by both cen-
tral public apparatuses and territorial public appara-
tuses.

1. BRAZIL

In Brazil as in Mexico, large regional development
projects continue to be undertaken by national or
central government. The most comprehensive examples
of regional planning and coordination undertaken by
the Central Government in Brazil involve the coun-
try's two most underdeveloped regions: the Northeast
and the Amazon. In both cases, the Central Govern-
ment has placed these regions under a special super-
intendencia (superintendency), which is responsible
for coordinating the activities of the Central and State Governments in each region in accordance with an integrated regional development plan.

The Brazilian Central Government has also used regional development corporations—mixed enterprises—to channel public and private capital for economic development to the region.\textsuperscript{96}

2. \textbf{THE PHILIPPINES}

Regional planning is undertaken by regional development councils (RDCs), which are composed of provincial governors, city mayors and regional directors of national ministries, managers of sub-regional authorities, and the regional director of NEDA. The RDCs prepare a comprehensive survey of regional resources, specify regional goals and objectives, extend technical assistance and expertise in planning, and coordinate local and regional planning. The RDCs keep track of the development plans of the provinces and cities within its region. Plans are reviewed to ensure that they are relevant to national development objectives.\textsuperscript{97}

3. \textbf{INDIA}

Like some other Asian countries, India is creating entirely new institutions at the local or regional level for planning, managing, and executing development. The central (federal) government has established "centrally sponsored schemes," experiments in administrative decentralization begun with the Community Development Program of the early 1950s. A few years later, democratic institutions known aspanchayati raj were built around the community development institutions, and all development activities were to be channeled through them.

\textbf{Control of Planning and Implementation.} The most effective means used to ensure good planning and effective implementation is the means of control which can be secured by the continuous association of State Government officials with the local authorities in the various stages of planning and implementation. The Village plans and the budget of the Village Panchayat are scrutinized at the Block level. The
Block plans, which are formulated on the basis of the village plans so approved, are, in turn, subject to similar scrutiny by the district council and are incorporated into the District Plans. The District Plans are scrutinized, approved and incorporated into the State Plans.

4. SUDAN

To overcome some of the managerial and executive problems facing the Government, President Nimeiry and the leaders of the Sudan Socialist Union announced new governmental reform in 1977. Nimeiry reorganized some central ministries and abolished others, transferring their functions to the office of the president or to the provinces. He also gave province commissioners greater executive and coordinative authority and changed the way the national budget would be formulated. President Nimeiry followed up his initial changes with others one year later in 1978.

The Ministry of Planning was ordered to establish offices in each of the nine provinces to assist the executive councils with short-range development planning, and the Ministry of Finance was told to provide technical assistance to every province for budget preparation and fiscal programming. The provincial planning teams would collect the socio-economic data needed to prepare province and district development plans and would assist the councils and commissioners in integrating local projects into provincial plans, and in coordinating provincial with national planning.

5. TANZANIA

In the years prior to 1972, the ministries in Dar-es-Salaam controlled nearly all development activities, even the creation of new settlements in rural areas. Although regional commissioners exercised substantial power within their jurisdictions, the central bureaucracy controlled administrative and technical personnel, services, and the flow of funds. Planning, budgeting, and project identification were done in central ministries without much knowledge of local conditions or needs. Rural development planning was
fragmented among ministries and agencies in which administrators had little motivation or ability to coordinate and integrate their activities.

**Control of Planning and Implementation.** The bottom-up planning procedure began with village development committees—a group of not more than twenty-five villagers, chaired by the local TANU (Tanganyika African Union, national political party) secretary submitting ideas for local projects. These suggestions were passed to the ward development committee consisting of leaders of the TANU ten-house cell groups, technical officers working in the ward, and selected members of the ward council, for consideration and approval. The approved projects were then sent to the District Development Committee, which assessed preliminary costs and placed high priority projects in the preliminary district plan. The plan then had to be reviewed and approved by the TANU district executive committee. The district development proposal was sent to the regional development committee and the regional executive committee of TANU, which combined district plans into a regional plan and submitted it to the Prime Minister's Office. The approved plan was then to be implemented by regional and district development directors. Small-scale village projects that were not included in the regional plans could be financed through the Regional Development Fund, which the central government allocated to regions on the basis of their population size.

6. **MALAYSIA**

In Malaysia, decentralization of authority is more concerned with improving policy implementation and with project planning and management than with administrative or governmental reorganization. Regional development plans are formulated at the center, and differences among provinces are taken into account during implementation. To make this kind of planning as realistic as possible, the government created an interlocking web of committees ranging from the village to the central level. Thus, the Village Development and Security Committee (Jawatan Pembangunan and Keamanan Kampong [JKKK]) is responsible for proposing local development projects. These are
scutinized or modified by the District Action Committee and then sent to the State Action Committee. The latter is directly linked to central agencies, usually the Economic Planning Unit (EPU), that frame the national development plan. Minor projects can be approved and financed by the Implementation Coordination Unit of the Prime Minister's Department, but other projects have to go to the National Cabinet for final approval.  

7. **KENYA**

In 1970, the Government of Kenya embarked on an extensive governmental reorganization that would place prefectural (province) governments and regional (district) governments at the center of national development at the territorial level. The government began to decentralize or deconcentrate responsibilities for development planning and administration to provinces and district. Provincial and district development advisory committees were established to coordinate and stimulate development at the territorial level by involving in the planning process not only government officials but also the people through their representatives. District Development Committees (DDCs) were created to provide technical assistance to local planning organizations.

8. **INDONESIA**

Planning for national development at the territorial levels in Indonesia is a semi-vertical task, as in many other less developed nations. Thus, it is under the authority of both the central and the territorial governments. Mathur described the system of planning for national development in Indonesia as follows: "In Indonesia, the history of central-local relationships is characterized by a continuous swing of the pendulum between the central and local governments."

Several types of planning agencies were established to identify local and regional needs and to monitor regional development, both required by the INPRES program. The National Development Planning Board (BAPPENAS) divided Indonesia into four regions and designated in each a growth center to act as a catalyst for the development of its surrounding area. In
1974 a presidential decree established a Regional Development Planning Board (BAPPEDA) in each province to assist the governor in formulating and implementing regional (provincial) development policies. The BAPPEDA staff is expected to prepare a provincial five-year development plan as a guideline for an annual sectoral program and for coordinating the plans of line agencies working in the province, ensuring that national development will take place in a way that keeps regions and sectors in balance. Further, to integrate their plans with those of the provinces some municipalities have established their own planning organizations (BAPPEKOs), but due to the shortage of skilled manpower, the process has been slow.
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