

The Comparative Study of Responding Systems in The Governmental Centers of Four Countries (America – Britannia- Pakistan- Bangladesh)

Hossein Khanifar¹, Seyed Reza Razavi Saeedi², Mojtaba Nik Aeen³, Hossein Ali Soltani⁴

¹Associate Professor of Faculty of Management of Tehran University

²M.A. In Public Administration, Qom College, University of Tehran, Iran

³MA Student in Public Administration, Qom College, University of Tehran, Iran

⁴Department of Economic, School of Social Science, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran.

ABSTRACT

This study is based on observation on court-domination, it tries to answer how the governmental organs and their staff who were not chosen by people directly should answer people. The same essay has introduced some concepts of answering; it is to examine some answering goals in the governmental centers and their different aspects. This study is to assign an example as a theoretical form in order to compare some of usual answering systems in the world. The writer, by using the same examples of answering systems in English and America which are two political (parliamentary and boss) systems and those of Pakistan and Bangladesh have explained all details. The writer hopes to study the reply systems in the foresaid societies, let us know about these systems and their effects.

KEYWORDS : responding systems, governmental centers, parliamentary and boss systems

INTRODUCTION

The reply in the governmental centers are to influence on the staff's decision economically politically, socially and culturally. People's ideas and decisions and the chosen volunteer's votes are affective in the democratic, political organs, they choose the deputies of people and governmental organs, hence people don't middle in choosing them directly.

On the other hand, the managers of governmental systems have assigned their agents to work for them[1]. Therefore, the main question is now the staff's behaviors and decisions provide people and to assure them are aligned in the governmental systems in order to gain the common benefits. There is one clear point among the political thinkers that operation should be followed by observation of political organs. The observation of political organs on the executive organs are based on two movements: the first is appearance of democratic systems in the western societies in 18th and 19th centuries as a legislative assemblies, and the political schools. The second is the necessity of assigning the governmental services as an expert, continuous service. The same need increases corruption, political biases, the necessary providence, the knowledge of governmental management[2].

The goals of reply

Whereas the replying is asserted in the different societies nowadays, it is a common concept that make people responsible for inhabitants and their behaviors. It is done by vote, hence the deputies of legislative assembly are assigned to respond the political managers, the governmental staff to observe them separately.

Therefore, the political managers both make their subordinate agents, and make courts and the executive agents to be responding. [3]. Which has three goals: the first is a means to observe power in order to avoid misuse in the public deeds. The second ins guarantee to apply the national sources is guarantee to follow rules and the public services.

The third is an effective means to improve the management of public services.

Responding as a means to control power

Wots of governments are ruling in the background which should be responding to the mass request of conscious inhabitants, groups, the relating groups, the social schools, media, and newspaper.

Nowadays, responding plays an important role in the observation aspects of political systems, and politicians are to observe the executive center of government against the unlimited, threading power in order to avoid abuse.

Therefore, there are predicted some process on the power. In the executive centers of governments[4].

Responding as guarantee used to make correct use of public sources.

The main aspects of responding aspect is to assure people at agents to provide and to make correct use of public sources, hence the chosen deputies of people observe the use of sources in the legislative assemblies [5].

*Corresponding author: Seyed Reza Razavi Saeedi M.A. In Public Administration, Qom College, University of Tehran, Iran

Responding as mean to improve the governmental services:

The observation on power and the guaranty of correct use of public sources associate the negative, threatening aspects of responding.

Responding is a means to progress and to improve the governmental services positively.

The same aspect is a kind of learning.

Responding Aspect in The Governmental Center:

Romzek shows a model on which responding to political, legislative , and technical aspects are classified. The following table shows four responding aspects.

Responding in two observational sources (internal and external) and the gegree at independence (less and more) are shown[6].

Legislative	Organizational	Less	The degree off independence
political	technical	more	

The source of observation

External internal

The organizational Responding:

It is internal observation in an organ. In such system which is based on superlative and subordinative relations, managers observe staff's operations lessly.

The direct, durational observation of their operations are clear signs of organizational responding. Besides, the assigning of rules, the organizational circular which limit the staff's options are classified in the same responding system.

The legislative Responding

It includes the external observation on the operation whose goal is royal necessities and the main laws.

The principle of legislative responding is the original lawyer relations.

The main question is whether lawyer has provided the original observation? Responding is usually based on certain observation including the legislative observation, the financial, planning differences, the external observation on the complaint of employment[7].

The technical, political Responding

There are two aspects, the first is internal, and the second is external. The difference between political and technical responding is in the source of assigning standard operation.

In other words, we should find who assign the standard operation on judgment in order to respond. In the technical responding, there is a standard source to judge about staff, but in the political responding, there are others not the same person[8].

In the technical responding, independence of a person to make decision would be saved, and their deeds would be judged by technical aspects, and experienced ideas.

In political responding, there are managers who respond to the political agents, it means those who chosen by people and those who relate to other political organs.

In other word's in political responding, the main owners observe the manager's operations.

In every of four responding systems, the special values and behavioral observations are asserted. The following table includes the different responding organs based on values and the behavioral observations[9].

Behavioral observation	Asserted value	Kind of responding
Obedience of organizational orders	Operation and applicability	Organizational
Answer to orders and external orders of organ	Execution of law	Legislative
Trust to a person's and expert and judgment	Special knowledge	Technical
Responding to owner's organs (people, assembly,...)	responding	political

Responding and political organs

According to foresaid theory, the comparison of responding organs in the governmental management will reveal the situations of same organs.

We are to study the responding organs in the countries such as Britannia and America as the deputies of two political, different organs (parliamentary and boss), then we describe responding organs in three countries of third world, at end, by using the theoretical examples, we compare the effects of responding organs in the foresaid societies.

Responding in Britannia

The political organ of Britannia is parliamentary.

Ministries are the main, official organs and the national industries, the governmental companies are some sections in the governmental sections.

Every ministry is managed by minister who is responsible in the parliament.

There is a constant secretariat in every ministry which is managed by subliminal staff of governmental services.

In Britannia, there is a secretary to manage the ministry, he is directly responsible for the minister. The constant secretary is helped by some assistants, and everyone is responsible for some sections in the ministry.

In Britannia, the observation of legislative organ on the executive one is based on ministerial responsibility[9].

The same observation has been provided in the nineteenth century. In fact, political responding of ministers relate to parliament.

In past, the governmental staff were assigned to ministers who were against the common assembly of responding staff.

But condition changed, and ministers avoid staff's decisions in details, because of extensive deeds of minister.

Later, they tried to make political responding guaranty including to make specialists qualified in the parliament. They set up an office to provide people's complaints, it resembled to Swedish organ, Amboman.

Further more, they tried to make responding executions guarantee, the same office considered inhabitant's complaints against colleagues.

The dependence of ministers to expert colleagues, their in difference, and their votes are signs of professional responding in Britannia.

The subliminal staff are professional, because they have gained valuable experience in the continuous services.

The knowledge and experience of subliminal, governmental staff are as a general managers who are available for British ministers. Meanwhile, the economic experts are professional in the governmental services to make decisions[10].

The organizational responding is considered in Britannia. They have concerned ministers the governmental staff against responding parliament.

Ministers report their deeds either traditionally or written to assembly. If they concern any abuse in the management, they should accept and agree their errors.

Regarding the corrections, the responsibility to governmental services are the same organs. There are some governmental (setade) centers in Britannia which are pre-assigned by ministries.

The executive managers are responsible for the same centers. Regarding this responding they gain the different options to manage the human sources.

In British, governmental services, the same centers (setade) of ministers are described on quantity. The same descriptions are basics to evaluate centers and people. The responding system have empowered in two decades before, the expenses have decreased and the number of governmental staff followed in order to omit the extra actions.

In order to empower the organizational, responding systems. They set up inhabitant's pyramid in 1991, to improve people's governmental services.

They set up thirty seven pyramids for main governmental services. The same pyramids were observed every year in order to be updated.

The inhabitant's pyramid provide clear services, therefore, the governmental staff respond to their operations. In order to update pyramids, the receives of services were studied and the results were published periodically.

Inhabitant's pyramids make some principles guaranty which are necessary including[11]:

- There are some standards for quality and quantity of services. The same receivers should know about standards.
- The quantity and quality of services should be sent simultaneously with the organizational results for public knowing.
- The correct information of now services are provided, their expenses, and the agents should be published.
- Respect to employee and the collaborative staff are the main principles among people.
- The governmental staff should attach their names and their official characteristics on their chest to let employee know about.
- If their official behaviors should be agreed with the same standards, colleague should apologize about.
- There are so many methods to complain the abuse in the organs, because they should be returned fine.

There are no usual courts in Britannia. The constitutional courts and political observations are important external responding means.

Responding in America

There is a military boss system in the united nations, it is court based system which is controlled severely by political observation while unbiased.

Furthermore , ministries are the main centers of executive power are different, they are responsible to observe economics and society.

Congress is the most powerful source to observe bourocracy. The same power is delivered by the main principles to the legislative power.

There are some special committees of legislative power which observe the court-based systems.

The candidas of court include some expert, special groups to observe the executive power.

There are some legislative responding systems in the usual court of America. The same courts are capable to observe bourocracy, the classification of them empower the legislative observation.

Nowadays, there are some responding systems in America. In 1987, the principles of morality were assigned in governmental. Regarding to it, the sublime federal staff are responsible to compose some forms every year including financial condition of official organs, and avoidance of gifts.

The same official laws are called moral principles of government, which relate to the management of personnel office.

After assigning, the laws of improved, moral principles in 1989, it was known as an independent system relating to the executive power, it reports the wrong deeds to America's court organ.

It plays an important role in the programs to attack corruption. According to moral principles, whole federal institutes of government are responsible to set a center to observe the staff's morality.

The same institutes are responsible to instruct the morality of official deed to staff.

The office of federal government sets up some conferncess to observe staff's morality

Including the international conferncess of governmental morality in 1994 constituting 42 countries. The office of moral government are mainly responsible to observe the staff's financial relations. When there was assigned a person as agent, the information of financial relations is observed.

This law limits abuse after exiting services greatly. Whole agents should be assigned by president should also complete some special forms, after Sana assembly observed their financial condition, they are asserted.

In 1993, the office of moral deeds composes a guidance book including some instructions to avoid wrong deeds. There were some deeds such as delivering gifts out of organs, the relations between two colleguse while one of them takes benefit, abuse of job position, the disordered actions.

There are some provincial commissions which are responsible for staff's differences between options and the effects of commissions in the different provinces.

It is necessary to say the office of moral governmental deeds observe staff's morality in the executive power, while commissions and the provincial organs are responsible for the staff in three power systems[12].

Responding systems in third world

They are less cohesive comparing with western, usual examples. One of the main causes is political un consistency in the third world. The political regimes of same societies are not consistant in the political crises.

Responding in Pakistan

There is no democratically system in Pakistan, the costum of keeping secret, controlling media, saving secret designing the responding systems were usually faced problems.

The differences of after expense are some traditional means and the public computing in Pakistan is offices in Pakistan's provinces to attack corruption as a police system, but its operation is not so fine.

There is an idiom about such offices yens capture butterflies and elephants are freely pasturing.

While Boto was ruller, the official courts setup of the official organs to get people's complaints. Besides, in Ayoob khan's career, there were so many complaints concerning with corruption, abuse management, delay snd wrong-doing.

The observational groups were set up by rullers in four provinces of western Pakistan which were most observed.

The same groups were responsible to respect people's complaints, but the most innovate organ was computing office to respond people in Pakistan. The organ existed before Islamic government to save Islamic moral values, while Zeia's government got it from Islamic trend, then it included in the observing organ in Sweden.

Zeia assigned one of judges of sublime court of Pakistan in 1983. The office of legislative assigning was unbiased, employee-based independent of three powers.

The same office was easily referred to complaints and the governmental corruptions. Some believed governmental management in Pakistan had influenced on the same organ[13].

Responding in Bangladesh

In Bangladesh, observation includes external and internal aspects. In the internal one, there were some research. It was not so influencing on the government staff and their responding to inhabitants. The external responding includes observation of legislative power, the observation office, media, people's groups. In parliament, the constant, computing, public commission exists, but the parliamentary observation is not so affective in observing executive power. The main problem is justice observation, while direct judgment does not concern people's complaints. On the other hand, it is expensive to concern the legislative power complaints, people usually avoid referring in the courts.

In 1980 parliament assigned the law of observation. Regarding to it, there was an office to concern people's complaints of different organs.

Meanwhile, media and newspapers did not save secrets about the abuse of management, wrongdoing, corruption, staff's corruption. Some of Bangladeshi political leaders set up the organ of observation to observe bureaucracy including the regional committee, the official courts which respectively in Zeia's and Abdol star's careers[14].

Conclusion

Comparison of responding organs in four countries concerned all necessities, all bureaucratic responding to political organs in order to set up some official organs.

The responding organs were set up both externally and internally.

The external observations (political-logical) were done usually by assemblies, courts and the relative organs, independent organs, the observation of assemblies and courts. The internal observations (organizational-technical) were done by executive organs. This study is to show the effects of responding organs in the foresaid countries were different. Such difference related to the political construction, democracy, the custom of court-based responding to the political organs. In the following table, the effects of observation in four countries were shown.

The above table showed that the external observation on the governmental centers were fine in America, and Britannia.

Furthermore, observation on assemblies, movements, the relative groups, newspapers, and media were affective in responding to governmental organs. There were observed externally on court-based one in the same countries including the pyramid of inhabitants in Britannia and setting up of moral office in America.

It seems both responding organs had been fine. In Bangladesh and Pakistan observing and assemblies were not so affective.

Whereas courts were mostly responsible to make the governmental organs responding, people usually could not find them.

The role of groups, the relative groups, newspapers in observing on bureaucracy were different in the foresaid societies. There were marginalized media in media in Pakistan, but the role of newspapers were very important to observe bureaucracy in Bangladesh[15].

In such countries, the internal responding organs existed in the executive power including the office of corruption attack in Pakistan, the regional committees, and the official courts in Bangladesh. However, it does not seem the internal observations are affective in two foresaid countries. The effects of observational organs in four countries of world.

REFERENCES

- [1]Adelberg, S., & Batson, C. D. (1978). Accountability and helping: When needs exceed resources. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,36, 343-350.
- [2]Anderson, P. A. (1981). Justifications and precedents as constraints in foreign policy decision-making. *American Journal of Political Science*,25, 738-761.
- [3]Antonioni, D. (1994). The effects of feedback accountability on upward appraisal ratings. *Personnel Psychology*, 47, 349-356.
- [4]Arkes, H., & Blumer, C. (1985). The psychology of sunk cost. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 35, 125-140.
- [5]Arkes, H. R. (1991). Costs and benefits of judgment errors: Implications for debiasing. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110, 486-498.
- [6]Ashton, R. H. (1992). Effects of justification and a mechanical aid on judgment performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 52, 292-306.

- [7]Baer, R., Hinkle, S., Smith, K., & Fenton, M. (1980). Reactance as a function of actual versus projected autonomy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 416-422.
- [8]Buchman, T. A., Tetlock, P. E., & Reed, R. O. (1996). Accountability and auditors' judgment about contingent events. *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting*, 23, 379-398.
- [9]Carnevale, P. J. D., Pruitt, D. G., & Seilheimer, S. D. (1981). Looking and competing: Accountability and visual access in integrative bargaining. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 111-120.
- [10]Cornell, L. M., & Gaines, G. (1997). *Accountability in the 1990s: Holding schools responsible for student achievement* (ED406739). Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- [11]Klimoski, R., & Inks, L. (1990). Accountability forces in performance appraisal. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 45, 194-208.
- [12]Lerner, J. S. (1994). *Accountability for allocation: Do one thing but say another*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of California, Berkeley.
- [13]Siegel-Jacobs, K., & Yates, J. F. (1996). Effects of procedural and outcome accountability on judgment quality. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 1, 1-17.
- [14]Skitka, L. J., Mosier, K., & Burdick, M. D. (1996, July). Accountability and automation bias. In J. S. Lerner & P. E. Tetlock (Chairs), *Accountability: The social context of cognition*. Symposium conducted at the 8th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Society, San Francisco, CA.
- [15]Tetlock, P. E., Skitka, L., & Boettger, R. (1989). Social and cognitive strategies for coping with accountability: Conformity, complexity, and bolstering. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 632-640.