

## **18BPA61C -DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION IN INDIA**

- **SUBJECT CODE: 18BPA61C**
- **PREPARED BY: DR.P. MAGUDAPATHY,**  
**Asst. Professor**
- **DEPARTMENT: PG & Research Department of Public**  
**Administration**
- **CONTACT NO.: 9994672379**
- **E-MAIL ID: [magudapathypalanisamy@gmail.com](mailto:magudapathypalanisamy@gmail.com)**

**The content is prepared according to the text book and reference book given in the syllabus.**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Subject Title</b>	<b>Sem.</b>	<b>Sub Code</b>
<b>2018 -19</b>  <b>Onwards</b>	<b>Core 10:Development Administration in India</b>	<b>VI</b>	<b>18BPA61C</b>

### **Objective**

To make the students to understand the Concept of Development Administration through integrated, organized and proper Coordination in Governmental Action in India.

### **UNIT – I: INTRODUCTION**

Meaning, Nature, Scope and Importance of Development Administration – Evolution of Development Administration – Traditional Administration and Development Administration – International Context of Development Administration.

### **UNIT – II: BUREAUCRACY AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION**

Development Planning in India – Bureaucracy and Development Administration – District Collector – DRDA – Field Level Agencies.

### **UNIT – III: URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES**

Urban Development Programs– Urban Housing Development Program– JNNURM.–Urban Wage Employment Program -Urban Self Employment Program

### **UNIT – IV: RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES**

Rural Development Programs – Integrated Rural Development Programs – Poverty Alleviation Program – SJSRY-MGNREGA.

### **UNIT – V: ISSUES IN DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION**

NGOs and Development Administration – Citizens’ Grievances and Redressal Mechanism.

### **Textbook**

1. Palekar-S.A ,Development Administration- Prentice hall India Publication -2012

### **Reference books**

1. Narayanan Hazary ,Development Administration, Quest for identity Publication- 2005- -Aph Rup
2. KuldeepMatheer ,Development Policy and Administration ,SAGE publication Pvt Ltd-1996

Anil K.Srivatsava ,Development of Public Administration in India, Kunal Book Publishers, 2011

# **MEANING, NATURE, SCOPE AND IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION**

## **INTRODUCTION**

Development has to be holistic having its bearings on the polity and society. Each nation attempts to be on the path of development irrespective of the fact whether the nation is developed, underdeveloped, or developing. In order to know clearly about development administration, which is innovative, achievement oriented, and dynamic, it becomes important to be conversant with the concept of development because the meaning of “development” has a distinctive understanding in the literature on development administration.

## **THE CONCEPT OF DEVELOPMENT**

Dictionary meaning of “development.” is teleological, that is, goal-focused. Development as the process is generally referred to as an attempt leading to growth into higher, fuller, and mature conditions. In contemporary parlance, development is interpreted to be a process of desirable changes in the achievement of a multiplicity of goals. For a political scientist, political development involves increase in the levels of political participation, greater progressivism and rationality in the legislative process, more progressive and effective judicial system and more effective political and administrative executive. It also assumes a mature media, independent election machinery, dynamic political parties and enlightened pressure groups. To an economist, on the other hand, development means a higher level of economic development and a greater concern for economic justice. Further, a sociologist looks at development as a process involving greater stratification of structures and a more forward-looking educational, health and other societal systems. Thus, the term development has a common philosophy despite variegated foci of contents.

Students of development administration view development as the dynamic change of a society from one state of being to another without positing a final mature condition. Development has been viewed as “state of mind, a tendency, a direction. Rather than a fixed goal, it is rate of change in a particular direction” (Riggs, 1970). Development is further seen as “ an aspect of change that is desirable, broadly predicted or planned, or at least influenced by governmental action” (Montgomery, 1966). Moreover, development can be measured in terms of “performance” and output or in regard to “justice” and equality (Riggs, 1970). These different interpretations suggest that the concept of development, at least as it is found in the literature on development administration, is quite broad, value-based, and even elusive.

Fred Riggs has defined development as “a process of increasing autonomy (discretion) of social systems, made possible by rising level of diffraction” (Ibid). “Discretion,” Riggs has observed, “is the ability to choose among alternatives, while ‘diffraction’ refers to the

degree of differentiation and integration in the social system” (Ibid). Riggs has considered diffraction as “the necessary and perhaps the sufficient condition for development, that is, for increased discretion” (Ibid).

The emphasis on “discretion” has enabled Riggs to view development as involving “the increased ability of human societies to shape their physical, human, and cultural environments” (Riggs, 1970). A developed system, then, is capable of changing its environment to a greater degree than an “underdeveloped” system (Ibid). Such capability may or may not be used to increase output, that is, a developed system could even have a low rate of output or growth (Ibid), although in empirical situations such a case might occur only rarely. Likewise, a change in environment, such as a technological innovation or foreign aid, liberalization, globalization or a change in climate might bring increase in output or growth of a system, even though the level of “discretion” of the system did not rise. In other words, there could be cases of “growth” without “development” (Ibid).

A social system, in the process of increasing its “discretion,” develops interdependence with other social systems, which are members of its “nexus” or role-set. The system is required to coordinate its actions with the other members of its role-set. Such interdependence of a system with other members of its role- set has been termed by Riggs as “heterogeny,” while the independence of a system in relation to other systems in its role-set is termed by him as “autogeny” Riggs has observed that development involves an increase in the degree of “discretion” of a social system, but a decrease in the degree of its “autogeny” (Ibid). This analytical bifurcation of the environment of a social system into something like the distant and the proximate environment would be difficult to operationalize, owing to the problem of defining the boundary of each in empirical situations. Despite such a problem, Riggs’s attempt is an important step in the direction of conceptualization of development, and it probably has relevance to all types of social systems.

## **THE CONCEPT OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION**

The Comparative Administration Group, in the early sixties, has had an overriding interest in the area of development administration (Esman, 1970). Nimrod Raphaeli has discerned two major “motivational concerns” in the literature in comparative public administration: (1) theory-construction and (2) development administration. These two concerns are intertwined. Much theorizing in comparative public administration has been related to development, while work in development administration has been concerned with, and contributes to, theory (Raphaeli, 1967). Thus, the development of theory and theory of development administration has moved together.

This is understandable, since the field of comparative public administration is primarily concerned with the comparison of administrative systems of different nations at varying stages of development. It has been recognized that because of its central concern, the study of development administration could be the meeting ground for almost all the approaches in comparative public administration (Heaphey, 1968). This could be so, especially when the concept of development administration is considered broadly and not just restricted to the focus on what are popularly called “developing” nations. Interestingly, development

administration can also be a meeting ground for portions of comparative public administration and the so-called “New” (American) Public Administration (Marini, 1971) that includes considerable elements of action and goal-orientation.

In the literature, the term “development administration” has been used in two interrelated senses. First, it “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 (Riggs, 1970). Second, it, “by implication, rather than directly, involves the strengthening of administrative capabilities” (Ibid). These two aspects of development administration, that is, the administration of development and the development of administration are intertwined in most definitions of the term.

Edward Weidner has viewed development administration in government as “the processes of guiding an organization toward the achievement of progressive political, economic, and social objectives that are authoritatively determined in one manner or another. Jose Abueva (Weidner, 1970), Inayatullah (Ibid), B.S. Khanna (Ibid) and Hahn-Been Lee (Ibid) have taken similar views. The major thrust of most of these definitions of development administration has been an “action-oriented, goal-oriented administrative system” (Ibid). Students of development administration have recognized that the administration of development and development of administration are functionally interrelated to each other. As Riggs has argued:

The reciprocal relatedness of these two sides (of development administration) involves a chicken and egg type of causation. Administration cannot normally be improved very much without changes in the environmental constraints (the infrastructure) that hamper its effectiveness; and the environment itself cannot be changed unless the administration of development programs is strengthened (Riggs, 1970).

Thus, in the study of development, governmental “capacity” must be taken into account. Generally, research on development administration considers the administrative system and changes within it as independent variables, while the developmental goals are treated as dependent variables (Weidner, 1970). Such a view has been emphasized by scholars like Fred Riggs, Edward Weidner, Joseph La Palombara, and Martin Landau.

Increasing the administrative capability to achieve developmental goals in an “efficient” manner is associated with the concept of planned development, which is based on the desire to achieve particular results within a given period of time and with minimum of cost. Today, development administration is concerned with the formulation and implementation of the four p’s – plans, policies, programs, and projects (Stone, 1967). Associated developmental models have an underlying assumption that “there are noticeable differences between the states of a system at different time series; that the succession of these states implies the system is heading somewhere; and that there are orderly processes which explain how the system gets from its present state. (To wherever) it is going” (Chin, 1961). A detailed analysis of the models given by Weidner and Riggs is contained in Unit 2. Such directional change has been emphasized by several students as the main thrust of development administration. A scholar has identified that development administration has an “administration of planned change” (Panandiker, 1964). However, not all planning may

be developmental, and not all development administration may be planned. Likewise, planned directional growth and “system change” may or may not move together.

The conceptualization of development administration involves, as is observed by Saul Katz, problems associated with the construction of any goal—oriented model (Riggs, 1970). It is common knowledge that goal identification is “never simple, and in complex developmental change situations it can be very elusive and difficult. Formal and informal, stated and unstated, intended and unintended, planned and not planned—and goals of whom – these are a few of the dimensions that need to be taken into account (Weidner, op. cit). Lack of clarity on important aspects of goal-orientation sometimes causes confusion about the true nature of “development” administration.

## **ATTRIBUTES OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION**

Let us now look at the essential characteristics of development administration as reflected in the literature on this theme.

### **Change-Orientation**

Development Administration is change-oriented administration. Change involves the movement of system or a structure from one point to another. The reverse of ‘change’ could be status quo or inertia. Thus, a development administrative system would be dynamic and not ‘static’. There is an in-built philosophy of development administration that values change. The change is a strategy for increasing the coping ability of an administrative system in relation to its external environment as well as a mechanism to activate its internal structures. Lately, in the context of a New World Economic order involving globalization and liberalization, governance systems are expected to be transformational in character.

### **Goal-Orientation**

As we have pointed out above. Development administration, as defined by Weidner, is a ‘goal-oriented’ administration. One might ask a simple question: Is an administrative system not necessarily goal-oriented? Do we not define administration as a collective human activity that is designed to achieve certain specific goals? Yes, it is true that all administrative systems per se are goal-oriented. Yet what distinguishes the general public administration from development administration is the dominant focus on goal-achievement in a more systematic manner. In other words, development administration is that aspect of public administration, which is dominantly goal-oriented. And these goals, as Weidner points out, are progressive in nature. Thus, development administration is concerned with the achievement of progressive political, economic, social and cultural goals.

### **Progressivism**

The element of ‘progressiveness’ of goals is an accepted feature of development administration. What is progressive for one society may not be so for another.

Nevertheless, there appears to be a broad consensus on the nature of progressiveness of these goals in most of the countries, particularly those that are ‘developing’ societies.

In political systems, progressivism would imply greater participation of the people in governmental affairs. In a democratic system, participation could imply strengthening of the pressure groups, political parties, free voting in elections and greater respect for public opinion in governmental affairs. Increasing participation would involve greater share of the common man in the formulation and implementation of government policies, plans, programs and projects. It is a very difficult goal to achieve, particularly by an administrative system.

Nevertheless, it is expected of a development administrative system to create and promote such conditions that will facilitate greater participation of the people in the process of development.

In the economic sphere, a progressive approach would involve faster pace of economic development and a more equitable distribution of income and wealth. It would involve an approach of economic justice where opportunities to develop economically are equitably distributed to all sections of society.

In the socio-cultural sphere, a progressive approach would involve universalization of education, promotion of health facilities for all sections of society, social justice based on equity, secularism and adequate opportunities to all social groups to promote their respective cultural distinctiveness. The emerging emphasis on “people-centered development” is a reflection of such new concerns.

Development Administration, thus, is, an administration designed to achieve progressive political, economic and socio-cultural goals.

### **Planning**

Planning is not a prerequisite to development administration, but it is the most helpful aid to the whole process of goal-oriented change. An Indian scholar, V.A. Pai Panandiker looks at development administration as administration of “planned change”. It is true that planning is a strategy that facilitates maximum possible utilization of human and material resource. And in poor countries, where such resources are scarce, planning gains a central importance. As a program of action to achieve certain specified goals in a given period, planning helps in the maximum possible utilization of time and other resources that make the whole process of development effective. Little wonder, almost all developing countries have adopted socio-economic planning as a strategy of development, and even the developed socialist countries continue to place great reliance on the mechanism of planned development. In the New Economic order, the stress on planning, however, seems to be waning. The likely shape of planning would be an indicative planning.

### **Innovation and Creativity**

Development administration is not dogmatic and traditional in its approach to problem solving. Instead, it stresses upon identification and adoption of new structures, method procedures, policies, plans, programs and projects, which would help, achieve the developmental objectives with the greatest possible facilitations. Experimentation and adaptation are the hallmarks of developmental administration. In India, for instance,

organizations such as District Rural Development Agency (DRDA) and Command Area Development Authority (CADA) and programs such as Integrated Rural Development Program (IRDP) are Tribal Area Development Program (TADP) are examples of such innovations. Likewise, use of computers, district planning, national education policy, etc., are other instances of an on-going creative approach to the development process.

This creativity is not confined to the organizational level only. At the group and the individual levels as well, creativity in administration is feasible and its overall contribution to effectiveness of goal-oriented change can be immense. A development administrative system has the responsibility to create an organizational environment, which would be congenial to creativity and innovations.

### **Flexibility in Organizational Processes**

Generally, a bureaucratic administration is considered as a synonym of rule-oriented administration. While it is true that no bureaucracy or administration can function without an adequate set of rules, it is also true that a totally “rule-oriented” administration can fall in the trap of treating rules as ends rather than as means. Such a dogmatic approach can make an administrative system straight jacketed and inflexible and thus make it unfit for promoting development at a faster pace. Development-oriented administration requires an optimum flexibility of operations, which would allow an administrator the required autonomy to apply rules with discretion to certain unique and significantly distinctive administrative situations. Though accountability for any decision made shall remain with the administrator, yet he/she will be granted adequate leeway in using the set of rules to the advantage of the organization and to the best of his ability and judgment. Yes, the risk is likely to remain of misuse of any discretionary powers, yet this little inevitable risk should not become an obstruction in the process of making a development administration optimally flexible in its functioning. Otherwise, the ideal notions of creativity and innovation will remain only myths.

### **Higher Level of Motivation**

Motivated personnel are the backbone of any organization designed to achieve certain progressive goals. A development administrative system needs a set of highly motivated personnel at top, middle and lower levels. Such personnel should be committed to the progressive goals designed to be the achieved and should have a high degree of enthusiasm and commitment to accomplish those goals. Their narrow vested interests or comforts should not deter them from acting in the highest interests of the organization and the society.

What factors can motivate the personnel functioning in development administrative organization? Essentially, the maxim of need-fulfillment will apply to any group of individuals entrusted with the responsibilities of achieving certain goals. For the developmental administrative personnel too, the bases of motivation will remain the same. Notwithstanding this commonality, it may be stressed that in a development administrative system, the personnel need to possess and demonstrate extra zeal, extra dedication and even perseverance to achieve lofty progressive goals of change. In case it is not possible to create



such a cadre of motivated people, there is a likelihood of reutilization of administration resulting in only modest performance.

How to get a group of highly motivated people to guide and man development administrative organizations are a difficult question. Yet, a rigorous exercise in building individuals and groups in a planned manner through proper training can be attempted. Behavioral training for attitudinal change can be effectively employed for creating a new class of motivated individuals.

### **People-orientation**

A development administrative system is a client-oriented (in new parlance, ‘customer-oriented’) or a beneficiary-oriented administration. It aims at providing maximum benefits of its services and products to the very people for whom the organization is designed. In other words, Development administration is “people-centered” administration, which accords primacy to the needs of its beneficiaries and tries to tune its policies, programs and actions to these needs.

Here it may be appropriate to refer to a very important aspect of motivation that is pre-eminent in any service-oriented or beneficiary-oriented administration. It is called “extension” motivation, which means motivation to “help” people.

Western motivation theorists such as Maslow, Herzberg and McClelland have not highlighted this particular type of motivation, but Indian social psychologists have been successful in identifying and highlighting this notable phenomenon.

The assumption of extension motivation is that there is a desire in every human being to be of help to others. There are varying intensities of extension motivation among people, depending on their socialization and orientations. It can be suggested without much risk of contradiction that in a beneficiary- orientated administration, existence of functionaries with a high degree of extension motivation will be a great asset in pushing that organization towards its goal of responsiveness. No doubt, a development administrative organization is a “responsive” organization. It is responsive to the needs, wishes and aspirations of the people that it purports to serve. Responsiveness is a trait that would do well to any administrative system, but for a development administrative organization, it is a fundamental prerequisite to its successful existence.

### **Participation**

We have discussed earlier that progressive political goals in a society will involve great participation of the people in governmental affairs. The notion of participation gains added importance in the actual functioning of a development administrative system. Development administration involves the participation of the people or the beneficiaries in the formulation and implementation of development programs. In identifying goals, prescribing objectives, formulating plans, designing action strategies, implementing projects and evaluating performance, the role of the beneficiaries is of utmost importance.

That is why the block level and district planning are gaining increasing importance in development administration in India. Not only participation helps in making policies and plans more realistic and down-to-earth, it also mobilizes people's cooperation and support in implementing development programs with minimum cost in terms of manpower, time and money.

Participation of the people in development programs depends on three factors. These are:

Ability to participate which in turn depends on their level of formal and informal education.

Willingness to participate which in turn depends on the socio-psychological framework of society, groups and individuals.

Opportunity provided to the people by the governmental organizations to participate. Their absence may cause low participation.

Participation has an important concomitant in decentralization. A development administrative system effectively utilizes the strategies of delegation and consultation and thus makes the administration "grass-root" oriented. People's willing cooperation is sought and mobilized by the governmental authorities and this cooperation and collaboration becomes a potent instrument for making the process of development administration successful.

### **Effective Integration**

Bringing together a host of groups and authorities for the achievement of common developmental goals would require a high degree of integrative capacity in an administrative organization. Verily, development administration is characterized by a high degree of coordination or integration. And in case, the level of integration is low, the developmental output is likely to be adversely affected. In a development administrative situation, coordination is required to be affected at various levels, among different organizations and units among various positions and functionaries and among the resources available for the achievement of goals. Lack of coordination is bound to result into wastage of resources and mitigation of effectiveness.

As is well known, any developing society experiences a proliferation of structures to equip it to undertake specialized tasks. But what generally happens is that the level of specialization of functions and structures increases. But a required level of coordination does not accompany this. This gap between specialization and coordination is termed as "integration lag". Fred Riggs calls that society "Prismatic" where the level of integration (coordination) is less than that of differentiation (specialization). In a Prismatic Society,  $I < D$  (I stands for "integration lag", D stands for Development)

### **Coping Ability**

A development administrative system is an "open" system. It receives inputs regularly from the environment and attempts to respond through its outputs, viz., decisions and actions. No

doubt there is a continuing interaction between a system and its environment and this reciprocity of relationship is an important trait of development administration.

Every development administrative system functions in an environment, which has its set of sub-systems. For instance, there are the political, economic, social and cultural (including technological) environments in which development administration has to function. Obviously, the influences of these environments affect the nature of functioning and effectiveness of development administration. The political environment places demands for a change and provides direction of movement, the economic environment outlines the agenda of action of the administrative system and puts constraints of resources on it and the socio-cultural system creates the milieu in which the development administrative system has to operate.

It does not imply that development administration is only a dependent variable and lacks its own mechanism to influence the environment. Essentially, the process of development administration is interactional and therefore it would be a mistake on the part of theorists to present it only as a one-directional process.

One thing is clear in this context: Development administration has to respond to the demands and challenges arising from its environment. Sometimes these challenges are moderate and modest and thus do not strain the development administrative system. However, on occasion, the challenges are serious and test the coping ability of the administrative system. A development administrative system, therefore, continuously tries to enhance its coping capacity. This is done through a process of greater sensitivity and responsiveness to the environment and the capacity to strengthen its administrative structures, behavior and process.

This is what is known as “Administrative Development”. Development administration is goal-oriented, change-oriented, progressive, planned, innovative, flexible, motivational, client-oriented, and participative, it is a highly integrated administrative system with substantial copying ability.

## **NATURE OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION**

### **Issue of Developmental – Non-Developmental Dichotomy**

Since all public organizations have at least some kinds of goals, they could, by virtue of having any goal-orientation, claim to come under the scope of development administration. This poses the problem of distinguishing between the developmental and the non-developmental public organizations. It has been recognized that development administration is generally similar to the “traditional” (apparently non-developmental) public administration in so far as it is concerned with how rules, policies, and norms are implemented by government organizations. On the other hand, it is contended that a developmental administrative system differs from a non-developmental one in its objectives, scope,

complexity, and degree of innovation in its operation. In attempting to explain such differences, Irving Swerdlow has used examples of an urban renewal program (apparently developmental) and the running of a city water department (apparently non-developmental). Swerdlow has remarked:

Perhaps the differences lies in the degree of difficulty encountered in executing these function, the amount of pioneering required, and the difficulties of finding adequate procedures for moving people who are unwilling to move, for reconciling conflicting interests in redesigning a section of the city, for establishing new relationships which involve major changes in how people and governmental agencies customarily do business. (Swerdlow, 1963)

In reference to Swerdlow's comment above, Wood has argued that in a developing country, operating an urban renewal program and running a city water department might present the same degrees of difficulty in meeting the requirements of innovation, resources, public support, and inter-organizational support (Dube, 1964). In fact, running a city water department in an "emerging" nation might encounter greater problems than an urban renewal program does in a developed country. Both types of programs would be called "developmental" in a developing country.

A popular contention in developing nations appears to be that developmental processes start only after political freedom has been achieved. Thus, distinctions are generally made between a colonial and a non-colonial bureaucracy. Such distinctions generally overlook the fact that even in the colonial period, a country may have had developmental programs and plans, such as in undivided India (contemporary India, Pakistan, Bangladesh) had in the early 1940s, and that it is equally plausible that a country with self-government may be unable to initiate programs which could truly be called "developmental." Thus, it would be an over-generalization to claim that a colonial administration is a "law and order" administration, while public administration under self-rule is a developmental administration. It has been well recognized that maintaining law and order, curbing communal violence and countering terrorism takes priority in most emergent nations, while the development efforts generally suffer due to a variety of factors.

Often within an administrative system, some organizations are termed or treated as developmental, while others are not. Indeed, there could be certain structures, such as developmental planning units and development banks, which seem by definition to relate particularly to development programs. However, this does not imply that there exist any purely non-developmental agencies. When rigid distinction is made between developmental and non-developmental activities and some particular officials are designated as "development officials," there is a danger that the morale of other (non-developmental) officials could go down.

Moreover, in allowing such a dichotomy to result in an emphasis on "new" institutions for development, planners may neglect the real adaptation of "existing" institutions to changing environmental conditions (Wood, 1967). It is worth recognizing, for example, that the

success of taxation, customs, excise, defense, law and order and intelligence organizations is fundamental to the success of developmental organizations and activities.

Contemporary India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh have to apportion a large chunk of financial resources on internal and external security. And this is done at the cost of development. These countries could have scored a higher level of socio-economic development had they experienced a more stable and secure environment on their borders and on the domestic front.

Another factor contributing to an apparent developmental- non-developmental dichotomy is a conception or impression that development administration is concerned solely with the administration in developing countries. In fact, it is almost impossible to find totally developmental in real-life situations, although most programs in developing countries have acquired a developmental thrust. Indeed, in the literature on development administration, there has been a heavy emphasis on the study of bureaucracies in “developing” nations, and relatively little attention has been paid to bureaucracies in “developed” countries” except as this has been considered helpful in understanding the developing countries” (Riggs, 1970).

With the political, economic and socio-cultural systems of “developed” countries passing through a period of turbulence, it is imperative that developed nations also are increasingly focusing on the problems of managing multidimensional change and on the issue of enhancing the capabilities of administrative systems to respond appropriately and positively to the challenges of environmental transformations. In the contemporary western nations, continuing socio- economic and political development has thrown up new administrative problems. The security scenario in the United States following the attack on the World Trade Centre buildings on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2001 has altered dramatically. The State Department, the Pentagon, the National Security Council, The Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Central Intelligence Agency and other associated Organizations at the federal as well as the state levels are intensely engaged in coordinating and directing the internal as well as external security systems in the USA. Similar is the situation in all other countries of the West as well as the East that are encountering the threat of terrorism. And all these nations are facing to a varied extent tough challenges of strengthening security and overcoming the knotty problems of socio-economic development.

A focus on the developmental aspects of public administration was already discernible in American administrative theory even three decades ago

(Marini, op. cit.). It is clear, then, that there could be no rigid dichotomy between the nature of administration in “developing” and “developed” societies, although it is fairly well recognized that the emerging nations have to face greater challenges of rapid societal change.

Some scholars have identified development administration with a high degree of innovation in administrative system, which in turn is expected to encourage innovations in non-administrative areas. Weidner has stressed that:

“... the problem of how to maximize the effectiveness of a bureaucracy so that it contributes to growth in the direction of modernity or nation-building and socio-economic progress is a problem of how to strengthen innovational forces in the bureaucracy.” (Weidner, op. cit)

It has been stressed that development administration, by its very nature, is innovative (Katz, 1965). However, this should not imply that there are some administrative systems, which lack innovation absolutely and, therefore, are entirely non-developmental. What this means essentially is that an administrative unit devoted to the attainment of developmental goals is likely to need greater innovation and creativity than the one engaged primarily in “routine” administrative activities.

In the present-day India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka, increasing innovative systems are being employed to curb economic offences, cyber crimes, terrorism and insurgency. The devices adopted by the governance system in enhancing the capability of the internal security and the financial systems are mind-boggling. In fact, latest developments in information technology are being employed to systematically update the “regulatory” (or the so-called ‘non- developmental) administration. And, there is bound to be international cooperation in this realm in all the South Asian countries.

It should be clear, then, that neat distinctions between developmental and non- developmental administrations couldn’t be made. Too often a dichotomy, which makes sense in ideal-type terms, is assumed as paralleled by absolute differences, which are associated with specific concrete organizations. Like the politics– administration dichotomy, the error in making such distinctions lies in the attempt to dichotomise concretely where differences lie only in degree of emphasis---as with “warm” and “cold” water in that what is “developmental” in one setting might not be so regarded in another. Nothing is either fully developmental or non-developmental “except as thinking makes it so.” Nevertheless, as the term “development administration” is used in the literature, it refers to those administrative systems or organizations which are centrally concerned with the achievement of progressive socio-economic and political goals, and which are innovational in attitudes and operation. Furthermore, in general terms, administrative systems of all “developing” nations are considered to be engaged in the dynamics of development administration, though the “developed” nations cannot be kept outside the ambit of development administration.

## **SCOPE OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION**

With the de-emphasis on the dichotomy between development administration and non-development administration, the scope of development administration as a discipline as well as a profession has increased enormously in recent years. The discipline or the study of development administration has focused on the progressive goals of administrative systems and thus have strengthened the ideological orientation of public administration. Values have taken a central place in the analysis of development administration. Second, these progressive goals are being studied in a very wide context involving political, economic, social, cultural and technological systems. Thus, the students of development administration are examining the variegated dimensions of political, economic, social, cultural and technological

development in an objective manner. Third, development administration analysis is not confined to national boundaries and it transcends them and has rightly become cross-national and cross-cultural in its approach and orientation. Fourth, its expanding intellectual network has enveloped a number of branches of public administration that have their origin in a variety of functional administrative areas. For instance, areas such as industrial administration, agricultural administration, educational administration, health administration, and the continually growing intellectual network of development administration would encompass irrigation administration and social welfare administration. Thus, development administration, going beyond the issues of large-scale transformation in developing countries, helps in strengthening the empirical base of public administration as a discipline and thus makes it more 'rigorous'. Its ideas and lessons can be fruitfully utilized for facilitating the process of all round development.

Little wonder, development administration, during the past four decades, has influenced the whole notion of governance at the national as well as the international levels. In South Asia, as in other regions of the Asia, Africa and Latin America, the concerns of holistic transformation of societies have penetrated into the philosophy and practices of governance. The interdependence of political, economic, social, cultural and technological development has become a widely accepted truth. This has made the strategies of national transformation increasingly multi-faceted and ecological in orientation. Second, the administrative system being the crux of the governance system has become an integral component of any process of change. It is impossible to conceive of 'development' in any realm without first examining the requisite role of the administrative system. What lends sustainability to the process of development is a sound administrative system that provides vitality and viability to the change process.

Third, the process of nation building has become closely intertwined with the process of institution building as a result of the thrust of development administration. Whether it is urbanization, rural transformation, educational development, health improvement, women welfare, childcare or technological growth, no organized development is possible without systematic planning, programming, coordinating, human resource management and administration of non-human resources. Thus, the dimension of effectiveness in the process of governance has taken a crucial place. Undoubtedly, this is the clear impact of the sprawling scope of development administration.

Fourth, development administration has paved the way for a new 'humane' administration. It has propelled the promotion of enterprising and inspiring leadership that generates a motivational climate and induces the best among the personnel forming the network of development organizations. This has led to the expansion in the scope of development administration.

And lastly, with the emergence of strong faith in the philosophy of liberalization, globalization, privatization, and public-private partnership, the scope of development administration is transcending the public (government) systems and is influencing the functioning of even the emergent modified private sector that is learning the strategies of co-

existing and co-functioning with the public system without in any way imbibing the dysfunctionalities of bureaucracies. In times to come, the scope of development administration is bound to further expand vertically as well as horizontally.

## **SIGNIFICANCE OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION**

Development administration has emerged as the meeting point of empirical as well as normative concerns. That way, it is post-behavioral in character and is akin to the movement of New Public Administration. Some students of development administration are concerned primarily “with the normative questions, with the desirability of proposed courses of action, with prescriptions for the maximisation or optimization of selected values,” while others have a dominant interest in “empirical question, in the descriptions and analyses of existing practices and situations, and in the prediction of what is likely to happen under given sets of conditions” (Riggs, op. cit). These foci have been interdependent. Scholars interested in prescription generally seek help of empirically based knowledge, while students interested primarily in empirical studies often chose a subject of study for its probable policy relevance. The study of development administration has generally had a dominant normative concern with enhancement of administrative capabilities in “developing” nations particularly. Thus, it is natural to find an emphasis on various normative questions in the field.

All policy sciences must have a paramount concern with the question of values. Thus, development administration has been viewed as “an aspect of public administration that is centrally concerned with one of the many values men seek and which varies in the strength and kind of allegiance it commands country to country, group to group, and person to person” (Weidner, op. cit). This focus has provided the whole area of public administration with a programmatic goal or value orientation. Development administration studies both the process of selecting values and the ways in which they influence administration in various ecological settings (Heady, 1966).

Further, the concept of development administration helps in relating administrative means to administrative ends, and thus aids the process of selecting appropriate means for achievement of developmental goals in various cultural contexts. Such a developmental focus can subtly reflect the parochial bias of what Dwight Waldo has called “ethnocentrism” (Waldo, 1968). To guard against this, research must recognize the diversity of ecological settings in which development may occur. In addition, the study of development administration can assist the practitioners of public administration to identify conditions that maximize the rate of development in these various settings (Riggs, 1964).

While discussing the scope of development administration, it was made clear that this discipline, during the past four decades has brought a metamorphosis in the analysis and application of the governance systems across the world. It has stressed upon the role of administrative system in generating and sustaining change in its environment. Thus, the non-administrative obligations of the administrative system have magnified the status of bureaucracy as a key factor in changing the social order. In the analysis on development



administration, the dynamism of administration is highlighted as a requisite to nation building.

Further, the stress on goals and their achievement has helped development administration go beyond the parameters of the 'goal-theory'. Development administrative theorists have highlighted that in a democratic society, a democratic administration can help, evolve and strengthen participatory philosophy and strategies. In this ambience emerge leaders who are visionary and motivational who, through goal-orientation and with an eye on future, create a motivational climate and an open communication system that facilitates the development of people-centered development. The whole structure of administrative systems creates a more effective climate for purposive action. An integration of goals by the administrative system through its mechanism of planning and programs helps in the process of holistic development of social orders. This holistic approach, in turn, promotes a value-based transformation that gives central place to the premises of equity, justice, instrumental values and positive work culture.

An important contribution of development administration is in strengthening the "regulatory" administration through the generation of additional resources and the creation of a climate of stability and happiness that, in turn, lends credibility to the governance system.

## **EVOLUTION OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION**

### **EVOLUTION**

#### **Genesis of Development Administration: The 1950s**

Ushering development in the developing and under-developed countries, the concept of development administration appeared. Besides, the success in dealing with the effects of depression and Second World War, the Marshal Plan for the reconstruction of Western Europe, and the process of decolonization provided the requisite background amounting to the coining of the theory of development administration. It was an Indian scholar, Goswami, who used the concept for the first time in 1955. Later on good number of scholars all in excess of the world has contributed to its enrichment.

Classical economists' view on development has been the significant basis of the development theory in the 1950s with emphasis on augment in the GNP or per capita income. The economic growth model based on the Keynesian economic approach (macro-economic approach) which paved the method to development thinking sought to transform the ascription, particularistic and functionally diffused underdeveloped societies into the one having modernization-achievement orientation, universalism and functional specificity.

It was the Instrumental Theory of Administration and popular Government which occupied the front rank in the development administration model in 1950s and early 1960s. This theory generated prescription or normative approach viewing administrative reforms as a precondition to development. The government became a crucial instrument in designing and administering goals for achieving developmental objectives. It was argued that the twin objectives of stability and growth could be achieved if the government designs monetary and

fiscal policies. It amounted to the concept of planned development having the assumption that the developing countries could be helped to develop with the aid of western technology of administration. The significant ingredients of the development administration model were:

- Establishment of planning institutions and agencies;
- Improvement of the Central administrative systems;
- Budgeting and financial control; and
- Personnel management and organization and methods.

This model had stress on reforming the administrative structures;

- Creation of new agencies improving the administrative technology in conditions of methods; and
- Procedures and practices on the lines of western-administrative thought.

The theories propounded through Weber, Gullick, Taylor and others were implanted into the administrative practices in the developing countries. In order to ensure the validity of such techniques and methods in the developing nations' environment, the administrative techniques and methods developed in the West were to be injected.

The administrative values prescribed in this period were efficiency, economy and rationality. Besides, the principles of professionalism, hierarchy, unity of command, formalization and impersonality, span of control, authority commensurate with responsibility, staff and line, decentralization and delegation of authority became the basis of organizational structure.

Administrative development was another aspect which drew the attention of academics and executives throughout this period. Personnel administration reforms centered on the problem of setting up merit systems, position classification schemes, and central personnel agencies. The introduction of the concepts of performance or program budgeting in the US was termed as crucial for improving efficiency and rationality in decision-creation. Throughout 1950s and early 1960s, which is measured as „Technical Assistance Era in Public Administration“, the US alone spent \$ 180 million on aid for Public Administration, stress was also on training of administrators to capacitate them to cope with the intricate troubles of development. In the training programs, techniques, like role-play, Case Method, T-groups, etc. were made use of. The Technical Assistance Program insisted on creating training institutions in several countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America on the one hand and imparting training to the people from these countries in one donor country on the other.

Though, there was a version gap flanked by the training programs and the needs of the recipient country. It has been argued through Esman that the rationale behind the technical assistance was as follows:

- Economic growth and modernization occurs through a deterministic sequence of stages. All societies are destined to participate in this beneficial evolution, but it can be accelerated through wise policy.
- Development can be facilitated through transfer of possessions and technologies from advanced to underdeveloped countries. Imparted capital speeds up growth, while technology increases efficiency and facilitates modernization.
- State is a benevolent institution and the principal instrument of development. The Roosevelt reforms and the Keynesian prescription for economic management all required a proactive state.
- Balanced development requires the mastery of modern science, including the science of economics and control of the main levers of public policy. Development decisions should be in the hands of benevolent technocratic planners, protected through enlightened, modernizing political leaders.
- Bureaucracy is the main vehicle and exemplification of modern administration. When its members are adequately trained and equipped with appropriate technologies, it can be a reliable and effective instrument of modernizing elites.
- The attentive public, specially the leaders of the developing countries eager for growth and modernization, will sacrifice other values in order to achieve these goals, and welcome the material contributions and intellectual tutelage of westerners.
- The transformation from backwardness to progress will be rapid and benefits will be widely shared. Since economic growth produces full employment and increased labor productivity, there is little need for explicit concern with distributive issues.
- Development will yield enhanced well-being as well as the preconditions for political democracy, but these depend on the maintenance of political stability. Since premature democratic participation could overload and destabilize fragile political institutions, it should not be emphasized throughout the transition period.

## **Development Administration in the 1960s**

### ***Failure of Technical Assistance Program in Public Administration***

It could be said that the Technical Assistance Program advanced the principle of emulative development administration for building up of administrative capabilities in a prescriptive manner. Though, it has been criticized through several a scholars. Dwight Waldo, for instance, has termed it as “naive” and “a sad waste of scarce human possessions”. The causes for the failure of technical assistance can be summed up as follows:

- The applicability of the development model was taken for granted in all countries, ignoring the relevance of environmental context to administration and technology;

- The concepts like efficiency, economy and rationality might be differently interpreted through the developing or recipient country than the meaning given to them in the West;
- It was planning without implementation. Furthermore, since planning has social, economic, political and cultural dimensions also, several proposals for administrative reforms, for instance, could not be implemented for the lack of political support and support from even the bureaucracy. Protagonists of Technical Assistance Program did not have adequate knowledge and information in relation to the administrative troubles of specific sectors, like agriculture, health, education, industry, labor, population control etc., which was much needed to be dealt with in more details.
- The modern administration/management techniques like CPM, PERT, Linear Programming, network analysis, long-range planning and forecasting, cost benefit analysis etc., were not incorporated for the purposes of transfer to the developing countries.
- Administrative reforms attempted throughout this period concentrated mainly on structural change and not on latitudinal change.

The technical assistance approach to development administration has been criticized through Esman when he offers the following views:

- Neither economic growth nor institutional modernization is nonlinear or historically inevitable. Economies may stagnate, institutions may decline in effectiveness and societies may fail to deal with their central needs. The benefits of rapid economic growth, especially, derived from mainline urban-industrial investment model, have been skewed towards a relatively small minority in the modern sector, leaving rapidly rising majorities especially in rural areas as impoverished, insecure and powerless as they were three decades ago.
- Confidence in the efficacy of planning, in science and in the benevolent role of the State has also been shaken. Most of the States of the Third World have taken on vast new functions in economic management and the provision of public services. The size of their bureaucracies has expanded and so have their budgets, but several have proved to be incompetent or repressive and sometime both.
- Public Administration is being looked now as plural rather than universal phenomena. In the words of Esman, “the management, of Central bank, of a research station, of a postal service, or of a small irrigation system confronts the analyst with dissimilar administrative necessities even within the same political system. Regular (e.g. Police), promotional (e.g. co-operatives), service (e.g. health clinics), construction (e.g. road building) activities directed at the same rural public produce distinctive set of troubles and require dissimilar treatment”

The early development theorists ignored the issues of agency-client linkage and the impact of administrative action on the clients. This approach resulted in urban bias at the cost of rural margin.

### **The Contributions of the Comparative Administration Group (CAG)**

It was Fred W. Riggs, under whose chairmanship the Comparative Administration Group was shaped in 1961 through the American Society for Public Administration. The CAG was made to carry out research in Comparative Administration with special focus on the troubles of development administration. The financial support to the CAG was given through the Ford Foundation, which was interested in the analysis of the relations flanked by administrative system and its socio-political, economic, and cultural contexts.

The Group felt that as the classical concepts of administration in the third world were rigid, narrow, and parochial and therefore unfit in explaining for the cross-cultural situations as these concepts were unable to answer the irrational, informal, and emotional behavior of administration. Further, the postulates of conventional organizational theory were appropriate only for “maintenance needs” rather than for “development needs”. The technological-managerial school having emphasis on planned and supervised change was challenged through the Ecological School which insisted on relating the organizational structures to other social structures. It resulted into the thought that sociological context of administration is more relevant than mere

„organizational change and personnel manipulation“.

The scholars in CAG insisted on a comparative analysis of the administrative systems of the third world. The Group also advocated concentration on the strategies and requisites for attaining public policy goals in the developing countries. The Group which organized its activities through several seminars, symposiums, conferences and evolving committee system, published more than 100 occasional, papers. It is a fact that the Group initially shared the assumption of technical assistance experts, but it was not without questioning. The studies accepted out through the CAG assumed developmental thrusts in the context of a “belief in the possibility of (initiating and) managing change through purposive intervention through administrative institutions”. As a result of its efforts, the Group was able to innovate several concepts viz: Systems Analysis; Patterns Variables; Traditional-Modernity Dichotomy; Information Theory and Pluralism.

The 1960s ushered in a period of evaluation of results, doubts and repetition of old strategies. It was also a period of a search for new concepts or analytical constructs which have cross-cultural validity. The Public Administration academics sought alternative approaches to development administration. They sought to look at the relationships flanked by Public Administration and social, economic, political and cultural' environment. In other words, Public Administration was seen in „ecological perspective. The most renowned exponent of this approach has been Fred Riggs. We shall discuss his views in some detail below.

## **The Contribution of Fred W. Riggs**

Riggs has criticized the development administration model through observing that GNP augment may not necessarily lead to improving the real life circumstances of the people. Therefore augment in the per capita income does not serve as an indicator of development. He has rather preferred the physical excellence of life indicators and social and psychological excellence of life index as the success of a development policy.

Riggs has analyzed the structural functional characteristics of the social and administrative systems of the developing countries in his industria- transitia-agraria formulation. He puts the developing countries in the category of prismatic society which is caught in flanked by tradition fused and modernity detracted and is undergoing the process of social change. The ecological approach provided a vision that reflected interest in the examination of the relationship of non-administrative factors to administrative ones. Administrative characteristics, it is argued, cannot be explained and analyzed in their abstract shapes where effective behavior, despite the establishment of formal political and administrative institutions, is still guided in modern traditional societies, to a great extent, through traditional structures and pressures, family, religion, region, caste and persisting socio-economic practices. So, an effort is made to understand the socio-cultural and administrative factors as related to the implementation of Technical Assistance Programs. The strong primary group affiliations and conservative mode of thought, where not much importance is given to the factors of accuracy, promptness and time, have behavioral implications.

## **The Empirical Approach to Development Administration**

The period of the 1960s also saw a shift from normative approach to empirical approach. This approach was undertaken to create a systematic study of the processes of institution-building basic to the technical assistance enterprise of the United Nations and other aid agencies. The fundamental units of analysis were the structures and their functions in dissimilar systems having parallel features. It is in contrast with the normative approach in which the main aim is to prescribe ideal or at least better patterns of administrative structure and action. This approach is implicit in most of the so-called principles of Public Administration works of Woodrow Wilson, L.D. White, Fayol, Gullick, F.W. Taylor and others. It reflected American practice as a model, especially for the people of the third world countries. This category comprises numerous reports and studies through experts, visiting consultants, technical assistants, and through some western trained Public Administration specialists of the new States. The basic orientation is the quest for ideal patterns and the identification of difficulties and obstacles to be overcome and troubles to be solved. Such endeavors seek to identify the universals of the administrative process.

## **The Thrust in the 1970s**

### **Review of Development Strategies of the 1960s**

Through 1970s not only the meaning of development underwent change in so distant as development goals were conceived in conditions of meeting basic human needs but also the development administration model, to meet these objectives, saw changes in strategies and substantive programmatic actions. The shifts in the approaches to the study of the theory and practice of development administration were also discernible. Public Administration shed its love for uni-directional emphasis. This period of the second U.N. Development Decade, though, began in the background of report of the Commission on International Development on Technical Assistance Program in 1969. The report has made it vividly clear that the focus of the 1960s on administrative modernization depicted as a technical process involving the expert of western administrative methods, procedures and practices to the newly Independent States needs a review and recast. It has been pointed out that the local people were, though poor, yet not so irrational in decision-creation. The development administration troubles were rooted in the political economy of the aid getting countries and stressed on inter- theoretic linkages to social explanation.

### **The Political-Economy Approach**

Several scholars sought to explain the dynamics of societal transformation and management of change through undertaking political-economy approach which attempted to seek politics-administration union and economics-administration confluence. It was asserted that administrative questions are political questions. The political economy paradigm seeks to relate administration to political and economic environment. This paradigm which is concerned with both political and economic dimensions of decision-creation and resource allocation deals with “organizational constitution” and “internal polity”. In the words of Mohit Bhattacharya, “Theoretical formulations in line with the classical study of political economy—explore relationship flanked by political and economic power in society.” The political-economy approach sub serves „goal paradigm“ and „rational model“. These new concepts refer to the concepts of power and action. The thrust of the paradigm consists in examining development administration in the context of power relationships and in conditions of the real process of conflicts and their resolution. The political-economy paradigm gives for the analysis of the context of administration.

### **The Ecological Approach**

Several a scholars have attempted to understand development administration with an ecological perspective. The ecological approach has been applied to relate Public Administration with social, economic and political-cultural structures of the country. It has been argued that development is a holistic concept. There is a rising realization that political development is necessary for national development and administration. Therefore political environment

acquires a special significance in relation to the „skill of Public Administration to play its role in the national development“. The politics-administration dichotomy principle is not a favored principle now, especially in practice. It is a recognized fact that administration plays a decisive role both in policy creation and its implementation. On the other hand political environment gives a conditioning effect on administrative environment in as distant as effective and efficient administrative performance requires the support of political executive. Even the question of administrative reforms is a political question. Moreover, it is stated that development is dependent on strong political institutions and practices. If the bureaucracy is more developed than the political leadership and structures, it might lead to negative impact on development efforts. It may be said that political context gives strategic opportunities for accomplishment. This political framework necessity is taken into account while studying development activities.

The cultural context also plays a significant role in determining administrative performance. Both goals and methods shall have to be related to these ecological factors. In the words of M.J. Esman, “At both project and program a stage of action behavior that produces and protects innovation depends on combinations of sanctions and incentives that meet the tests of political and cultural feasibility. Accessible incentives and sanctions are not only individual and economic, but also communal and non-material; the latter especially are derived from indigenous culture and experience”. The point here is that special features of a country prescribe a dissimilar role for its government and administration. It is equally significant to have the economic and sociological understanding of administration in developing countries. The economic and social dimensions of development administration are a part of the process of nation-building and socio-economic progress.

The administration makes circumstances for economic development through mobilization and better utilization of possessions on the one hand and through determining the extent and context of training to be given for modernizing labor forces on the other. The importance of social development has also been recognized in the 70s. Several organizations have argued for introducing programs and policies and evolving relevant strategies to bring in relation to the change in the minimum standards of living of the people and to ensure human dignity. This is the focus, for instance, of Declaration on Human Rights, Declaration on Social Progress and Development and the New International Economic Order. The emphasis here is on the reduction of poverty, improved delivery of social benefits like education, health, nutrition, transport etc. and removal of socio-economic disparities in the society.

### **Basic Needs Approach to Development Administration**

Through the end of 1960s and early 70s, it was experienced that poverty, hunger, squalor, unemployment have been on the rising level despite achievements in the area of economic growth. The role of human factor in development process began to attract the focus of the students of development and development administration. How to give the millions and millions of poor people with the bare minimum of life became a major concern of the scholars as well as



the policy makers. Meeting the basic needs of food, clothing and shelter, beside with education and public health became the indicator of development. Therefore development acquired a social and economic meaning throughout the U.N. Second Development Decade (1971-81) instead of economic growth. The concern was obvious for qualitative change rather than mere quantitative one. It was realized through the developmentalists of this period that the GNP (Gross National Product) model has benefited only a small minority of the rich and privileged persons who were already an entrenched class. The need for new economic framework and accordingly a new approach to development administration was felt. The economists like G. Myrdal argued in favor of social and institutional preconditions for progress. This called for the adoption or creation of new strategies as well.

A group of scholars from Third World Forum also advanced the new framework of development, more so in the year 1975 when they met at Karachi. The development ideology as has been mentioned through Marc Nefrim was characterized through need orientation, ecological orientation, self-reliance orientation, rural development orientation based on development and creation of endogenous techniques and institutional structures. The objectives of development were recognized as reduction and removal of poverty, inequality, hunger, squalor, disease, illiteracy, unemployment and malnutrition. Therefore the impact of economic growth occupied central place instead of the augment in the production of goods and services per se. In other words, the problem of increased production was to be seen beside with the problem of distributive justice. The process of efficient and fair/social choices became a matter of analysis for the students and practitioners of Public Administration.

De-bureaucratization and participatory management were regarded as the appropriate strategy to implement this shift. The development of regional, local and sectoral structures was focused upon rather than central organizations. Moreover, rural development became a new management strategy for development. The implication is the design of a strategy to improve the socio-economic circumstances of the life of the rural poor. The key elements of this approach are: satisfaction of the basic needs, augment in production in the agricultural sector, development of labor-rigorous technology for agriculture, providing the services of credit, technological information, marketing facilities and assistance, seeds and fertilizers to the peasants and small and marginal farmers. Though, the problem is to discover an appropriate organizational/administrative model to achieve these goals. Some scholars have suggested the following strategy for development:

- **Decentralization and Devolution:** Decentralization in administrative language means delegation of authority from the functional department to the regional and local to formulate and implement projects, to allocate funds and to raise possessions. Decentralization is also political when provincial, regional and local governments work under autonomous regions of authority and functions. Devolution of powers and authority implies creation of autonomous administrative institutions and agencies at several stages having freedom to plan and implement development projects and programs.

- Strengthening of local self governments and creation of intermediary organizations.
- Peoples' participation in plan formulation and implementation.
- Development of communicational co-ordination and integration channels.
- Removal of negative socio-political circumstances e.g. rural, social and class structures—persistence of dependency-relationship-factional politics.

### **The Trends in the 1980s**

The 1980s present a third world view of development administration in which attention has been given to indigenous concepts, methods and theories of development and administration. Arvind Singhal mentions two modern approaches to development (1) pluralistic, recognizing several pathways to development less western in their cultural assumptions. These approaches stress on the new socio-economic goals and strategies. The works of Roger, Korten and Klaus, Bijur, Bryant and White have recognized the following as key elements of the modern approaches to development administration:

- Greater excellencies sharing of development benefits
- Popular participation, knowledge-sharing and empowerment to facilitate self-development efforts through individuals, groups and communities
- Self-reliance and independence in development, emphasizing the local possessions mobilization and use
- The problem of containing the population-augment, and
- Integration of appropriate technology with big modern technologies in order to facilitate development.

Development administration theory today focuses upon the involvement of non-government, voluntary and community organization in the development process and emphasizes localized, decentralized and participative approaches to development administration. The shifts in development administration theory in the 80s have been very well summarized through Arvind Singhal who sees Learning Process Approach and People-Centered Approach replacing Blue-Print Approach and Production-Centered Approach respectively.

### **Blue-Print Approach to Learning-Process Approach**

The conventional development administration theory was concerned with preparing blue-print for administering a development program. This approach involves designing a specific plan of action in advance for implementing a development project. Lately, this approach was found inappropriate in as distant as it is rigid and closed and, so, unable to respond to the needs of a

changing environment. Hence, several scholars prescribe a learning process approach which is not only a relatively open-ended strategy to planned social change, but also involves a cybernetic process through which development administration can adapt themselves to changing environment and incorporate mid-course corrections, based on existing local circumstances.

Distinguishing the two approaches, A. Singhal states, “The blue-print approach emphasizes advanced planning for the people. The learning process approach emphasizes planning with the people and doing so throughout the process of administering a development program.” The philosophy of action-learning repudiates the management theory and lays stress on learning through experiences of each other. The action-learning approach attempts to look at oneself and others approximately oneself and seek solutions rather than look beyond the shores for chosen people to raise them from impoverished circumstances in which they live.

### **The Participatory Approach to Development Administration**

This approach is also termed as people-centered approach. The approach stresses upon peoples’ empowerment and promotion of psychological strength so as to enable the people relate themselves with the officials on a partnership basis. It is based on developing community action through people. The key elements of participatory approach contain:

- Respecting the ideas of employees and the beneficiaries without evaluation or criticism;
- Raising of certain diagnostic questions of what the administrators are doing;
- Stimulating ideas from all stages and acceptance of good ideas for implementation; and
- Latitudinal change through dissimilar methods and close observations and discussions in the middle of officials and the people.

The major theme of participatory or people-centered approach is the growth to capability via equity. It concentrates on the sharing of development benefits economic as well as social. Equity became a primary issue in development plans and programs. The concern for equity reinforced participation and micro-stage concerns. These concerns focused on direct attack on poverty and rural development. The set of priorities in the people-centered approach, says Esman, comprises:

- An emphasis on reaching large mass of public often in remote areas;
- Developing programs that are responsive to their very diverse needs, capabilities and preferences;
- Organising the public so that they may interact more effectively with the service-providing agencies of the State;
- Devolution to constituency organization and the fostering of local action capabilities;

- Innovation of appropriate services and practices in support of basic needs strategies, not the plantation of recognized and replicable techniques. Though, it may be mentioned here that some Western administrative methods and practices like record-keeping, monitoring and reporting methods, public information procedures etc. may give useful assistance to programs oriented to poor masses.

The participatory approach to development administration gives a link flanked by beneficiary needs, program outputs and the efficacy of the assisting agency. The effective popular involvement in decision-creation and decision-implementation through local skills, knowledge and institutions like local self governmental institutions or voluntary agencies is given importance. The participatory development involves leadership and teamwork, besides sharing of knowledge and possessions flanked by the beneficiaries and the program officials. The people-centered approach also lays emphasis on sustainability of development programs and creating opportunities for change. This objective can be achieved through:

- Creating a felt need in the middle of beneficiaries in relation to the efficacy of the program
- Developing institutions which continually adapt
- Providing (or self-generation) of possessions and
- Building support in the middle of political elites and community groups.

## **TRADITIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION**

### **Variation Flanked by Traditional Administration and Development Administration**

Several scholars like George Gant, Ferrel Heady and others have sought to conceptualize development administration as dissimilar from traditional administration. They explain that these two types of administration differ from each other in conditions of purpose, structure and organization, attitudes and behavior, capabilities, techniques and methods. This is the implicit meaning of the observation of John Gunnell who says, “The rising shift of development scenario requires increased diversification and specialization of knowledge and skills and high stage of managerial skill for integrative co-ordination. To quicken the pace of development there is an additional need for a new breed of administrators of superior caliber and vision with a passion for achieving results and of those who can take risks and introduce innovations. There is a rising need to have heightened sensitivity to the welfare of the poor sections and greater responsiveness to the political process.” It follows that development administration has to have dissimilar characteristics and should be based on dissimilar requisites than the traditional or law and order or general administration. The distinction flanked by the traditional and development administration has been presented through S.P. Verma and S.K. Sharma as follows:

Traditional administration has been visualized as one concerned with fulfilling all the legal necessities of governmental operations and maintenance of social stability. In the main, this type of administration confines itself to the maintenance of law and order, collection of revenues and regulation of national life in accordance with the statutory necessities. The assumption behind the differentiation flanked by development administration and traditional administration is that administration in newly emergent nations necessity switch totally from law and order values to developmental values. Therefore the qualitative goals of development administration i.e. planning for the people, with people's support and co-operation distinguishes it from the quantitative goals of Public Administration i.e. implementing rules.

Another point that distinguishes development administration as a separate identity is that "it is not a closed system; the linkages with experts, relationships with the grassroots stage and with the people is more significant than Central structures. Though there are technical and behavioral techniques common to all shapes of management, in development administration, external relations have to be optimized before possessions can be focused on limited incremental goals. Development administration is concerned with attitudes and processes rather than procedures and structures." Though, there are scholars, like W. Wood, who do not favor separation or division of administration into such separate categories. Wood objects to such dichotomization on the grounds that:

- The division of government servants into developers and non- developers might result in the loss of esteem to one and gain in excess of-importance to the others.
- This would demoralize administration the possibility of innovation and new design is neglected
- There is insufficient analysis of the term development in that, on the one hand, it is treated as an extension of the „supposed“ law and order and revenue collecting State and on the other, it appears to have a special relationship with independence and POST-colonization. The commonness of the two could also be observed from the following facts as presented through V.A. Pai Panandikar:
  - The prevailing structure of general administration has a decisive power on the strength and weakness of development administration.
  - Both have a common source of authority within the structure of the government, for instance, a Cabinet responsible to a legislature.
  - A number of key officials, like divisional commissioner, and district collector, combine general and developmental functions.
  - Citizen sees and judges as a whole the acts of administration, drawing no fine distinction flanked by general and development administration.

The differences of views on the question of dichotomy still persist leading to an inconclusive debate. Though, it may be maintained that the administration for fulfilling the developmental tasks needs to be exclusively studied and explained. The creation of new and separate development agencies and organizations is a further pointer to the rising incapability of the law and order function and revenue collecting administration. That is why in some states in India an effort has been made to vest the office of deputy development commissioner or district development officer with only the development administration. That development administration is not synonymous with Public Administration is pointed out through Gant in the following words:

“Development administration is distinguished from, although not independent of, other characteristics and concerns of Public Administration. Certainly, the maintenance of law and order is a prime function of government and is basic to development, although it precedes and is not usually encompassed within that definition of development administration. Likewise, the provision of essential communications and educational facilities and the maintenance of judicial and diplomatic systems would have an impact on but not be an integral part of development administration.”

Therefore a rigid distinction cannot be made flanked by traditional and development administration. The traditional functions of maintenance of law and order are also basic to development. Development administration has assumed the responsibility of formulating and implementing several development and welfare functions because of rising complexities of administration and aspirations of people. These functions are not absolutely separate from traditional functions. In fact maintenance of law and order, and security is a precondition for an economy to undertake developmental tasks. But as development administration is wider, broader, participative, innovative and change-oriented, the traditional administration has to make the circumstances for the effective working of development administration.

## **DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION AND TRADITIONAL ADMINISTRATION**

In the concept of development administration and traditional public administration; it has already been said earlier that public administration is employed for translating governmental programs into execution. Before its conceptual development, it was prevalent since the growth of government. As a process of operations in human activities and relationships, it can scarcely be reduced to any common principle except at relatively high generality levels that are quite worthless for analytical or comparative purposes. So it isn't easy to chalk out any usable principle based on which development administration and traditional public administration can be distinguished.

### **1. Ecology:**

In the difference between development administration and traditional public administration of ecological perspective. The concept of development administration gets momentum in such a situation where nation-states exist in the ecology. When people are in the backward states in all respects in an independent nation, their development administration emerges. The development of science and technology often accentuates it. The main ground of development administration lies in social instability and higher demand.

The main field of traditional public administration is a colonial society where the colonial government has little role in the people's betterment. In fact, all the earlier administrative systems were also traditional. For the absence of economic complexity, minimum scientific and technological growth, and due to the very nature of agrarian society – traditional administration then existed with its tradition. In the ultimate analysis, the societal condition and the more or less simple international relationship confirm traditional public administration. This is the difference between development administration and traditional public administration.

### **2. Objectives:**

Based on the ecological differences of development, administration and traditional public administration differ in their objectives. The objective of development administration is the total change of the system in a very planned way of giving up the country's socioeconomic and political condition. The terminal condition of development administration is the image of a good society that is multidimensional in nature.

On the other hand, traditional public administration has only the objective of keeping the system going on as it is at present. Its main focus is to uphold the status quo. It is almost clear that the traditional bureaucratic system existed mainly for the upkeep of law and order, justice, and revenue collection, whether done on behalf of a monarch or a colonial power.

### **3. Scope:**

The objectives of the two administrative systems (development administration and traditional public administration) determine their scopes. For very natural reasons, the scope of traditional public administration is minimal. On the other hand, the scope of development administration is extensive for the multiplicity of development nature. It deals with the different dimensions of the

society like political, economic administration, etc. different sectoral developments are equal by emphasized in development administration what is lacked by the traditional public administration.

#### **4. Nature:**

In the context of the nature of these two types of development administration and traditional public administration, there are several differences, which are as follows:

- The Development administration is innovative in nature. It is involved in experimental and creative ideas. But traditional public administration parochial in nature and lacks positive thinking.
- A prominent characteristic of traditional public administration is its upper-class orientation. The Development administration is dealt with all classes.
- In the difference between development administration and traditional public administration, the traditional public administration is desk oriented and confined within an office. The Development administration is field-oriented. That is why the development administration maintains close contact with people. There is, theoretically, less gap between the administrator and the mass.
- Traditional public administration is an executive type, and development administration is a managerial type. In traditional public administration, bureaucrats' role is confined to the application of the law, and they have a sense of superiority. On the other hand, development administrators are concerned with mobilizing men and resources to realize socio-politico and economic development goals and objectives.
- One of the main differences between development administration and traditional public administration is that the latter is static, and the former is dynamic. The traditional public administration is concerned with the maintenance of stability in society. But development is highly concerned with the changing ecology, and thus it is to maintain dynamics even through risk and problem.
- The policy administration dichotomy is prevalent in traditional public administration. The Development administration denies this dichotic concept of politics and administration. It recognizes smooth co-operation between these two systems.



- The concept of accountability draws much attention in development administration. In traditional public administration, accountability not necessarily goes to the people. But the civil servants in development administration are always accountable to the people as it is employed for people.

### **5. Structure:**

The structure is the anatomical framework of the system. It designates who is where and how of the organization. In respect of structure, development administration and traditional public administration differ from each other to a great extent. Among others, the basic ones are discussed below:

- Due to its involvement in limited functions, the traditional public administration structure is very simple, and it displays a few differentiations. Development administration possesses a complex structure having greater differentiation. These complexities have resulted from the increased activities of the government. Subunits of development administration extend up to the grass-root level and formulate a complex network of units. This sort of network is absent in the traditional public administration.
- In the difference between development administration and traditional public administration, the traditional public administration is generally conducted by the departmental management form. This pattern of administration is strict on formalities. At the same time, development administration is less dependent upon the departmental form. It assumes most frequently public corporations, joint-stock companies, etc. types of organizations. All these have special features quite different from the traditional administrative setup.
- Development administration requires local government units closely linked with the governmental administrative system for ensuring people's participation. Local government units cannot be isolated from the structure of development administration. Traditional public administration pays little attention to this arena of administration.

### **6. Process:**

There are some significant differences between development administration and traditional public administration's respect for the various process. Such as: –

- **Leadership:** In traditional public administration, leadership is authoritative. But in development administration, democratic leadership exercised for having legitimacy and cooperation from the people.
- **Decision Making:** Decision making is centralized in traditional public administration almost there is no access of the people to decision making. In development administration, participative decision making is preferred. Here, there is a demand for regional planning, and thereby there is a decentralizing bias in development administration.
- **Communication:** Development administration requires multi-dimensional communication due to its very nature. Communication goes up and downward and lateral ways in development administration. But traditional public administration adheres to unidimensional communication thus, naturally development administration observes a very complex network, whereas the traditional public administration has the opposite.
- **Co-Ordination:** In the difference between development administration and traditional public administration, due to its complex structure, huge numbers of field offices working different levels, and multi-dimensional objectives, development administration requires a well-developed coordination system. In any development administrative system, co-ordination not within the governmental units but also with the local government units and international trends. On the other hand, the traditional public administration is not acquainted with such serious coordination problems.
- **Motivation:** The methods of motivation in development administration are indirect, and in traditional public administration, it is direct. Civil servants in traditional public administration try to motivate people through the fear of peace or of punishment. But in development administration, it is achieved through the confidence of the people. Civil servants in development administration motivate the people not by imposing anything upon them by inducing and stimulating them.
- **Budget:** In the difference between development administration and traditional public administration, traditional public administration generally formulates an accounting type of budget. Deficit financing is hardly grasped by it. Development administration formulates two types of budgets as revenue budget and development budget with sectoral allocations, plans programs, the traditional public administration lacks it.

#### **INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION:**

## **DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION IN DEVELOPED AND DEVELOPING NATIONS**

### **MORE DEVELOPED NATIONS:**

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

### **High Level of Differentiation**

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

### **High Degree of Professionalization**

Structural differentiation and functional specificity have led to a high degree of internal specialization of bureaucracy. This has become possible primarily on account of a visible stress on recruitment on the basis of merit and specialized educational background of the entrants into the civil service. In France, Japan, the United States of America and most other developed countries, it is the technocrat who has been recruited to hold important administrative posts and conduct the affairs of organizations involved in development administration. It is only in Great Britain that the legacy of the generalist administrator continues to dominate. Although since the

late 1960s, as a result of the implementation of Fulton Committee recommendations, there has been an increasing amount of specialization in the structure of bureaucracy in Britain.

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

### **Great Stress on Training**

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

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

### **A Motivated Work Force**

In developed nations, the basis for recruitment of civil servants is “achieving” rather than “ascription”. It is the merit of a person that not only brings him into the civil service and it is his competence, alone which pushes him to the higher ladders of governance system. It is interesting to know that because of the flexibility in the recruitment of civil service at higher level in most developed nations, a large number of competent individuals, specialized in different areas of development administration, are inducted into the civil service through a pattern of “lateral” entry and “contractual” appointments. Service conditions and compensation systems for those entering the civil service are made flexible in order to accommodate them and retain for whatever period they are needed.

Thus, in developed nations, not only self- motivated individuals are inducted into the administrative system through aggressive recruitment, but providing them requisite attractions and supports also retain them.

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

While in most developing countries, because of scarce financial resources, it is not always feasible to introduce modern technology into administration of development programs, the

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

### **Effective Integration**

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

### **Sound Regulatory Mechanisms**

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

## **Public-Private Partnership**

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

## **Participatory Governance**

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

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

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

## **Indicative Planning**

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

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

### **Higher Level of Integrity**

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

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

The vigilance machinery functioning in the western countries has, over the years, evolved strength and effectiveness and this has been a deterrent to corrupt practices indulged in by government functionaries. The general level of ethics in public has been relatively high in the Western nations and as a result, hardly any corrupt practices are highlighted in the press or otherwise remain unpunished.

The high and the mighty have been brought to the book in the US, Japan, Italy and other developed nations. One factor that helps the process of punishing the culprits is the relatively fast

pace of justice as compared to the dilatory judicial process in most developing nations, particularly those that have been ruled by the British. The criminal justice administration in these countries is cumbersome and slow, though the British system of today cannot be accused of tardy justice.

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

### **Responsiveness**

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

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

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

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

### **The Innovative Spirit**

One reason why there has been an increasing structural differentiation in the governance systems of developed countries is their penchant for imbibing an innovative culture. These nations have never desisted from experimentations and have therefore, attempted to keep their administrative systems in a creative mould. In the United States of America, administrative reforms in the structural sphere are difficult to come by in view of the legislative powers to approve or veto any



major governmental reorganization, yet the history of the past thirty years goes to prove that the US organs of state have taken initiative in introducing significant transformation in the administrative system. A yearning for greater effectiveness is visible in the efforts made in the realm of administrative reforms in recent years. The spirit of the Brownlow Committee (1938) and the Hoover Commissions (1949 and 1955) lives on in the form of continual reforms in the administrative system.

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

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

### **Balanced Polity**

Most developed western nations have enjoyed political stability. No doubt there have been exceptions such as France and Germany, but recent years have witnessed political stability even there. France, since 1958, has had a stable regime under the Fifth Republic while Germany, even after unification, has not encountered any political traumas.

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

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

## THE DEVELOPING NATIONS

A critical difficulty in discussing the status of development administration in developing countries is the phenomenal heterogeneity in the environmental context, structures, behavioral patterns and outputs of the administrative system of these countries. There are prominent variations in the levels of political, economic, social, cultural and technological development in the so-called “developing nations” that cover geographically, a major part of the globe. Most nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America will fall in this category. Exceptions are, however, too obvious to be ignored. While Japan has joined the big league of developed nations, South Korea is not too behind. But most notably, the People’s Republic of China is leaping towards the status of a Super-power and the Asian Tigers are not comfortable in the company of Nepal, Sri Lanka or Bangladesh.

Thus, the variations in their level of socio-economic development create categories within the broader category of developing nations. And then there are countries such as North Korea, Cuba and Vietnam, which still value certain attributes of Communism, while there are nations like India and Philippines that have honored the tenets of parliamentary democracy.

### Diversity in Political Regimes

Assuming that regimes sharing common structural and behavioral characteristics are likely to approach the task of nation-building and socio-economic transformation in similar ways, Milton Esman had designated, more than three decades ago, five political regimes in developing nations (1) conservative oligarchies, (2) authoritarian military reformers, (3) competitive interest-oriented party system, (4) dominant pass party systems, and (5) communist totalitarian states (Esman, 1966). Merele Fainsod, basing his typology on the criterion of “the relationship of bureaucracies to the flow of political authority,” distinguished five different political systems in the developing world: (1) ruler-dominated bureaucracies, (2) military-dominated bureaucracies, (3) ruling bureaucracies, (4) representative bureaucracies, and (5) party state bureaucracies (Heady, op. cit.).

Ferrel Heady further explored the nuances of the above categories and came up

with a six-fold classification: (1) traditional autocratic systems, (2) bureaucratic elite systems-civil and military, (3) polyarchal competitive systems, (4) dominant-party semi-competitive system, (5) dominant party mobilization system, and (6) communist totalitarian system (Ibid). Heady maintains that despite the recent shift in the political arrangements in a few developing nations, his classification would hold true even today. There does not seem to be any dispute about any specific classification of developing countries for they mostly deal with the nature of power and its distribution among the various organs of the political systems and more eminently,

its bureaucratic system. The consensus remains that the nature of a political system influences the character and efficacy of development administration functioning in a country.

### **Bureaucratic Polity**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **Differing Levels of Human Development**

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

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

## **COMMON PATTERNS IN DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION**

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

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

Efforts need to be made and some have already been made to inculcate among administrators attributes that can make them more positive to the requirements of development. Training can

help in this respect, but it is overburdened with the responsibilities for improving knowledge and skills, rather than changing attitudes.

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

One major problem in this sphere has been a multiplicity of policies and a lack of synthesis among them. Every new political regime or chief executive generally rejects the policies of predecessors and frames new policies and programs.

And, administrators have only to follow the directions of their political masters. Even in the changed situations, their role and importance in policy making remain crucial to the success of development administration.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Concept of Development Administration in Developing Countries like Nepal:**

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

as North Korea, Cuba and Vietnam, which still value certain attributes of Communism, while there are nations like India and Philippines that have honored the tenets of parliamentary democracy.([www.google.com](http://www.google.com), Development Administration in Developed and Developing Countries) the following factors play a pivotal role in Development Administration for developing nations: