Public Administration in a Globalizing World

Theories and Practices

Bidyut Chakrabarty
Prakash Chand

Public Administration in a Globalizing World

Public Administration in a Globalizing World
Theories and Practices

BIDYUT CHAKRABARTY
PRAKASH CHAND

(With assistance from Arindam Roy)

To our children—Arkamita, Gaurav, Bhavya, Barbie, and Pablo—
for being supportive to our intellectual creativity

Thank you for choosing a SAGE product! If you have any comment, observation or feedback, I would like to personally hear from you. Please write to me at contactceo@sagepub.in

—Vivek Mehra, Managing Director and CEO,
SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd, New Delhi

Bulk Sales

SAGE India offers special discounts for purchase of books in bulk. We also make available special imprints and excerpts from our books on demand.

For orders and enquiries, write to us at

Marketing Department
SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd
B1/I-1, Mohan Cooperative Industrial Area
Mathura Road, Post Bag 7
New Delhi 110044, India
E-mail us at marketing@sagepub.in

Get to know more about SAGE, be invited to SAGE events, get on our mailing list. Write today to marketing@sagepub.in

This book is also available as an e-book.

Contents

List of Abbreviations

AIS	All India Services
AMUL	Anand Milk Union Ltd
ARC	Administrative Reforms Commission
ASPA	American Society for Public Administration
BFIR	Board for Industrial and Financial Reconstruction
CAG	Controller and Auditor General
CBI	Central Bureau of Investigation
CDP	Community Development Programme
CII	Confederation of Indian Industry
CMS	Centre for Media Studies
CPA	Comparative Public Administration
CSRE	Crash Scheme for Rural Employment
CVC	Central Vigilance Commission
DDP	Desert Development Programme
DPAP	Drought-prone Area Programme
EG	Entrepreneurial Government
EGS	Employment Guarantee Scheme
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
FFW programme	Food for Work programme
FRBM	Fiscal Responsibility and Budget Management
GEM	Gender Empowerment Measure
GMFC	Grow More Food Campaign
GNP	Gross National Product
GONGO	Government-organized Non-governmental Organization
HADP	Hill Area Development Programme
HNFDC	National Handicapped Finance and Development
HYVP	High Yielding Variety Programme

IAAP	Intensive Agricultural Areas Programme
IADP	Intensive Agricultural District Programme
IAS	Indian Administrative Service
ICDP	Intensive Cattle Development Programme
ICDS	Integrated Child Development Services
ICPS	Integrated Child Protection Scheme
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IRDP	Integrated Rural Development Programme
IT	Information Technology
JUSE	Japanese Union of Scientists and Engineers
MFAL	Marginal Farmers and Agricultural Labourers
MGNREGA	Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act
MMP	Mission Mode Project
MNCs	Multinational Companies
MRTP Act	Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act
NCW	National Commission for Women
NEGP	National E-Governance Plan
NES	National Extension Services Scheme
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NHFDC	National Handicapped Finance and Development Corporation
NIC	National Informatics Centre
NPA	New Public Administration
NPC	National Police Commission
NPM	New Public Management
NREGA	National Rural Employment Guarantee Act
NREP	National Rural Employment Programme
NRHM	National Rural Health Mission
NSE	National Stock Exchange
NYSE	New York Stock Exchange
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PDS	Public Distribution System
PIL	Public Interest Litigation
PIO	Public Information Officer

POSDCORB	Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting, and Budgeting
PPBS	Planning, Programming and Budgeting System
PPP	Public–Private Partnership
PSU	Public Sector Unit
RBI	Reserve Bank of India
RLEGP	Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme
RMK	Rashtriya Mahila Kosh
RTI	Right to Information
RWP	Rural Works Programme
SAP	Structural Adjustment Programme
SCOVA	Standing Committees of Voluntary Agencies
SCSs	Senior Civil Services
SEBI	Security and Exchange Board of India
SFDA	Small Farmer Development Agency
SPC	Statistical Process Control
SQI	Service Quality Initiative
SSA	Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan
TADP	Tribal Area Development Programme
TMT	Top Management Team
TQM	Total Quality Management
NPA	New Public Administration
TRAI	Telecom Regulatory Authority of India
TRYSEM	Training of Rural Youth for Self-employment
TSP	Tribal Sub-Plan
UEE	Universalization of Elementary Education
UGC	University Grants Commission
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UPSC	Union Public Service Commission
WCP	Women's Component Plan
ZBB	Zero-based Budgeting

Preface

This was our dream project. We are thankful to SAGE for having agreed to publish the book for wider attention. There is hardly a book dealing with theories and practices of public administration in the same depth. The book shall, therefore, serve a useful purpose to the students seeking to grapple with the complex articulation of governance in varied socio-economic and political contexts. Critical of the so-called universal designs of public administration, the book argues for the context-driven models of public administration. Questioning the neo-Taylorist theoretical mould, the book raises important issues that are undoubtedly useful in redefining the scope and domain of public administration. By reiterating some of the concerns that Dwight Waldo expressed in 1968 in the Minnowbrook Conference I, our effort is directed towards bringing back the role of 'politics' in public administration. Politics adds character to governance within a specific kind of 'power relationship' that can never be understood independent of the socio-economic matrix in which it evolves. The New Public Management (NPM) perspective remains clueless in conceptualizing public administration in countries other than the developed West; this was the primary concern that seemed to have bothered the participants of the 2008 Minnowbrook Conference III. Their effort was to make the discipline relevant and meaningful in addressing contemporary human concerns. In the changed environment of the growing ascendancy of market, public administration, in order to remain relevant, needs to be responsive to the critical problems of our time. Public administration is hardly bureaucracy-centric. The centre of gravity in governance shifts away from bureaucracy that has become just one of the agencies

in public administration. Public managers no longer remain just unitary leaders of unitary organizations. Instead, they operate in multi-organizational arrangements to solve problems that cannot be solved, or solved easily, by a single organization. We need to reinvent public administration in the light of the growing importance of 'networked governance' and 'collaborative public management' in day-to-day administration. So the discipline, in the spirit of Dwight Waldo's original emphasis, has to evolve new theoretical parameters to re-conceptualize governance as a problem-solving mechanism and also as a process in the changed socio-economic environment.

Two important ideas seem to be most critical in re-conceptualizing public administration in the context of a globalizing world: First, it is impossible to understand the complex world of administration simply in Weberian theoretical paradigm, given the importance of civil society organizations in today's governance. Public administration is no longer exclusively bureaucracy-driven because multiple actors get involved in public decision-making. A good example is certainly the movement that Anna Hazare launched in 2011 for a strong Lokpal, which became an important source of inputs for framing the bill. This was a decision in which government bureaucracy, parliament and civil society activists joined hands to meaningfully address 'the public outcry' over the creation of a Lokpal (Ombudsman) to institutionally counter corruption. Second, as a discipline, public administration has truly become 'multidisciplinary' drawing on 'interdisciplinary' borrowing. The Minnowbrook Conference III represented both Simonesque and Waldonian perspectives: those clinging to the former were drawn to economics, organization theory and management and those appreciative of Waldonian methodological tools seemed to have found adequate intellectual backing from political science, sociology, philosophy and history. The prevalence of these two important perspectives confirms that as a field of study, public administration continues to be relatively 'diverse' and 'multi-theoretical'.

Book-writing is always a collaborative project. We are fortunate to have been trained by our teachers who injected in us the art of being inquisitive which helped us in plunging into the world of

unknown. We are grateful to our teachers. We are honoured by being associated with the SAGE textbook project. It is a great feeling that SAGE continues to have faith in us for the third book in a row in this series. It would not have been possible without personal interests of Dr Sugata Ghosh, Vice President, Commissioning, at SAGE, and his competent team members, especially Rekha Natarajan and Gayeti Singh. We are thankful for their support. We shall be failing in our duties if we do not thankfully acknowledge the contribution of the readers because their comments have significantly improved the presentation of the text around a persuasive argument. By her very thought-provoking comments, Professor Rosemary O'Leary of Maxwell School, Syracuse University, New York, who was also a participant in the 1988 and 2008 Minnowbrook conferences made a useful difference in the final text of the book. The book would not have been the same without the generous intellectual support of Arindam Roy of the University of Burdwan, India, who is now pursuing a very thought-provoking work on health and politics in the state of West Bengal in India. By being proactive in the classroom, our students in India and abroad always remain important sources of thought. If they find the book useful and intellectually stimulating, we will have achieved what we are looking for.

Last, but not the least, we are indebted to our families that always stood by us. By distracting us off and on during the preparation of the manuscript for the book, our children helped us to get out of the writers' block and thus made our task easier and enjoyable. We dedicate this book to them with the hope that their journey in life is friction-free and emotionally gratifying.

Introduction

Public administration is government in action. Public administration is a contextual response to governance. Since the context is important, one has to grapple with the ideological inputs whereby 'the art of governance' is articulated. Starting with the Wilsonian conceptualization of public administration as independent of politics, the discipline has become far more complex than is usually admitted. The reason lies in the fact that the government of the day is invariably influenced by the prevalent socioeconomic and political milieu. One, therefore, cannot ignore the ambience in which public administration is conceptualized. Linked with this is the idea that the nature of public administration differs from one context to another. So, there cannot be a universal design. Despite the theoretical importance of the Weberian 'ideal form of organization', it would be wrong to undermine the 'spatial' nature of public administration. Models of administration are, therefore, contingent on the historical circumstances. Whatever is relevant today may not remain so in the days to come.

Following the onset of globalization, the traditional bureaucratic model appears to have lost its significance presumably because of the growing importance of the non-state actors in administration. The instrumental view of administration does not, therefore, appear to be tenable for reasons connected with 'the pluralization of state'. Given the increasing role of transnational forces even in domestic administration, the state-centred theories of bureaucracy seem to be inadequate in addressing the radical

metamorphosis of public administration both in the developed and developing countries. One can thus safely argue that while the twentieth century was the age of organization where bureaucracy symbolized the core values of public administration, the twenty-first century has ushered in an era of 'network-based organization', drawn on neoliberal values.

Globalization is a force that cannot be easily dispensed with. Government is being 'reinvented' not only structurally but also ideologically in an environment where neoliberal values seem to have triumphed. The state retreats and the government withdraws from areas that traditionally remain their domains. Globalization has led to the 'marriage' between the corporate discipline and the entrepreneurial spirit, with government discarding its traditional image of 'a doer'. Seeking to accommodate 'the market impulse', the government has become 'an enabler'. Globalization, thus, restricts the national governments and limits its policy options. A new situation has emerged and the governmental functions have been redefined within the neo-conservative theoretical parameters. The corporate state has become a reality, resulting in an obvious shrinkage of the traditional state system. The state is increasingly being guided by neoliberal values, endorsing globalization of capital. The distinction between the public and the private administration does not appear to be critical in conceptualizing public administration. Citizens are customers and those involved in public administration are functionaries seeking to approximate to the 'corporate' culture. Accountability in public bureaucracy is ascertained not only internally but also through various external agencies, including citizen's charter. Public administration is now the 'governance', which is nothing but checklists of certain activities designed to stabilize and also to consolidate neoliberalism. The neoliberal thought found favour with the Western donor agencies such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) who were engaged in the funding of the development projects of the 'debt-ridden' Third World. The convergence of thought in regard to 'change' reached its apogee in the newly emergent phenomenon of 'structural adjustment programme', facilitated by the free flow of fund, goods and services as dictated

by the new conditionalities laid down by the WTO, and by the new IT revolution (Internet, fax, and Web-based communication). In other words, the structural adjustment programme led to economic reforms in the developing countries that largely 'delegitimized' the role of 'the hegemonic state'. And the conditional loans to the developing countries by the transnational agencies make them dependent on the global capital. This appears to be a vicious circle from which there is no escape for the developing countries, presumably because the alternative ideological power-centres are too weak to be effective partners in sustaining the drive for development. Furthermore, the drive towards 'depoliticizing development' systematically obscures 'power', 'class' and 'politics'. Critical to development are activities around 'civil society'—that, by implication, identifies development as a mere techno-economic effort which takes place outside the political arena. This is an argument that clearly undermines the role of ideology in development, especially in the developing countries where public administration is critically 'partisan', for historical reasons.

The impact of all these on government and public administration has been forcefully and systematically argued out in various World Bank reports. The demise of the alternative Soviet bloc has brought about this momentous ideological and institutional turning point in the evolution of public administrative thinking on 'reform' or 'innovation', another word that has been coined recently. Although differing on contextual parameters such as 'developing' country situation, organized private sector, more firm regulatory framework, etc., the world-wide search for governmental reform today exhibits certain striking similarities. Governance is the buzzword now. Conceptually different from public administration, governance seeks articulate administration independent of its purpose. Concerned with the 'structure' and the 'processes' of administration, governance is a neoliberal response to public administration undermining its 'purpose'. The 'public' in public administration seems to have lost its significance, and market has acquired salience in governance. Citizens have thus become clients, guided largely by neoliberal individualism. Bureaucrats are 'rent-seekers' and not society's 'benevolent guardians', as Bentham believed. Explaining

the distortions in public bureaucracy within 'the public choice' perspective, governance provides a conceptual framework to define collective behaviour in terms of 'methodological individualism' in which selfish interests of the individuals seem to be the driving force in whatever they undertake in the society. Such an extreme position may not find an easy acceptance, though it has raised issues that need to be addressed to meaningfully explain the changed nature of public administration in recent times. The traditional Weberian mould seems to be inadequate in responding to the challenges that are rooted in what is euphemistically called as 'the end of history'. One cannot dismiss governance as 'a ripple', given its growing salience both as a concept and a format of administration. There is no doubt that the World Bank–sponsored governance campaign has radically altered the conventional approach to public administration by providing a critique of public bureaucracy, which is defined as rent-seekers charging a heavy premium for whatever tasks they are traditionally assigned.

II

There are challenges as well, especially in the developing countries, where public administration can never be said to be a derivative of Western models. A cursory look at the Indian administration confirms that despite having adopted the 1991 New Economic Policy, it still has features which are not strictly neoliberal but drawn on the Nehruvian socialistic pattern of society. This is why the contextual model is theoretically viable and practically meaningful. Rooted in peculiar historical circumstances in which colonialism remained most decisive, the postcolonial government in India sustained several significant administrative structures, including the All India Services that safeguarded the alien interests during the British rule. Given their role in the context of 1947 partition riots, these administrative structures became organic to India's public administration despite their imperial origin. Despite its imperial legacy, the steel frame was retained in independent India. When the matter was introduced in the Constituent Assembly for discussion, there was no unanimity among the members. Critical of its

role in the freedom struggle, members like, M.A. Aayyangar and S.L. Saksena vehemently opposed the continuity of the All India Services in free India. There were some members who defended the dismantling of the Services because of the heavy financial burden which the government had to bear on account of their salary. Some of them were keen to have a written assurance from those in the Service expressing their willingness to serve the country 'sincerely, honestly, and incorruptibly' because they were created and nurtured in opposition to the interests of the nationalists. That the Service was retained more or less *intact* was due to Vallabhbhai Patel's insistence on its continuity for practical considerations.

The Constituent Assembly debates are very useful in grasping what finally defended the continuity of the steel frame in otherwise unfavourable circumstances. Not only does the discussion in the Assembly draw our attention to the mindset of the founding fathers, it is also very significant in grasping the nature of the emerging public administration in India under the stewardship of those who fought the British and won freedom.

While accepting the 'steel frame' of the British bureaucracy presumably because of its structural utility, the founding fathers sought to radically alter its nature by locating its functioning within a system of democratic governance. So, bureaucracy metamorphosed substantially in view of the involvement of the people in the decision-making processes. And, the administrator had to articulate these characteristics in his/her deeds. All this involved 'close contacts and touch with the people and winning over the people to his side'. It was 'a normal approach of a politician when he wants to win over the people to his side to do something with their help'. So administration was not merely a routine job, it was also a creative response to human problems in which people had a decisive role. This was a revolutionary step for two reasons: First, instead of doing away with the prevalent bureaucratic set-up, the postcolonial leaders sought to adapt the structure to the requirement of democratic values and ethos which free Indians represented. Second, the steel frame of the past transformed its nature radically to fulfil the goal of the new nation that emerged after a long struggle against the British. Interestingly, for the prevalent

bureaucracy, the transition from an imperial to a qualitatively different regime in free India was smooth and it was rather easier for those who took charge of administration immediately after independence to initiate reforms in administration without difficulty.

With the adoption of the socialistic pattern of society these structures had obviously undergone radical changes. By the 1990s, the scene was, however, different and India's bureaucracy responded, though in a guarded manner, to the neoliberal values challenging the state-directed planned economic development. Government is being 'reinvented' but with a caution presumably because of the ideological pressure, exercised by forces critical of globalization and neoliberalism.

The recent changes in Indian public administration owe, to a significant extent, to inputs from both the external and internal sources. Administrative changes are generally articulated in the reports of Reforms Commission, appointed regularly by the Government of India. The Fifth Pay Commission, 1997, has however gone beyond the conventional bounds of a pay commission and performed the role of an administrative reform commission, touching on the vital issues of governance in India. Although this pay commission has set the new agenda of 'good governance' into action, the Fourth Pay Commission, 1982, had also suggested steps to improve 'efficiency' in public administration primarily in terms of enhanced salary and other benefits. What is unique about the Fifth Pay Commission is its articulation of the changed role of government in response global inputs. The government needs to be downsized and de-bureaucratized. The government should confine itself primarily to 'core functions' that cannot be performed by the market. Everything must be left to private initiative. So, not only has the Fifth Pay Commission, 1997, suggested a new pay structure for civil service, it has also made recommendations of far-reaching nature affecting its size, efficiency, morale and motivation, training and recruitment and general operation procedures. The 1998 *Action Plan for Effective and Responsive Government* is a clear articulation of the proposed measures to attain the goal, set by the Fifth Pay Commission. A product of the 1996 Chief Secretaries Conference, the Plan seeks to (*a*) make

administration accountable and citizen-friendly, (*b*) ensure transparency and right to information and (*c*) take measures to cleanse and motivate civil services. The Action Plan clearly indicates that the vertical structure of hierarchy is 'unsuitable for either speedy decision making or empowerment down the line to encourage bright young talent to take decisions and be accountable for them'.

III

There is no doubt that globalization has radically altered public administration all over the globe. Its impact, however, is varied. In the developed countries, public bureaucracy redefines its role, accommodating the neoliberal thrust on administration. The transition from one ideological *raison-d'être* to another is not as thorny as it is in the developing countries. Reasons are not difficult to seek. First, historically public administration flourished under the state patronage in most of the developing countries that had a long colonial past. Even after decolonization, public bureaucracy continued to remain perhaps the most decisive 'cog' in the entire governmental machinery. Second, by following the path of state-directed centralized planned development, these postcolonial states sought to provide an alternative to the Western capitalist route that never appeared to be an effective challenge to the rampant poverty and other related problems. Whatever the justifications, the centralized planning failed to bring about economic development to the extent it was expected. Arguments were thus marshalled against 'protected' economy and bureaucratically designed public administration. And, globalization seems to have created an occasion to try out other alternatives since the non-/anti-capitalist path of development did not appear to be adequate. In the changed context, centralized bureaucracy became a stumble block to change and reform. As a result, under the 'new public management regime', many developed and developing countries have shifted from 'process-oriented' to 'result-oriented' performance of public agencies with increasing focus on outcome rather than inputs. On the face of it, the result-oriented administration may look quite attractive; but such mode of governance may not always uphold the 'publicness' of

public administration. In other words, since the result-oriented public administration tends to focus on 'what' is being achieved regardless of the consequences, it is likely to undermine its nature as 'a benevolent guardian'.

Apart from re-conceptualizing public bureaucracy, economic reforms have also contributed to our search for alternative to the Weberian pyramidic structure of power. Decentralization, both the Gandhian and non-Gandhian forms, provides significant inputs to administrative reforms and innovations especially in the context of 'democratic surges' at the grass roots. The Weberian theoretical format has no clue to this system of governance in which hierarchy is replaced by the Gandhian notion of 'an oceanic circle'. Drawn on people's participation, governance structured around the theoretical ideas of the Panchayati Raj system provides a creative solution to the administrative *impasse* due to well-entrenched bureaucratization. This is undoubtedly a serious theoretical discourse seeking to redefine the goal and thus nature of an administration that is apparently reluctant to change due to historically nurtured social, economic and political prejudices. In a way, globalization is thus a significant input in our search for appropriate explanatory models of governance.

IV

Synoptically, four interconnected themes have emerged in recent years as 'new' directionality in the discipline: 'globalization', 'network' administration, 'governance', and 'democratization participation'. The first theme refers to a new emergent world order based on deep and wide interconnectivity among nations. This phenomenon has been compelling nations to reorient their public administration to manage externalities and strike a balance between domestic needs and international linkages. The second theme, which is closely related to the first and the third, symbolizes a novel transformation of public administration from its traditional insular and hierarchic status to a 'network' profile with linkages protruding in different directions, as most problems tend to elude its erstwhile

monopolistic grip. The third theme of 'governance' that essentially extended the ambit of domestic public administration was given considerable space in the present anthology. What is presently being experienced is the need for its 're-scoping' in terms of complex linkages with a variety of external actors in an intensely globalized situation. The fourth theme that has figured in public administration discourse is being resurrected more stridently in recent years as a reaction to both globalization and the neoliberalist trend in administrative repositioning. Democracy, not so much as a form of government, but as a structural and processual feature of public administration, is assuming considerable significance contemporaneously. There is a resurgence of people-as-actor syndrome today to safeguard a beleaguered 'legitimacy' of government under the NPM dispensation as also to assert real popular control over government in terms of decentralization, openness, transparency and accountability.

V

Given the complex nature of public administration in the changed national and international milieu, it would however be difficult, if not impossible, to dwell on each and every relevant issue. Our aim here is to provide a synoptic view of the developments in the discipline which are useful in grasping the rapidly changing public administration both at home and elsewhere. The effort is both innovative and provocative: innovative because the present exercise dwells on those issues that figure prominently in public administration which is far from Weberian; provocative since it will raise questions which are relevant in conceptualizing public bureaucracies around the globe in a context where neoliberal politico-economic values appear to have prevailed over other contrasting ideological strands. So, this is a book that serves twin purposes of dissemination of knowledge and laying foundation for further research. In order to grasp the complex unfolding of contemporary public administration, what is critical are the linkages between the structures of administration and the ambience in which the process

of administration is articulated. Appreciative of interdisciplinary borrowings, this book is thus a serious intervention in relocating public administration both as a discipline and as a practice.

The book is an exhaustive account of public administration as an effort seeking to accomplish public well-being. Indian example is perhaps the most appropriate illustration to understand the changing nature of public administration for two reasons: First, because of peculiar historical circumstances in which Indian administration was shaped immediately after the Independence in 1947, it has characteristics which are neither completely Western nor purely 'indigenous', but a unique mixture of both. The pattern seems to have continued. Even after the adoption of the 1991 New Economic Policy, public administration still remains committed to 'the public sector' despite having endorsed 'the market rhetoric' in development. Second, besides substantial continuity, both in spirit and content, Indian administration provides a creative response to the neoliberal avalanche by drawing upon India's distinct socioeconomic circumstances. Given the obvious organic nature of public administration, Indian example also directs our attention to the underlying values shaping public administration. One cannot avoid taking note of the values because they are the ones which are critical in reinventing public administration in response to the changing circumstances. Hence, public administration can never be static or stationary, but is being constantly redefined and altered.

VI

The aim of this book is to acquaint the readers with the latest development in the discipline of public administration. By dwelling on issues which are critical in comprehending governance, the book provides new inputs for further exploration in the field. Written in the textbook mould, the exercise also focuses on how globalization significantly changes the contour of public administration which is not merely bureaucracy-centric, but also draws on civil society organizations as equally important partners in administration. This

is a new thrust in the discipline which the book has tried to capture in 12 well-written chapters. And also, the book makes a fundamental argument by linking the context with the unique nature of public administration that always remains context-driven. Hence, it is inappropriate to seek universal models in public administration simply because 'one-size-fits-all' approach is theoretically sterile and also inadequate to explain the rapidly changing texture of governance.

Chapter 1

Public Administration: Evolution of a Discipline

> **Learning Objectives**
> - To explain the meaning, nature, and scope of public administration
> - To trace the evolution of public administration as a discipline
> - To figure out the new trends unfolding in the discipline

Administration is a part and parcel of our daily lives. The food we eat, the clothes we wear, the goods we buy, the streets and highways on which we travel, the automobiles in which we ride, and the many services we enjoy—education, medical care, housing facility, entertainment, protection of our lives and property, and many others—are made possible by administration. Our high standards of living, progress in the field of agriculture and industry, communication, travel, medicine, education, and others have been possible due to the administrative efforts (Corsen and Harris 1967: 1–2). Thus, administration is everywhere with us from 'womb to tomb'. This chapter will deal with the meaning, scope, and significance of the subject; evolution of public administration as a discipline; and the major approaches to understand public administration.

MEANING OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Public administration is a sub-division of the broader concept of administration. Administration means 'to serve', 'to look after people', or 'to manage affairs'. In this sense, administration means management of the affairs of an organization. When we add public to administration, it means governmental administration; it is the management of governmental affairs and activities. Dimock and Dimock define public administration as 'the accomplishment of politically determined objectives'. However, according to them:

> [M]ore than the techniques or even the orderly execution of programs, public administration is also concerned with policy… Public administration…must be sufficiently practical to solve problems and attain society's goals, but it must also be exploratory and innovative in its search for better methods based on broader understandings of what is involved in effective group activity. (Dimock and Dimock 1969: 3, 11)

Woodrow Wilson, an authority in the field, defines public administration as 'detailed and systematic execution of public law. Every particular application of general law is an act of administration' (Wilson 1953: 65–75). By public administration what is meant, in common usage, are the activities of the executive branches of national, state, and local governments (Simon, Smithburg, and Thompson 1950: 7). According to L.D. White 'a system of public administration is the composite of all the laws, regulations, practices, relationships, codes, and customs that prevails at any time in any jurisdiction for the fulfilment or execution of public policy' (White 1955: 2). Public administration is decision-making, planning the work to be done, formulating objectives and goals, working with the legislature and citizen organizations to gain public support and funds for government programmes. To Corson and Harris, 'it is the action part of the government, the means by which the purposes and goals of government are realized' (Corson and Harris 1967: i). Public administration according to Pfiffner and Presthus (1953: 3) is mainly concerned with the means for implementing political values…they define public administration as 'the

coordination of individual and group efforts to carry out public policy. It is mainly occupied with the routine work of government. Felix A. Nigro holds that there could not be a condensed definition of public administration. It can, however, be presented in the form of a brief summary that will constitute the definition. According to him, public administration:

- is a cooperative group effort in a public setting;
- covers all three branches—executive, legislative, and judicial—and their interrelationships;
- has an important role in the formulation of public policy and thus a part of the political process;
- is different in significant ways from private administration; and
- is closely associated with numerous private groups and individuals in providing services to the community. (Nigro 1965, 1971: 21)

Despite the pervasiveness of public administration in our daily lives, there is hardly any mutually agreed definition of it. In fact, the discipline is still in search of an agreeable definition. For example, even in the latest meet at Minnowbrook (2008) or what is popularly known as the Third Minnowbrook Conference, attempts have been made by scholars to define public administration in the context of the twenty-first century. The definition that emerged out of the Minnowbrook Conference III (2008), warrants special mention here, as it reflects the evolving nature of the discipline especially the elements, which have so long been avoided by the scholars in the discipline. Public administration was defined as 'a socially embedded process of collective relationships, dialogue, and action to promote human flourishing for all'. Implicit in the definition was the recognition of an emerging globalized and multicultural order, within which public administration was supposed to work.

On the basis of the above definitions, it can be concluded that public administration is an instrument of translating political decision into reality, it is the action part of government, the means by

which the purposes and goals of the government are realized. The process of public administration consists of the actions involved in affecting the intent or desire of a government. It is, thus, the continuously active, 'business' part of the government, concerned with carrying out the law, as made by legislative bodies and interpreted by courts, through the processes of organization and management.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

There are two broad views regarding the nature of public administration: managerial and integral view. According to the managerial view, administration comprises of the work of only those persons who are engaged in performing managerial functions in an organization. Luther Gulick, Henry Fayol, Herbert Simon, Donald W. Smithburg, and Victor Thomson are the main supporters of this view. Gulick has summed up the managerial activities in the acronym POSDCORB. It stands for the seven functions of the chief executive: P-Planning, O-Organizing, S-Staffing, D-Directing, CO-Coordinating, R-Reporting, and B-Budgeting. According to the managerial view, those who are performing these managerial functions are only part of administration. The clerical, manual, and technical activities of the staff are excluded from the purview of public administration. This view regards administration as getting things done, not doing things. This view is also known as the narrow view of administration. As opposed to the managerial view, the integral view proposes that administration is the sum total all the activities—manual, clerical, or managerial—which are undertaken to realize the goals of an organization. As per this view, all the acts of the government officials from the peon to the secretary are part of public administration. The successful accomplishment of any task in an organization requires contribution from all the employees. The main supporters of this view are Woodrow Wilson, L.D. White, Marshall E. Dimock, and John M. Pfiffner. This view is a wider perspective of the organization and takes it as a whole in the fulfilment of its objectives.

As in the case of its nature, there is also much debate between the followers of the traditional and modern views over the scope of

public administration. By scope, we mean the major concerns and areas of the public administration. The traditional writers restrict the scope of public administration to the executive branch of the government. The modern writers have extended the scope of public administration to all the three branches of the government. According to them, public administration is the whole government in action. They argue that the activities of the legislature and the judiciary also affect and shape the functioning of public administration considerably. Thus, the study of public administration includes the activities of the executive branch as well those aspects of the legislative and judicial activities that have considerable impact on the functioning of public administration. This view is more acceptable today. In India, we cannot accept the restricted view of public administration. So much is the mutual dependence and so intensive is the interaction between all the three branches of government that public administration must be defined in a broader sense. Necessarily, it is to be studied as a part of the larger political processes in a country.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE ADMINISTRATION

One of the interesting debates concerning the nature of public administration is public versus private administration. The similarities and differences of public and private (business) administration concerns an almost unavoidable topic in textbooks on public administration. The interpretation given to the differences has implications for ideas about people and organizations. Based on the nature of the distinction, authors, for example, argue for different core values guiding action, or having a different relevance. Paul H. Appleby, Herbert A. Simon, and Peter Drucker have made a distinction between public and private administration. The differences sketched here indicate some of the distinguishing characteristics of public administration.

The prime purpose of public administration is to serve the public, of private administration, to produce a profit for the owners of the business. This provides the private administration with a single objective criterion to measure the performance of the enterprise.

The drive for profits forces the private administration to watch costs, to seek improvements in operations, to discharge incompetent employees, and to maintain responsibility of subordinates for results. On the other hand, the primary purpose of public organizations is to provide services to the people and promote social goods. First, they are not oriented towards making profits for the government. The government, very often, has to provide even unprofitable and costly services, namely, food, health, education, and defence for the public interest. In this sense public administration is really 'public'. Second, the public administrator's activities are fixed by law, he may not undertake others without legislative authority. The business executive, on the other hand, is free to select those activities that promise to be profitable and to discontinue others which fail to show a profit.

The discretion and freedom of action of the public administrator is markedly limited. Numerous laws, regulations, and reviews exercised by the legislature, by political executives, and by central staff agencies limit his discretion and his choice of methods as to how and what he shall do. Such controls are designed to ensure that public activities are carried on in accordance with legislative and executive policies and to prevent abuses or misuse of political power or of public funds. Although private administration is subject to certain governmental regulations, these regulations are not comparable to those which apply to the conduct of government activities. Public sector employees generally enjoy greater job security than their counterparts in the private sector. Employee protections in government include such amenities as the Civil Service Commission's merit system, hearing procedures for grievances, employee associations, and union and pension plans. To date, labour organizations in the private sector have had a far more turbulent history than have unions in the government sector.

Public accountability is the hallmark of public administration. The public administrator carries on his work in a 'glass bowl'. His actions are exposed to public review and criticism at all times. His mistakes tend to be widely publicized and his achievements often

pass unnoticed. Thus, public administration is held accountable for its activities through legislative oversight and judicial review. On the other hand, public accountability is not a value affecting private administration. The public administrator must also maintain a high degree of consistency in his actions. He must serve the public without discrimination, if he makes an exception in applying the traffic or tax laws to one man; all are entitled to similar treatment. The private administrator is subject to no similar requirement, indeed, it may be poor business to treat the small customer and large customer alike (Corson and Harris 1967: 14)!

The political character of public administration differentiates it from private administration. Public administration is subject to political direction and control. It implements the policies made by the elected members of the legislature and political executive. Private administration, on the other hand, is not subject to political direction. It functions largely directed by the market forces. Finally, public administration is much wider in scope than private administration. Paul H. Appleby puts forth that the organized government impinges upon and is affected by practically everything that exists or moves in society. Public administration provides each and everything to the people, namely, food, health facilities, education, housing, transportation, and so on. On the other hand, private administration deals only in those sectors where it can earn profits. Thus, it cannot claim the breadth of scope, impact, and consideration of public administration.

Even though, they differ in certain respects, there are many similarities between public and private administration. Administrative thinkers like Henry Fayol, M.P. Follet, Luther Gulick, and Lyndall Urwick do not make a distinction between public and private administration. The managerial techniques and skills of planning, organizing, coordinating, budgeting, and so on, are same in public as well as private administration. Both are organized on the basis of principles of hierarchy or scalar chain. In modern times, private businesses are also subjected to many governmental rules and regulations. Both have similarities so far as the problems of

organization, personnel, and finance are concerned. In the new public management model, the public sector is expected to follow the principle of efficiency, economy, and profitability as practised in the private sector. These days outsourcing, contracting out, and voluntary retirement schemes are common in the public sector units. In many ways, the differences between public and private enterprise are diminishing. There is now considerable flow of personnel between the two, especially at the higher management levels, and with increased governmental intervention in the areas of subsidies, taxes, regulations, and contracting, distinctions between public and private are no longer clear cut. These days governments are taking much interest in public–private partnership (PPP) in implementing its policies and projects. The successful functioning of the Delhi Metro is a good example of the PPP model. Thus, public and private administration are co-operating and complementing each other.

SIGNIFICANCE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Public administration plays an important role in the modern society. First of all, it is an instrument for providing services. It protects the life and property of people by maintaining law and order. It provides a number of services for the people like public health, education, housing, social security, amongst others. The various services provided by public administration affects the life of every citizen from birth to death. In fact, it will not be possible for us to enjoy various governmental services if there were no public administration. Public administration is also responsible for implementing the laws and policies of the government. It is the public administration which translates the decisions of the government into reality. By implementing public policies and programmes, it delivers the promised goods and services to the intended beneficiaries. By delivering goods and services to the people, public administration maintains harmony and cohesion in society. In this way, it maintains stability in society. In India, during the period of Emergency (1975–77), there was no elected government. It was the bureaucracy which provided goods and services to the people

and maintained law and order. In that way, it provided stability in society.

Public administration is also an instrument of socioeconomic change. The Third World nations which emerged in the post-Second World War period faced the problems of poverty, unemployment, and social and economic backwardness. Public administration in these nations emerged as an instrument of change. The massive developmental drive by the bureaucracy in these nations led to the implementation of poverty eradication programmes, employment assurance schemes, community development programmes, electrification of remote villages, road construction, and all areas of infrastructural development. This has transformed the face of the erstwhile colonial backwardness both in physical and attitudinal spheres. In India, the credit for successful implementation of the various programmes like poverty eradication, employment schemes, rural development, land reforms, green revolution, industrial development, and infrastructure development goes to its bureaucracy.

Public administration is an instrument of national integration. Indian administration played an important role after Partition. It helped in the rehabilitation process of the refugees. It also helped in integrating the princely states with the Indian territory.

India is a nation of diversity. It has a number of castes, classes, and religious communities. Despite these differences, India is an example of unity in diversity. The credit for this goes to the Indian bureaucracy. It has successfully implemented the goals of the Indian constitution which believes in equality, fraternity, and social justice. Today, India is an example of the largest successful democracy. We have regular elections, independence of judiciary, and freedom of press. This has been possible due to the smooth implementation of rules and regulations and efficient provision of services to the people by the Indian administration. Thus, it has provided stability to the Indian democracy.

In the era of liberalization and privatization, there is a decrease in the scope of the functions of the state. It brings about shrinkage in the administrative apparatus as well as the size of the bureaucracy. Under these circumstances, the role of the bureaucracy has

changed. Now, it is supposed to promote, encourage, and motivate the private sector. It has also to see the operational side of the private market. It is the duty of the state to prevent the earning of greater profits through illegal means. Hence, it is the duty of the state to prevent such practices in the larger interests of the society as a whole. The role of the state as a regulator requires the existence of a regulatory mechanism to protect and promote public interest by imposing regulations upon the private enterprises. Thus, in the era of the free market economy, public administration has to regulate the private sector in order to protect public interest. The absence of good administration would make a mockery of the new economic system.

To sum up, public administration plays an important role in modern society. It is an instrument to formulate and implement public policies. It maintains law and order. It is an instrument of social change and economic development. It provides various goods and services to the people. It also promotes national integration. In the era of liberalization and privatization, there is a change in the role and scope of public administration. Now it has to promote, encourage as well as regulate the private sector in order to protect public interest.

APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

As public administration is a generalized human activity concerned with the ordering of men and materials required to achieve collective social ends, it has drawn widely from the various social sciences. Since its birth, the study of public administration has been growing in different directions and today it involves complex concerns and functions. There have been numerous attempts by different scholars to explain the different aspects of public administration. The result is that the public administration consists of relatively distinct approaches that grow out of the different perspectives that shape its structures and functions. Each approach gives a particular point of view of administrative activity. These different approaches are best regarded as ways in

which to approach the study of public administration. There are a number of approaches to the study of public administration:

Institutional Approach

Perhaps, the earliest approach to public administration may be designated as the institutional approach. This approach is largely based on the legal rights and obligations of the government. It tends to emphasize formal relationships and the separation of powers among the three branches of the government. Policy and administration are often separated, with the assumption that the role of administrators is almost entirely confined to merely carrying out policies designed by the political arms of the government. The generalizations of this approach were often based upon formal analyses of organizational structure and the constitutional delegation of authority and responsibility to the three branches of the government. A major emphasis of this approach is upon the normative question of responsibility. The focus is upon the ways and means of keeping public administration responsible to the elected branches of government and to the average citizen (Presthus 1975: 7).

Structural Approach

This approach was much influenced by scientific management and the success of American corporations that tend to focus upon organizational structure and personnel management. The supporters of this approach concentrate their attention on the study of formal administrative structures, their functions, and the limitations imposed on their activities. They treat public administration as non-political and a purely technical organization based on certain scientific principles. They believe that public administration has nothing to do with politics and policy-making. Its main function is to carry out politically determined policies effectively and efficiently. They hold the view that the tasks of an organization are pre-determined and that, employees have to adjust themselves to the tasks assigned to them. To some extent, the role of the individual and the so-called informal organization was neglected. This approach has sometimes been criticized for not relating public

administration to its political environment, and not emphasizing adequately, the fact that organizations are composed of human beings and when decisions are made, they are, in the last analysis, made by individuals. Thus, this approach is sometimes known as the 'organization without people' approach.

Behavioural Approach

The behavioural approach to the study of public administration focuses on the actual behaviour of individuals and groups in real organizations. This approach argues that one cannot understand the actual functioning of organizations without understanding why people act as they do. Hence, the behaviouralists have come to apply the knowledge of social psychology, anthropology, psychology and many other disciplines in an effort to secure a better understanding of the actual human behaviour within organizations. The main aim of this approach is to establish a body of knowledge that facilitates understanding, explaining, and prediction of human behaviour in administrative situations.

In contrast to the earlier approaches, the behavioural approach tends to focus quite strongly on methodological problems, the use of survey analysis to determine organizational reality, and is concerned with the human aspects of administration and decision-making. It attempts to build descriptive and analytical generalizations about organizations and administration. One of its normative assumptions is that it is possible to build an administrative science through careful research on organizations and the behaviour of those who work in them. Herbert Simon and Robert Dhal have been among the pioneers of this approach to the study of public administration.

System Approach

In general, system theory means that the administration is seen as a system of interrelated and interdependent parts and forces. The administrative system receives 'inputs' in the form of demands from the people and converts them into 'outputs' which takes the form of goods and services. The system theory owes its origin to

the biologist Ludwig Von Bertalanffy. In sociology, Talcott Parsons applied system approach to the study of social structures and political scientists like David Easton and G. Almond have made use of system analysis in political science and thus contributed much to the literature on empirical political theory. The system approach is now being widely used in organizational analysis. It has proved to be a very useful tool for the conceptualization of the organization and its internal and external relationships. The system approach facilitates information exchange between parts of the system. It is very relevant to the study of complex public organizations that have huge diversified structures.

Ecological Approach

The ecological approach to the study of public administration views public bureaucracy as a social institution which is continuously interacting with the economic, political, and sociocultural sub-systems of a society. Bureaucracy is not only affected by these environmental systems but also affects them in turn. Thus, this approach emphasizes the necessary interdependence of public bureaucracy and its environment. Fred W. Riggs is a strong advocate of this approach. In his opinion, administrative institutions are shaped and affected by their social, economic, cultural, and political environment. Therefore, he emphasizes the fact that in order to understand better the real nature, operations, and behaviour of a particular administrative system, one should identify and understand deeply the various environmental factors influencing it. The ecological approach determines how an administrative system operates in practice. Thus, it is useful to understand administrative realities.

Comparative Approach to Public Administration

The comparative approach to public administration seeks to compare the administrative structures of different nations with different cultural settings. The Comparative Administrative Group has defined it as the public administration applied to diverse cultures and national setting and the body of factual data, by which it can

be examined and tested. The purpose of such comparisons is to find out the universal elements in public administration and build a theory of public administration. Woodrow Wilson was the first who stressed the need for a comparative study of public administration. In 1947, Robert Dahl, in his essay, 'The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems' also emphasized the utility of comparative public administration to develop a science of public administration. However, the comparative approach to public administration became popular only after the Second World War with the emergence of new nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. These nations were facing the challenges of modernization and technological development. It was hoped that a science of comparative public administration would provide insights into such problems and yield some useful hypotheses about administrative behaviour in general. Two important figures in this field are Ferrel Heady and Fred Riggs. The comparative approach to public administration is not only useful to strengthen the theory-building process in public administration but also helps us to know whether the administrative practices in a particular nation are applicable to other nations or not. On the basis of this, the applicability of the administrative models can be judged and practised in other political systems.

Public Policy Approach

The public policy approach aims at improving the public policy process. It is a systematic and scientific study of public policy. The main concern of policy approach is with the understanding and improvement of the public–policy-making system. The concept of policy approach was first formulated by D. Lerner and Harold Lasswell in their work, *The Policy Science* in 1951. Public policy is a significant component of any political system. It is primarily concerned with the public and their problems. The role of a public policy is to shape the society for its betterment. W. Parsons while narrating the role of public policy says that the wider purposes of public policy is involving enlightenment, the fuller development of individuals in society and the development of consensus, social awareness and legitimacy, rather than simply the delivery of

goods and services. Public policies, thus, involve improving the democratic and political capacities of the people, and not simply the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery of services. This also implies that public policy has a participatory and democratic character. Public policy has assumed considerable importance in response to the increasing complexity of the society. Public policy helps in explaining the causes and consequences of government activity. Public policies not only help us to understand social ills but also provide devices and mechanisms for moving a social and economic system from the past to the future.

Political Economy Approach

Political economy approach is concerned with the moving of political science closer to economics in the interest of greater theoretical coherence and better policy guidance. Economists like Anthony Downs and Gordon Tullock have applied this interdisciplinary approach by experimenting with the application of economic methods to political problems. Thus, public administration as a branch of political science and on its own has moved closer to economics. Political economy most commonly refers to interdisciplinary studies drawing upon economics, law, and political science in explaining how political institutions, the political environment, and the economic system influence each other. 'Traditional' topics include the influence of elections on the choice of economic policy, determinants of electoral outcomes, the political business cycles, redistributive conflicts in fiscal policy, and the politics of delayed reforms in developing countries and of excessive deficits. From the late 1990s, the field has expanded to explore such wide-ranging topics as the origins and rate of change of political institutions, and the role of culture in explaining economic outcomes and developments. When more narrowly construed, it analyses such public policy as monopoly, market protection, institutional corruption, and rent seeking. A more classical–liberal approach which dates from the 1970s that denotes 'public-choice' theory type approaches which question the benevolence of social planners to maximize the utility of a representative individual.

Both economists and public administrationists understand that there is a lot we do not know—to the extent that we share a common interest in efficiency and economy—recognize that we can learn much from each other by pursuing convergence and interplay between economic models and long-standing insights from public administration.

Public-choice Approach

The public-choice approach to the study of public administration emerged in the early 1960s. An early reference to this theory is found in the writings of Vincent Ostrom. The other important supporters of public-choice approach are James Buchanan, Gordon Tullock, William A. Niskanen, and William C. Mitchell. Public-choice theory is a method to study the decisional processes for the allocation of scarce resources in the society. It lays emphasis on the element of choice, with the citizen in the role of consumer. It is in favour of the citizen's choice in the provision of public goods and services. The advocates of this approach assume that the individual can make rational decisions about his needs and demands. An individual will act in accordance with his self-interest in order to maximize his decision. Thus, the supporters of this approach demand that the actions of the government should be consistent with the values and interests of its citizens. Vincent Ostrom remarks that public-choice theory is the most appropriate approach to the study of public administration. He suggests public administration scholars to turn away from the traditional bureaucratic approach towards the public-choice approach.

EVOLUTION OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AS A DISCIPLINE

Public administration is both a field of activity and a field of systematic study. As a part of government activity, it has existed ever since the emergence of an organized political system. However, as a field of systematic study, it is of recent origin. Indeed, there is no sharp point in history where the story of public administration

begins. However, an essay by Woodrow Wilson in 1887 is often taken as the symbolic beginning. Wilson's article entitled, 'The Study of Administration', published in *Political Science Quarterly*, was written at a time when there was a crying need to eliminate corruption, improve efficiency, and streamline service delivery in pursuit of public interest. His advocacy that 'there should be a science of administration' has to be seen in its historical context. Wilson's basic postulate was that 'it is getting to be harder to run a constitution than to frame one'. Writing against the background of widespread corruption, science meant, to Wilson, a systematic and disciplined body of knowledge which he thought would be useful to grasp and defuse the crisis in administration. While commenting on the domain of administrators, Wilson argued that administrators should concentrate on operating the government rather than on substituting their judgement for that of elected officials. The administration was separate from politics and was confined to the execution of policies. So, there is a dichotomy between politics and administration.

While Wilson gave the call, it was Frank J. Goodnow who practically fathered the movement for evolving the discipline of public administration in the United States of America (USA). In his book *Politics and Administration*, he also draws a functional distinction between politics and administration. He writes, 'The former having to do with the politics or expression of the state's will, the later with the execution of the policies' (Goodnow 1900: 10–11). Public administration began picking up academic legitimacy in the 1920s, notable in this regard was the publication of Leonard D. White's *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration* in 1926, the first textbook entirely devoted to the field. It reflected the general characteristics of public administration as non-partisan. Public administration was stated to be a 'value-free' science and the mission of administration would be economy and efficiency. While not rejecting politics per se, the public administration reformers of this period sought better government by expanding administrative functions (planning and analysing), keeping them distinct from political functions (deciding). The politics–administration dichotomy emerged as a conceptual orientation whereby the world of government was

to be divided into two functional areas, one administrative, and another political.

W.F. Willoughby's book *Principles of Public Administration* (1927) appeared as the second textbook in the field and reflected the new thrust of public administration. These were that certain scientific principles of administration existed, they could be discovered, and administrators would be expert in their work if they learned how to apply these said principles (Henry 2007: 27–28). The work of Frederick Taylor and the concept of scientific management were to have a profound effect on public administration for the entire period between the two world wars. Taylor believed that his scientific principles of management were universally applicable. He was keen to apply them to public administration and supported attempts by his disciples to employ scientific management techniques in defence establishments. One of the first test of applicability occurred when the Taft Commission on Economy and Efficiency undertook the first comprehensive investigation of federal administration. Its recommendations closely followed scientific management principles. This period reached its climax in 1937 when Luther Gulick and Urwick coined seven principles 'POSDCORB' (Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting, and Budgeting) in their essay 'The Science of Administration'. Thus, this period marked by the tendency to reinforce the idea of politics–administration dichotomy and to evolve a value-free science of management. The central belief was that there are certain principles of administration, and it is the task of scholars to discover them and to promote their application. Economy and efficiency was the main objective of the administrative system.

If Wilson is the pioneer of the discipline, Max Weber is its first theoretician who provided the discipline with a solid theoretical base. His 'ideal' type of bureaucracy continues to remain fundamental in any conceptualization of organization. Weber's formulation has been characterized as 'value neutral'. It simply provides a conceptualization of a form of social organization with certain ubiquitous characteristics. It can be examined from three different points of view, which are not, of course, mutually exclusive. First,

bureaucracy can be viewed in terms of purely structural characteristics. In fact, the structural dimension has attracted the most attention in the discussions on bureaucracy. Features like division of work and hierarchy are identified as important aspects of structure. Second, bureaucracy can be defined in terms of behavioural characteristics. Certain patterns of behaviour form an integral part of bureaucracy. According to Weber, the more bureaucracy is 'dehumanized', the more completely it succeeds in eliminating from official business love, hatred, and all purely personal, irrational, and emotional elements which escape calculation. This is '*the specific nature of bureaucracy and its special virtue*' (Weber 1946: 215) (emphasis added). Third, bureaucracy can also be looked at from the point of view of achievement of purpose. This is an instrumentalist view of bureaucracy. As Peter Blau suggests, it should be considered as an 'organization that maximizes efficiency in administration or an institutionalized method of organized social conduct in the interests of administrative efficiency' (Blau 1956: 60).

What is distinctive in the Weberian formulation is the attempt to construct an 'ideal type' or a mental map of a 'fully-developed' bureaucracy. The ideal type is a mental construct that cannot be found in reality. The bureaucratic form, according to Weber, is the most efficient organizational form for large-scale, complex administration developed so far in the modern world. It is superior to any other form in precision, stability, maintenance of discipline, and reliability.

Following the Second World War, many of the previously accepted theories of public administration came under attack. Under the crisis decision-making atmosphere of the Second World War, Washington quickly exposed the politics–administration dichotomy as a false division. The rapid pace of mobilization decisions in a wartime environment quickly demonstrated the necessity for flexibility, creativity, and discretion in decision-making. The rigid, hierarchically based proverbs of administrative practice proved totally ineffective in such an environment. Finally, as a result of these experiences, now the attempt was reintroduce a focus on the broader social, moral, and political theoretical effectiveness to challenge the dogma of managerial effectiveness.

In 1938, Chester I. Barnard's *The Functions of the Executive* challenged the politics–administration dichotomy. Dwight Waldo, a leading critic, questioned the validity of 'principles' borrowed from the scientific management movement in business and urged the development of a philosophy or theory of administration based upon broader study and a recognition of the fact that public administration cannot be fruitfully studied from its political and social setting. The most formidable dissection of principles appeared in Herbert Simon's *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-making Processes in Administration Organization* (1947), a volume of such intellectual force that it led to Simon's receiving the Nobel Prize in 1978. Simon proposed the development of a new science of administration based on theories and methodology of logical positivism. The focus of such a science would be decision-making. He maintained that to be scientific it must exclude value judgements and concentrate attention on facts, adopt precise definition of terms, apply rigorous analysis, and test factual statements or postulates about administration (Corsen and Harris 1967: 1). Simon's work sets forth the rigorous requirements of scientific analysis in public administration. About some of the classical 'principles', Simon's conclusion was that these were unscientifically derived and were no more than 'proverbs'.

The pioneering studies which resulted from the experiments in the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company in the late 1920s also challenged many prevailing ideas about incentives and human behaviour in groups. Since the Second World War similar studies have been carried on at a number of universities. These studies of human behaviour stress the human aspect of administration; the need of employees for recognition, security, and ego-satisfaction; and the importance of the social environment and group attitudes in work situations. They reach the conclusion that employee-oriented supervision is more effective than production-minded, authoritarian supervision (Carson and Harris 1967: 1). Thus, these studies brought out the limitations of the machine concept of organization by drawing attention to the social and psychological factors of the work situation.

The claim that public administration is a science was challenged by Dahl in his 'The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems' (1947). He argued that the quest for principles of administration was obstructed by three factors: values, individual personalities, and social framework. Dahl argued that a science of public administration cannot emerge unless we have a comparative public administration. He further hoped that the study of public administration inevitably must become a much more broadly based discipline, resting not on a narrowly defined knowledge of techniques and processes, but rather extending to the varying historical, sociological, economic, and other conditioning factors.

Thus, dissent from mainstream public administration accelerated in the 1940s in two mutually reinforcing directions. One objection was that politics and administration could never be separated in any remotely sensible fashion. The other was that the principles of administration were something less than the final expression of managerial rationality.

In the post Second World War period, the emergence of new nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America have set in a new trend in the study of public administration. Western scholars, particularly the American scholars, began to show much interest in the study of the varied administrative patterns of the newly independent nations. In this context, they recognized the importance of the relevance of environmental factors and their impact on the different administrative systems in these nations. This factor largely accounts for the development of comparative, ecological, and development administration perspectives in the study of public administration (Naidu, Apparao, and Mallikarjunayya 1986: 22). In this regard, the contribution of Ferrel Heady, F.W. Riggs, and Edward Wiedner is significant. The cross-cultural and cross-national administrative studies have provided the impetus needed for the extension of the scope of public administration.

The period of the late 1960s was a time of academic foments that yielded a new perspective which was a distinctly public perspective. This was the new public administration. In the late 1960s, a group of young American scholars voiced strong resentment against the contemporary nature of discipline. At the Minnowbrook

Conference I (1968), they advocated for what is known as new public administration to make the study and practice of the subject relevant to the needs of the emerging post-industrial society. The said conference was truly a wake-up call for the theorists and the practitioners alike to make the discipline socially relevant and accountable. It was held in the backdrop of a turbulent time which was marked by a series of contemporary developments like social upheavals in the form of ethnic skirmishes across the American cities, campus clashes, Vietnam War and its repercussions in American society, and the like. Above developments coupled with a deep sense of dissatisfaction among the practitioners regarding the present state of the discipline, especially its obsession with efficiency and economy, had ushered in a qualitatively improved phase in public administration, subsequently christened as new public administration. The Minnowbrook Conference I was famous for bringing about arguably a new era in public administration informed with relevance, values, social equity, and change. Public interest formed the core of the deliberations. Relating administration to the 'political' was the central focus of the new public administration school.

Public choice school is another landmark in the evolution of public administration. Far from accepting bureaucracy as 'rational' and 'efficient', the protagonists of this school have been highly sceptical about its structure and actual operating behaviour. The argument of Niskanen, Downs, and Tullock, in this context, is based on the assumption of administrative egoism. The bureaucrats are, in their view, individualistic self-seekers 'who would do more harm than good to public welfare' unless 'their self-seeking activities are carefully circumscribed' (Das 1998: 7). This explains the tendency towards bureaucratic growth that brings in more and more rewards for the officials and quid pro quo. To mitigate the evils of bureaucratic monopoly, Niskanen (1971) suggests the following steps:

- stricter control on bureaucrats through the executive or legislature;
- more competition in the delivery of public services;

- privatization or contracting-out to reduce wastage; and
- dissemination of more information for public benefit about the availability of alternatives to public services, offered on a competitive basis and at competitive costs.

The public choice school has been successful in pointing out that there are alternatives available for the delivery of services to citizens. The role of the market as a competing paradigm has challenged the hegemonic position of the state. Also the power of the bureaucracy has been similarly slashed, opening up possibilities of non-bureaucratic citizen-friendly organizational options.

The Minnowbrook Conference II, which was held in 1988, is another landmark in the evolution of public administration. The outcome of the conference gave birth to the new public management (NPM) approach to governance. Its emergence reflected the changes that took place in the Western nations. State as major dispenser of social justice had been increasingly questioned across the globe since late 1970s. The popular mood was against the state for its dismal performance in almost every sphere—social, political, and economic. Recent changes in the form governance in advanced Western countries also contributed to the development of NPM. From late 1980s and early 1990s public sector management in the advanced Western democracies underwent a sea change. NPM is depicted as a normative conceptualization of public administration consisting of several interrelated components: providing high-quality services that citizens value; increasing the autonomy of public managers; rewarding organizations and individuals on the basis of whether they meet demanding targets; making available human and technological resources that managers need to perform well; and, appreciative of the virtues of competition, maintaining an open-minded attitude about which public purposes should be performed by the private sector, rather than public sector.

The main features of the NPM are:

- It proposes a thorough organizational revamping so that organizational structure will become conducive for organizational leadership. Organizational restructuring includes

simplifying organizational procedures, flattening of hierarchies, and so on;

- one of the major hallmarks of NPM is the empowerment of citizens. Unlike the traditional public sector, it reconceptualizes citizens as 'active customers' to be always kept in good humour;
- it calls for more autonomy for the public sector managers. It is in favour of greater elbowroom for managerial leadership by providing public managers with greater flexibility in personnel policy like contractual appointment, workplace bargaining, and so on;
- application of rigorous performance measurement technique is another hallmark of NPM;
- it suggests disaggregation of public bureaucracies into agencies, which will deal with each other on a user-pay basis;
- inspired by New Right philosophy, the NPM is in favour of cost-cutting in public sector;
- it encourages quasi-markets and contracting out techniques to ensure better management of ailing cash-strapped public sector; and
- it believes in a decentralized form of governance. It encourages all kinds of organizational and spatial decentralization.

The NPM focuses on the entrepreneurial government. It is a participatory management and community-owned governance, in which citizens are considered as active consumers and not as passive recipients of programmes and policies. The main motto is to empower citizens.

The publication of *Reinventing Government* by Osborne and Gaebler (1992) redefined the functions of the government. The authors argue in favour of 'entrepreneurial government' that is certain to bring about radical changes by (*a*) improving public management through performance, measurement, and evaluation, (*b*) reducing budgets, (*c*) downsizing the government, (*d*) selective privatization of public enterprises, and (*e*) contracting out in selective areas. Thus, the focus is on de-bureaucratization, democratization, and decentralization of the administrative processes in

the interest of the citizens. The concept of governance has further led to the recognition of the role of multiple agencies in organizing and undertaking public business. In addition to formal governments, the role of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and community-based organizations has been acknowledged as supplementary public agencies.

In the late 1990s, Janet and Robert Denhardt have proposed a new public service model in response to the dominance of NPM. A successor to NPM is digital-era governance, focusing on themes of reintegrating government responsibilities, needs-based holism (executing duties in cursive ways), and digitalization (exploiting the transformational capabilities of modern IT and digital storage). Another new public service model is what has been called new public governance, an approach which includes a centralization of power; an increased number, role, and influence of partisan-political staff; personal-politicization of appointments to the senior public service; and, the assumption that the public service is promiscuously partisan for the government of the day.

Globalization is another phenomenon which has brought a paradigm shift in the nature and scope of public administration. It has virtually unshackled the discipline from the classical bondage of structure and paved the way for a more flexible, less-hierarchical, and accommodative kind of discipline informed by networks and collaboration. However, more than two decades down the line, ever since globalization was first thrust upon the nation states, public administration did show absolutely no sign of receding. On the contrary, rendering those dooms-day predictions wrong, public administration reincarnated in a readjusted form to cope with the new set of challenges. In fact, globalization had increased the urgency of having a more proactive public administration. However, the traditional notion of public administration with a sheltered bureaucracy, rigid hierarchy, and organizational principle no longer exists today. Both structurally and functionally, public administration has experienced a metamorphosis of sort. Structurally speaking, thanks to the sweeping socioeconomic–political transformation under globalization, the rigid, hierarchical, and bureaucratic form of governance has given way to a more flexible,

de-hierarchical, and post-bureaucratic form of governance based on networks and partnership. Similarly, at the functional level public administration has witnessed a profound transformation in the form of delivery of public goods and services. Until recently, the delivery of goods and services was considered as one of the important functions of public administration. But, the onset of globalization and the eventual rolling back of the welfare state ushered in a new collaborative form of public administration, where state administration has had to readjust itself to deliver public goods and services in collaboration with the innumerable other players and NGOs functioning at the societal level.

Hence, public administration in the era of globalization has been playing a new role of 'enabler' or 'facilitator' by privatizing the substantial part of welfare delivery functions. Several methods have been used to facilitate the privatization of welfare delivery, namely, contracting out, encouraging private provision, introducing quasi-markets, mobilizing voluntary sectors, and the like. However, the shift from the role of a direct provider to a facilitator of welfare delivery has not made public administration redundant. In fact, it has continued to enjoy its key position. The centrality of public administration is neither denied by the state nor by the market. Though, the rationale of having a public administration differs widely, for a state, a vibrant public administration is fundamental for its sustenance. It provides the state with adequate support mechanism to govern. In a market economy, public administration has a great instrumental value, which not only facilitates the smooth functioning of the market, but also legitimizes its operations within a society. Market economy is also anxious to add a human face by provisioning the key social services. The significance of public administration will remain despite globalization as Farazmand has reassured us about its continuity as a self-conscious enterprise and as a professional field, in the broader sense of the term (Farazmand 1999). Globalization has 'transformed the nature and character of state from traditional administrative welfare state to a corporate welfare state' with the corresponding changes in the nature of public administration (Farazmand 1999). In a traditional public administration set-up, an elaborate administrative mechanism was

put in place to facilitate the smooth delivery of public services, which was popularly known as 'public administration model of welfare delivery'. This model envisaged an impartial and efficient administration, informed with five distinctive features, namely, a bureaucratic structure, professional domination, accountability to the public, equity of treatment, and self-sufficiency (Butcher 1995). However, such providential nature of services had come under severe challenge with the emergence of market alternative advocated by the New Right movement in the West from the late 1970s to early 1980s. A bold step like the privatization of welfare delivery was prescribed on the pretext of efficiency and economy. The introduction of the globalization package under the garb of the structural adjustment programme (SAP) in the early 1990s had further accentuated demand mooted by the advocates of the New Right movement.

THE MINNOWBROOK CONFERENCE III, 2008

In the evolution of public administration as a field of enquiry, the Minnowbrook Conference III that was held in 2008 was as important as the earlier Minnowbrook conferences of 1968 and 1988. While the Minnowbrook Conference I that took place in 1968 marked the beginning of new public administration (NPA), the second conference, held in 1988, reflected on the impact of NPA as a theoretical discourse for the discipline in the context of globalization. The context of the Minnowbrook Conference I is not significantly different though globalization has manifested itself in a varied form which was inconceivable for the participants of the 1988 Minnowbrook Conference. Unlike the first two conferences, the Minnowbrook Conference III was held in two parts: in the first pre-conference workshop at the original Minnowbrook site on Blue Mountain Lake, the junior faculty members presented their views to initiate debates on 'the problem areas' of contemporary public administration; the second workshop was held in Lake Placid, in which scholars of all ages and degrees of experience participated. This division of the conference was useful in conceptualizing the difficulties that public administration

was confronting in a globalizing world in two different and yet complementary perspectives: one perspective, rooted in the complex texture of globalization, seemed to have governed the effort at building universal models, and the other related to the quest for context-specific models, underlining simultaneously the possible influences from the wider global milieu. It was, therefore, an occasion to chart the future road map for public administration by involving both senior academics like Frederickson, Lambright, and Rosemary O'Leary and as well as their younger counterparts. By strongly arguing for a context-driven perspective, the younger colleagues forcefully put their points on the table. And, there is no doubt that the new scholars' critique seemed to have set the agenda for the Minnowbrook Conference III. As it was articulated, the critique reflected the genuine concern of those seeking to conceptualize public administration as an organic discipline that was equipped adequately to respond to the new demands of global human concern. Primarily, the scholars focused on four specific areas of 'discomfort' that appeared to have been critical in contemporary research. These four specific areas of concerns relate to (*a*) the nature of public administration in the changed environment of a globalizing world, (*b*) the complexities of the market-oriented NPM, (*c*) the impact of interdisciplinary borrowing on the methodological core of the discipline, and (*d*) the growing importance of networked governance and collaborative public management in re-conceptualizing public administration in a rapidly changing socioeconomic and political milieu. Public administration has, thus, become a complex area of human endeavour simply because of the equally complex socioeconomic circumstances in which it is rooted as a practice. Hence, the scholars highlighted the following challenges that needed to be addressed meaningfully to reorient the discipline. Five major challenges seemed to have governed the discussion in the pre-conference workshops. These are (*a*) the challenge of remaining relevant, (b) of understanding public administration with the election of the first African–American nominee to the US presidency, (*c*) of teaching public administration in Asia given the clear Western bias of the discipline, (*d*) of creating a global discourse in public administration, and (*e*) of retaining an

independent identity for the discipline since public administration has reportedly been 'roofied [drugged] and rolled [mugged]' by economics (O'Leary et al. 2011: 9).

Like their younger colleagues, the senior faculty members who participated in the Lake Placid deliberations identified the following key themes that needed a threadbare discussion to reinvent the discipline, given their dissatisfaction with the market-oriented approach to public administration and also Weberian command bureaucracy. As evident in the text that emerged out of the 2008 Minnowbrook Conference, five key themes drew the attention of the participants (O'Leary et al. 2011: 12). These are:

- How is the field of public administration different in 2008 from 1968 and 1988? What is public administration in 2008?
- Can there be definitive theoretical and empirical conclusions about the market-oriented NPM that now has a thirty-year history?
- Given the influx of scholars from many disciplines into public administration, is it closer or farther away from developing a core theoretical base?
- How are new ideas about networked governance and collaborative public management changing the way we look at public administration, public management, and public service? Are they changing the practice of public administration? Should they change what we teach in our programmes?
- How has globalization affected our understanding of the key challenges that face the study and practice of Public Administration, Public Management, and Public Service in the United States, the developed world, and developing and transitional countries?

The key themes are clearly indicative of a road map for public administration, both as a discipline and as a practice. Instead of pondering over the grand theory, the participants focused more on what works and what does not, while dwelling on the changing nature of public administration. Theoretically, it is fair to suggest

that the Minnowbrook Conference III represented both Simonesque and Waldonian perspectives: those upholding the former perspective were largely drawn to economics, organization theory, and management and those clinging to Waldonian methodological tools seemed to have appreciated frameworks and models from political science, sociology, philosophy, and history. The prevalence of two important (and also complementary) perspectives also confirms that as a field of study, public administration continues to be relatively diverse and 'multi-theoretical'. The advantage is obvious: as a practical science, public administration is context-driven and the participants of the last Minnowbrook Conference by being appreciative of the philosophical concerns of Herbert Simon and Dwight Waldo strengthened the multi-disciplinary texture of the discipline, which is not merely a theoretical discourse but also a problem-solving device. Praxis in character, public administration is another meaningful effort at comprehending human activities embedded in myriad socioeconomic forces which are both contextual and also historically articulated. By highlighting 'the organic nature' of the discipline, the Minnowbrook Conference III sought to rearticulate its 'human face' that was significantly undermined in the Minnowbrook Conference II of 1988, with the uncritical acceptance of the neoliberal and market-driven structural adjustment programme to address economic underdevelopment (except the intense debate that took place between Kurt Zorn [an economist] and Gary Walmsley [a public administration scholar] where the latter lambasted the market-driven perspective). In the debates and discussions, the participants highlighted the importance of being truly 'multi-disciplinary' in order to understand the complexities in public administration that would remain unaddressed within the Simon–Waldo perspective. In fact, this was 'an enabling' exercise that had set in motion a powerful critique of 'catholicism' in the discipline.

The 2008 Minnowbrook Conference is undoubtedly a break with the past for two specific reasons: first, by reiterating some of the major concerns of the Minnowbrook Conference I, the participants seemed to have put in place an agenda which was based on collaboration, interaction, and meaningful engagement with the

stakeholders. There always existed a perceptible gap between public problems and government capacity and also capability. What was thus required was the goal-driven participatory governance which is surely an innovative theoretical conceptualization in the age of the shrinkage of government. In this sense, the Minnowbrook Conference III reiterates the concern of the first conference which sought to redesign public administration by insisting on its 'commitment to responsiveness, social equality and participation' (Frederickson 1980: 4–12). The peculiar nature of contemporary public administration created circumstances in which agencies other than the government became important in solving public problems. The 'public' in public administration is thus redefined because public administration is no longer understood as mere government-driven activities. Second, by reaching out to learn non-Western experiences of dealing with public problems, the 2008 Conference is a counter to ethnocentric public administration. One should adopt a global approach to public governance in order to understand the intricate functioning of the institutions that remain critical in public administration. Given technological advancement, it is easier for scholars to interact and collaborate among themselves; it also creates opportunities for broader engagement and learning among a diverse set of communities. In the context of globalization, public administration, despite its contextual character, is thus well-equipped to meaningfully address human concerns of varied nature. The discipline has thus become both a scholarly enterprise and also a well-designed and goal-oriented device to offer meaningful solutions to human problems.

REDESIGNING PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE CHANGING GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT

In the context of globalization, public administration ceases to become nation-centric since it is open to various kinds of influences which are rooted elsewhere in the globe. In order to respond to the 'new' demands, the discipline needs to shake off its ethnocentric character. One of the areas that clearly reflects this concern is comparative public administration (CPA) which is so far drawn

on structural functionalism of the old variety and system theory. Instead of drawing theoretical inspiration from Gabriel Almond, Fred W. Riggs, and Ferrell Heady, contemporary CPA is largely oriented towards theories of governance and public management. This means that public administration is truly inter-disciplinary and appreciates cross-disciplinary borrowing unlike its earlier incarnation when it heavily drew on grand theories and remained 'inflexible'. Besides its substantially altered theoretical perspectives, the focus of CPA has also undergone radical changes. Contrary to past practices when bureaucracy remained the primary focus of attention, public administration in its present articulation is multidimensional in which bureaucracy remains one of the mechanisms for governance. This is reflected in approaches to administrative reforms that involve the role of the stakeholders in governance—an area that was never considered significant in past conceptualization of the administrative change. One of the significant outcomes of the Minnowbrook Conference III is the idea that administrative reform is not a one-time phenomenon; it is a continuous process, in which role of mechanisms other than public bureaucracy is equally significant and critical. Simultaneously, with such a conceptualization, comes another perspective critiquing the ethnocentric bias of the erstwhile scholars of CPA: by highlighting the significance of cross-cultural borrowing, the conference emphasizes the importance of learning from different experiences to evolve a meaningful methodology to understand the contextual peculiarities of public administration in varied socioeconomic and political circumstances. Being critical of 'the top–down model', the participants seem to have focused more on 'the reasons for reform diffusion' rather than attributing the failure of reforms to the inflexible, if not inept bureaucracy in developing countries. The fundamental point that came out of the 2008 Minnowbrook Conference is a serious endeavour to capture the changing nature of public governance in globalizing world when cross-national experiences are considered most critical in re-conceptualizing public administration in its present incarnation. The most powerful voice that was articulated in the conference was a challenge to the efforts at explaining the diverse nature of public

administration with those theoretical models that have grown out of the US-specific socioeconomic circumstances. So, to remain meaningful in the present context, there is a need to reinvent public administration by underlining the distinctive nature of the discipline in different national contexts in a global perspective.

The context in which the Minnowbrook Conference III took place needs special attention. Ours is a network society. The key driver in the emergence of network society is technology, primarily new information and communication technologies, and its growth is dependent on the ability of actors and institutions to perform communicatively and effectively in the emerging networks by reaping the benefits of the new technology paradigm. The network society is 'new' in the sense that networks are no longer relegated to private or social life but have become key to economic production as well as public–policy-making and implementation. The network society consists of networks operated by information and communication technologies that generate, process, and distribute information on the basis of the knowledge accumulated in the nodes of the network (Bang, Henrik, Esmark, and Anders). In such a context, the idea of collaborative governance seems to have struck 'organic roots' which was clearly articulated by the participants in the conference.

The Minnowbrook Conference III emphasized the importance of 'collaborative governance' as perhaps the best shield against 'government slackening' or bureaucratic delay. In an interdependent world, collaborative governance refers to ways of institutionalizing coordination and to establish decision-making processes that works in multi-organizational settings, such as networks of government agencies. Key to an effective decision-making is a meaningful coordination among various institutions involved in making and also implementing decisions. Furthermore, there has to be compatibility between policy decisions and government capability; otherwise, it will lead to a policy paralysis simply because the institutional capacity of the government will hardly be adequate to translate the decisions in deeds. This is a serious impediment to the growth of Public Administration as 'a solid science', as the Minnowbrook Conference III underlines. In order to address the

difficulties due to lack of coordination among the governmental institutions/agencies, the conference introduced a new concept of 'interoperability', an idea borrowed from the engineering sciences which refers to the ability of diverse systems and organizations to work together. It is about a process of working together by taking into account all possible social, political, and organizational factors that impact the outcome. In the wake of revolution in information and communication technology (ICT), interoperability is a value addition in public administration through 'the creation of connected [or networked] systems that facilitate better decision-making, better coordination of government programs and enhanced services to citizens and businesses' (Pardo, Gil-Garcia, and Luna-Reyes 2011: 133). The key driver in the construction of interoperability is technology, primarily new ICTs. As the findings of the conference identifies, the following list provides examples of how interoperable systems can contribute to the creation of meaningful and people-enabled governance:

- *Democracy and citizen participation*: (*a*) access to information for engaging in political action activities, such as advocating, debating, and voting; (*b*) creation of new electronic forums for citizen engagement.
- *Transparency and trust*: access to integrated, holistic views of government resources and operations create transparency and build citizen trust in and allegiance to government.
- *Citizen and business services*: (*a*) information about benefits and services available to citizens that they would otherwise be unaware of or unable to acquire; (*b*) easy-to-use, accessible, and geographically distributed citizen and business services (multichannel access to payment services and application forms).
- *Government management and economic development*: (*a*) internal, modernized infrastructure for government operations to support the back-office processing of citizen and business services and provide information for financial transparency and accountability; (*b*) improved government-wide coordination for responding to crises such as natural disasters or

public health problems; and (*c*) facilitating the creation of consumer-producer networks and alternative, more sustainable markets such as fair trade.

- *Government long-term strategy and policy-making*: (*a*) consolidated databases and data warehouses provide information to support strategic planning and policy-making in government; (*b*) stimulate local, regional, and national economies by attracting investments through an enhanced reputation for improved government operations and new and innovative services available to citizens and businesses (Pardo, Gil-Garcia, and Luna-Reyes 2001: 133).

The primary concern of today's public governance is, as is evident, to make governments sensitive to a public that has now become the centre of public administration. Also, interoperability creates a context for the rise and consolidation of collaborative governance that characterizes 'processes and structure of public decision-making and management that enable constructive engagement within or across public agencies, levels of government, private and public interest sectors and the public at large' (Emerson and Murchie 2011: 142). Collaborative governance includes, argues Carlson, 'a variety of processes in which all sectors—public, private, and civic are convened to work together to achieve solutions to public problems that go beyond what any sector could achieve on its own' (Carlson 2007: 6). This is not only a step towards serious civic engagement, but also a sure guarantee to consolidate participatory democracy that both strengthens 'public voice' and improves the responsiveness of the government by 'providing an opportunity to embed governance systems and institutions with greater levels of transparency, accountability and legitimacy' (Henton and Melville 2005: 5).

Public administration is embedded in a specific socioeconomic milieu. Hence, it is contextual. Collaborative governance is a meaningful articulation of some specific techniques (which are again situation-driven) to re-emphasize the 'publicness' of public administration. This is a significant theoretical conceptualization which is both 'enabling' and reflective of a movement towards

reconfirming the public roots of governance. By laying the foundation for serious public engagement, collaborative governance is about those practices upholding some of the principles of the Minnowbrook Conference I of 1968 that sought to project 'the human face' of public administration by emphasizing its concern for public well-being. It is thus a well-defined practice that is designed to foster more effective engagement or deliberations with the whole of agencies and stakeholders, including 'creating conditions (for transparency and coordination) and capacity for people to engage constructively (by providing resources and skills)' (Emerson and Murchie 2011: 143).

The other fundamental point that attracted significant attention concerns the visible decline of democratic ethos and the relative ascendancy of bureaucratic ethos in contemporary public–decision-making which is explained in terms of the failure of 'deliberative democracy' to strike roots in process itself. In the era of governance, public administration refers to a process-driven act in which the role of citizen seems to be negligible and thus contrary to the idea of deliberative democracy which refers to 'infusing government decision-making with the reasoned discussion and collective judgment of citizens' (Nabatchi 2011: 159). The reasons are to be located in the traditional emphasis on bureaucracy-centric public administration since the publication of *The Study of Public Administration* by Woodrow Wilson in 1887. Luther Gulick's 1937 conceptualization of POSDCORB (an acronym for planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting) and Herbert Simon's notion of bounded rationality (1947) further strengthen this perspective and public administration as a discipline remained confined, to a significant extent, to explaining various dimensions of the involvement of bureaucracy in public–decision-making. The obvious result is what is conceptualized as 'citizenship deficit' which refers to the withdrawal of citizens in matters of public consequences. As a result, public administration fails to adequately confront and grasp the issues of public administration in a democracy where political system acts on collective choices or decides on the basis of civic engagement. Several new issues grip public attention which so far have remained peripheral in

public–decision-making. In the changed socioeconomic circumstances of the twenty-first century, public administration is not merely a face-less function, but an act that embodies 'a different set of norms and principles, such as regime values, citizenship, public interest and social equity' (Nabatchi 2011: 169). Prominent scholars—those who re-conceptualized public administration within the theoretical paradigm of democratic ethos—include John Gaus, Marshall Dimock, Paul Appleby, Norton Long, Frederick Mosher, and Dwight Waldo. By integrating administrative practices with democratic values, not only did these authors reinvent public administration, they also initiated a new debate in the discipline suggesting the critical importance of the context in understanding the nature of public administration, an initiative challenging the effort at building a universal model following the Weberian theoretical dispositions. Deliberative democracy is a theoretical design for the 'rediscovery' of democratic ethos in public administration. Drawn on the basic democratic values of inclusion, equity, participation, and public interests, this provides an institutionalized design for formally involving citizens in the making of public decisions because dialogue among the stakeholders creates a forum for discussions and deliberations which generally lead a consensual decision, and in this sense it is a process that is more than mere aggregation of individual views. Deliberative democracy is, thus, an effective mechanism to relocate 'the public in the discipline of shaping public affairs [and in doing so] provides a way to help balance the tensions between the bureaucratic and democratic ethos in public administration' (Nabatchi 2011: 162).

CHALLENGES AHEAD

Similar to the Minnowbrook Conference II of 1988, the Minnowbrook Conference III is both a stock-taking exercise and also an articulation of the future road map for public administration in the changed socioeconomic environment of a globalizing world. While reviewing the efforts at 'repositioning public administration' in the context of globalization, the participants agreed that the expectations remained unfulfilled. As a discipline, public administration

does not seem to be well-equipped to manage an administrative state that is jurisdictionally, functionally, and sectorally fragmented. This creates possibilities of inter-disciplinary borrowings to understand the complex articulation of administration, with reference to the constantly changing global scenario. There is a serious lack of meaningful theoretical yardstick. The Weberian model of bureaucracy and management are undoubtedly less relevant to public administration than they once were, yet they remain 'a sharper set of intellectual tools than the still-fuzzy concept of governance [which is] confusing because it lacks a precise definition' (Frederickson and Smith 2003: 209). Nonetheless, the idea of governance cannot be altogether ignored because it formally recognizes the role of the practitioners of public administration in re-conceptualizing and also repositioning the discipline in conjunction with the volatile socioeconomic circumstances around globe. Public administration has to address this concern and governance, despite its obvious theoretical limitations, seems to have provided possible tools to capture the changed reality. The growing acceptance of governance to mean public administration also confirms that the discipline no longer remains 'boundary-conscious' and the issues that had emerged in the Minnowbrook Conference III are reflective of a growing openness to new ideas, coupled with enduring issues that span the decades. The 2008 conference is thus said to have provided a new attire to public administration by throwing away its 'orthodoxy' that appeared to have impeded its growing as a discipline with its organic link with prevalent socioeconomic circumstances.

Despite disagreements among the participants over various issues, there developed a consensus on some issues which were likely to set the basic agenda for future research in public administration. First, the most obvious and important issue that was addressed in the Minnowbrook Conference III was the impact of globalization on the field. This is an important change since the second conference, and certainly since the Minnowbrook Conference I. The world, today, has become a single entity, at least in its physical sense. Seeking to capture such an interconnected entity within the rubric of globalization, participants in the conference

focused more on the new dimensions of connectedness, interdependency, knowledge-sharing in governance, and collaborative public management among government agencies and across international boundaries. So, the challenge before the analysts is not merely to comprehend public administration in the changed environment, but also to identify its distinctive features which were hardly visible in the command administration in the Weberian bureaucracy-driven paradigm. The fundamental question that was raised related to re-conceptualizing democratic (in the liberal sense) governance as a means to transparency and accountability, even in political systems which are not democratically constituted in the conventional sense.

The second issue that attracted attention related to the effort at building and also consolidating collaborative governance, as perhaps a panacea to weak or inadequate administration. Critical of hierarchical governance, the governance paradigm underlines the importance of connected forms of administration through networks, contracts, and a range of information technology innovations in which government is an important institutional actor, but not the only or most important one. As a result, collaboration is the principal norm in administration and power is 'diffused through a number of institutional mechanisms and policy instruments' which is manifested in the growing importance of managerial tools, such as, 'facilitation, negotiations, collaborative problem solving and dispute resolution' in public administration (Van Slyke, O'Leary, and Kim 2011: 284). Governance is not merely a managerial response to public administration; it is a political response underlining critical public engagement in societal issues. The concern was to ensure public participation and public engagement in policy discussion and implementation. In order to make public administration 'democratic' and 'transparent', the meaningful public participation in the decision-making is required where forms may vary though it will create forums for effective dialogue among the stakeholders. This was a perspective in which NPA was conceptualized in the context of the Minnowbrook Conference I of 1968. What is new in the third conference is a clear shift in focus: public always remains, at least conceptually, a critical component

and hence it is assumed to be a driving force in public administration. The most important issue, raised in the conference, is one of when and how best to involve the public in public administration. This is a recurring problem regardless of circumstances: it is easier to conceptualize public in its reactive role; but it is difficult to make public 'pro-active' in issues of public governance unless situations change radically. Nonetheless, the basic point highlighting the importance of public participation in governance is very useful in relocating public administration in the field of social sciences in its new avatar.

Public administration is extremely benefitted by the easy availability of new tools of communication following the Information Technology (IT) revolution. No one can deny the growing role of IT tools in the public sector; in fact, it has facilitated decision-making by ensuring access to a huge array of information which may not have been otherwise available. One of the most significant outcomes of IT-enabled public administration is e-governance that has become an acceptable form in contemporary governance, not only because it is cost-efficient, but also because it is transparent and time-saving. A new idea of interoperability which is a mix of policy, management, and technology has gained precedence in contemporary governance. This is an era of network governance which is based on effective coordination among the stakeholders on the basis of shared information and knowledge from different sources. There are two ways in which coordination is articulated: (*a*) information sharing whereby information is transferred from one agency to another and (*b*) information integration which involves not only the transfer of information, but also translation and transformation of information to evolve new techniques of collective problem-solving. Both these concepts converge into an integrated database of inputs that remain very useful in addressing similar problems in the future. The availability of database, once inadequate to conclusively solve problems, is likely to provoke further research in areas which need attention. So, with the access to IT-driven techniques, public administration appears to have further enriched its theoretical tools which were inconceivable in the era of command bureaucracy, but have become integrally linked

with contemporary public administration presumably because of the consolidation of a networked global village.

In a way, the Minnowbrook Conference III is a continuity of the past, in the sense that the principal concern of the participants since the first conference in 1968 has remained the same. The common theme that ran across the Minnowbrook conferences across four decades since it was first convened in 1968 was the challenge of remaining relevant. There is a clear lack between scholarship and practice in public administration which, the participants apprehend, needs to be meaningfully addressed to make the discipline relevant in the era of globalization. In other words, the focus is on the nature of public administration which is different from other social sciences, given the fact that public administration is largely a practice-based discourse. Hence the question—how to make public administration relevant?—seems most pertinent. The entire discussion revolves around this question and David Rosenbloom, in his closing plenary remarks, listed the following four proactive steps to make public administration 'a stronger and more robust field' (Van Slyke, O'Leary, and Kim 2011: 284).

First, supportive of collaborative research, Rosenbloom insisted on 'the need to aggregate knowledge in the sense of making it cumulative'. In order to make public administration a meaningful tool of analysis of real human problems, the scholars, he further argues, need to develop a common framework on the basis of give-and-take not only from their counterparts in the discipline, but also from other disciplines. By being rigidly boundary-conscious, the scholars have done more harm than what was apprehended. Public administration needs to be interdisciplinary by shunning its orthodoxy. The second point, raised by Rosenbloom, is a demand 'to maintain methodological and epistemological pluralism' in public administration. The effort here is to welcome pluralism in our choice for methodology because imposition of a single or hegemonic methodology or epistemology shall 'narrow and weaken the field'. Third, one of the sources of weakness in contemporary public administration is its failure to understand non-Western administration, presumably because of its catholicity in clinging to a single set of values—whether utilitarian, instrumental, egalitarian, libertarian,

or contractarian—while addressing contemporary administration-related concerns. In view of the complex nature of the prevalent system of administration which is enmeshed with equally complex socioeconomic and political factors, the theoretical catholicism may certainly be an impediment in articulating a creative response. Finally, Rosenbloom is highly critical of boundary-conscious public administration. He is in favour of promoting boundary spanning. The discipline shall never be adequately practice-driven unless the boundary obsession of the scholars disappears, he argues. According to him, serious academic probing in public administration in comparative perspectives is a significant step towards making the discipline well-equipped to handle diverse socioeconomic problems; and also, by being receptive to the developments in related fields of economics, sociology, business administration, and political science, the scholars of public administration will further enhance their capacity to intervene in collective problem-solving.

As the above discussion shows, while taking stock of the developments in public administration in contemporary context, the Minnowbrook Conference III reiterates some of the concerns of those participating in the Minnowbrook Conference I. The effort was to make the discipline relevant and meaningful in addressing contemporary human concerns. In the changed environment of the growing ascendancy of market, public administration, in order to remain relevant, seems to have tilted in favour of private enterprises. The fulcrum had, it is argued, moved to 'a position beyond the center in which government was now in a relationship not of interdependence but of dependence on private and non-profit firms to deliver government services' (Van Slyke, O'Leary, and Kim 2011: 14). The centre of gravity in governance no longer remained bureaucracy which became just one of the agencies in public administration. So, what was required was a new theoretical parameter to re-conceptualize governance in the changed socioeconomic environment. The Minnowbrook Conference III of 2008 is certainly a meaningful step in this regard. Despite serious disagreements among the participants, they however came together by their search for acceptable theoretical designs to explain

complex administrative processes. Public administration therefore needs to be creative to remain meaningful and relevant in rather uncertain in these times of our civilization.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Thus, public administration has undergone a sea change in response to new inputs from the contemporary socioeconomic and political scene. It is therefore difficult, if not impossible, to grasp the nature of public administration in terms of the Weberian conceptualization underlining its rigid, rule-bound and hierarchic characteristics. Instead, the preferred form of administration is one which is accessible, transparent, and accountable, and where the citizens are consumers. Furthermore, the notion of 'public' in public administration has acquired new dimensions where the public–private distinction is more analytical than real since there is a growing support for both cooperation and healthy competition between these two sectors in the larger interests of societal development. To sum up, public administration has gone through various stages in its evolution and growth as an academic discipline. The evolutionary process indicates the shifting boundaries of the discipline in response to constantly emerging social needs.

REFERENCES

Bang, Henrik, Esmark and Anders, 'Good Governance in Network Society: Reconfiguring the Political from Politics to Policy'. Available at http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_7440/is_200903/ai_n39229449/?tag=content;col1

Blau, Peter M. 1956. *Bureaucracy in Modern Society*. New York: Random House.

Butcher, Tony. 1995. 'The Major Government and White Hall: The Civil Service at the Crossroads', *Teaching Public Administration*, 15 (March): 19–31.

Carlson, C. 2007. 'A Practical Guide to Collaborative Governance: Policy Consensus Initiative, 2007'. Available at www.policycinsensus.org

Corson, John and Joseph Harris. 1967. *Public Administration in Modern Society*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Dahl, Robert H. 1947. 'The Science of Public Administration: Three problems', *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 7.

Das, S.K. 1998. *Civil Service Reform and Structural Adjustment*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Dimock, M.E. and G.O. Dimock. 1969. *Public Administration*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Emerson, Kirk and Peter Murchie. 2011. 'Collaborative Governance and Climate Change: Opportunities for Public Administration', in Rosemary O'Leary, David M. Van Slyke, and Soonhee Kim (eds), *The Future of Public Administration around the World: The Minnowbrook Perspective*. Washinton DC: Georgetown University Press.

Farazmand, Ali. 1999. 'Globalization and Public Administration', *Public Administration Review*, 59 (6): 509–22.

Frederickson, H. George. 1980. *New Public Administration*. Alabama: The University of Alabama Press.

Frederickson, H. George and Kevin B. Smith. 2003. *The Public Administration Theory Primer*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Goodnow, Frank J. 1900. *Politics and Administration*. New York: Macmillan.

Henry, Nicholas. 2007. *Public Administration and Public Affairs*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.

Henton, D. and I. Melville. 2005. *Collaborative Governance: A Guide for Grantmakers*. Menlo Park, CA: William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. Available at www.hewlett.org

Kim, Soonhee, Rosemary O'Leary, David M. Van Slyke, H. George Frederickson, and W. Henry Lambert. 2011. 'The Legacy of Minnobrook', in Rosemary O'Leary, David M. Van Slyke, and Soonhee Kim (eds), *The Future of Public Administration around the World: The Minnowbrook Perspective*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

O'Leary, Rosemary, David M. Van Slyke, and Soonhee Kim (eds). 2011. *The Future of Public Administration around the World: The Minnowbrook Perspective*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Nabatchi, Tina. 2011. 'Why Public Administration Should Take Deliberative Democracy Seriously', in Rosemary O'Leary, David M. Van Slyke, and Soonhee Kim (eds), *The Future of Public Administration around the World: The Minnowbrook Perspective*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Naidu, S.P., J. Apparao, and G. Mallikarjunayya. 1986. *Elements of Modern Public Administration*. New Delhi: S. Chand & Co.

Nigro, Felix A. 1965, 1971. *Modern Public Administration* (2nd ed.). New York: Harper International Edition.

Niskanen, William A. 1971. *Bureaucracy and Representative Government*. Chicago: Aldine Atherton.

Osborne, David and Ted Gaebler. 1992. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector*. London: Plume.

Pardo, Theresa A., J. Ramon Gil-Garcia, and Luis F. Luna-Reyes. 2011. 'Collaborative Governance and Cross-boundary Information Sharing: Envisioning a Networked and IT-enabled Public Administration', in Rosemary O'Leary, David M. Van Slyke, and Soonhee Kim (eds), *The Future of Public Administration*

around the World: The Minnowbrook Perspective. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Pfiffner, John and R. Presthus. 1953. *Public Administration*. New York: Ronald Press.

Presthus, Robert. 1975. *Public Administration*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.

Simon, H.A., D.W. Smithburg, and V.A. Thompson. 1950. *Public Administration*. New York: Knopf.

Van Slyke, David M., Rosemary O'Leary, and Soonhee Kim. 2011. 'Challenges and Opportunities, Crosscutting Themes, and Thoughts on the Future of Public Administration', in Rosemary O'Leary, David M. Van Slyke, and Soonhee Kim (eds), *The Future of Public Administration around the World: The Minnowbrook Perspective*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Weber, Max. 1946. 'Bureaucracy', in H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds), *From Max Weber: Essays in Modern Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

White, L.D. 1955. *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*. New York: Crowell-Collier and Macmillan.

Wilson, Woodrow. 1953. 'The Study of Administration', in Dwight Waldo (ed.), *Ideas and Issues in Public Administration*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Administrative Theories

Learning Objectives
- To equip readers with adequate conceptual tools to approach the discipline for the first time
- To provide an explanation of the chaotic world of theory building in public administration
- To illustrate the major theories of public administration
- To assess the state of theory building in public administration

Administrative theory is a highly contested terrain of public administration. Theory is a body of generalization, which attempts to make sense of the world. Broadly speaking, validity of any theoretical construct depends on its ability to describe, explain, and predict (Frederickson and Smith 2003).[1] As a separate academic discipline, public administration cannot claim to have a very solid theoretical foundation. A few commentators have opined that public administration fails to attain the intellectual pedigree[2] it deserves, because it is yet to develop a systematic body of theory (Caiden 1971). Interestingly though, there is no dearth of theorization in public administration as such. In fact, 'there are theories in public administration', writes Caiden, 'but there are no general theories of public administration'. The effort of theory building in public administration is marked by a multiplicity of contesting

claims, ideas, paradigms, and models. Critics argue that such effort instead of creating a systematic body of knowledge has given birth to a 'chaotic array of fragmented assumptions, vacuous prescriptions, and disorganized beliefs about public organization' (Dunn and Fozouni 1976).[3] Almost in similar vein, Landau remarked that the administrative theory is 'still in its pre-paradigmatic stage'.[4] For Kuhn:

> [administrative theory is] marked by a plethora of competing schools, a polyglot of languages, and, accordingly, a confusion of logics. There is neither a common research tradition nor the necessary consensus for a common field of inquiry. Each of the competing schools questions the others, adventurism is rampant, and commonly accepted standards of control do not exist. (Landau 1966 quoted in Caiden 1971)

Why is public administration still in a pre-paradigmatic stage? What makes theory-building exercise in public administration a mess? These are but a few nagging questions that invariably come to the mind when one looks up the discipline for the first time. Several factors are held responsible for such chaotic world of theory in public administration. First, the confused[5] state of public administration as an independent discipline is often held responsible for the impoverished state of theory building. Public administration as a separate academic discipline is yet to get a stable identity. Both as an academic discipline and a contemplative-cum-operational science of management, it has been suffering from the crisis of identity since its inception. More than 100 years down the line, the discipline is still in search of a stable identity (Waldo[6] 1968). Thanks to its constant exposure to real world, the discipline and profession of public administration is grappling with a whole lot of challenges, which include among others the challenge of democracy, the New Right challenges and its latest incarnation in an all-pervasive garb of globalization, challenges of management, the feminist epistemology, governance discourse, sociocultural diversity, postmodernity, and so on. Consequently, the theory-building effort has suffered stunted growth of sort. Second, explanation is also associated with the discipline itself. Scholars have traced the

root of such untidy nature of theory building in the professed objective of public administration theory, which put a lot of emphasis on the cross-disciplinary interactions. For example, Stephen Bailey's[7] statement on the rationale of theory building in public administration may be mentioned:

> [T]he objectives of public administration theory are to draw together the insights of the humanities and validated propositions of the social and behaviourial sciences and to apply these insights and propositions to the task of improving the processes of government aimed at achieving politically legitimized goals by constitutionally mandated means. (Bailey 1968: 128–39)

Public administration, in its persistent effort of getting closer to administrative reality, has transcended the orthodox boundary of discipline and made hostile inroads in the related disciplines of social sciences. Moreover, thanks to apparent receptiveness of the nascent discipline, experts *trained in other fields* have also ventured into public administration, which has led to further expansion of the discipline. Third, another problem with the mushrooming of theories in public administration, as viewed Caiden, is that either they are addressing problems too big or too small, instead of the typical problems of public administration (Caiden 1971: 225–26). Fourth, though public administration serves the interests of all members of the society, theories do not address issues like what should compose the interests and ends? How public administration might maximize those interests and ends? Theories under the influence of behaviouralism have shied away from the so-called brute realities[8] of politics and administration and concentrated on precision and objectivity. The normative questions pertaining to administration have been left for the philosophers. Fifth, another common problem associated with theory building in public administration is that most of the practitioners, either consciously or unconsciously, presuppose the philosophy of organizational society. Consequently, no one questions them. In fact, 'aware of the political implications', writes Caiden (1971: 66), 'they tend to pull back from the deeper philosophical, moral, and political issues involved in theorizing about public activities and public

institutions. Instead they take refuge behind behavioural administrative science'. Sixth, the role of legitimization is another important feature of administrative theorization, which has contributed to the added confusion of the administrative theory. Critics argue that administrative theories are not the product of exigency[9] but more often than not they are the tools of legitimation.[10] Hence, administrative theories are manufactured to legitimize the dominant interests, leading thereby to proliferation of theories and the resultant confusion.

Gerald E. Caiden (1971) has identified following factors behind the poor state of theory building in public administration: (*a*) the study of public administration has nothing distinctive to be theorized about. In fact, its development owes a lot to political science, history, law, government, cameralism, and so on; (*b*) there are chances of theorizing only in those situations where the rise of big governments with the proliferation of public authorities, public law, and public services is apparent; (*c*) another important factor behind the paucity of theory in public administration is that neither the philosophers nor the practitioners are interested in philosophizing about what they do, or unravelling the mystics of the discipline; (*d*) though there was no dearth of knowledge in public administration, development of social science has given the proper theoretical edge to the discipline; (*e*) theories are generally produced when there are problems and no plausible solutions are in sight. Public administration is suffering from dearth of theories because there is no serious problem before the discipline at this time; and (*f*) public administration theory (American) has been too culture-bound to be of much use elsewhere (Caiden: 1971: 225–26).

This chapter attempts to review the development of administrative theory with reference to the contribution of individual thinkers.

THE CLASSICAL ORGANIZATION THEORY

The classical organization theory[11] assumes that administration is a universal structural construct, which has a universal applicability, regardless of the situation and context, and is susceptible to

49

same kind of problems. Therefore, the protagonists of this theory are of the opinion that certain universal principles of organization can be worked out to facilitate the smooth functioning of organization. Contextually[12] speaking, the classical organization theory was born in a typical Western ambience at the end of eighteenth century and beginning of the nineteenth century when the Industrial Revolution had reached its apogee and efficiency and economy became the watchwords of industrial productivity. The classical organization theory with its inherent structural bias rose up to the occasion to streamline the productivity. The classical organization theory is built around four key pillars. They are the division of labour, the scalar and functional processes, structure, and span of control (Scott 1961).

The classical theory of organization has the following basic premises:

1. Efficiency and economy are the universal goals of all organizations;
2. to achieve efficiency and economy, there is a need to design and re-design organizational structures in such a manner that the various structural parts of an organization function with coordination and harmony; and
3. with a view to developing greater rational structures, an organization should follow certain 'principles' of formal designing and re-designing various organizational parts, so that the goals of maximizing efficiency and economy are achieved with least effort and resources.

The following are the major principles of the classical organization theories:

1. This school of thought assumes administration as a universal structural construct, which is amenable to certain common principles of organization;
2. the proponents of this approach have shown their keen interest in discovering the true basis on which division of work in an organization should be carried out;

3. the proponents of this approach, however, are not totally in oblivion of the danger of the excessive de-centring of organizational task. Hence, they put a lot of emphasis on proper coordination in an organization;

4. this school of thought equally favours an element of restrain in the use of authority in administrative matter;

5. the advocates of this school are strongly in favour of unity of command and direction;

6. this school also favours centralization of authority; and

7. another important feature of this school of thought is the managerial perspective. Most scholars belonging to this tradition approach administration from a typically managerial perspective and thereby prescribe a host of techniques or principles to make organization successful.

The major proponents of this theory are Henry Fayol, Luther Gullick, Lyndall Urwick, J.D. Mooney, A.C. Reiley, Mary Parker Follett, R. Shelton, among others. In the following sections, we shall discuss each of these theories in detail.

Henry Fayol

Fayol is perhaps one of the earliest administrative theorists to discuss universal principle of administration. Owing to his long personal experience, Fayol had interpreted administration from a point of view of a manager and spelled out five key elements of administration, namely, planning, organizing, command, coordination, and control. He had contributed a host of papers on mining, engineering, and geology, of which 'General Principles of Administration' (1908), 'General and Industrial Management' (1916), and 'The Administrative Theory of the State' (1923) deserve special mention. Moreover, Fayol had refuted the popular distinction between management and public administration. Instead, he had opined that administration is an activity common to all human undertakings, whether in the home, business, or government. Fayol had further developed fourteen principles of administration, namely, division of labour, authority and responsibility, discipline, unity of

command, unity of direction, subordination of individual interest to the general interest, remuneration, centralization, scalar chain/hierarchy, equity, stability of tenure of personnel, order, initiative, and esprit de corps to make it more comprehensive. He was also of the opinion that good administration required efficient managers and wanted his managers to have the following traits: physical qualities, mental qualities, moral qualities, general education, special knowledge, and experience.

Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick

Despite their individual contribution, they have been mostly clubbed together for their seminal publication entitled 'Papers on the Science of Administration' (1937). In the said book they have introduced a popular acronym 'POSDCORB' to the administrative theory encapsulating the crux of administration. But individually, both of them contributed a lot to the organization theory to merit separate mention. Gullick is also known for his theory of departmentalization and principle of organization. The theory of departmentalization addresses the problem of assignment of duties in an organization. It is generally viewed that the departments are often locked horns on the issues of assignment of duties. Gullick has brought about his theory of departmentalization to get rid of this crisis.

Mary Parker Follett

Follett is another important proponent of classical organization theory. Though trained as a political scientist, she ventured in social administration subsequently. Throughout her career, she was much preoccupied with the problem of conflict and integration and came out with an innovative idea of 'constructive conflict'. She has recognized conflict as a normal and unavoidable consequence of social interaction in every organization. Therefore, it should not be taken as 'wasteful outbreak of incompatibilities', but a normal process through which 'socially valuable differences register themselves for the enrichment of all concerned'. She wants every organization to make use of the unutilized potential of conflict for its betterment. Follett has nicely encapsulated it in these words:

'All polishing is done by friction. We get the music from the violin by friction and we left the savage state when we discovered fire through friction.' After introducing the idea of 'constructive conflict', she had preferred integration among the three popular ways of resolving a conflict, namely, domination, compromise, and integration. Another important contribution of Follett is the concept of 'de-personalizing order'. According to her, issuing order is a perennial problem in an organization. Administrators often refrain from issuing order as they fear that it might invite negative repercussions. Follett, instead, has introduced a concept of 'de-personalizing order', which is mostly originating from the situation. And, as administrative orders are emanating from the actual situation, the problem of personalizing order does not arise.

The classical theory of organization has been severely criticized for over-emphasis on institutional structure and for ignoring the human elements of organization. Herbert Simon has ridiculed the classical organization theory as 'homely proverbs, myths, slogans and pompous identities'. There is no denying that the classicists are too much preoccupied with the formal structural part of organization and sometimes that too at the cost of human factors. Despite the shortcomings, identified by the human relation theorists, behaviouralists, and the neo-classicists, the importance of classical organization theory cannot be denied. In fact, it was the classical organization theory, which had formed the bedrock for the modern organization theories.

THE SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT THEORY

The origin of scientific management theory is considered to be a major breakthrough in industrial management. With the growing expansion and consolidation of large-scale industries in the wake of the Industrial Revolution, the Western world had witnessed a resultant crisis of management. The problem was further aggravated by events like the First World War. The growing scarcity of resources, competition, and complexity in managing business had demanded an efficient science of management. The scientific management theory was the outcome of such a need. It had drastically

'redefined' the science of management by ensuring maximum efficiency with the consequent economization of time and resources. In other words, it had 'revolutionized' industrial relations by proposing to revamp the age-old manager–worker relationship by standardization of work procedure, improvement in the working conditions, and so on, and also by making managers equally responsible for overall productivity. It suggested that the application of scientific technology would maximize the overall productivity in an industry, which in effect would increase the earnings of both the workers and employers and minimize the friction between them.

Frederick W. Taylor has been considered as the father of scientific management theory, though the term 'scientific management' was coined much later by Louis Brandeis in 1910, reflecting on the ideas of Taylor. Taylor believes that in every trade there is *one best way* of doing a job, and the objective of the manager is to explore that best way to expedite the situation optimally. Taylor's own words better convey the essence of scientific management theory:

> [A]mong the various methods and implements used in each element of each trade there is always one method and one implement which is quicker and better than any of the rest. And this one best method and best implement can only be discovered or developed through a scientific study and analysis of all the methods and implements in use, together with accurate, minute, motion and time study. (Taylor, quoted in Nigro and Nigro 1983)

The major works of Taylor include 'A Piece-rate System' (1895), 'Shop Management' (1903), 'The Art of Cutting Metals' (1906), and 'The Principles of Management' (1911).[13]

Aims of Scientific Management

The major objectives of scientific management theory, as articulated by the advocates of this school, may be summarized as:

- To gauge industrial tendencies and the market, in order to regularize operations in a manner which will conserve the

investment, sustain the enterprise as an employing agency, and assure continuous operation and employment;

- to assure the employee, not only of continuous operation and employment by correct gauging of the market, but also assure by planned and balanced operations, a continuous earning opportunity while on the payroll;
- to earn through a waste-saving management and processing technique, a large income from a given expenditure of human and material energies, which shall be shared through increased wages and profits by workers and management;
- to make possible a higher standard of living as a result of increased income of workers;
- to assure a happier home and social life to workers through removal (and by increase of income), of many of the disagreeable and worrying factors in the total situation;
- to assure healthy as well as individually and socially agreeable conditions of work;
- to assure the highest opportunity for individual capacity through scientific methods of work analysis and of selection, training, assignment, transfer, and promotion of workers;
- to assure by training and instructional foremanship the opportunity for workers to develop new and higher capacities, and eligibility for promotion to higher position;
- to develop self-confidence and self-respect among workers through opportunity afforded for understanding of one's own work specifically, and of plans and methods of work generally;
- to develop self-expression and self-realization among workers through the simulative influence of an atmosphere of research and valuation, through understanding of plans and methods, and through the freedom of horizontal as well as vertical contacts afforded by functional organization;
- to build character through the proper conduct of work;
- to promote justice through the elimination of discrimination in wage rates and elsewhere; and
- to eliminate factors of the environment which are irritating and the cause of frictions, and to promote common

understandings, tolerances and the spirit of teamwork (H.C. Person, quoted in Sapru 1996).

Principles of Scientific Management

The distinguishing features of Taylor's scientific management theory can be enumerated as follows:

1. *The development of a true science of work*: Scientific management theory seeks to discover a true science of work, which in effect will benefit both the workers and managers alike. The basic objective of this principle is to replace the 'rule of thumb' by application of scientific methods. Taylor claimed that there was 'one best way' to perform almost any task. This can be done by observing and analysing the work assigned to a worker with respect to each element and the time involved in it. This procedure will decide the ideal working method or the best way of doing a job. Taylor considers this 'organized knowledge' as 'science of work'.

2. *The scientific selection, training, and progressive development of the workman*: This theory has put a lot of emphasis on scientific selection and proper grooming of the workforce. It believes that vibrant workforce can bring about rapid increase in productivity. Scientific selection involves selecting a right person for a right job. For this, some standard selection procedure must be there. Workers' skill and experience must be matched with the requirements of the respective jobs they are to perform. The workmen so selected must be given training for the specific tasks assigned. This would help worker to accept new methods, tools, and conditions willingly and enthusiastically. Taylor holds that it is the managements' responsibility to implement appropriate selection and training systems and to see to it that the worker's intellectual, psychological, and physical traits match the requirements of these jobs.

3. *The close coordination between the science of work and the scientifically selected and trained men*: The theory advocates a close coordination between the science of work and the

trained workforces for smooth functioning of an organization. Taylor says that in order to get the best results, someone has to bring the science and workmen together. He felt that it is the exclusive responsibility of the management to do this job. He believes that workers are always willing to cooperate with the management but there is more opposition from the management side. He suggests 'mental revolution' for a change in this perception.

4. *The division of work and responsibility between the management and workers*: This is another important hallmark of the scientific management theory. It put the onus of industrial productivity equally on the management and workers. That is, industrial well-being is a joint responsibility, which needs to be shouldered by both of them.

None of the above mentioned principles could be isolated and called scientific management. Collectively, they contribute as scientific management. In 'The Principles of Scientific Management' (1911), Taylor states that scientific management is 'no single element', but a combination summarized as:

- Science, not rule of thumb
- Harmony, not discord
- Cooperation, not individualism
- Maximum output, in place of restricted output
- Development of each man to his greatest efficiency and prosperity (Taylor 1947: 140).

These characteristics constitute the philosophy of scientific management.

Taylor employs a number of techniques to facilitate the application of the principles of scientific management. These include functional foremanship, motion study, time study, piece-rate plan, exceptional principle, standardization of tools, and so on. In order for scientific management to succeed, Taylor urges a complete 'mental revolution' in the attitude of managers and workers as to their duties, towards their fellow workers and towards all of their

problems. Mental revolution or we can say a new outlook requires the realization on part of both the parties (workers and managers) that their mutual interest is not contradictory and both can prosper only through cooperation, not conflict. Taylor believes that without this great mental change and new outlook on both sides, scientific management cannot exist. Taylor suggests that in any organization both workers and employers should cooperate with each other and work towards increasing the productivity. Increased organizational output would give better wages to workers and high profit to management and the atmosphere of conflict will be replaced by peace and harmony.

Critique of Scientific Management

Scientific management led to a reform movement which offered the hope of minimizing industrial problems. However, it was equally opposed by many people. The anger of the labour community was so harsh that, early in his career at Midvale Steel, Taylor received death threats for trying to speed up work, and when he later worked at Bethlehem Steel, the planning room was mysteriously burned. The application of Taylor's 'mental revolution' resolves all the disputes between the employers and the workers and establishes effective cooperation between them and thus makes the role of trade union unnecessary. Thus, labour leaders considered Taylorism as not only destroying trade unions, but also destroying the principle of collective bargaining. They also had a fear that it would increase in unemployment. Taylorism was also attacked by the managers. Their workload increased due to the application of 'equal division of work and responsibility'. Those who wanted promotion to high managerial positions also opposed Taylor's stand, which advocated training and assessment of managers by highly trained experts. It was because of the differences with the company managers that Taylor had to resign from Midvale Steel as well as Bethlehem Steel companies. Human relation theorist criticized Taylor's principles for being impersonal and undermining the human factor. Behaviourist also charged that Taylor's methods scarificed the initiative of the worker, his individual freedom, and

the use of his intelligence and responsibility. Herbert Simon and James G. March described the scientific management principles as the 'physiological organization theory'. Taylor's theory is also criticized for oversimplifying human motivation in terms of economic rewards and neglecting the social and psychological aspects of motivation. Likewise, the assumption that an individual existed in isolation from his social environment is erroneous.

Contribution of Fredrick W. Taylor

Taylor is considered as the father of scientific management theory. An engineer by profession, Taylor was obsessed with efficiency and economy. Orderliness was the hallmark of Taylor's thought. He had reacted to the disorder he found in organizations in his time. In a true commitment to the spirit of science, he believed that there is always a best way of doing a job and the manager should strive for achieving that best way through the application of the scientific technique. Instead of the rule of thumb method, he was in favour of greater autonomy for the workers, who would decide the work methods among themselves and select their tools accordingly. Apart from the scientific management, Taylor was also known for his idea of participative management, which was implicit in his advocacy for greater autonomy of workers. Thus, despite a numbers of limitations, the ideas of scientific management greatly influenced administrative thought and management practices in subsequent years. Even after the initial period of resistance, it conquered the citadels of old-fashioned industrial management in the United States and had a tremendous effect on industrial practice (Gross 1964: 127). It even influenced the administrative and managerial practices of France, Germany, England, erstwhile USSR, and other European countries.

BUREAUCRATIC THEORY

No organization has ever been existed without any form of bureaucracy. In fact, every collective effort demands some form of bureaucratic structure. Bureaucratic form of governance is

an inescapable and omnipresent phenomenon of modern orga-
nization and it is hailed for its perceived qualities of precision,
speed, unambiguity, continuity, efficiency, regularity, consistency,
economy, reduction of friction and of material and personal costs,
unity, strict subordination, and so on. Despite the centrality of bu-
reaucracy in organization, no serious effort was made to theorize
bureaucracy before Max Weber. And more interestingly, after the
pioneering contribution of Weber, no serious work on the impor-
tance of bureaucracy has been done either. Most of the theories
on bureaucracy that succeeded Weber are centring round the dys-
functionalities and pathologies of bureaucratic organizations. So
much so that bureaucratic form of governance assumes pejorative
connotations. Hence, there is enough scope for confusion about
the exact meaning of the term bureaucracy. This was evident in the
following introductory words by Martin Albrow:

> The student coming to this field can be excused bewilderment.
> Sometimes, 'bureaucracy' seems to mean administrative efficiency,
> at other times the opposite. It may appear as simple as a synonym
> for civil service, or it may be as complex as an idea summing up the
> specific features of modern organizational structure. It may refer
> to a body of officials, or to the routines of office administration.
> (Albrow 1970: 14)

The following section will dwell on the portrayal of bureaucracy
in administrative theory under the following heads:

- Max Weber's ideal-type bureaucracy
- Instrumentalist theory by Marx
- Functionalist theory by Merton et al.
- Public choice theory
- Pathological theory

Max Weber's Ideal-type Bureaucracy

There is no denying that any discussion on bureaucracy deserves
to begin with noted German sociologist Max Weber. In fact, it was
Max Weber who had systematically theorized bureaucracy for the

first time. However, before we appraise the Weberian model of bureaucracy, a few introductory words need to be discussed. First, Weber had neither defined bureaucracy in a clear-cut manner, nor even considered it as a part of the language of social sciences. His frequent use of the term in quotation indicated that he had coined the term from everyday parlance. Second, Weber did not include all officials within his notion of bureaucracy. He refused to include elected or selected officials within his conceptualization of bureaucracy. The distinctive character of Weberian bureaucracy was that he was an appointee (Albrow 1970). Third, despite the systematic treatment of bureaucracy, Weber's notion of bureaucracy is largely scattered in his writings. Fourth, there is an apparent inconsistency in Weber's treatment of bureaucracy. Sometimes, he used the term in a more general sense, while in other he concentrated only on the pure and rational variety. Fifth, Weber's conception of bureaucracy needs to be placed within his overall sociological perspective.

Keeping the above points in mind, Weber's conceptualization of bureaucracy needs to be appreciated as a purely sociological phenomenon. To be more specific, Weber's theory of ideal-type bureaucracy as the manifestation of rational–legal authority will become more intelligible if it is placed in the backdrop of his theory of domination or 'herrschaft' (Bhattacharaya 1996). According to Weber, domination is not merely a structure of command that elicits obedience, rather it is what is readily complied with. He has identified three sources of legitimation, namely, traditional, charismatic, and rational–legal, of which rational–legal authority is codified in bureaucracy. In case of traditional authority, the source of legitimation is tradition. Basically, traditional societies are subject to this kind of authority, where patriarchs, tribal, or clan heads have drawn their authority from innumerable customs, traditions, and conventions. The charismatic source of authority rests upon personal charm, which may include magnetic personality, heroic figure, gift of gab, and the like. However, as Weber reminds us, such sources of legitimation are inherently unstable and ephemeral. The charisma, views Weber, evaporates once it is routinized. By contrast, the rational–legal authority invokes the sanction of law.

According to Weber, bureaucracy is the universal and most progressive and modern form of organization, which is based on rational–legal authority. It plays a crucial role in ordering and controlling modern societies. Weber heaped praises on bureaucracy in the following words:

> It is superior to any other form in precision, in stability, in the stringency of its discipline, and in its reliability. It thus makes possible a particularly high degree of calculability of results for the heads of the organization and for those acting in relation to it. It is finally superior both in intensive efficiency and in the scope of its operations, and is formally capable of application to all kinds of administrative tasks. (Weber 1946: 220)

Considering the centrality of bureaucracy in the development of society, Weber has come up with a heuristic-type construct of bureaucracy, applicable to all kind of societies. Weber has enumerated the following characteristics of bureaucracy:

- There is a clear hierarchy of officials;
- the functions of the officials are clearly specified;
- officials are appointed on the basis of a contract;
- the staff members are personally free, observing only the impersonal duties of their offices;
- they are selected on the basis of a professional qualification, ideally substantiated by a diploma gained through examination;
- they have a money salary, and usually pension rights. The salary is graded according to position in the hierarchy. The officials can always leave the post, and under certain circumstances they may also be terminated;
- the official's post is his sole or major occupation;
- there is a career structure, and promotion is possible either by seniority or merit, and according to the judgement of superiors;
- the official may appropriate neither the post nor the resources which go with it; and
- he is subject to a unified control and disciplinary system (A.M. Henderson and T. Parsons, quoted in Albrow 1970: 36).

Critique of Weber's Bureaucratic Model

The actual practices of bureaucracies often fall short of ideals mentioned by Weber. In fact, bureaucracy produces a number of unintended consequences or dysfunctions. Thus, the bureaucratic model has been criticized on a number of grounds. It has been characterized as 'machine theory' and a closed system model due to its over-concerns with the formal structure of the organization and neglecting the environmental factors. Critics claim that it is rigid, static, and inflexible. An early critic, Robert Merton (1949: 365), argues that strict adherence to rules can become an end in itself, resulting in 'goal displacement'. This process in turn produces bureaucratic rigidity, red tape, and resistance to change. Bureaucratic procedures cause inordinate delay and frustration. By encouraging conformity to rules and regulations, bureaucracies leave nothing for original or innovative behaviour. Thus, Michel Crozier describes bureaucracy as a rigid 'organization that cannot correct its behavior by learning from its errors'. Weber's theory is characterized by anti-humanist overtones. He gives little attention to the interest, prejudices, and fears of an individual as a social being. It is, therefore, insufficient as a description of the actual functioning of organization. Bureaucracy is also criticized as an essentially self-seeking institution. It develops a tendency to become an interest group itself and places its own interest at the centre of things. Robert Presthus observes that Weber's model is not suitable for developing countries as it is a product of Western culture. The developing countries require a flexible, imaginative outlook to achieve quickly their socioeconomic development. But the Weberian rule-bound rigid bureaucratic system is found to be incompatible with the many-faceted complex tasks. Bureaucratic obsession with rules engenders inability to cope with the changing conditions in the developing nations.

Weber was quite alive to the problem of bureaucratic expansion or what he called bureaucratization. Though this was a rather neglected area in his study, he had mentioned a few defence mechanisms of sort to withstand bureaucracy, namely, collegiality, the separation of powers, direct democracy, and representation. Weber considered *collegiality* as the most powerful weapon of restraining

bureaucracy. Collegiality as a concept is sought to counter the bureaucratic monopoly by collective decision-making. *Separation of power* has been considered as the most tried and tested antidote of absolutism in any form, ever since it was propounded by Montesquieu. Weber also sought to check the bureaucracy by introducing the separation of power in dividing the responsibilities for the same functions. *Direct democracy* was another mechanism for Weber to contain the bureaucratic authoritarianism. Finally, Weber views *representation* as the most effective technique of keeping bureaucracy under check (Albrow 1970).

Thus, despite a number of shortcomings, Weber could be credited for the beginning of a systematic study of bureaucratic organization. It has helped to develop professionalism in administration by avoiding favouritism and nepotism. It has assured the rational attainment of the goals of an organization. The permanent character of bureaucratic model is very relevant to developing countries. While the political master may be changed frequently, bureaucracy continues to rule. Though bureaucracy has earned a nick name for red tapism, nepotism, and corruption, but at the same time no state in the world so far has been in a position to dispense with bureaucracy, which in itself speaks about its utility. If Wilson is the pioneer of the discipline, Max Weber is its first theoretician who provided the discipline with a solid theoretical base. His 'ideal' type of bureaucracy continues to remain fundamental in any conceptualization of organization.

Instrumentalist Theory by Karl Marx

The instrumentalist theory of bureaucracy is largely attributed to Karl Marx and his metanarratives of revolutionary social change. However, Marx had no intention to present a systematic exposition on bureaucracy. His theory of bureaucracy should be read in his overall schematic framework of social change. He had identified bureaucracy as an appendage of the ruling class, which had worked in tandem with the state to perpetuate the existing rule. Citing the example of French bureaucracy during the revolution of 1789, he had shown how bureaucracy had facilitated the ruling

bourgeois class. Bureaucracy, as viewed by Marx, is often acted as a buffer which absorbs shocks that might hit the state. Therefore, as a true scientist of social change he had identified the crucial importance of bureaucracy in sustaining the status quo and prescribed the simultaneous abolition of bureaucracy and the state.

Marx, unlike Weber, never attempted a full-length discourse on bureaucracy or public administration. His interests were largely peripheral in the sense that he dealt with public administration only as complementary to capitalism. Yet, his ideas are profound in two respects: (*a*) while elaborating his argument concerning the rise and decline of capitalism, he was more and more engaged in the real momentum of developed capitalism, as evidenced in the struggle between those upholding capitalism and those who are opposed to it. In this process, bureaucracy had no choice but to act formally as an appendage to the system of production contributing to the division of the classes and (*b*) by identifying the institutional roots of bureaucracy, Marx provided a contextual explanation of public administration contrary to the Weberian universal model of administration. Bureaucracy is 'rational', provided it is conceptualized within a socioeconomic format. There cannot, therefore, be a meaningful universal design. This is where Marx stands out as a creative theoretician of public administration, which is not merely a structure, but is ideological in the sense of its behaviour, specific to the socioeconomic and political milieu within which it is located (Chakrabarty 2007: 25).

Functionalist Theory by Robert Merton

Written basically as a critique of Weberian ideal-type bureaucracy, Robert Merton brings about his theory of bureaucracy from the functionalist perspective. In an article entitled 'Bureaucratic Structure and Personality' Merton asserts that emphasis on precision and reliability in administration may prove to be counter-productive as the rules, which have been designed as means to ends, may well become ends in themselves. Moreover, with excessive dependence on hierarchy, impersonality, and so on, bureaucracy as a career service will degenerate into a dysfunctional organization.

Public Choice Theory

The public choice theory is generally understood as the application of economics to the study of political processes and institutions. Methodologically, public choice theory is based on a couple of elements: (*a*) methodological individualism and (*b*) rational choice. It draws its ideological support from the New Right philosophy. The New Right is a group of thinkers who believe in a range of ideologies which seek to promote, among others, free market, anti-welfarist, libertarian, and sometimes socially authoritarian (conservative) policies (Jary and Jary 2000). With its explicit market bias, the public choice theory seeks to dispense with public bureaucracies as it has an uncanny tendency of oversupply and over expenditure.

The above reservations against public bureaucracy are crystallized around a number of areas.

Oversupply

The public choice theorists castigate public bureaucracy for its inherent tendency to oversupply. Bureaucracy as a self-aggrandizing institution along with several interest groups has further accentuated the tendency to oversupply.

Budget maximization

Budget maximization is a fairly open-ended process, which has its own logic of augmentation. Bureaucracies, in tandem with political executives, often 'manufacture' work to justify the 'increase' in plan outlay. It is an influential model of analysis in public administration inspired by the public choice theory and rational choice theory, which shows how bureaucrats maximize their personal utility through budgeting. William Niskanen put forward this model in a seminal publication entitled 'Bureaucracy and Representative Government' way back in 1971. It argued 'that rational bureaucrats will always and everywhere seek to increase their budgets in order to increase their own power, thereby contributing strongly to state growth and potentially reducing social efficiency' (Niskanen 1971, 1973).

However, the proponents of public choice do not just feel contented to criticize public bureaucracies. They also come out with a few

suggestions to overcome the problems. These are contracting out/ leasing out, fragmentation of existing bureaucracies, performance-related pay, hiring of consultants, cut on spending, and so on.

- *Contracting out/leasing out*: The New Right thinkers have suggested contracting out as the most efficient technique to bring back efficiency and economy in government bodies, as it sheds the extra bit of flab from the governmental structure. Contracting out governmental programmes and services to private entrepreneurs or service providers through competitive biddings as a cost-effective way of implementing public policies, is gaining huge currency these days. It infuses the spirit of competitiveness among the service providers and thereby improves the standard and quality of services. Moreover, contracting out also challenges the monopoly positions of in-house service providers and as a consequence the restrictive practices of trade unions and professionals can be challenged (Dunleavy 1986).
- *Fragmentation of bureaucracy*: The second institutional reform suggested by them is the fragmentation of existing bureaucracies. The public choice thinkers have opined that bureaucracy has an inherent tendency to expand, no matter what type of bureaucracy it is and where it is located. What is necessary, therefore, is to have several smaller local bodies. This is because, the smaller bodies may encapsulate more homogeneous social groups making it easier for citizen preferences to be met.
- *Performance-related pay*: The public choice theory has also proposed a rigorous performance appraisal system for determining the pay structure for its personnel. Unlike a traditional bureaucratically managed government, where seniority is the basis of promotion and consequent hike in pay packet, the public choice theorists have argued in favour of performance-based pay structure in public bureaucracy. This is because a bureaucratically managed organization gives seniority precedence over performance. In this context, a management theorist Laurence J. Peter has shown

how in a bureaucratically managed organization employees are promoted to their level of incompetence. Peter in his famous 'Peter Principle' shows that in a typical hierarchical organization a competent employee continues to be promoted (on the basis of mere seniority) to the next position, until he arrives at a job beyond his capacity. In other words, observes Peter, every employee rises to the level of incompetence or 'Peter's Plateau' at which his promotion quotient is zero (Peter and Hull 1972).

- *Hiring of consultants*: Another important suggestion put forward by public choice theory is the hiring of consultants. The appointment of consultants, viewed the public choice theorists, will effectively challenge the state bureaucracy, especially its monopoly over information and advice.
- *Cut on spending*: Finally, the public choice theory has advocated major cuts on public spending to counter the tendency of oversupply and overstaffing in public bureaucracies.

Pathological Theory

A group of theorists castigated bureaucratic phenomenon as pathological. The pathological syndrome in bureaucracy has been identified as a typical sickness, common among the governmental organizations that substantially reduce their effectiveness in successfully implementing the policies and programmes. Victor Thompson has explained the nature of the pathological syndrome in bureaucracy or what he called 'bureaupathology' as 'the behaviour pattern of insecure people using their authority to dominate and control others' (DeHoog 2000: 133). Hence, the pathological theory of bureaucracy was born out of popular resentment and antipathy regarding the bureaucratic form of governance. An excerpt from a popular textbook written in the backdrop of the American administrative context appropriately captures the essence of bureaupathology:

> To most Americans, 'bureaucracy' is a fighting word. Few things are more disliked than bureaucracy, few occupations held in lower

esteem than the bureaucrats. Both are subjected to repeated criticism in the press and damned regularly by political soap box orators and ordinary citizens. 'Inefficiency', 'red tape', 'stupidity', 'secrecy', 'smugness', 'aggressiveness', and 'self-interest' are only a few of the emotionally charged words used to castigate bureaucrats. (Stillman II 2005: 50)

Two theories can be identified here, namely, Parkinson's Law and Peter Principle as the pathological manifestation of bureaucracy. Parkinson, in his path-breaking formulation the 'Parkinson Law', has exposed the intricate internal dynamics of bureaucracy. According to him, bureaucracy as a self-maximizing interest group, expands its magnitude via the following laws: first, 'work expands to fill the time available for its completion'; second, 'expenditure rises to meet income'; third, 'the law of triviality'. The first law explains that there is no direct correlation between the amount of work to be done in an organization and the staff actually manning the organization. 'Officials make work for each other' is the logical corollary of the first principle. A question may crop up among concerned minds as to what the bloated bureaucracy does in reality since in most cases it is blown out of proportion. In other words, the second principle explains how bureaucracy rationalizes excess manpower within its organization by 'manufacturing' several organizational paraphernalia. The second law, 'expenditure rises to meet income', in fact, reiterates the long standing New Right objection of budget-maximization against bureaucracy. Parkinson equates the bureaucratic attitude regarding the organizational expenditure with an analogy of a wife's attitude regarding her husband's salary! The analogy used by Parkinson to demonstrate budget maximization tendency in a bureaucratic organization is a typically common domestic phenomenon, where family need is simultaneously increased in tandem with the breadwinner's salary. Hence, according to Parkinson, needs are constructed to fill up the funds available for the purpose. The third law 'the law of triviality' has uncovered another contrivance of bureaucracy to camouflage the huge expenditure from the state coffer. 'The law of triviality' is a commonly used technique, where bureaucrats deliberately belittle the staggering

sums of expenditure and thereby make an impression that the said expenditure is routine.

Another recent theory that addresses the pathological attribute of bureaucracy is the 'Peter Principle'. The term has acquired the notoriety of an organizational system, marked by incompetence and inefficiency. It has come to mean 'any individual or organizational behaviour which is irrational and inefficient, yet supported by the hierarchy' (Paddock 2000: 157). Laurence J. Peter, with reference to a typically hierarchical organization (where the principle of promotion is largely determined by seniority), has shown how incompetence is systematically reified and lauded in his celebrated formulation, the 'Peter Principle'. Peter has come out with this formulation on the basis of his keen observations of the functioning of bureaucracy in different forms of organization. He begins with a hypothesis that in every organization, thanks to the rigid adherence to hierarchy, employees are promoted to their next level of incompetence till they arrive at Peter's plateau', where the promotion quotient is nil.

POST-BUREAUCRATIC THEORY

The post-bureaucratic theory conjures up a metamorphosis of a new organizational reality informed with temporary work systems. The idea was that the contour of organization had undergone a sea change in terms of magnitude, boundary, and mode of operation with the onset of new century. Therefore, the traditional structure of bureaucracy fails to cope with the new organizational reality. Warren Bennis was one of the chief proponents of the post-bureaucratic theory. According to him, the bureaucratic 'machine model', emerged out of the organization's need for order and precision and the worker's demands for impartial treatment during the early days of the Industrial Revolution. For Bennis, bureaucracy, which proved to be a boon for managerial practices to fight odds like nepotism, cruelty, personal subjugation, capricious and subjective judgements, and so on, in the early phase of Industrial Revolution is no longer valid today. Bennis has identified four relevant threats to bureaucracy: rapid and unexpected change;

growth in size where the volume of an organization's traditional activities is not enough to sustain growth; complexity of modern technology where integration between activities and persons of very diverse, highly specialized competence is required; and a psychological threat springing from a change in managerial behaviour (Bennis 1968, quoted in Nigro and Nigro 1983: 187).

Bennis has outlined the contours of future social structures of organizations or what he called 'temporary systems'.

The key word will be 'temporary'. There will be adaptive, rapidly changing temporary systems. These will be task forces organized around problems to be solved by groups of relative strangers with diverse professional skills. The group will be arranged on an organic rather than to programmed role expectations. The executive thus becomes coordinator or 'linking pin' between various task forces. He must be a man who can speak the polyglot jargon of research, with skills to relay information and to mediate between groups. People will be evaluated not according to rank but according to skill and professional training. Organizational charts will consist of project groups rather than stratified functional groups— adaptive, problem-solving temporary systems of diverse specialists, linked together by coordinating and task evaluating executive specialists in an organic flux; this is the organization form that will gradually replace bureaucracy as we know it. Organizational arrangements of this sort may not only reduce the inter-group conflicts mentioned earlier; they may also induce honest-to-goodness creative collaboration (abridged version of Bennis's *Beyond Bureaucracy* reproduced in Nigro and Nigro 1983: 197).

GANDHI'S MODEL OF OCEANIC CIRCLE

Gandhi's contribution to the human civilization is articulated in his alternative 'visions' particularly of the 'nation' and 'state'. While challenging many forms of 'domination, whether ancient or modern, in the subcontinent', he developed a comprehensive theory that transcends national boundaries about the basic contours of 'a good society' and the importance of 'non-violence'. Drawing upon 'ethnicity', 'religion', and other India-specific socioeconomic characteristics, the

Mahatma sought to articulate a distinctive 'cultural' vision of nationhood which is a powerful critique of urban-industrial civilization. The model which he sought to develop is based on an interrogation of history and contestations of assumptions about modernity, modernization, and the nation state. Refusing to accept the definitional catholicity of these ideas due to their West-centric intellectual roots, Gandhi, as an activist–theoretician, sought to redefine them, both in ideological terms and in the domain of praxis, by constantly problematizing what is often thought to be settled today. The ideas that Gandhi nurtured in his battle for freedom clearly identify a definite domain of nationalist thought, which, though different, had its root in post-Enlightenment philosophy of nationalism. Given the public nature of *harijan*, the views that Gandhi expressed, were carefully drafted and the Mahatma therefore appeared to be less ambiguous here than anywhere else. Seeking to integrate what was worth salvaging in modern civilization within the framework of Indian civilization, Gandhi went beyond the conventional approach to 'nationalist' thought where the so-called Indian vision was always uncritically glorified to champion 'a sectarian' political thought. As shown, *Hind Swaraj* is Gandhi's creative response to the theoretical basis of Western civilization. Drawn on the civilizational resources of Hindu religion and its traditions, he put forward a new theoretical framework to conceptualize both colonialism and industrial capitalism. Perhaps the most controversial Gandhian economic formulation was his theory of trusteeship which he developed as a counter to the both capitalism and socialism. The thesis drew on the assumption that the capitalists would hold their wealth as trustees for the service of society. Trusteeship was thus viewed as a 'moral compact' between the wealthy and society at large. The thesis provoked vehement critique. But, in the context of globalized capitalism when the command economy in retreat, Gandhi's trusteeship seems to have raised a relevant question by underling the need for a moral and ethical basis for business.

Gandhi was a revolutionary offering a radical critique of the oppressive and unjust status quo. His definition of violence was not restricted to physical violence. He spoke about structural violence and violence of the status quo that is hardly recognized on the surface. Several designs for 'affirmative action' either in developed or

developing countries seem to have been drawn on this Gandhian assumption. The Gandhian welfare design underlining 'distributive justice' is at the core of the Part IV of the Constitution of India, entitled 'Directive Principles of State Policy', which, for instance, has been significantly influencial in some of the major policy shifts that have taken place in contemporary India. Furthermore, Gandhi's notion of democratic decentralization is both a critique of bureaucracy and a device of participative governance. By according constitutional guarantee to grassroots democracy or Panchayati Raj, as Gandhi described, the Indian policy-makers put into practice the Gandhian formula.

Like Karl Marx, Mahatma Gandhi also put forward a model of public administration which was qualitatively different from the Weberian 'ideal form of organization'. Before sketching Gandhi's contribution to public administration, three points are in order at the outset: (*a*) Gandhi was a complete misfit in this scheme for he neither talked about administration nor believed in its ability to bring about administration. His position is close to that of the anarchist in the sense that state, being regulatory, is not a necessary instrument for individual well-being; (*b*) he was also critical of positivist rationalism for a single model of development, for each society has its exclusively own track record. He was, thus, opposed to the tendency to shape all societies in a single mould; (*c*) Gandhi's purpose was to mobilize new segments of Indian society and to make such participation meaningful as well as lend a perspective to the movement. He, thus, developed a large variety of social and economic programmes which were designed for instantaneous appeal to peasants, artisans, craftsmen, and *harijan*s, in short, every group of society.

It is true that Mahatma Gandhi did not provide a theoretical model of public administration. But, one can draw out his ideas from his writings on human life as such. In an interview to the press in 1946, he, for instance, clearly spelt out his vision for a society by saying:

Life will not be a pyramid with the apex sustained by the bottom. But it will be an oceanic circle whose centre will be the individuals

always ready for the village, the latter ready to perish for the circle of villages, till at last the whole becomes one life composed of individuals, never aggressive in their arrogance but even humble, sharing the majesty of the oceanic circle of which they are integral units.

Mahatma Gandhi was deeply uneasy with the modern state. For him, a society based on *swaraj*, 'true democracy' or non-violence was the only morally acceptable alternative to the modern state. According to him, the *swaraj*-based polity would be composed of small, cultured, well-organized, thoroughly regenerated, and self-governing village communities; elected by these communities, a small body of people would administer justice, maintain order, and take important economic decisions and would thus be not merely administrative and powerful economic and political units. As such, they would have a strong sense of solidarity, provide a genuine sense of community, and act as nurseries of civic virtues.

A perusal of Gandhi's writings also underlines that Mahatma did not comment on bureaucracy per se, but he provided a blueprint of public administration that was appropriate to India. To a large extent, his views were historically conditioned. His critique of modern state was, for obvious reasons, informed by his day-to-day confrontation with the ruthless colonial state under the Raj. His preference for community-based governance is powerful design to translate democratic decentralization into reality. Gandhi's notion of democratic decentralization is both a critique of bureaucracy and a device of participative governance. By according constitutional guarantee to grassroots democracy or Panchayati Raj, as Gandhi described, the Indian policy-makers put into practice the Gandhian formula. Last and not the least, Gandhi's emphasis on *dharma* in governance, seeking to redefine bureaucracy, seems to have articulated a modern concern that remains at the core administrative innovations—with focus on reinventing government, or downsizing bureaucracy—in contemporary world.

THE HUMAN RELATIONS THEORY

The human relations theory, gives primacy to the human factor over institutional factors as popularized by the traditional

schools of public administration. As the name suggests, it is a path-breaking theory in the discipline of public administration, which views organization as a social system by elevating human behaviour as the basic unit of analysis. The employees in human relations theory are treated as human beings, rather than mere human appendage of machinery or work hands. The theory is based on a simple premise that the 'human problem requires a human solution', since, happier workers are the secret to a successful organization. The proponents of this theory have shown that in public organization, attempts have been made to solve human problems with non-human data. Unlike the traditional approach, which glorifies 'Economic Man', the human relations theory enthrones the 'Social Man'. This theory underscores four key elements of organization, which the classical theorists seem to have overlooked. These are: (*a*) organization is to be viewed as a social system; (*b*) workers are human beings with all humanly attributes; (*c*) informal elements also play an important role in the overall organizational output; and (*d*) organization has a social ethics, instead of individual ethics.

Elton Mayo is considered to be the father of human relations theory. As a professor of industrial research at the Graduate School of Business Administration at Harvard University, Mayo had conducted a number of landmark researches including the famous Hawthorne studies. Originally trained as a graduate in medicine, Mayo subsequently switched over to psychology and philosophy. His training in medicine, psychology, and philosophy had helped him grasp industrial relations in a more comprehensive manner. In fact, he was also instrumental in initiating the study of industrial sociology. His major works include *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization* (1933), *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization* (1945), and *The Political Problem of Industrial Civilization* (1947).

The Hawthorne Experiments

Origin of human relations theory can be traced back to Hawthorne experiments. The startling findings in the said experiments have

ushered in a new vista in the organization theory, subsequently known as human relations theory. The Hawthorne plant of Western Electrical Company at Chicago was one of the progressive firms in the US, which enjoyed a unique distinction in terms of better wages, liberal working hours, and cordial employer–employee relationships. But from early 1920s, the firm had been grappling with a unique problem of moderate productivity. Despite the liberal incentives and better working environment, the firm had to content with a modest growth rate. The management of the firm had tried all the possible remedies prescribed by the scientific management theory and the classical organization theory to get rid of the situation, but with no avail. Under the circumstances, the management of the company had approached Elton Mayo and his associates of Harvard Business School to find a solution of the problem. The Harvard Business School took the responsibility in the late 1920s and early 1930s and began a series of experiments over a couple of years. Among those experiments the notable were the Great Illumination Experiment (1924–27), the Human Attitudes and Sentiments (1928–31), the Bank Writing Experiment (1931–32).

The great illumination experiment

This experiment intends to assess the impact of the work environment on industrial output. In the said experiment, two groups of female workers, who were engaged in assembling telephone relays, were selected among the workers and placed into two different test rooms to see the above correlations. The experiment continued over a period of one-and-a-half years, where different elements of physical working conditions like levels of illumination, room temperature, humidity, wage payments, working hours, rest periods, and so on, were deliberately altered to evaluate their impact on the productivity per se. Quite to the contrary of what was expected, the female groups under study behaved quite unpredictably, proving the popular hypothesis as wrong. Instead of responding favourably or unfavourably to the incentive schemes and physical work environment or their removals, the groups kept a steady growth rate and remained a puzzle for the researchers. This particular experiment, as the research team claimed,

had discarded the typical incentive-driven growth hypothesis of the scientific management theory.

The human attitudes and sentiments

In another study conducted from 1928 to 1931, Mayo and his team started a study of human attitudes and sentiments. The workers were asked to express freely their likes and dislikes about their working conditions and the policies of the management. After interviewing more than 21,000 workers, the team concluded that the workers appreciated the method of collecting the information on the problems of the company from them. They realized that they were allowed to express their views freely and thought they had valuable comments to offer. The research team also realized that they had acquired new skills in understanding and dealing with their fellow beings. It was felt that in the absence of proper appreciation of the feelings and sentiments of the workers, it was difficult to understand their real problems, personal feelings, and sentiments derived from both an employee's personal history and his social situation at work. Overall the study of human attitudes and sentiments helped both workers as well as the management.

The bank wiring experiment

This particular experiment uncovers a startling element of underlying group psychology, which influences overall industrial productivity. This experiment, as the name suggested, involved a group of male workers, who were assigned to do a wiring job, which also included the job of soldering and fixing the terminals. Wages were paid on the basis of a group incentive plan and each member got his share on the basis of the total output of the group. Following Taylor's assumption of a scientific management, it was expected that the workers would react positively to the economic incentives and increase the production. Instead, the workers had refused to act like the Economic Men and agreed among themselves to keep the production to a moderate level. Such behavioural pattern among the workers was directly attributed to a deep-seated distrust against the management. The workers had an opinion that too much increase or decrease in

production might cost their jobs. Investigating further, the researchers discovered that the workers were members of a small, closely knit group, governed by a code that rejected the 'rate-buster' (who does too much work), the 'chiseler' (who does too little), and the 'squealer' (who communicates detrimental information about others to the supervisor).

The Crux of the Human Relations Theory

The essence of the human relations theory can be summarized as follows. First, the human relation theory, unlike the machine model of organization, views organization in its holistic social perspective. Second, in human relations theory, workers are being treated as human beings with all humanly attributes. Instead of viewing workers as homogenous cogs in the machine, human relations theory put emphasis on the uniqueness of each worker. The human relations theory believes that each worker carries with him his culture, attitude, belief, and way of life. Therefore, the industry must take proper cognizance of such sociocultural aspects of a worker while hiring an employee. Third, another important attribute of human relations theory is the identification of informal groups, which play a huge role in the overall organizational output. Unlike the exclusive structural bias of the classical organization theory, the human relations theory for the first time has identified the impact of informal groups on motivation and productivity. Fourth, the human relation theory lays emphasis on social ethics, instead of individual ethics. Responding to the changing environment, the human relations theory, unlike the individual ethics popularized by Taylorism, was insisting upon a social ethics based on 'human collaboration and social solidarity' (Nigro and Nigro 1983). Finally, the human relations theory in effect has engendered a new form of management, that is, the participative management.

Chester I. Barnard's theory of organization

Barnard is another important exponent of human relations theory. Barnard's ideas on organization were basically culled from his vast personal experience as a practising executive of the telephone

major, AT&T. Hailing from a practical world of organization, Barnard has presented a more systematic and nuanced exposition of organization by nicely synthesizing theory and practice. To him organization is an organic and evolving social system. Managing organization had remained the utmost priority for him. His magnum opus, *The Functions of Executive* bears an indelible mark of his practical wisdom of organizational functioning. Written in the backdrop of a tumultuous America of 1920s and 1930s, it carries an undeniable concern of the business corporations as to how organizations would withstand the challenges thrown open by the events like Great Depression and the New Deal. Bernard's organization theory was more a prescription for the executives, than a theory per se. The major features of Barnard's theory of organization can be enumerated as follows:

- *Organization as a cooperative system*: Barnard viewed the organization as a cooperative system. Its underlying premise is that the inherent limitations of individual—both social and physical—to manage his/her own affair, demands cooperation. Therefore, cooperation forms the heart of any organization.
- *Formal and informal organization*: He laid equal importance to both formal and informal organizations. Being at the helm of a formal organization, Barnard unlike other executives did not lose sight of the importance of informal organization. On the contrary, he believed in the apparent complementarity between formal and informal organizations. Hence, as a true participant observer of organizational functioning, he wanted an organization to have proper balance between its formal and informal structures.
- *Consent theory of authority*: Another important contribution of Barnard is the consent theory of authority or accepted authority. Unlike the traditional conception of authority in organization, Barnard had introduced a consent theory of authority, where he had identified 'acceptance' or 'consent' as the basis of authority. According to him, the effectiveness of authority in an organization is determined by the willingness

of the subordinates to carry forward the order. Barnard had identified four essential preconditions behind the acceptance of authority, namely, intelligibility, conformity to the purpose of the organization, compatibility with personal interests, and physical and mental ability to comply. Barnard has opined that it is the onus of the executive to make sure that only such orders are issued which are acceptable. To facilitate the authority to be acceptable to whom it is directed, Barnard had introduced the concept of 'zone of indifference', which implies a situation of unconditional acceptance of authority. However, such situation is not fixed; it changes in accordance with the situation. It is the functions of the executives to identify the zone of indifference by arranging proper inducement package.

- *Inducement–Contribution balance*: Another important hall-mark of Barnard's theory of organization is the equilibrium between contribution and satisfaction. Barnard was mindful of the hiatus between one's contribution in an organization in terms of labour and the satisfaction level generally calcu-lated in terms of inducements or incentives and prescribed equilibrium between these two.
- *Moral responsibility*: Barnard has also reminded the execu-tives of their moral responsibilities. For a smooth function-ing of organization, Barnard calls for moral standing of the executive.
- *Communication*: The necessity of smooth and uninterrupted communication figures prominently in the writings of Bar-nard. The success of his idea of cooperative system is contin-gent upon the nature of communication network.

Barnard's writings have also been a source of some controversy. Andrews's comment is that Barnard's work lacks abstractness of presentation, the paucity and pedestrian quality of examples (Barnard 1938: 263). Barker also laments when he finds absence of practical examples in Barnard's works (Barnard 1938: 15). Similarly, there is a lack of clarity about executive leadership and his definition of authority. Notwithstanding these few criticisms,

Barnard is considered to be an outstanding theorist of modern administrative thought. His publication, *The Functions of the Executive* (1938), still stands as an outstanding classic in the field of administration.

A Critique of the Human Relations Theory

Indeed, the human relations theory brings in a refreshingly new perspective in organization theory by acknowledging the importance of workers in their respective sociocultural milieu. However, it has been subject to severe criticism. Before we get into the detail of those criticisms, Urwick's comment on the human relations theory deserves some space here.

> [T]he idea that organization should be built up around and adjusted to individual idiosyncrasies, rather than that individual should be adapted to the requirements of sound principles of organization, is as foolish as attempting to design an engine to accord the whimsies of one's maiden aunt rather than with the laws of mechanical science. (Urwick, quoted in Nigro 1965: 93)

The above statement captures the apparent disillusionment regarding the human elements of administration. The major criticisms against the human relations theory can be crystallized as follows:

- First, critics argue that human relations theory was based on a wrong and simplistic assumption of organization. Relationists often claim that any problem of organization can be solved by adept utilization of human relations skills.
- Second, a few commentators even have gone a step further saying that Hawthorne findings was conducive to many managers (Nigro 1965: 95). Even some analysts based on contextual analysis, have traced the severe shortage of labour behind the emergence of the human relations movement. According to them, the human relations movement was brought into being to meet the growing demands of labour during and after the Second World War (Arora 1979).

- Third, the human relations theory is also criticized for its 'vagueness, psychological jargon, distortion of the organizational environment, and unwillingness to distinguish the administrative aspects' (Caiden 1971: 225).
- Finally, the human relations theory is also accused of overemphasizing the human element of organization at the cost of basic structural element.

Despite the above criticisms, the contribution of the human relations approach to the organization theory cannot be neglected. It revealed the fact that positive social environment influenced worker's productivity. It paved the way for adequate communication system between the lower rungs of the organization and the higher levels. It also highlighted the importance of a manager's style and therefore revolutionized management training programmes. The significance of the Hawthorne experiments in discovering the 'informal organization' cannot be neglected. By stressing social needs and importance of the human side of the enterprise, the human relationists improved on the classical theory of organization.

DECISION-MAKING THEORY

Though this approach is generally associated with the pioneering contribution of Herbert Simon; three other approaches of decision-making, namely, the bargaining approach, the participative approach, and public choice approach can also be identified within its fold. In this sub-unit, we will attempt to cover other three approaches of decision-making along with the most celebrated one of Simon.

The decision-making approach usually equates administration with decision-making. Decisions are made at every stage of the organization and are considered as fundamental steps in the process of policy formulation. However, decision-making is neither a single-shot job nor a single person's task, it involves a series of steps including feedback and follow-up actions and obviously multiple actors. Interestingly, there is no 'the' decision-making approach

either, as it is often so equated with Herbert Simon's rational decision-making approach. In fact, there are other approaches as well pertaining to decision-making, spawned in the wake of Simon's path-breaking analysis of rational decision-making.

Decision-making Process

Decision-making is a complex process involving several steps. They can be sequenced in the following manner:

Step-I: Identification of or locating the problem.

Step-II: Getting related information and data and figuring out tentative options.

Step-III: Weighing the tentative steps by seeking opinion of the subordinates.

Step-IV: Zeroing in on a particular option.

Step-V: Evaluate the efficacy of the decision reached at.

Step-VI: Getting the feedback and make necessary modification if situation so demands.

Hence, decision-making is no one-shot job of the chief executive or seasoned mandarin. It requires among others a total teamwork starting right from the chief executive down to the personnel stationed at the ground level. If we elaborate the above sequence a little bit in an actual organizational setting, the complexity of decision-making can be better understood. In a real organizational setting, the identification or locating the problem area is considered to be the first important step of decision-making. It depends upon the sagacity and administrative efficiency of the administrator or the officer-in-charge. However, the identification of the problem is not the end in itself. The administrator requires adequate information, view points, statistics, and so on, relating to that problem to contemplate on it. It is generally the staff agency in an organization that feeds all the relevant information to the executive. And on the basis of the information accrued from the staff agency, the administrator starts figuring out viable options to remedy the problem and seeks the opinions of the subordinate

staff to weigh the tentative step. Finally, he settles down to a particular option. Decision-making, however, does not end with reaching out to a particular decision. It also includes feedback and follow-up actions if necessary.

Simon's rational decision-making approach

Decision-making approach is popularly associated with Herbert Simon, who has introduced the rational decision-making approach in organization theory. Simon views organization as a structure concerned solely with decision-making. According to him, decision-making is not a specific task of a particular part of an organization; rather decisions are made at every level of organization. With an objective of ensuring that decision-making is more effective and scientific, Simon tried to uncover the complicated inner dynamic of a decision in order to see how multiplicity of value premises determines the ultimate decision-making. In this context, Simon has identified a whole lot of value premises that colour the decision-making process, namely, decision-makers' preferences, social conditioning, and so on. Simon breaks up decision-making process into three phases, namely, intelligence activity, design activity, and choice activity. By intelligence, Simon referred to those activities by which one scans the environment and identifies occasions to make a decision; by design, he referred to finding or developing alternative options; and by choice, he referred to finding or developing alternative courses of action from those available options. Of course, in real life, Simon acknowledged, these phases are not distinct, however, for analytical purposes, they seem to constitute the basic elements of decision-making (Denhardt 2008: 78).

Hence, to Simon, decision-making involves choice between alternative plan of actions, and the choice in turn, involves logical coordination between fact and value propositions. Thus, Simon's decision-making approach has another redeeming feature, that is, the rationality criteria. Simon has been pretty much alive to the problem of setting lofty targets in decision-making, which he views, are in most cases remain unattainable and romantic at best. Hence, he has prescribed a moderate level of rationality (bounded rationality) based on a practical level of satisfaction. Hence, the

major component of Simon's decision-making approach can be identified as follows:

- *Fact–Value proposition in decision-making:* Simon views that decision-making in an organization is based on proper coordination between fact and value proposition. Every decision involves a combination of a fair amount of fact and value proposition.
- *Rationality criteria in decision-making:* Another important hallmark of Simon's decision-making approach is the rationality criteria. However, Simon did not use the rationality criteria in the economic sense of the term. In fact, he ruled out the possibility of absolute rationality in administrative decision-making. He explains rationality in terms of the means–end construct. Simon has differentiated between different types of rationality. Simon views that total rationality in an administrative situation is almost impossible. Hence, he calls for a moderate level of rationality or 'bounded rationality', based on a point of 'satisfycing'. The term satisfycing was coined by Simon for the first time to explain the moderate or satisfactory state of mind of an administrator, consists of two words—satisfactory and sufficing. Therefore, for Simon a decision-maker is more a 'satisfying man' than a 'maximizing' man (Arora 2007). Nothing could capture the essence of Simon's satisfycing better than his own words:

> [W]hile Economic man maximizes, selects the best alternatives from among all those available to him-his cousin, whom we shall call administrative man, satisfices-looks for a course of action that is satisfactory or good enough. (Simon, quoted in Nigro 1965/1971: 183)

Simon's efforts to construct a value-free science of administration have been criticized by Selznick on the ground that it encourages the divorce of means and ends (Selznick 1957: 79–82). Simon's concept of rationality is also criticized by Argyris for not recognizing

the role of intuition, tradition, and faith in decision-making. Argysis feels that Simon's theory focuses on status quo ante. It uses satisfying to rationalize incompetence (Argyris 1973: 255). A critique has remarked that the notion of rationality only serves the purpose of rationalizing the capitalist immorality. In spite of these criticism, Simon's contributions are undoubtedly a major breakthrough in the evolution of administrative theory. His model has greatly encouraged the need for the use of various management techniques in public–policy-making, and policy science has received the initial impulse from his formulation.

The bargaining approach

The bargaining approach of decision-making suggests that conflicts are the rules in decision-making, which cannot be resolved by rational analysis. It calls for 'partisan mutual adjustments'—the pulling and hauling among decision-makers offers the best hope for best decisions (Bhattacharaya 1999). Charles E. Lindblom has argued that decision-making is essentially value-laden and conflict prone. Lindblom, a Yale economist and a profound scholar of public policy issues, has presented a refreshingly new conceptual perspective of governmental decision-making in a seminal essay entitled 'The Science of Muddling through' (Lindblom 1959).

Drawing heavily on Chester Barnard and Herbert Simon, Lindblom has come out with his thesis of decision-making. According to Lindblom there are two separate varieties of decision-making, namely, the rational-comprehensive or root method and the successive limited comparisons or branch method, of which the second method is closer to administrative reality. In the rational and comprehensive or root method, a decision-maker in order to attain a given objective puts all the relevant values in a rational manner. Then he formulates several alternatives, of which the best option is chosen in accordance with values earmarked before. Despite being rational and comprehensive, Lindblom concentrates on the second method, which he thought, is the heart of actual administrative decision-making. Lindblom views that in actual practice the so-called rational values are compromised and only those values are chosen which are immediately relevant. Moreover, in selecting appropriate course of action, administrators outline not a broad

range of possibilities, but only a few incremental steps that experience tells them are feasible. Public administrators pragmatically select from among the immediate choices at hand the most suitable compromise that satisfies the groups and individuals concerned with the programme. To Lindblom the reality of administrative decision-making contains the following attributes: First, it is incremental in nature. This means that administrative decisions are not reached in a single go, but through small and calibrated steps. Second, it is always incomprehensive. This means that administrators cannot take into account the whole range of options available at their disposal. Third, the branch technique of decision-making involves successive comparisons because policy is never made once and for all, but is made and remade endlessly through small chains of comparisons between narrow choices. Fourth, in practice, decision-making suffices rather than maximizes from among the available options. Fifth, it rests on a pluralist conception of the public sector, in which many contending interest groups compete for influence over policy issues, continually forcing the administrator, as the person in the middle, to secure agreement among the competing parties. The political art of compromise, thus, becomes a major part of decision-making methods (Stillman II 2005).

Participative decision-making approach

This approach constitutes the heart of political democracy. It advocates participation of general people, who are going to be affected by those decisions. Participative decision-making is most effective where a large number of stakeholders are involved and all from different walks of life, coming together to make a decision which benefits everyone. Some such examples are decisions for the environment, health care, anti-animal cruelty, and other similar situations. In this case, everyone can be involved, from experts, NGOs, government agencies, to volunteers, and members of public. When employees participate in the decision-making process, they improve understanding and perceptions among colleagues and superiors, and enhance personnel value in the organization. Participatory decision-making by the top management team (TMT) 'ensures the completeness of decision-making and increases team members' commitment to final decisions' (Ling

et al., quoted in Carmelli, Sheaffer, and Halevi 2009: 697). In a participative decision-making process, each team member has an opportunity to share their perspectives, voice their ideas, and tap their skills to improve team effectiveness. As each member can relate to the team decisions, there is a better chance of their achieving the results. There is a positive relationship between decision effectiveness and organizational performance. Thus, the better the effectiveness, the better the performance. When everyone in an organization participates in the decision-making process, organizational communication is much more effective and everyone produces more efficient results.

Public choice approach

The basic assumption of public choice approach is that human being is by nature 'rational utility maximizer', always striving for self-interest. Based on this assumption, public choice approach to decision-making has shown that bureaucrats are the utility maximizers, who have deliberately increased the size of the government for their self-interest. The public choice approach to decision-making, on the contrary, calls for a transfer of governmental duties to the private sector. It advocates privatization and reduction of the inefficient governmental sector.

Common errors in decision-making

The decision-making process, though deliberate, is not completely free of error. It involves several common errors, which have often impaired the process of decision-making. Nigro has identified five such errors. These are (*a*) cognitive nearsightedness, (*b*) oversimplification, (*c*) over-reliance on one's own experience, (*d*) preconceived notions, and (*e*) reluctance to decide.

1. *Cognitive nearsightedness*: This refers to an inherent human tendency to skirt crisis with the satisfaction of immediate goals. Human beings are always courting comfort with some short-term benefits. To get over this problem of decision-making, an organization requires to ensure better coordination among the officials, stationed at different levels of organization. Once coordination is established, officials

would stop justifying their short-term measures and look at the organization from a holistic perspective.

2. *Oversimplification*: The oversimplification is another common fallacy of decision-making. Decision-makers often oversimplify the administrative reality to arrive at comfortable decisions. Such attempts on the part of decision-makers have negative repercussions for the administration as well.

3. *Over-reliance on one's experience*: This is perhaps most common problem of decision-making where administrators rely more on personal experience and judgment than on organizational goals.

4. *Preconceived notions*: Sometimes, the decision-making process is also hampered by the preconceived notions of the decision-makers. There are situations in organizational decision-making, where administrators prejudge a situation by dint of some dominant social constructions, stereotypes, and prejudices and thereby arrive at a 'coloured' decision.

5. *Reluctance to decide*: This inherent human tendency also poses a huge challenge for decision-making. Chester Barnard has acknowledged this human tendency as the 'natural reluctance to decide' (Barnard 1956). This 'natural reluctance to decide' is often associated with a tendency of evading the responsibility and passing the same to others, which is commonly known as 'passing the buck' in the US (Nigro and Nigro 1983). Dahl and Lindblom have made this tendency further explicit in the following words: 'Reluctance to render a decision combined with an effort to push the decision on to someone else—what Americans call "passing the buck"— is also inherent in bureaucratic structures' (Dahl and Lindblom, quoted in Nigro 1965, 1971).

FRED RIGGS' ECOLOGICAL APPROACH

F.W. Riggs is a contemporary theorist in the fields of political development and comparative public administration who has been primarily interested in conceptualizing on the interactions between administrative systems and their environment. He has particularly

studied the differences in social, cultural, historical, or political environment and their effect on administration. He has also studied as to how an administrative system affects the society of which it is a part. This interaction of the environment with administration has been termed by him as 'ecology' of administration. His views on ecological approach are found in his books *The Ecology of Public Administration* (1961) and *Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society* (1964).

Riggs developed the first model in 1956 by classifying societies into agrarian societies and industrial societies. In 1957, he developed an equilibrium model named 'transitia' which represents the transforming societies. Because of the criticism and limitations, Riggs developed another set of models, to analyse the administrative systems in developing countries, that is, the Fused, Prismatic, and Diffracted model. They represent underdeveloped, developing, and developed societies, respectively. Riggs' primary interest has been to illuminate administrative problems in developing societies.

Prismatic Model

Although Riggs has given the three ideal typical categories, yet his attention has focused on the social structures of prismatic society and their interactions with the administrative sub-system in a society. The intermediate society between two extremes—fused and diffracted—is called a prismatic society. According to Riggs, the prismatic society has three important characteristics features, namely:

1. *Heterogeneity*: *A prismatic s*ociety is characterized by a high degree of 'heterogeneity' which refers to the simultaneous side-by-side presence of quite different kinds of systems, practices, and viewpoints. There is a co-existence of modern administrative structure in urban areas and traditional administrative set-ups in rural areas.
2. *Formalism*: *A prismat*ic society is characterized by a high degree of formalism which refers to the degree of difference

between the formally prescribed and effectively practised norms and realities. Because of formalism, the actual behaviour of the sala officials will be at variance with what laws and regulations laid down. Thus, formalism often results in official corruption.

3. *Overlapping*: *Overlapping* refers to the extent to which differentiated structures of diffracted society co-exist with undifferentiated structures of a fused type. In a prismatic society, although modern social structures are created, in essence the old or undifferentiated structures continue to dominate the social system. Thus, in reality the new structures are paid only lip-sympathy and are overlooked widely in favour of traditional structures. Overlapping has severed important dimensions such as (*a*) nepotism and favouritism, (*b*) poly-communalism (hostile interaction among diverse groups), and (*c*) the existence of elects (interest group having communal membership).

Prismatic sala model

Prismatic society is characterized by various social, economic, political, and administrative sub-systems. Riggs called the administrative sub-system 'sala model'. In a prismatic society, family welfare, nepotism, and favouritism play a significant role in the making of appointments to various administrative positions and in the performance of certain administrative functions. In a prismatic society, apart from the superimposition of new formal structures on family and kinship, it disregards the universalization of law. The 'sala' officer gives priority to personal increase in power and wealth rather than social welfare.

Further, the poly-communalism also creates certain administrative problems. Theoretically speaking, the government officers have to implement the laws impartially. But a government official may be found to be more loyal to the members of his own community than to the government. As a result, a dominant minority community may gain a high proportion of representation in the matter of recruitment, thereby creating dissatisfaction among

the larger number of people. The elect, that is, the pressure group maintains close links with a particular group and functions primarily in interest and pays lip-service to achievement and universalistic norms.

As a result of overlapping of the formal and the 'effective' standard of conduct, the prismatic society's social interactions are characterized by a lack of consensus on the norms of behaviour. Sala officials may enter service by virtue of higher educational qualifications or through success in competitive exams but in respect of their promotion and career development, they depend largely on ascriptive ties and also on the basis of seniority or on the influence of senior officers. The power structure consists of a highly centralized and concentrated authority structure overlapping control system that is highly localized and dispersed.

Riggs has termed the prismatic society an unbalanced polity in which bureaucrats dominate the politico-administrative system, due to the weak political system. As a result, the sala officials play a more dominant role in decision-making. Since the performance of the government depends on the level of output of the sala official, Riggs says that there is a close link between bureaucratic behaviour and administrative output—the more powerful a bureaucrat is, the less effective he is an administrator. As a result, the sala is characterized by nepotism in recruitment, institutionalized corruption, and inefficiency in the administration of laws on account of its being governed by the motives of gaining power for protecting its own interest.

The bazaar canteen model

Riggs called the economic sub-system of prismatic society 'Bazaar Canteen Model'. There is discrimination and favouritism at all levels, prices of commodities vary from place to place, time to time, and person to person. The price of any commodity or service depends on family contacts, individual relationship, bargaining power, and politics. In a bazaar canteen model, a small section of people may enjoy all benefits with control over economic institutions and exploit a large number of people. Exploitation, poverty, and social injustice, therefore, become the major features of the bazaar canteen model.

To sum up, Riggs' contribution lies not only in conceptual constructs and tools of analysis for the study of administrative problems of developing societies but also in applying the macro approach for the first time towards such studies. His prismatic sala model and the value-neutral conceptualization of development have taken the cross-cultural administrative studies towards greater objectivity. The ideal typical models have encouraged several empirical studies on the administrative systems of developing countries. His analysis of the process of administrative development can provide guidelines to the policy-makers in different nations.

SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACH/THEORIES

By the socio-psychological approach/theory, we generally mean a host of social and psychological interpretations of human behaviour in organization, contributed largely by individual sociologists and psychologists. Owing to their central focus on human behaviour, these socio-psychological approaches are often clubbed under the capacious banner of the behavioural school. Conceptually speaking, this behavioural school has touched upon the following areas of organizational behaviour, namely, motivation, leadership, communication, organizational conflict, organizational change and development, and group dynamics. Major exponents of this school are Abraham Maslow, Frederick Herzberg, Douglas McGregor, Rensis Likert, Chris Argyris, among others.

The socio-psychological approach is not a theory of organization in the strict sense of the term. The central objective of this approach is the scientific study of human behaviour in diverse social environment. The root of behavioural approach can be traced back to the famous Hawthorne experiment and the resultant emergence of the human relations theory. Hence, the behavioural approach can be interpreted as a continuation of human relations theory. However, the behavioural approach, unlike the human relation theory, does not content with the happy worker, rather it gropes further deep into human psychology to find out the answer to why workers behave the way they do. It takes cues from the human relationists, especially Elton Mayo and the famous Harvard

group, Chester Barnard, who himself was actively involved in the Hawthorne experiment, and had hinted at the behavioural approach by emphasizing the psycho-social aspect of management. In a seminal publication, 'The Function of the Executive', Barnard 'looks like a full-blown behaviouralist' (Bhattacharaya 1996). Another important contribution came from Herbert Simon. Simon, through his famous decision-making theory, had uncovered nuance of human behaviour. As stated earlier, the behavioural school is a mixed bag of approaches. In this section, we shall discuss some key exponents of behavioural school with reference to their concerned approaches.

Motivational Approaches

Abraham Maslow

Abraham Maslow is one of the prominent exponents of motivation theory. Drawing on Freudian psychoanalysis, Maslow attempts to understand human behaviour by applying it in organizational behaviour. His need hierarchy theory of motivation is largely a product of his clinical experience as a psychologist. Maslow's need hierarchy theory states that human needs are hierarchically arranged in an ascending order, where the satisfaction of higher needs comes when the lowest needs are duly satisfied. According to Maslow, human beings like organisms are always driven by needs. Or in other words, the satisfaction of needs always motivate human beings.

Maslow has enumerated five kinds of needs in ascending order: lowest needs like physiological and security needs are at bottom, while the self-actualization needs will be at the top of the pyramid. The needs for social and self-esteem, in the meanwhile would remain in the middle rungs. The *Physiological Needs* are perhaps the most fundamental needs of human being. The gratification of other needs is solely contingent upon the satisfaction of these needs. These needs include hunger, thirst, sex, and so on. The *Security Needs* refer to the search for security and safety which is a perennial need of the human being. The *Belongingness Needs* point to the fact that human beings are by nature social beings with a

gregarious instinct. Maslow views that once the physiological and security needs are satisfied, human being will strive for love and belongingness. The *Esteem Needs* is another important need of human beings. This is the need for self-esteem. Finally, the *Need for Self-Actualization* is the highest need in the hierarchy of needs as propounded by Maslow. At the top of the scale, man becomes self-actualized in that he successfully fuses the responsibilities of his position with his personal aspirations. The implication of Maslow's need hierarchy is that in order to bring efficient outcomes, the management should satisfy workers' needs according to the prescribed hierarchy.

Frederick Herzberg

Another prominent thinker of the school is Frederick Herzberg. Herzberg is famous for his Motivation–Hygiene theory or Two Factor theory. His Motivation–Hygiene theory was a product of an empirical study, which he conducted on about 200 accountants and engineers in and around Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, to find out what motivates employees into work. Based on the research findings, Herzberg has clearly identified two sets of factors as motivator and hygiene factors. For Herzberg, motivators are basically satisfiers or the factors which led to job satisfaction among the employees. Under this category Herzberg has identified five factors, namely, achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement. By hygiene factor, Herzberg denotes the potential dissatifiers for the employers. Herzberg has enumerated five such dissatisfiers. These are company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations, and working conditions.

The essence of the Motivation–Hygiene theory is that the factors involved in producing job satisfaction are separate and distinct from the factors that lead to job dissatisfaction. Growth occurs with achievement, and achievement requires a task to perform. Hygiene factors are unrelated to tasks. The opposite of satisfaction on the job is not dissatisfaction; it is not merely no job satisfaction. Satisfaction and dissatisfaction are discrete feelings. They are not opposite ends of the same continuum. Herzberg described

them as 'uni-polar traits'. The motivators have a much more long-lasting effect on sustaining satisfaction than hygiene factors have on preventing dissatisfaction. The motivators in a work experience tend to be more self-sustaining and are not dependent upon constant supervisory attention. Hygiene needs, however, are related to things for which our appetites are never satisfied completely. Applications of hygiene improvement must be constantly reapplied.

Leadership Models

Rensis Likert

Likert has extended the scope of behavioural analysis from individual personality and motivation to organizational effectiveness. How does an organization perform better than others? What makes a supervisor far better than others in managing an organization? These are but a few baffling questions that led Likert to contemplate a prolonged research on organizational leadership and effectiveness. In the course of his research, he has constructed his famous 'Management Systems I–IV model', 'Linking Pin model' and thereby underlined the importance of organizational leadership and congenial working relationship.

Management Systems I–IV model

Analysing different forms of management systems, Likert has come out with his celebrated Management System I–IV model. In the said model, Likert has conceived systems of management along a continuum, where there is a continuous effort on the part of each management system to move from the lesser efficient system of management to the higher one. Likert has identified four systems of management on the basis of the nature of authority and control of organization and the operating characteristics. Arranged in an ascending order of efficiency, the systems of management have been categorized as exploitative–authoritative, benevolent–authoritative, consultative, and participative.

1. *System-I: Exploitative–Authoritative*: This kind of organizational system is marked by a steep hierarchical structure, centralized decision-making, top–down communication,

tight supervision, man-to-man rather than group-to-group relations, performance under pressure, and low motivation.

2. *System-II: Benevolent–Authoritative*: This system of organization is still authoritative, but becomes less exploitative and more benevolent towards the members of the organization. Subordinates in this system are allowed to have some freedom to comment and adequate flexibility in implementation. Communication is far better and subordinates may approach the manager. Here in this system, managers are condescending but not trusting.

3. *System-III: Consultative Leadership*: In this system of management, the mode of operation is based on consultation. Managers decide, especially with regards to setting goals, in consultation with the subordinates. Subordinates are equally free to voice forth their opinions as this system allows free communication.

4. *System-IV: Participative*: This, according to Likert, is the ideal management style. Every organization should aspire to adopt this style of management. The distinctive mark of this system, unlike the systems listed above, is the participative nature of management, where the subordinates are allowed to put forward their opinions and managers give proper cognizance to those opinions.

Likert explains that in his proposed model the system-I or the authoritative–exploitative system and the system-IV or participative system will form the two axes of the continuum, respectively. The system-II and system-III will remain in the intermediate level. Likert is also known for his famous 'Linking Pin' model. In the said model, Likert shows that an individual in an organization acts as a linking pin by holding organization together.

Douglas McGregor

As a noted management psychiatrist, McGregor has amply contributed to the development of behavioural theory of organization. In his celebrated text *The Human Side of the Enterprise*, McGregor has come out with his famous 'theoretical assumptions' regarding the nature of human being, proper realization of which he thought

would determine very contour of organization. The said assumptions are popularly known as the 'Theory X' and 'Theory Y'.

Theory X: The coercive compulsion

The major assumptions of Theory X are as follows:

- The average human being has an innate antipathy to work, which he will avoid if he can.
- Owing to such an inherent nature of human beings, most people need to be coerced, controlled, directed, and threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort towards the achievement of organizational objectives.
- The average human being, with relatively little ambition, prefers to be directed and wishes to avoid responsibility. Security is his main concern.

Theory Y: The alternative assumptions of integration and self-control

In his Theory Y, McGregor has come out with altogether different assumptions of human nature, portraying human being as enterprising in nature. These are:

- The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.
- Mass exercises, self-direction, and self-control in the services of the objectives to which he is committed.
- Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement.
- The average human being learns under proper conditions not only to accept but to seek responsibility.
- The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of creativity, imagination, and ingenuity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly distributed in the population.
- Under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilized (McGregor 1960).

The organizational principle to which these assumptions point to is integration; the creation of conditions under which the individual's own objectives will be obtained at the same time that he or she contributes to the attainment of the organization's goals. The worker is to be integrated into the organization, that is, managers must take care to determine the needs and desires of their employees, perhaps through more open and participatory modes of conduct, and then help orient those individual objectives so that they can be best obtained through work towards the organization's objectives (Denhardt 2008: 94).

Chris Argyris

A far more sophisticated interpretation of the relationship between the individual and the organization is found in the work of Chris Argyris. He gained early prominence with the publication of *Personality and Organization* (1957), a review and synthesis of previous literature on the interchange between the individual personality and the demands of the organization. Chris Argyris has focused on the apparent incompatibility between the prevailing organizational strategies and individual need for fulfilment as the root of organizational crisis. Argyris was very much critical of formal organization informed with task specialization, chain of command, unity of direction, span of control, and so on. In a formal organization, views Argyris, there is a tendency to envelop the life of the constituting man power with strict control and hierarchy, with an invariable impact on human capital. He was of the opinion that the relationship between personal development and organizational goal should not be viewed as a zero-sum proposition. For, there is no inherent contradiction between personal development and organizational well-being. In fact, they complement each other. Hence, the innate potential of every individual or what he called 'potential for self-actualization' needs to be unlocked. He viewed that the acceptance of this self-actualization needs will eventually benefit the organization.

Argyris has called for a total change in the strategies as well as assumptions of organization. Unlike the traditional organization, his new form of organization would be a combination of both the old pyramidal type and new matrix type of organization. As a part

of bringing about organizational change, Argyris has urged for the improvement of interpersonal competence. Argyris has identified three preconditions for the development of interpersonal competence, namely, self-acceptance, confirmation, and essentiality.

Argyris has put a lot of emphasis on the techniques of programmed learning as a necessary part of organizational development. In this context, Argyris' T-group or sensitivity training for honing the personal skills of employees may be mentioned. The T-group training as the name suggests is a laboratory-based training programme, which seeks to inculcate sensitivity among employees. Unlike the traditional interpersonal relationship based on strict adherence of hierarchy and authority, the T-group training prefers more sensitivity regarding the personality of others. Moreover, the training, as it is claimed, also enables a more free and consensus formula for decision-making. Argyris was also critical of the organization discourse, which put excessive importance on either human psychology or organizational sociology. In fact, Argyris was in favour of perfect blend between psychology and sociology.

In Argyris work, we find one of the most sophisticated and comprehensive examinations in the human relations literature of the relationship between personality and organization. However, this work still seems bound to an instrumentalist perspective. Argyris' concept of self-actualization is also criticized for being utopian and without any precise operational indicators. To Simon, self-actualization is synonymous with anarchy (Simon 1973: 352). The T-group remedial approach also seems myopic in nature and cannot get to the root of the problem so long as the basic conflict of interests between the employers and employees exists. Rather, these techniques cannot serve better than maintaining the status quo. We can hope that Argyris' emphasis on learning will ultimately permit even farther-reaching conclusions than have yet been entertained, even by Argysis. It may even be possible to construct a new relationship between instrumentalism and critique. In any case, Argyris has clearly had a substantial impact on theories of public and private organization, especially with respect to the issue of organizational change.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

In the foregoing analysis, an attempt has been made to venture into, as stated earlier, the contested terrain of public administration. Understandably, in doing so we have unpacked a Pandora's box, as it were. For, there has been an endless proliferation of theoretical constructs in public administration with the associated claims of greater representations of administrative reality.

An analysis of the administrative theories reveals that they have tried to respond to the prevalent circumstances in their own way. The classical theories came as a response to the Industrial Revolution in the West at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century. They successfully constructed certain universal principles of organization that facilitated the smooth functioning of an organization. To avoid increasing industrial conflicts, the scientific management of Taylor emerged. It stressed the fusion of resources and manpower to effect predetermined goals in the most efficient manner. The goal was the 'one best way' to implement a predetermined policy. Though criticized for viewing 'the human organism as simple machine tools', Taylor's influence on the early study and practice of public administration was profound.

The classical theorist from Taylor to Weber laid emphasis on the physiological and mechanical aspects of work organization. They had taken a rather simplistic view of efficiency which they thought could be achieved by following certain specific principles of organization and management. The environmental and organizational characteristics of the Industrial Revolution in contemporary Europe greatly influenced the thoughts of the traditional theorists (Bhattacharya 2008: 92).

An assault on the unqualified application of classical principles to public administration swelled after the Second World War. Accompanied by an effort throughout the social sciences, researchers on administrative decision-making were led to consider the impact of man as a social and political animal. Classical theory was scientific in the sense that it stressed concern for the best way to divide labour, supervise, plan, report, and coordinate. It paid little heed to the response of workers to these norms, which ignored factors

actuating their behaviour. The search for casual explanations for administrators' behaviour led researchers into psychology, sociology, and politics, thereby sidetracking the more prescriptively oriented classical theory with a more descriptively flavoured modern theory. Claims that public administration was susceptible to scientific analysis was questioned because inclusion of informal, human-nature factors made behaviour predictability much less certain. In addition, because politics is concerned primarily with resolving clashes among values, and because values represent individual preferences and are therefore unverifiable, pessimism grew over the applicability of science to the study public administration. Scholar Herbert Simon argued for the deliberate separation of fact and of value questions in research. Simon argued that by assigning values to the realm of politics, the 'one best way' to administer programmes could be ascertained once the direction of substantive policy had been set. Methodologically close to Taylor and Gullick, Simon suggested that social and psychological factors that affect employee attitudes be included in the descriptive analysis of organizations. To ignore socio-psychological factors, argued Simon, could result in less, rather than more, efficiency (Morrow 1975: 47).

As with classical theory, post Second World War theory has been bolstered by private research. The famous Hawthorne study sponsored by Western Electric Company, although conducted between 1927 and 1932, did not receive its due attention within public administration until much later. Elton Mayo who was the founder of the human relations approach gave much emphasis on non-economic incentives in motivating the workers towards higher levels of production. The human relations approach matured further with the research and writing of socio-psychologists like Chris Argyris, Dogulus Mecgregor, Rensis Likert, and Abraham Maslow. The solution offered by this school of thinkers to the maladies of modern organizations was better leadership, effective communication, team-spirit, cooperation, and so on. The writings that were published by this school of thought came to be characterized as the 'neo-human relations' movement.

Recent innovations in administrative theory are heavily rooted in the human relations school. Much research has focused on systems theory, whereby behaviour is viewed as a response to

an individual's and agency's interaction with external environmental factors. Some scholars stress game theory, whereby the competitions between individuals for various self-imposed rewards are mathematically analysed. Decision theory applies this competitive syndrome to the analysis of individual roles relating to a single decision.

On the basis of the above developments in the field of administrative theories, two major trends can be identified. First, there is a Western bias in the field. The American influence over the ideas and concepts, which are grown and nurtured by American social scientists all over the world, especially created with the sole objective of protecting the main interests of American economic order and its political hegemony. Second, there is a lack of a formidable base of its own. The discipline in the course of its historical development never attempted to acquire any theoretical base of its own, and on which now, relevant knowledge could be developed (Manohar, Rao, and Rao 1991). Thus, all these theories emerged in the Western capitalist system, only aimed at legitimizing and maintaining the capitalist order intact. There has been no attempt, even at the Minnowbrook Conference III (2008), to develop models in administration to meet the special needs and requirements of the changing societies in the developing nations. The discipline has still to evolve to respond these concerns.

NOTES

1. For details, see *The Public Administration Theory Primer* (Frederickson and Smith 2003) where they have identified three criteria of evaluating the worthiness of any theoretical construct, namely, the ability to *describe*, *explain*, and *predict*.
2. In terms of intellectual pedigree, public administration is often looked down upon as there is hardly any universal theoretical construct.
3. For details, see *Towards a Critical Administrative Theory* by William N. Dunn and Bahman Fozouni (1976). This small booklet provides an excellent critical analysis of administrative theory.
4. Pre-paradigm stage is said to be marked by several incompatible and incomplete theories. There is hardly any consensus on theory building in this particular phase. Thomas Kuhn in his seminal publication entitled *The Structure of Scientific Revolution* (1962) has used this phrase. He has mapped

the history of science in three successive stages, namely, pre-paradigm stage, paradigm stage, and revolutionary science stage.

5. Public administration as a discipline has been in a confused state of sorts, ever since it came into being, as no clear definition and distinctive boundary have been fixed for it, let alone having self-sufficient theoretical constructs.

6. Dwight Waldo was the first who had mooted the palpable insecurity and confusion regarding the identity of public administration as a separate discipline.

7. S.K. Bailey (1968) may be referred to for further study on the state of public administration theory.

8. By 'brute realities of politics', we generally refer to the unavoidable realities of politics like poverty, inequality, war, and so on.

9. It is generally held that theories in social science are contemplated only when there is a crisis and no ready-made solution in the existing knowledge. The origin of a theory is sought to respond to that crisis by providing an antidote.

10. However, all the theories are not the product of exigency. In fact, they are often 'manufactured' as ideological smokescreens to serve the interest of the dominant groups.

11. Classical organization theory is also known as 'organization theory', 'structural theory', 'formal organization theory', 'mechanistic theory', 'engineering theory', and 'traditional theory.'

12. 'Contextuality' is the most important element to evaluate a particular theory or theorists as it helps one appreciate why a theory or theorist gives such view point.

13. These works were later published in one volume under the title *Scientific Management* (1947).

REFERENCES

Albrow, Martin. 1970. *Bureaucracy*. London: Macmillan.

Argyris, Chris. 1973. 'Some Limits of Rational Man Organizations Theory', *Public Administrative Review*, 33 (3, May–June).

Arora, Ramesh K. 1979. *Perspective in Administrative Theory*. New Delhi: Associated Publishing House.

———. 2007. 'Organization Theories: Concerns and Orientations', in Rakesh Hooja and Ramesh Arora (eds), *Administrative Theories: Approaches, Concepts, and Thinkers in Public Administration*. Jaipur, New Delhi: Rawat Publications.

Bailey, S.K. 1968. 'Objectives of Theory of Public Administration', in J.C. Charlesworth (ed.), *Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives and Methods*, pp. 128–39. Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science.

Baker, R.J.S. 1972. *Administrative Theory and Public Administration*. London: Hutchinson University Library.

Barnard, Chester I. 1938. *The Functions of Executive*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

———. 1956. *Organization and Management: Selected Papers*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Bennis, Warren G. 1968. 'Beyond Bureaucracy', in Warren B. Bennis and Philip E. Slater (eds), *The Temporary Society*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers. Reprinted in an abridged version in F. Nigro and G. Nigro, *Readings in Public Administration* (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1983).

Bhattacharaya, Mohit. 1996. *Public Administration and Planning*. Calcutta: World Press Pvt. Ltd.

———. 1999. *New Horizons of Public Administration*. New Delhi: Jawahar Publishing.

———. 2008. *New Horizons of Public Administration*. New Delhi: Jawahar Publisher and Distributions.

Caiden, Gerald E. 1971. *The Dynamics of Public Administration: Guidelines to Current Transformations in Theory and Practice*. Hinsdale, Illinois: Dryden Press.

Carmelli, A., Z. Sheaffer, and M.Y. Halevi. 2009. 'Does Participartory Decision-making in Top Management Teams Enhance Decision Effectiveness and Firm Performance,' *Personal Review*, Vol. 38, pp. 696–714.

Chakrabarty, Bidyut. 2007. *Reinventing Public Administration: The Indian Experience*. New Delhi: Orient Longman.

Crozier, Michel. 1946. *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DeHoog, Ronald Hoogland. 2000. 'Bureaupathology', in Jay M. Shafritz (ed.), *Defining Public Administration-Selections from the International Encyclopedia of Public Policy and Administration*. Colorado: Westview Press (Indian reprint: Jaipur/New Delhi: Rawat Publications).

Denhardt, Robert B. 2008. *Theories of Public Administration*. Australia: Thomson.

Dunleavy, Patrick. 1985. 'Bureaucrats, Budgets, and the Growth of the State', *British Journal of Political Science*, 15: 229–328.

———. 1986. 'Explaining the Privatization Boom', *Public Administration*, 61: 13–14.

Dunn, William N. and Bahman Fozouni. 1976. *Towards a Critical Administrative Theory*. Beverly Hills, London: SAGE Publications.

Fayol, Henry. 1937. 'The Administrative Theory of the State', in L. Gulick and Lyndall Urwick (eds), *Papers in the Science of Administration*. New York: Columbia University Press.

———. 1949. *General and Industrial Management*. London: Pitman (originally written and published in 1916 in French).

Felix, A. 1970 [1965]. *Modern Public Administration*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Frederickson, H. George and Kevin Smith. 2003. *The Public Administration Theory Prime: Essentials of Public Policy and Administration*. Colorado: Westview Press.

Gross, Bertram M. 1964. *The Managing of Organization: The Administrative Struggle*, Vol. 1. New York: The Free Press.

Gulick, Luther and Lyndall Urwick (eds). 1937. *Papers on the Science of Administration*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Jary, David and Julia Jary. 2000. *Collins Dictionary of Sociology* (3rd edition). Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers.

Kuhn, Thomas. 1996 [1962]. *The Structure of Scientific Revolution*. United States: University of Chicago Press.

Lindblom, Charles E. 1959. 'The Science of Muddling Through', in *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 19, no. 2. Reprinted in Richard Stillman II, *Public Administration: Concepts and Cases*, 2nd edition (Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin company, 2005).

Manohar, K. Murali, K. Seetha Rama Rao, and B.J. Janardhan Rao. 1991. *Administrative Theory: Trends and Perspectives*. Warangal: Book Bird Publisher.

Mayo, Elton. 1933. *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. Boston: Harvard Business School.

———. 1945. *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

———. 1947. *The Political Problem of Industrial Civilization*. Boston: Harvard Business School.

McGregor, Douglas. 1960. *The Human Side of the Enterprise*. New York: McGrew-Hill Book Co.

Merton, Robert. 1949. 'Bureaucratic Structure and Personality', in Robert Merton (ed.), *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.

Morrow, William L. 1975. *Public Administration: Politics and Political System*. New York: Random House.

Nigro, F.A. 1965. *Modern Public Administration*. New York: Harper & Row.

Nigro, F. and G. Nigro. 1983. *Readings in Public Administration*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Niskanen. 1971. *Bureaucracy and Representative Government*. New York: Aldine-Atherton.

———. 1973. *Bureaucracy: Servant or Master?* London: Institute for Economic Affairs.

Paddock, Susan C. 2000. 'Peter Principle', in Jay M. Shafritz (ed.), *Defining Public Administration: Selections from the International Encyclopedia of Public Policy and Administration*. Colorado: Westview Press. [Indian reprint: Jaipur/New Delhi: Rawat Publications].

Parkinson, C.N. 1957. *Parkinson's Law and Other Studies in Administration*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Peter, Laurence J. and Raymond Hull. 1972 [1969]. *The Peter Principle*. New York: Willam Morrow & Co.

Prasad, Rajendra D., V.S. Prasad, and P. Satyanarayana. 2001. *Administrative Thinkers*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd.

Raghuvulu, C.V., 'Chris Argyris', in Rajendra D. Prasad, V.S. Prasad, and P. Satyanarayana. 2001. *Administrative Thinkers*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd.

Sapru, R.K. 1996. *Theories of Administration*. New Delhi: S. Chand and Co. Ltd.

Scott, William G. 1961. 'Organization Theory: An Overview and an Appraisal', *Journal of the Academy of Management*, 4 (1, April): 27–41.

Selznick, Phillip. 1957. *Leadership and Administration*. Evanson: Row, Peterson and Sons.

Simon, Herbert. 1973. 'Organisational Man: Rational or Self-actualisation', *Public Administration Review*, 33 (4, July–August).

Stillman, Richard, II. 2005. *Public Administration: Concepts and Cases* (2nd edition). Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Taylor, F.W. 1947. *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper and Row.

Waldo, Dwight. 1968. In J.C. Charlesworth (ed.), *Theory and Practice of Public Administration*. Monograph 8, American Academy of Political and Social Science.

Weber, Max. 1946. *Essays in Sociology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chapter 3

Contemporary Developments in Public Administration[1]

Learning Objectives
- To understand contemporary developments in the discipline
- To comprehend the 'paradigm shift' in the discipline
- To dwell on the new approaches to public administration

Public administration is an evolutionary discipline. It has tried to respond to the constantly emerging social needs. It is with this background that the present chapter will deal with some of the significant contemporary developments in the discipline, that is, NPA, NPM, theory and practice of governance, feminist and environmental perspectives on public policy and administration and corporate governance.

NEW PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

New Public Administration (NPA) can be defined as a new and qualitatively different phase in the growth of public administration infused with political values like equity, social justice, change, and commitment. This new phase is often equated with the 'crisis

of identity' of public administration as a separate discipline. In fact, the discipline has been wrestling with this crisis ever since it came into being. NPA can be seen as the first serious attempt on the part of the practitioners of public administration to give it a stable identity by re-emphasizing its core commitments towards the society.

The origin of NPA can be traced back to a path-breaking conference in 1968 at the Minnowbrook Conference I site at Syracuse University, attended by a host of young intellectuals drawn from different branches of the social sciences. The said conference was truly a wake-up call for theorists and practitioners alike to make the discipline socially relevant and accountable. It was held in the backdrop of a turbulent time which was marked by a series of contemporary developments like social upheavals in the form of ethnic skirmishes across the American cities, campus clashes, Vietnam War and its repercussions in American society, and the like. The above developments coupled with a deep sense of dissatisfaction among the practitioners regarding the present state of the discipline, especially its obsession with efficiency and economy, had ushered in a qualitatively improved phase in public administration subsequently christened as NPA. This new 'counter-culture', as Mohit Bhattacharyya (1998) puts, has called for the 'primacy' of 'politics' in administration.

The Minnowbrook Conference site at Syracuse University has been a household name for the students of public administration, which has a unique distinction of hosting three consecutive conferences pertaining to the development of public administration. In an exact interval of twenty years (1968, 1988, and 2008), the centre has organized three consecutive conferences known as the First, Second, and Minnowbrook Conferences III, respectively. The Minnowbrook Conference I was famous for bringing about arguably a new era in public administration informed with relevance, equity, change, and social justice. Public interest formed the core of the deliberations. Emerged out of dissatisfaction with the state of the discipline, the scholars who attended the conference were busy chalking out the boundary of the discipline. Social equity has

been added to efficiency and economy as the rationale or justification for policy positions. Equal protection of the law has come to be considered as important to those charged with carrying out the law (public administrators), as it is to those elected to make the law. Ethics, honesty, and responsibility in governance have returned again to the lexicon of public administration. Career service bureaucrats are no longer considered to be merely implementers of fixed decisions as they were in the dominant theory of the late 1950s and early 1960s; they are now understood to hold a public trust to provide the best possible public service with the costs and benefits being fairly distributed among the people. Change, not growth, has come to be understood as the more critical theoretical issue. A responsive government both grows (where new needs are clear) and declines (where agencies' services are no longer critical). Managing change, not just growth, is the standard for effectiveness. Effective public administration has come to be defined in the context of an active and participative citizenry. Correctness of the rational model and the usefulness of the strict concept of hierarchy have been severely challenged.

In addition to advancing these themes, participants of the Minnowbrook Conference I were influential in the field's primary professional association—the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA). Their actions, joined by others, facilitated in making ASPA more open and democratic. It now has open elections, sections for minorities and women, and an enviable record of women and minorities in leadership positions. It has developed a code of ethics, and it now takes positions on the significant public policy issues of the day, in sharp contrast to ASPA's earlier culture (Frederickson 1999: 705).

Despite a few redeeming features, NPA has been subject to severe criticism. It is often held responsible for the propagation of an illusion of 'paradigm change, paradigm shift or paradigm revolution within the field' (Dunn and Fozouni 1976). The argument goes that NPA instead of contributing to a paradigm shift, has 'fostered intellectual confusion, the obfuscation of critical philosophical and methodological issues and the institutionalization of undisciplined mediocrity in the field' with a definite political

intention of reinforcing of the status quo. Moreover, NPA is under attack for philosophical dilettantism and absence of methodological rigor and self-criticism (Dunn and Fozouni 1976). However, NPA is a kind of soul-searching exercise, which sought to bring back relevance in public administration by integrating theory and practice in a coherent whole.

NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

Today, NPM has become a standard prescription for the ailing public sector across the globe. However, it is very difficult to pin down the exact meaning of the term as a whole lot of interpretations are available, ranging from a whole-hearted appreciation of it as a new-found mantra of resurrecting public sector to one of total rejection. Christopher Hood, a leading exponent, has nicely encapsulated the dilemma that one would invariably encounter in dealing with the subject: 'Although ill-defined, NPM aroused strong and varied emotions among bureaucrats. At one extreme were those who held that NPM was the only way to correct for the irretrievable failures and even moral bankruptcy in the "old" public management' (Hood 1991). He adds, 'At the other were those who dismissed much of the thrust of NPM as gratuitous and philistine destruction of more than a century's work in developing a distinctive public service ethic and culture' (Hood 1991). Stripped of all jargons, NPM can be defined as new set of experiments in public sector management informed with the market principles of efficiency and economy to make ailing public sector effective. It was basically a late 1990s development in the public sector management that gathered much steam with the re-inventing movement and governance discourse in 1990s.

Unlike the traditional Weberian and Wilsonian paradigm of public administration, NPM calls for a paradigm shift in public sector management informed with three E's—Efficiency, Economy, and Effectiveness. Moreover, in order to resurrect the sagging credibility of the public sector, NPM asks for liberal borrowings of market principles in public sector management. It would be more appropriate to see it as an outgrowth of the initiatives of public sector

reform sweeping across the West since late 1980s. Mark Bevir, in an edited volume, has endorsed the fact by designating NPM as 'first wave of public sector management'. Christopher Hood considers NPM as 'a marriage of opposites', of which one partner being the new institutional economics, while the other is 'a set of successive waves of business-type managerialism' (Hood 1991). NPM is actually proposed to make a hostile inroad in the domain of 'sheltered bureaucracy' and substitute it by a more flexible, market-based public administration. Under NPM, a whole set of new nomenclatures like managers, service providers, and customers are manufactured to distinguish it from its predecessor. In sum, it portrays an image of a public administration informed with minimum government, de-bureaucratization, decentralization, market orientation of public services, contracting out, privatization, performance measurement, and so on.

The origin of NPM can be traced back to administrative reform measures in the West, to be more specific, in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) group, of countries from late 1970s (Hood 1991). Christopher Hood has shown that the emergence of NPM was coincided with four 'administrative megatrends':

1. Attempts to slow down or reverse government growth in terms of overt public spending and staffing;
2. the shift towards privatization and quasi-privatization and away from core government institutions, with renewed emphasis on subsidiary in service provision;
3. the development of automation, particularly in IT, and in the production and distribution of public services; and
4. the development of a more international agenda, increasingly focused on general issues of public management, policy design, decision styles, and intergovernmental cooperation, on top of the older tradition of individual country specialism's in public administration (Hood 1991).

However, there is hardly any consensus among the scholars regarding the emergence of NPM. Virtually, a host of factors are

held responsible for such a paradigm shift in public sector management. For analytical convenience, we can identify those factors under four heads: (*a*) receding credibility of state or the public sector; (*b*) the emergence of New Right Approach; (*c*) emergence of post-Weberian, post-Wilsonian bureaucracy; and (*d*) administrative changes in advanced Western countries.

1. *Receding credibility of state*: The state as a major dispenser of social justice has been increasingly questioned across the globe since late 1970s. The popular mood was against the state for its dismal performance in almost every sphere—social, political, and economic.

2. *Emergence of New Right philosophy*: New Right philosophy is considered to be a prime mover for this recent spate of public sector reform and the emergence of NPM. Generally, it is used as an umbrella term, accommodating a whole range of ideas and theories pertaining to free market, individual liberty such as the radical right, libertarianism, supply-side economics, monetarism, Thatcherism, Reganomics, and so on, under its head. It came into vogue in late 1960s and early 1970s under the tutelage of Ronald Regan and Margaret Thatcher. The New Right philosophy sought to challenge Keynesian demand management and the egalitarian welfare package it entrusted upon state. The New Right challenge, as rightly put by David G. Green, is not solely guided against the public policy-makers as it is often so viewed. Rather, it takes on the whole gamut of social sciences like economics, sociology, and political science.

   Apparent difference among its adherents notwithstanding, the New Right philosophy in general has been very much sceptical about the role of state in a given society. For them, state involvement per se 'leads to increasing monopoly, increasing budget and suppressing of entrepreneurial behavior, limiting choice, overproduction of unwanted services and encouragement to waste and inefficiency' (Ghuman 2001). Hence, they suggest a six-point reform agenda, namely, deregulation, privatization, the reduction of inflation, lower

taxation, increasing role of taxation, and increasing role of market forces in the provision of public services (Ghuman 2001).

3. *Emergence of post-Weberian/post-Wilsonian conception of public administration*: The changing contour of public administration, especially the transition from the traditional Weberian bureaucracy to one of post-Weberian type and the pragmatic rejection of Wilsonian politics-administration dichotomy has signalled a steady and subtle change in public sector management. The post-Weberian/post-Wilsonian avatar of public administration sought to usher in an altogether new paradigm of public administration informed with democracy, efficiency, flexibility, and free flow of communication.

4. *Administrative changes in advanced Western countries*: Recent changes in the form of governance in advanced Western countries have also contributed to the development of NPM. From late 1980s and early 1990s, public sector management in the advanced Western democracies has undergone a sea change. Mohit Bhattacharya has nicely spelled out the said changes in the following ways: (*a*) structurally from a rigid, hierarchical, and bureaucratic form of public administration to one of flexible market-based form of public management; (*b*) substantial change in the role of government in society; and (*c*) a huge change in the citizen–government relationship (Bhattacharya 1998).

Major Components of New Public Management

Christopher Hood, a leading expert of the field has encapsulated the doctrinal component of NPM in a tabular fashion. For the sake of our discussion we will draw heavily on Hood's table. Hence, the essential doctrines of NPM are as follows:

- *Hands-on professional management in public sector*: It seeks to dole out extra ounce of professional manager—like freedom to public sector.

- *Explicit standards and measures of performance*: NPM is in favour of laying out explicit parameters of performance. In other words, definitions of goals, targets, and indicators are to be clearly expressed.
- *Greater emphasis on output controls*: NPM stresses on results rather than procedures.
- *Shift to disaggregation of units in the public sector*: NPM is proposed to break up formerly monolithic structures in the public sector into 'manageable' units. Moreover, it also asks for 'unbundling of U-form management systems into corporatized units around products, operating on decentralized one-line budgets and dealing with one another on an arms-length basis'.
- *Shift to greater competition in public sector*: NPM, on principle, is in favour of infusing competitive spirit among public sector enterprise. For, competition brings down the cost of product/service and ensures efficiency.
- *Stress on private-sector styles of management practice*: NPM lays emphasis on proven private sector management tools in order to salvage ailing public sector. Since the hierarchical bureaucratic management technique is increasingly proved to be counterproductive for public sector, NPM calls for liberal borrowing of private sector management technique.
- *Stress on greater discipline and parsimony in resource use*: Finally, NPM is sought to impose greater discipline and economy in resource utilization by adopting a series of steps, namely, cutting direct costs, raising labour discipline, resisting union demands, limiting compliance costs to business, and so on (Hood 1991).

Another expert of the field Nicholas Henry has identified 'five fundamentals' or five A's of NPM:

- *Alertness*: Government should improvise the problem and act before it actually hit the system, not the other way round.
- *Agility*: Government should be agile in the sense that it should be 'entrepreneurial, open, and communicative'.

- *Adaptability*: Government should be continuously engaged in improving quality of its programmes and services and thereby adjusting with demands.
- *Alignment*: Government should collaborate with other government, non-governmental, and civil society organizations to achieve social goals.
- *Accountability*: Government should have a clear and compelling mission that focuses on the needs of the people (Henry 2007).

Another leading exponent Patrick Dunleavy has enumerated three key components of NPM, namely, *disaggregation*, *competition,* and *incentivization*. For the sake of operationalization, Dunleavy has further fine grained the constituting elements of above components.

Disaggregation means splitting up public bureaucracy into smaller components with underlying emphasis on flattening of hierarchies and 'flexibilization' in personnel, IT, procurement, and so on. Under this component, a host of elements have been identified, namely, purchaser–provider separation, agencification, decoupling of policy system, growth of quasi-government agencies, separation out of micro-level agencies, chunking up privatized industries, corporatization and strong single, organization management, de-professionalization, improved performance measurement, and so on.

Competition refers to the competition that NPM seeks to infuse among the potential providers. It includes among others quasi-market, voucher scheme, outsourcing, compulsory market testing, intra-government contracting, public/private liberalization, deregulation, consumer-tagged financing, user-control, and so on.

Incentivization favours providing pecuniary-based specific performance incentives for augmenting productivity in organization. This component has also several constituting elements as well, namely, re-specifying property rights, light touch regulation, capital market involvement in projects, privatizing asset ownership, anti-rent seeking measure, deprivileging professions, performance-related pay, private finance initiative, private–public partnership,

united rate of return and discounting, valuing public sector equity, mandatory efficiency dividends, and so on (Dunleavy 1991).

In sum, NPM is depicted as:

> ... a normative conceptualization of public administration consisting of several inter-related components: providing high quality services that citizens value; increasing the autonomy of public managers, rewarding organizations and individuals on the basis of whether they meet demanding targets; making available the human and technological resources that managers need to perform well; and, appreciative of the virtues of competition, maintaining an open-minded attitude about which public purposes should be performed by the private sector, rather than public sector. (Borins 1995)

Salient Features of the New Public Management

On the basis of the above components the following features of the NPM can be identified:

Revamping of organizational structure

NPM proposes a thorough organizational revamping so that organizational structure will become conducive for organizational leadership. Organizational restructuring includes simplifying organizational procedures, flattening of hierarchies, and so on.

Empowerment of citizens

One of the major hallmarks of NPM is the empowerment of citizens. Unlike the traditional public sector, NPM reconceptualizes citizens as 'active customers' to be always kept in good humour. It calls for a huge perceptual change among the public bureaucrats vis-à-vis citizens. Until recently, in public sector, citizens were viewed as 'passive recipients' of the goods and services, to be given by the state. It was thought that they should not have any choice. But, NPM asks for greater freedom of choice of citizens. Following Albert Hirschman the freedom of choice can be crystallized under three specific freedoms, namely 'exit', 'voice', and 'loyalty'. Here 'exit' denotes the freedom of the customer to pull back from any market transaction; 'voice' states that he is able to complain in a

way that will lead to some changes in services or products offered; and 'loyalty' is where customer stays with the suppliers, regardless of the standard of services provided.

Greater autonomy for public sector manager

NPM calls for more autonomy to the public sector managers. Unlike private sector, public sector managers have to work within a strict regime of laws and by-laws. Hence, they have no room for innovation and contemplation. NPM is in favour of greater elbow-room for managerial leadership by providing public managers with greater flexibility in personnel policy like contractual appointment, workplace bargaining, and so on (Bhattacharya 1998).

Application of rigorous performance measurement technique

Application of rigorous performance measurement technique is another hallmark of NPM. The root of performance measurement as a technique of quality assurance has its first forceful advocacy in the Scientific Management Theory of Fredrick Taylor. Though it has become a household name in private sector enterprises for quite some time, its acceptance in the public sector management is only a recent phenomenon. Thanks to the 're-inventing government' movement in the US in early 1990s, a host of performance measurement techniques like TQM, counter services, citizen's charter, and so on, have increasingly become the part of bureaucratic parlance. However, a caveat needs to be sounded regarding performance measurement technique. For, applications of performance measurement techniques like benchmarking and report card do not necessarily guarantee unadulterated success in terms of productivity in every situation. Sometimes, they are mechanically introduced without proper appreciation of the ground reality or problem (Campo and Sundaram 2004).

Disaggregation of public bureaucracy

Public bureaucracy has an uncanny knack of expansion and extravagance. The public choice theorist have shown how bureaucracy has blown out of proportion and eaten out the vitals of a given society. Parkinson has unpacked the intricacies of bureaucratic expansion by his famous Parkinson Law. NPM suggests

disaggregation of public bureaucracies into agencies, which will deal with each other in a user-pay basis (Hood 1991).

Cost-cutting

NPM is strongly advocating economy in public sector. Inspired by New Right philosophy, NPM is in favour of cost-cutting in public sector.

Goal-orientation

Another important feature of NPM is its goal-orientation. NPM is exclusively committed to goal.

Use of quasi-markets and contracting out technique

NPM encourages quasi-markets and contracting out techniques to ensure better management of ailing cash-strapped public sector.

Emphasis on managerial support service

NPM asks for managerial support service to facilitate public sector managers reaching the pre-set target. Under managerial support service, an array of policies has been undertaken collectively known as human resource management. The basic objective is to draw best talents from the market in the public sector by offering attractive salary, perks, incentives, and other benefits. Moreover, NPM also suggests regular periodic skill-improving training programming to hone up the competitive edge of the man power (Bhattacharaya 1998).

Organizational and spatial decentralization

NPM believes in decentralized form of governance. It encourages all kinds of organizational and spatial decentralization.

Implications of the New Public Management

NPM has engendered an administrative reform spree of sorts across the globe. Ghuman has identified five broad categories of administrative reforms:

1. *Reorganization and downsizing of government*: Though NPM does not directly suggest downsizing of government, however, the elaborate reorganization and restructuring measures it prescribes, often lead to slimming of government.

2. *Performance-based organization*: One of the direct implications of NPM for public sector management is to adopt performance as the basis of organization.

3. *Creation of Senior Civil Services (SCS)*: Under NPM the idea of unified civil service is repudiated by separating policy from administration. For effective implementation of policies, NPM proposed to contract out service delivery functions to non-governmental or quasi-governmental agencies and private service providers, saving the major policy-making functions for core departments to be manned by seasoned public servants. Hence, it recommends forming a cadre of SCS based on written employment contracts and partly performance-based pay for effective formulation of public policies.

4. *Adoption of private sector styles of management practices*: Another major implication of NPM is the adoption of private sector managerial practices in pubic sector management. NPM moved from bureaucratic model of Kanter's model of flatter (non-hierarchical) and more focused structure of organizations to an entrepreneurial form of governance as Osborne and Gaebler (1992) seemed to have suggested. Hence, NPM calls for greater synergy between public and private sector management.

5. *Customer-driven administration:* If there is any seemingly positive implication of NPM on overall governance, it must be the customer-orientedness of administration. NPM, unlike the traditional bureaucratically managed public sector management, elevates citizen to centre of discourse. Customer's satisfaction index is considered to be 'the' criteria of public service. Several procedural innovations like Citizen's Charter, citizen's report card, and so on are manufactured to reflect citizen's choice (Ghuman 2001).

NPM, especially the way it has been packaged and marketed, comes under serious challenge. The criticism against NPM is ranging from questioning its claim of universality (Hood 1991) to the proclamation of its death. In this section we will mainly

concentrate on the major criticism labelled against it. The professed claim of universal applicability of NPM as a trusted antidote of any kind of 'management ills' irrespective of culture and contexts is no longer found tenable. Christopher Hood has enumerated some major objections: First, despite the initial hypes and hooplas, NPM seems to have worked only in superficial level, leaving most of the old problems and weaknesses intact. The only substantial change that has occurred is in the language that the public managers speak in public. Second, NPM's claim of economy or cost-cutting also sounds hollow as it failed to bring down the cost per unit of service. Critics argue that the net result of NPM is an 'aggrandizement of management' and 'rapid middle level bureaucratization of new reporting system', which in effect hampered public service. Third, NPM on the pretext of promoting public good actually serves the 'career interest of an elite group of new managerialists (namely, the top managers, officials, management consultants, business schools). Fourth, NPM's claim of universal applicability is also not tenable as different administrative values call for different administrative designs (Hood 1991).

To the other extreme, critics like Patrick Dunleavy and others have written the obituary of NPM and proclaimed a post-NPM regime of digital era governance. A few commentators, who are not willing to go that far, have identified 'one important shift in the thinking of NPM'. In its earlier Entrepreneurial Government version, the emphasis was on de-governmentalization and privatization. The government was supposed to be slim, smart, and responsive. But considering the centrality of government in development discourse and nation building, the contemporary version of NPM emphasizes on better government, not on less government (Arora 2007).

Some critics argue that managerialism in the form of NPM is the revival of the Scientific Management principles advocated by F.W. Taylor. Pollitt, a staunch critic, sees managerialism representing a revival of Taylor's Scientific Management ideas which, according to him, are contrary to the development of the organizational behaviour (human relations approach). According to him, the central

thrust of NPM is to set clear targets, develop performance indicators to measure the achievement of those targets, and to single out, by means of merit awards, promotion or other rewards, those individuals who get 'results'. There is far less official acceptance of the complexities of workplace norms, beliefs, and aspirations or of the equally complex issues of motivational biases in decision-making and inter-institutional interdependencies. Pollitt argues that managerial reforms in the 1970s and 1980s was dominated by the values of efficiency, economy, and effectiveness, while other values such as fairness, equity, justice, and participation were either off the agenda or were treated as constraints on the drive for higher productivity.

To sum up, NPM is a reform programme that has caught the fancy of the developed and developing countries and aims to make public administration more efficient, effective, and responsive. However, it is not seen as an unmitigated blessing. Critics debate its major premise of the superiority of the private over the public sector and its lack of concern for ethics and such other crucial issues. However, it is certain that it is an attempt to give market orientation to the public sector, adopt modern management approaches and techniques, downsize bureaucracy and empower the lower echelons, and increase popular participation in governance. In the government sector, equity is equally important. Thus it is suggested that the administrative reforms patterned on the NPM doctrine must promote four Es (economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and equity) by striking a proper balance among them.

THEORY AND PRACTICE OF GOVERNANCE

In the contemporary social science discourses, governance has acquired ubiquity. Governance does not simply mean 'rule' or 'administration'; it has a specific meaning in the context of globalization. Broadly speaking, governance is the manner in which power is exercised. This is different from public administration that apart from structure and processes of administration, also underlines the importance of its 'purpose'. Governance is about 'the capacity' of the public authority and its accountability. Capacity includes

the state's 'hardware', its financial resources and administrative infrastructure, and its effectiveness in executing policy decisions. Accountability is the 'software' of the state whereby the political system is linked with its performance. Governance is, thus, another mode of conceptualizing public administration in the changed global scenario. Before critically evaluating the phenomenon, the following three points seem most appropriate in putting the discussion in a perspective: (*a*) governance as a concept and also as a paradigm is a practitioner's contribution to public administration in the sense that it has been conceptualized by the World Bank in the context of sub-Saharan Africa at a particular historical juncture. Failure to repay the World Bank loans, among other things, led to its formulation; (*b*) the World Bank definition of governance is very limited and is associated with administrative and managerial arrangements seeking to instil 'efficiency' in public administration; and (*c*) governance is political as well in the sense that it also includes an insistence on 'competitive democracies' of the Western variety. In a way, governance is, therefore, a well-defined administrative set-up that draws its sustenance from 'participatory democracy'. Its historical roots cannot be ignored for governance was articulated when the state-led development paradigm, at the behest of the former Soviet Union, collapsed. The aim here is two-fold: first, by contextualizing governance, the readers will be acquainted with its roots in the contemporary global socioeconomic and political circumstances especially in the aftermath of the disintegration of the former Soviet Union. Second, since the conceptual roots of governance are located in the neoliberal theoretical discourses, it is incumbent on the analysts to identify the significant intellectual inputs that informed the alternative to the state-directed development paradigm.

Governance: Definitional Difficulties[2]

There is no entry in the International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences on 'Governance'. This is clear evidence of the term's new entry in social scientific discussion. As the neoliberal view started

downplaying the state and overvaluing the 'market', and the trend was set to decentre the state from its monopoly status in social control. The idea of 'governance' gained in prominence connoting a plurality of rules replacing the state's monopoly. The transition from 'government' theories to 'governance' theories implies a more processual view of politics and the state—the assumption of a hierarchical structure capable of panoptically overviewing society, somewhat implicit in a 'government' perspective, is abandoned. Frederickson, thus, argues that 'governance is used in place of public administration to distance the writer from the traditions of public administration and from criticism of bureaucracy' (Frederickson 1999: 705). 'Governance', like NPM, defies simple definitions (Rhodes 1999),[3] but indicates the emergence of a more plural political world, a declining role of the nation state, and a more complex set of societal problems. The growing respectability of governance as a paradigm coincides with those societal changes—sometimes theorized as a shift from government to governance, in a context of globalization—from coordinated hierarchical structures and processes of societal steering to a network-based process of exchange and negotiation. Society is seen as a network of negotiating units, whose compositions vary, as do their positions in the power structure, over time and across subjects. From a 'government' perspective, a logical structure is presupposed: thus, in this line of thinking, it is possible to identify relatively clear distinctions and connections, implications, and derivations between policies and programmes. Seen from a 'governance' point of view, the policy process must constantly negotiate logics and rationalities.

There are many views of 'good governance' (Jreisat 2004: 1004–06) seeking to prove as a panacea for 'bad governance' in a changing world demanding more dynamic, result-oriented, transparent, and accountable government on the one hand and a networking of formal institutions of government, the market and the private sector, and the civil society on the other. As it has been rightly cautioned, good governance has also its pitfalls, as the tendency seems to 'depoliticize' government and bring in more technicism and expertise at the cost of citizens' age-old and

hard-fought democratic right to govern politically. The concern with good governance in international development arose out of a particular politics at a time when there were major arguments regarding the need to downsize the state. Throughout the 'governance' discourse, references are made to the current approaches to improving governance that is calculated to reduce the act of governing to an apolitical and technical exercise. A key issue, however, is that governance is about power and politics. As various forms of confrontations and people's struggles for their 'rights' in various parts of the Third World clearly point out, for democracy to survive, 'governance' has to be seen as a project of continuous struggle for social construction, which includes issues of inclusion, equity, and equality.

Governance is a conceptual riddle. Semantically, it refers to government-run administration. Hence, it should be studied within the format of public administration. However, given its roots in the concern of the World Bank for recovering 'loans' given to the sub-Saharan African states, it has become integrally linked with the 'neoliberal' thrust in contemporary global politics. In an interdependent world, governance is also projected as, perhaps the most appropriate device to confront and mitigate the challenges of the network society. It is identified as 'a perception of the good society and the means to attain it: a construction of rationalities and a range of political technologies constantly negotiated among actors in a network' (Salskov-Iversen, Hansen, and Bislev 2000: 186). Governance is, thus, sought to be universalized as a condition of development. This also implies that failures in development efforts have largely been the result of 'poor governance', explained in 'politics-specific' terms and democratic processes that induce 'inefficiency'.

Governance generally means 'the act or process of governing, specifically authoritative direction and control' (*Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary* 1979). To be more precise, governance can be further defined as 'the political direction and control exercised over the actions of the members, citizens or inhabitants of communities, societies and states' (*Random House College Dictionary* 1984: 571). While conceptualizing good

governance in the context of debt-ridden sub-Saharan Africa, the World Bank (1989b: 18) was guided by:

> … efforts to create an enabling environment and to build capacities will be wasted if the political context is not favourable. Ultimately better governance requires political renewal. This means a concerted attack on corruption from the highest to lowest level. This can be done by setting good example, by strengthening accountability, by encouraging public debate, and by maturing a free press. It also means … fostering grassroots and non-governmental organizations such as farmers' associations, cooperatives and women's groups.

Underlining the above goal, the World Bank (1992a: 29) defined 'good governance' as:

> Good governance is epitomized by predictable, open and enlightened policy-making, a bureaucracy imbued with a professional ethos acting in furtherance of the public good, the rule of law, transparent processes and a strong civil society participating in public affairs.

As evident, there are four key elements: (*a*) public sector management; (*b*) accountability; (*c*) legal framework for development; and (*d*) information and transparency. Improving governance would begin with an assessment of the institutional environment—accountability, rule of law, openness, and transparency—which determines the patrimonial profile of the country. Good governance is also contrasted with 'poor governance' that is held responsible for lack of sound development in sub-Saharan African nation states. Poor governance is, according to the World Bank (1992b: 27) formulation, 'characterized by arbitrary policy-making, unaccountable bureaucracies, un-enforced or unjust legal systems, the abuse of executive power, a civil society unengaged in public life and widespread corruption'. According to the World Bank, some of the main symptoms of poor governance are as follows:

1. Failure to make a clear separation between what is public and what is private, hence, a tendency to divert public resources for private gain;

2. failure to establish a predictable framework of law and government behaviour conducive to development, or arbitrariness in the application of rules and laws;
3. excessive rules, regulations, licensing requirements, and so forth, which impede the functioning of markets and encourage rent-seeking;
4. priorities inconsistent with development, resulting in a misallocation of resources; and
5. excessively narrowly based or nontransparent decision-making (World Bank 1992c: 9).

Underlying the litany of Africa's development problems is, thus, 'a crisis of governance'. The World Bank expressed concern for 'the lack of official accountability, the control of information and a failure to respect the rule of law'. Since, governance is 'the conscious management of regime structures, with a view to enhancing the public realm' the bank, thus, insists on 'independence for the judiciary, scrupulous respect for the law and human rights at every level of government, transparent accountability of public monies, and independent public auditors responsible to a representative legislature, not to an executive' (World Bank 1989b: 192). Such a distortion in public institutions appears to be unavoidable because they, superimposed 'on political and economic systems in which they had no roots, continued to lack accountability … but were captured by clan pressures, politicized by booty [resembling largely] the kinds of patrimonial states common in early Europe' (Brautigam 1991: 8). The tragedy of 'mismanagement' and 'corruption' seems to have its root in this colonial imposition of states and bureaucratic institutions, rather than 'their natural evolution through a process of citizen demands for accountability and ruler adjustments' (Brautigam 1991: 9). Driven by concern for efficient governance, another World Bank document, *Governance and Development* (1992c), defines governance as 'the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country's economic and social resources for development'. It denotes (*a*) the form of political regime (parliamentary or presidential, military or civilian, and authoritarian or democratic), (*b*) the process in which the power

is exercised, and (*c*) the capacity of the government to design, formulate, and implement policies to discharge the government functions. While the first aspect of governance falls outside the World Bank's ambit, the second and third aspects, as claimed by the World Bank, appear critical to the bank (World Bank 1992c: 58, fn 1). However, on a closer look at the subsequent elaboration of the concept by other international agencies endorsing the World Bank agenda, it is clear that these three aspects remain integral to governance. Absorbing the primary thrust of the World Bank prescriptions, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), for instance, elaborates the concept by underlining that governance is 'the essence of economic, political and administrative authority to manage a country's affairs at all levels. It comprises mechanisms, processes and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights, meet their local obligations and mediate their differences' (UNDP 1997: 9).

Governance is also articulated by the UNDP in terms of eight major characteristics (UNDP 1997: 19). It is participatory, consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive, and follows the rule of law. It assures that corruption is minimized, the views of minorities are taken into account, and that the voices of the most vulnerable in society are heard in decision-making. It is also responsive to the present and future needs of society.

Participation

Participation by both men and women is a key cornerstone of good governance. Participation could be either direct or through legitimate intermediate institutions or representatives. It is important to point out that representative democracy does not necessarily mean that the concerns of the most vulnerable in society would be taken into consideration in decision-making. Participation needs to be informed and organized. This means freedom of association and expression on the one hand and an organized civil society on the other hand.

Rule of law

Good governance requires fair legal frameworks that are enforced impartially. It also requires full protection of human

rights, particularly those of minorities. Impartial enforcement of laws requires an independent judiciary and an impartial and incorruptible police force.

Transparency

Transparency means that decisions taken and their enforcement are done in a manner that follows rules and regulations. It also means that information is freely available and directly accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions and their enforcement. It also means that enough information is provided and that it is provided in easily understandable forms and media.

Responsiveness

Good governance requires that institutions and processes try to serve all stakeholders within a reasonable timeframe. By being responsive, governmental institutions gain 'legitimacy' in the public realm which will automatically ensure their wider acceptance and thus effectiveness in governance. Apart from well-designed structural devices, responsiveness of public institutions can only be meaningfully ascertained only if there is a serious civil society engagement in public affairs.

Consensus oriented

There are several actors and as many view points in a given society. Good governance requires mediation of the different interests in society to reach a broad consensus in society on what is in the best interest of the whole community and how this can be achieved. It also requires a broad and long-term perspective on what is needed for sustainable human development and how to achieve the goals of such development. This can only result from an understanding of the historical, cultural, and social contexts of a given society or community.

Equity and inclusiveness

A society's well-being depends on ensuring that all its members feel that they have a stake in it and do not feel excluded from the mainstream of society. This requires all groups, but it is important to ascertain that particularly the most vulnerable, have opportunities to improve or maintain their well-being.

Effectiveness and efficiency

Good governance means that processes and institutions produce results that meet the needs of society while making the best use of resources at their disposal. The concept of efficiency in the context of good governance also covers the sustainable use of natural resources and the protection of the environment.

Accountability[4]

Accountability is a key requirement of good governance. Not only governmental institutions but also the private sector and civil society organizations must be accountable to the public and to their institutional stakeholders. Who is accountable to whom varies depending on whether decisions or actions taken are internally or externally to an organization or institution. In general, an organization or an institution, is accountable to those who will be affected by its decisions or actions. Accountability cannot be enforced without transparency and the rule of law.

Strategic vision[5]

Leaders and the public have a broad and long-term perspective on good governance and human development, along with a sense of what is needed for such development. There is also an understanding of the historical, cultural, and social complexities in which that perspective is grounded.

Governance is, thus, a check list of criteria of managing public affairs. As Lewis T. Preston (1992: v), President, World Bank, categorically stated in his foreword to *Governance and Development*,

> [g]ood governance is an essential complement to sound economic policies. Efficient and accountable management by the public sector and a predictable and transparent policy framework are critical to the efficiency of markets and governments, and hence to economic development.

Broadly speaking, good governance is conceptually three-dimensional. First, it refers to certain espoused principles of public administration, namely, accountability, transparency, and participation. Second, it also dwells on the processes in which

political power is articulated and exercised. The process involves a complex interplay among the prevalent values, policies, and institutions which are critical to making and implementing decisions for the society in question. Governance also recognizes the importance of interactions between state, market, and civil society. Third, successful application of governance, both as principles and processes, is contingent on the regulatory capacity of the state. While control without good governance is oppressive, good governance without the capacity to apply them is an empty slogan. A perusal of these features suggests that governance is not a magical formula. Instead, it seeks to articulate a device to improve governmental functioning in areas where the government is apparently minimal and is largely appropriated by 'partisan' interests where it exists. Hence, it is stated:

> Governance is a continuum, and not necessarily unidirectional, it does not automatically improve over time. It is a plant that needs constant tending. Citizens need to demand good governance. Their ability to do so is enhanced by literacy, education and employment opportunities. Government needs to prove responsive to those demands … Change occurs sometimes in response to external or internal threats. It also occurs through pressures from different interest groups, some of which may be in the form of populist demands. Although lenders and aid agencies and other outsiders can contribute resources and ideas to improve governance, for change to be effective it must be rooted firmly in the societies concerned and cannot be imposed from outside. (World Bank 1992c: 11–12)

A careful reading of the World Bank formula suggests the following checklist of requirements of the new governance paradigm:

1. A recommended shift to general emphasis from policy to management, with administrators becoming fully cost-conscious in every action they take and before making decisions;
2. clusters rather than the pyramids as the preferred model for the design of administrative systems (for example, autonomous agencies form liaison with the major ministries as equal partners in various governmental projects);

3. in place of planning and hierarchical execution of decisions, a dichotomy between core policy activities and adaptive operational services;

4. a process-oriented administration gives way to an output-oriented administration (hence, the insistence on performance indicators, evaluations and performance-related pay, and quality improvement);

5. flexible provision of individualized products instead of collective provision (the customer replaces the citizen, and 'the production line' of public administration is broken down into individual pieces for contracting out or privatization);

6. an emphasis on cost-cutting rather than spending (the modern administrator's motto is value for money, that is to do more and better with less or the same);

7. the purpose of ownership is seen as efficient management rather than possession (budgeting in terms of simple input/output quantities is replaced by 'accrual' accounting, and all public services are considered for privatization, if their commercial viability may be sustained at less cost in the private sector).[6]

As is evident, there is no standard recipe for good governance except (*a*) respect for rule of law—it is the duty of civil society to ensure that the rule of law is maintained and protected; (*b*) special care for the disadvantaged and weak; (*c*) tolerance and broad-mindedness to embrace unity and diversity, that is values of multiculturalism; and (*d*) respect for the institutions upholding the spirit of democracy, primarily procedural democracy.

To sum up the discussion on the definition of good governance, one can safely make the following points: Governance is a conceptual approach (*a*) concerning 'big questions' of a 'constitutional' nature that establish the rules of political conduct; (*b*) involving creative intervention by political actors to change structures that inhibit the expression of human potential; (*c*) emphasizing the nature of interactions between state and social actors and among social actors themselves; and (*d*) referring to particular types of relationships among political actors which are socially sanctioned

rather than arbitrary.[7] Taking all these features together, governance refers to 'the traditions, institutions, and processes that determine how power is exercised, how citizens are given a voice, and how decisions are made on issues of public concern'.[8] Governance is, thus, inherently 'political' since it involves 'bargaining and compromise, winners and losers, among actors with different interests and resources' (Lyer, Jr., Heinrich, and Hill 2001: 10). Thus, governance is also a platform for interactions between the stakeholders and government that is always frictional largely due to obvious incompatibility of interests among them. Informed by this concern, governance is also defined as 'engaged governance', whereby engagement between government and civil society is formally recognized. The primary focus is on the policy cycle of the government within a value-driven governance system. Drawn on the UNDP description of governance as 'processes' involving civil society institutions, the engaged governance is a serious theoretical formulation underlining how authority is exercised and what mechanisms and processes are seen to be legitimate from the point of view of the stakeholders. What is striking in this conceptualization is the endeavour to respond to some of the major normative questions that relate to, respectively, questions around the distribution and the exercise of power and the empowerment of citizens, broadly defined as participants in governance lexicon.[9] Governance is, thus, integral to World Bank rhetorics and lending policies towards the Third World, addressing 'not only issues of political legitimacy and democracy, but also the need for administrative efficiency by means of marketization and competition' (Salskov-Iversen, Hansen, and Bislev 2000: 194).

CHANGING PERSPECTIVE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

'Governance', as a model of public administration, cannot be understood without reference to the context in which it has been conceptualized. There is no doubt that 'globalization' provides significant inputs to its epistemological articulation. Depending on the specific perspective taken, the theme of globalization along

with its varied ramifications has been the subject of conflicting interpretations. Economists and international trade experts have been adopting their own disciplinary angles. Political scientists and sociologists have taken their respective viewpoints, and so on. Public administration has basically been an inward looking discipline concerned with the management of a country's domestic public affairs. Very recently, it has woken up to the need for focusing on the pulls and pressures of the on-going processes of globalization and their impact on domestic administrative management. Since then, the search has been on how to 'reinvent' or 'reposition' the discipline in the context of a newly emergent world order. Public administration, thus, now represents, 'a decisive move away from direct provision by government agencies and their employees—the standard "bureau model" of the past' (Lyer, Jr., Heinrich, and Hill 2001: 1).

Traditionally, public administration has been concerned with the policies and actions of a country's formal governmental machineries, including their organizational structures, decisional processes, and behavioural dimensions. Globalization, as it is being currently perceived, has considerable implications for the management of a country's public affairs contextually as well as substantively. The purpose of the present discussion is to clearly bring out these implications by placing public administration within the framework of contemporary globalization process and discourse. There is almost universal recognition today of the urgent need for realignment of a country's public administrative system, but the direction and contents of reform are far from clear. Globalization has been defined in various ways and its newness has also not gone unchallenged. Economic and market integration of the countries of the world through increased flow of goods, services, investment and capital fund flows, and labour mobility has been the common marker of 'globalization'. It might sound over-economistic, yet at the heart of contemporary globalization discourse is the central fact of increase in international transactions, particularly international trade in markets for goods, services, and some factors of production. Along with this noticeable trend, there is remarkable growth and expanded scope of many institutions that transcend

national boundaries including multinational firms, international institutions, and NGOs operating globally. There has also been expansion and international exchange in many other fields such as foreign direct investment (FDI), role of multinational corporations (MNCs), and integration of world capital markets. At the national or domestic level, the extra-territorial reach of government policies has been quite common in many areas of concern such as trade, international investments negotiation, and even social development policies in vital sectors like health, education, and poverty reduction. In the process, governments are facing constraints on their functioning because of their subjection to certain rules and regulations framed and 'imposed' by a number of international institutions (WTO, for instance) of which they are members.

HISTORICAL ROOTS OF GOVERNANCE

Historical circumstances appeared to have favoured the articulation of governance as a mode of public administration. To be precise, governance is conceptualized in a historical context supporting 'the decline, if not end, of authority'. In the formulations by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), *four sets* of historical developments seem to have influenced these profound shifts in governance. First, is the impact of struggles for 'greater democracy and competitive markets'. The second set is linked with the ways in which 'changes in economic productivity and material wealth alter both the aims and methods of governance'. The third set of forces relate to demands for reforming the well-entrenched and excessively rule-bound system of administration. Finally, the fourth set is about managerial innovations and their application to transform 'the institutional design and organization structure' of administrative operation (Michalski, Miller, and Stevens 2001: 9). The search for a new conceptualization had an antecedent also in the collapse of the former Soviet Union where 'alternative management practices', grounded in Marxism–Leninism were articulated and also successfully executed. Within the developed capitalist countries, almost simultaneously, there was the rise of strong anti-bureaucratic and anti-state

criticism directed against what came to be called 'government overload', as a consequence of 'welfare backlash'. The state, it was alleged, has over the years taken upon itself a large array of activities that have inflated its budgetary and financial commitments, and led to the 'overgrowth' of bureaucracy. The battle cry was to 'downsize' government and allow more free play to the market and civil society, giving rise to the new ideology of 'neoliberalism'.

Following the onset of globalization, the traditional bureaucratic model appears to have lost its significance presumably because of the growing importance of the non-state actors in administration. The instrumental view of administration does not, therefore, appear to be tenable for reasons connected with the 'pluralization of state'. Given the increasing role of transnational forces even in domestic administration, the state-centred theories of bureaucracy seem to be inadequate in addressing the radical metamorphosis of public administration, both in the developed and developing countries. One can, thus, safely argue that while the twentieth century was the age of organization where bureaucracy symbolized the core values of public administration, the twenty-first century has ushered in an era of 'network-based organization', drawn on neoliberal values.

Globalization is a force that cannot, thus, be easily dispensed with. Government is being 'reinvented', not only structurally, but also ideologically in an environment where neoliberal values seem to have triumphed. State retreats and government withdraws form areas that traditionally remain its domain. Globalization has led to a 'marriage' between corporate discipline and entrepreneurial spirit with government discarding it traditional image of 'a doer'. Seeking to accommodate 'the market impulse', the government has become an 'enabler'. Globalization, thus, restricts the national governments and limits its policy options. A new situation has emerged and governmental functions are redefined within the neo-conservative theoretical parameters. The corporate state has become a reality resulting in an obvious shrinkage of the traditional state system. The state is increasingly being guided by neoliberal values endorsing globalization of capital.

The distinction between public and private administration does not appear to be critical in conceptualizing public administration.

Citizens are customers and those involved in public administration are functionaries seeking to approximate to the 'corporate' culture. Accountability in public bureaucracy is ascertained not only internally but also through various external agencies, including the citizen's charter. Public administration is now 'governance' which is nothing but checklists of certain activities designed both to stabilize and also to consolidate neoliberalism. As a piggyback to globalization, the structural adjustment programme led to economic reforms in the developing countries that largely 'delegitimized' the role of 'the hegemonic state'. And, the conditional loans to the developing countries by the transnational agencies make them dependent on the global capital. As it was emphasized in the 1989 World Bank report, to be eligible for financial assistance from the World Bank, countries need to recast their socioeconomic and political goals, in accordance with the World Bank prescriptions. The report, thus, insists that the countries

> … that had adopted a sound medium-term economic policy framework would be eligible for Bank support. Support would be decided on a case-to-case basis, taking into account the strength of the medium term adjustment program … The severity of the debt burden, the scope for voluntary market-based operations, the medium-term financing plan, and the potential benefits from Bank support, particularly for investment and growth. (World Bank 1989a: 49)

In return of a new wave of loans from various international agencies, including the World Bank, several post-colonial states adopted structural adjustment programmes that was a package of measures, suggested by the World Bank and other donors. The aim of adjustment was to provide an effective alternative to 'the dominant post-war, state-led development paradigm … by promoting open and free competitive market economies, supervised by minimal states' (Leftwich 1993: 607). Two processes seem to work in structural adjustment programmes. On the one hand, the concerned economy is sought to be stabilized by 'immediate devaluation' and 'drastic public expenditure cuts'. This is accompanied, on the other hand, by a process of adjustment that seeks to 'transform

the economic structure and institutions through varying doses of deregulation, privatization, slimming down of allegedly oversized public bureaucracies, reducing subsidies and encouraging realistic prices to emerge as a stimulus to greater efficiency and productivity, especially for export' (Leftwich 1993: 607).

There appears to be a vicious circle from which there is no escape for the developing countries presumably because the alternative ideological power centres are too weak to be effective partners in sustaining the drive for development. Furthermore, the drive towards 'depoliticizing development' systematically obscures 'power', 'class', and 'politics'. Critical to development are activities around 'civil society', that, by implication, identifies development as a mere techno-economic effort which takes place outside the political arena. This is an argument that clearly undermines the role of ideology in development, especially in the developing countries where public administration is critically 'partisan' for historical reasons.

THEORETICAL ROOTS OF GOVERNANCE

Conceptually, governance is linked with the ideological triumph of neoliberalism. Theoretical roots of governance are located in 'neoliberal' economic theories, especially 'New Right ideology'. Government is 'redefined' in market paradigms by redrawing boundaries of public administration. In the new dispensation, governance is an interface between state, market, and civil society. The 'governance' discourse has its origin in (*a*) the new thrust towards neoliberalist restraint on the 'state', along with the positing of 'market' as a competing social authority, and bringing in 'civil society' as a provider of local level social services; (*b*) the international funding authorities' (particularly, the World Bank) concern for more accountable, transparent, open, and participative rule; and (*c*) the newly emergent 'globalization' trend—a socioeconomic integration of the world propelled by economic, technological, and political considerations.

The New Right ideology seeks to redefine public administration by championing the cause of the free market and calls for a significant reduction in the size and role of government in society.

Although, the advocacy has generally been in favour of a greater role for the market and a lesser role for the state, the new right had within it, a neoliberal wing and neo-conservative wing. The former has been primarily concerned with the promotion of individual liberty and the latter with the restoration of traditional values.

Four main schools of New Right thought are Chicago, Austrian, Public Choice, and Supply Side. The supply side approach needs a separate treatment. All that can be noted in our context is that it is based on neo-classical micro economic theory and its main perspective for growth is reduction in interest rate.

As the chief critic of the Keynesian ideas that dominated the post war era until the mid-1970s, Milton Friedman has been the most prominent among the Chicago School of economists. Their main argument has been that empirical analysis of the consequences of government actions clearly establishes that the market is more effective than government in achieving social goals. That this argument had a major impact can be understood from his conceptualization of the legitimate role of government, which is very much based on the doctrine of 'limited government' propounded in the past by Adam Smith.

Friedman identified four areas of legitimate government activity—the protection of individuals from external coercion; the administration of justice; the provision of public goods and the settling of some problems arising from neighbourhood effects; and the protection of irresponsible, such as the mad and children. He was aware of the fact that special interests requiring government intervention in their favour exerted excessive influence on the political process. Money supply which, in his view, was the cause of inflation could be solved by non-discretionary monetary rules. He was attracted to the idea of constitutional reform to provide limited government.

The Austrian school, represented by, among others, Carl Manger, Friedrich Hayek, and Ludurig Von Mises, has also been free-market-oriented, taking a more principled stand in favour of the doctrine of laissez-faire. Three distinguishing features of Austrian economics are: (*a*) social science is the study of purposeful human action; (*b*) only individuals are the appropriate study (methodological

individualism); and (*c*) value is in the eye of the beholder (subjective theory of value). We will be focusing on the thoughts of Hayek who was the most influential Austrian with his wide-ranging contribution to political philosophy and scientific methodology. Relevant writings of Hayek, for our limited purpose are *The Road to Serfdom* (1994), *The Fatal Illusion* (1989), *Law, Legislation and Liberty* (1973), and *The Constitution of Liberty* (1960). The major themes that recur in his thought are:

1. Society is a spontaneous order; as evolved, spontaneous order is to be preferred to a planned society.
2. Liberty has instrumental value because it makes best use of widely dispersed knowledge and provides for the unpredictable growth of knowledge, allowing individuals to experiment with new ideas and techniques.
3. Socialism is undemocratic and impossible. What will be produced is determined by a few and not by the mass of consumers. There is no agreed common purpose in society. The recognition of private property or the rules of contract exist to enable individuals to pursue their own goals and not to reach common goals. As regards planning, socialist planning has no way of predicting consumer demand without the role of prices, the planner does not know what to produce and at what cost.
4. One of Hayek's controversial arguments was that the concept social justice is meaningless. As a principle of state action, social or distributive justice requires agreement on 'who deserves what' and existence of sufficient power in the hands of the state to determine it. It is implied that some concept of 'merit' should be determinant of the distribution of goods and income. It is difficult to have 'unanimity' on this question because everyone has a different view on merit. In a free society, there is no consensus on what would be the correct distribution of goods.

Again, when the state assumes the role of a decider—to determine who gets what—whoever controls the state would determine

what they thought people deserved. Income distribution policy would be determined not by the ability to satisfy consumers but by political influence. In this situation, government becomes a scramble between the interest groups for influence over the political allocation income. In Hayek's view, justice was procedural. Just rules of income would be the stability of possession, transfer by consent, and the keeping of promises. The distribution of income that results from these rules is not the legitimate concern of government in a free society.

Hayek became interested in the establishment of a principle of a liberal constitution in which the role of government is to create a framework within which individuals and groups can pursue their respective ends, and sometimes to use its coercive power of raising revenue to provide services for which for one reason or another, the market cannot supply. Elected politicians, in his views, have increasingly come under the influence of interest groups who use political power for their own narrow purposes. Hayek was, therefore, in search of principles that would ensure that the state's activities did not go beyond certain limits.

We have now set the stage for direct entry into the 'public choice' debate. The thesis of limited government reaches its apogee in the public choice model which is a theory of politics, also known as the 'economics of politics'. Political behaviour is sought to be explained and predicted on the assumption that political actors are 'utility maximizers' who seek to promote their self-interests. The public choice subset of rational choice theory has played a strategic role in supporting the privatization movement and the application of market rationality in government's decision-making processes. This is a stark contrast to theories which view politics as 'the pursuit of public interests'. Most public choice writers converge on the main point that government has grown much larger that what the general public wish it to be, because it has grown to meet the preferences of politicians, bureaucrats, and interest groups.

The Virginia School of public choice started an intellectual tirade against the nature of politics and bureaucracy. James Buchanan drew attention to the 'misfortunes of modern political life' in the welfare state. In his view, 'the basic structure of property

rights is now threatened more seriously than at any period with two-century history of the United States'. Again, as he argues:

> [G]overnment failure against standard efficiency norms may be demonstrated analytically and empirically, but I see no basis for the faith that such demonstration will magically produce institutional reform. I come back to constitutional revolution as the only attractive alternative to the scenario that we have seen but to act out.

In an almost similar vein, Gordon Tullock underlines that:

> [W]e are saddled with a large and basically inefficient bureaucracy. Efficiency in this sector could, looking at the matter economically, raise our national income and improve our rate of growth. Politically, it could both increase the degree of control over citizens, *qua* voters and thus restrict his freedom.

The Virginia School has, thus, had its unique interpretation of advanced societies with liberal democratic constitutions, and their thrust is towards the rejection of the welfare state. In this view, the public sector has been suffering from inherent systemic failure in terms of policy-making and implementation, and political failure is being more overtly felt than market failure.

The public choice prima facie emerges almost as science of political failure—a right wing perspective on the public sector. In his authoritative interpretation, Mueller has sought to present an apparently value-neutral definition:

> Public Choice can be defined as the economics of non-market decision-making or simply the application Economics to Political Science. The subject matter of public choice is the same as that of Political Science: the theory of state, voting rules, voter behaviour, party politics, the bureaucracy, and so on. The methodology of public choice is that of economics however.

The Mueller formulation seems ethically neutral and does not imply that public choice is the science of the public sector as social misfortune.

The Virginian version of the public choice approach has two underlying epistemological commitments: (*a*) public sector actors behave as if they maximize their own interests and (*b*) all social entities are fundamentally sets of individual actors. As Buchanan writes, 'the basic units are choosing units, acting, behaving persons rather than organic units such as parties, provinces, or nations', and again, 'persons seek to maximize their own utilities, and … their own narrowly defined economic well-being is an important component of these utilities'.

Thus, the doctrine of methodological individualism and model of self-interest maximizing behaviour together seek to explain the structure of the public sector and the motivation of public action. Premised on these two fundamental assumptions, the Virginian version of the public choice approach represents a positive theory about the public sector. Additionally, in this version, there is a normative theory of the state which is a straightforward right wing ideology of a neoliberal kind. The foundation of this normative approach was laid by the elements of a state theory proposed by Wicksell in 1896. Considerations of efficiency in taxation were at the heart of the Wicksellian state theory which pleaded strongly for a quid pro quo rule on individual basis. The only mechanism that will guarantee optimal taxation for public goods provision is the unanimity rule or the individual veto principle in a legislative context.

Following the Wicksellian principles governing decision-making, Buchanan has derived two normative rules which are, in his views, constitutive of the public choice approach: (*a*) politics as exchange and (*b*) economic constitutionalism or contractarianism as the basis of public–policy-making.

The first normative rule—politics as exchange—means that every public policy must be based on the consent of all citizens. It is the application of the Wicksellian unanimity rule to politics. To quote Buchanan, 'in the absence of individual interest, there is no interest [and individuals are] motivated by self-interests' (Buchanan and Tullock 1965: 312) By definition, therefore, politics does not entertain any idea of the common good. Just policies are those that meet with unanimous consent from individual citizens. The second normative principle of constitutional economics is a mechanism

for the expression of political criticism. As Buchanan writes, 'existing constitutions or structure of rules, are the subject of critical scrutiny. The conjectural question becomes: could these rules have emerged from agreement by participants in an authentic constitutional convention?' In the absence of any system of constitutional revisions on a permanent basis, it is a matter of conjecture as to what would be acceptable to the citizens, had they been in a constitutional setting. The public choice approach forbids all evaluative exercises (in respect of public policies), except those based on the unanimity principle. Again, in Buchanan's language:

> [T]here is no criterion through which policy may be directly evaluated. An indirect evaluation may be based on some measure of the degree to which the political process facilitates the translation of expressed individual perfuse into observed political outcomes. The focus of evaluative attention becomes the process itself, as contrasted with end-state or outcome patterns.

The public choice school has been successful in pointing out that there are alternatives available for the delivery of services to the citizens. The role of the 'market' as a competing paradigm has challenged the hegemonic position of the state. Also the power of bureaucracy has been similarly slashed opening-up possibilities of non-bureaucratic citizen-friendly organizational options. It is not, however, a state versus market debate, as it is often made out to be. The real issue is how to make the state more democratic and citizen-friendly and not to relegate it to the background altogether and install the 'new god' of market in its place. The assumptions of the public choice school are not above board, nor are the arguments in favour market always justified. Again, the situations may differ from country to country and their prescriptions to check governmental overgrowth may not be of universal relevance. For instance, the state-led development activities in the Third World are not everywhere amenable to public choice prescription. It is probably true that the growth and complexity of government and perhaps a decline in the force of social opinion and sanctions have given increased opportunities for politicians and bureaucrats to pursue their own gain at the general expense. '[B]ut the extent to

which they actually do', argues Peter Self, 'is another matter which is unlikely to be settled by formal models of behaviour based upon simple assumptions' (1985: 31).

GOVERNANCE AND NATION STATE

The concept of governance is inextricably linked with the working of the nation state as it involves all those activities of social, political, and administrative actors which can be seen as purposeful efforts to guide, steer, control, or manage societies. The weedy growth of nation states in the decolonized Third World in the twentieth century, primarily because of the growth of its commitment and activities, combined with a perception of its limited or diminishing effectiveness, has led in the 1980s to a global crisis of confidence in the state. The crisis was prompted by the dismal performance of states in sub-Saharan Africa, statist failures in the Soviet bloc and deteriorations elsewhere. These concerns have thereby brought into focus the states' governing capacity. That states in the Third World are unable to govern themselves contributes to 'misgovernance'—a term that has gained currency simultaneously with 'good' governance.

If assessed superficially, governance is just another mode of public administration. But if one locates governance in the global neoliberal thrust for social, economic, and political homogenization, the concept acquires completely different connotations. This becomes a mode articulating the neoliberal agenda and seeking to fulfil the neoliberal goal. Anchored in specific theoretical reasoning, governance is not, at all, an innocent construction of administrative practices. Instead, it is loaded with specific ideological preferences, supported by the so-called uni-polar world drawing on 'neoliberalism'. The neoliberal thought found favour with the Western donor agencies, such as the World Bank and IMF that were engaged in the funding of the development projects of the 'debt-ridden' Third World. The convergence of thought in regard to change, reached its apogee in the newly emergent phenomenon of globalization, facilitated by the free flow of funds, goods, and services as dictated by the new conditionalities, laid down by the

WTO, and by the new IT revolution (internet, fax, and web-based communication).

In the context of globalization, the traditional bureaucratic model drawn heavily on hierarchical theory of organization appears to have lost its significance because of the growing importance of the non-state actors in administration. The institutional Weberian view of administration does not, therefore, appear to be tenable for reasons connected with the 'pluralization of state'. Given the increasing role of transnational forces in domestic administration, the state-centred theories of bureaucracy seem to be inadequate in addressing the radical metamorphosis in public governance, both in developed and developing countries. Once can, thus, safely argue that while the twentieth century was the age of organization where bureaucracy symbolized the core values of governance, the twenty-first century has ushered in an era of 'network-based' organization, drawn on neoliberal values. As evident, the complex socioeconomic and political circumstances have raised issues that cannot be grasped within the traditional boundary-conscious social sciences. It requires an interdisciplinary interaction.

Three basic points relating to governance: (*a*) government is to 'steer' and not 'row'. Government is an enabler; not doer. Government acts as a regulator outsourcing services that traditionally belong to the government. (*b*) Government is conceptualized as a corporate house seeking to re-orient its functions. Privatization is the mantra, seeking to re-orient the government accordingly. (*c*) Redefine the relationship between state and citizen. The citizen is client or a customer—you have to pay the price to for the services you use.

Governance is, thus, a mechanical act, governed not by any political ideal, but by the market where the satisfaction of the client is, always prior to any other considerations. Public administration in the new dispensation is just a mechanism of the delivery of public services efficiently and with a smile to the individual customers rejecting the role of 'political ideals' in its distribution. Politics lies in choosing 'what services to deliver, but implies nothing about how to deliver it' (Salskov-Iversen, Hansen, and Bislev 2000: 196). If governance means interactional plurality, in respect of collective

societal problem solving, where do we place the phenomenon of gender as a constituent of governance? How does one explain women's empowerment in development by focusing on the concept of governance? In other words, does good governance or governance as such signify any specific standard of women's involvement in societal decision-making? This is certainly a grey area that has not received adequate attention in the available conceptualization of governance. However, by insisting on collective endeavours in development, governance model seems to be theoretically receptive to 'gender' as a significant input. Good governance and gender equality have, thus, acquired salience in contemporary development debates. The gap between de jure and de facto equality has sharpened the focus on women's access to and participation in governance. It has now been accepted that unless the women constitute a 'critical mass' of the decision-making process, their presence makes little difference to the outcome of governance. The mere presence of women in structure of governance does not however guarantee that the gender considerations are accommodated in laws, governmental policies, and programmes. There are, however, reasons to believe that where women are present in critical numbers and are able to participate effectively, the result is more 'socially responsive governances outcomes'. It is true that given the hegemonic patriarchy in most of the societies, women may not be entirely independent of their male counterparts while discharging their responsibilities in governance. Here, policies towards ascertaining gender-equality act critically towards taking women out of the domestic shackles. The 73rd Amendment Act of 1992 is illustrative here. By, formally including women (through reservation of 33 per cent seats) in the local governance structure, this legal enactment seems to have initiated a process challenging the patriarchy-based rural power structure.

There is no denying that governance has refashioned the contemporary debate on public administration by raising certain major critical questions. However, the primary goal that remains at the core of this new dispensation in the World Bank-sponsored model is to seek to champion universal goals within particular constraint where the role of politics is significantly minimal, if not

entirely outlawed. Despite the formally apolitical stance of the World Bank on this question, 'there is little doubt that underlying even this limited vision of governance is a Western model, ringing with Weberian ethos, with its emphasis on free markets, individualism and a neutral but efficient public administration, subject to a legitimate government' (Leftwich 1996: 16). Without politics, democracy has a restrictive meaning. Politics is the only social process of negotiation and contestation—politics as consisting of all the processes of conflict, cooperation, and negotiation involved in the use, production, and situation of resources. Hence, John J. Kirlin argues that 'as long as democracy is valued the big questions of Public Administration must go beyond the big questions of Public Management' (Kirlin 1996: 217). Public administration diminishes its role in society if understood primarily in terms of managing public agencies. The Minnowbrook Conference I (1968) and the Blacksburg manifesto have both raised this issue of democratic governance in public interest. What is relevant in the context of the 'Third World' is that public administration is being crippled in the name of structural adjustment, invoking more and more the 'market model' of governance, in utter disregard of the crucial social developmental role of the state in the developing countries. The interests of public administration are no longer people-related but capital-related. And, here lies the perils of externally induced administrative reform through which most of the Third World countries are passing today. Hence, Leftwich rightly argues:

> the primacy of politics in development should not … be disguised any longer behind a technicist language about governance and management. For while no one would deny the importance of institutions and rules, it is political processes which bring them into being and crucially, which sustain them. (Leftwich 1996: 20)

Public administration as management, thus, misses altogether the overarching perspective of a democratic polity. Sustained capacity of the political system for collective action, effective citizenship, and developing and nurturing the civic infrastructure for protecting citizens' rights and promoting collective life are of vital

significance for any public administration in democracy. The new management cult is particularly ominous for Third World public administration, as it tends to strengthen bureaucracy further impending the development of alternative people's institutions, so necessary, for both generating social capacity to govern and creating more democratic spaces independent of bureaucratic administration. Characterized as 'neo-Taylorism', good governance seems, thus, a rehash of 'the one-best-way-principle' of the classical administrative theory which is a complete mismatch, for obvious reasons, with the contemporary global context that demands more 'open-endedness' in governance than rigidity of any kind.

DIGITAL/E-GOVERNANCE

In the context of globalization, the recent conceptualization of 'e-governance or digital governance'[10] is of significance in administrative reforms. Drawn on the latest ICT, the aim of e-governance is to open up government processes and enable greater public access to information. Both digital and e-governance are of recent origin and there is hardly any universally acceptable definition. Digital/e-governance refers to the use of the emerging ICT like the internet, web page, and mobile phones to deliver information and services to citizens. It can include publication of information about government services on web sites and citizens can download the application forms for these services. It can also deliver services, such as filling of a tax form, renewal of licence, and processing on-line payments as well. The purpose of digital government is to create 'super counters in [the government departments] and eliminate the endless maze citizens have to negotiate in going from door to door, floor to floor, to obtain service' (Kapoor 2000: 394). Appropriate use of various techniques of ICT will usher in a new era in public administration by seeking to make the governmental functioning and processes more transparent and accessible.

So e-governance through a technological innovation 'has changed the basic character of governance—its operational methodology, functional style, ideological orientation, even the spirit, heart and soul' (Dey 2000: 306). In the developed countries, e-governance is

a well-established mode in which governmental services are made available to the citizens through online portals. In India, digital governance has been legalized by the Information Technology Act of 2000. This act provides:

> legal recognition for transaction carried out by means of electronic data interchange and other means of electronic communication, commonly referred to as 'electronic commerce' which involve use of alternatives to paper-based methods of communication and storage of information, to facilitate electronic filling of documents with the government agencies. (Government of India 2000: 2)

Defining 'electronic form' as 'any information generated, sent, received or stored in media, magnetic, optical, computer memory, microfilm, computer-generated microfiche or similar device', the act accords legal sanction to the following devices which are:

> (a) the filling of any form, application or any other document with any office, authority, body or agency owned or controlled by appropriate government in a particular manner; (b) the issue or grant of any license, permit, sanction or approval by whatever name called in a particular manner; and (c) the receipt or payment of money in a particular manner. (Government of India 2000: 10)

Legally endorsed, this act is a watershed in conceptualizing administrative reform in India. More importantly, e-governance is certainly an attack on bureaucratic red tapism causing unnecessary delay and corruption. Furthermore, it also creates a space for regular involvement of citizens who, as customers of public services, have now direct access to governmental activities through the ICT. So, the citizens can not only view online the governmental acts, they can also provide significant inputs to the government through e-mails and electronic devices. Technology is, thus, an important tool integrating citizens' input and transparency into one model. The ICT-based e-governance has ushered in a new era in government innovations with improved capacities to (*a*) reduce the cost of government, (*b*) increase citizens' input into government, (*c*) improve public decision-making, and (*d*) increase the transparency of government transactions. In view of

these well-defined functional characteristics, e-governance is also a very meaningful step in combating corruption. Not only does it take any discretion, thereby curbing opportunities for arbitrary action, e-government also empowers the citizens by making their intervention in the transactions of governmental business regular through ICT.[11]

Drawn on the ICT, e-governance articulates public administration in a refreshingly new way. However, its application is considerably limited in the public sector simply because e-governance threatens mass retrenchment of workers involved in government. So, the public sector cannot opt for e-governance to replace people for two reasons. First, access to internet is still limited even in the developed countries. Thus, while transactions through ICT cost less than they are by conventional devices, the government has to maintain both the old and new systems to sustain its 'public' character; otherwise, a large portion of the 'people' will remain outside governmental transactions. Second, downsizing and reducing public sector employment in many countries result in economic hardship of those losing jobs, which, for obvious reasons, has severe political repercussions. Thus, for the leadership, this is not a desirable option unless there is no option available.[12] In other words, given the obvious adverse consequences of e-governance both in developed and developing countries, its applicability is both uncertain and limited.

FEMINIST PERSPECTIVE ON PUBLIC POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

The feminist or gender perspective in public policy and administration is an inevitable outcome of heightened gender sensitivity since 1960s or what is known as the second wave of feminist movement. The major objective of feminists is to engender public administration, which according to them is the bastion of male chauvinism. Feminists have demonstrated how patriarchy has systemically excluded women from public space and arrested their private space by capturing the state and public administration. Hence, the feminist perspective seeks to access the role of public

administration, especially of bureaucracy, public policy, and so on, through a gendered lens. However, a caveat seems to be in order at the outset as feminism is neither a homogenous ideology, seeking to undone the injustices perpetrated against women, nor a homogenous group, which unanimously advocates the women's cause. In fact, on the contrary there are innumerable shades and contours in feminism, which negate any generalized position as such. Only one common thread that distinguishes feminist position from the rest is its uncompromising stand on gender equity and gender justice. The feminist theory of public administration is trying to unearth the gender biases embedded in the public agencies and administrative practices. Camilla Strivers (2002: 132) writes '… feminist theories of Public Administration, then use gender as a lens through which to analyze critically women's current status and role in public agencies, bring to light ways in which gender bias inhabits ideas and practices in the field, and formulate new theoretical approaches'.

The feminist discourse in public administration is crystallized into two categories—descriptive and conceptual. While the descriptive theories record the manifestations of underlying gender inequalities in public institutions on the basis of empirical studies; the conceptual theories on the other use gender to rethink the existing philosophy of public administration. At the beginning the feminist scholarship of public administration was mostly confined to descriptive theorization. The conceptual theorization in public administration begins only recently (Strivers 2002). Hence, it can be seen as the application of overall feminist epistemology in the theory and practice of public administration. Feminist theory has shown that women have been subjugated on the pretext of biology, and that gender discrimination is so pervasive because it is socially and culturally embedded. Hence, gender empowerment is recommended to break free the invisible shackles of male domination.

The feminist assertion in public administration was a mid-1970s development. It was basically the outcome of a symposium on 'Women in Public Administration' in 1976 under the leadership of Nesta M. Gallas, the first female president of ASPA. The symposium organized under the auspices of *Public Administration Review*, a

noted journal of the discipline, was mainly concentrated on issues like how and why had women been trapped under the glass ceiling, what kind of affirmative action was needed to ameliorate the status of women, strategies to facilitate women administrators perform better, the idea of women's right as a basis for public policy, and the like. Important publications of descriptive feminist theory of public administration were Lorraine D. Eyde's 'The Status of Women in State and Local Government' (1973) and Judith Mohr's *Why Not More Women City Managers?* (1973). In both the publications, discrimination against women was questioned. The conceptual theories on the other, view that behind the so-called objectivity of public institutions, there are hidden gender biases. Hence, the fundamental theoretical assumptions, approaches, and concepts need to be re-evaluated. The earliest attempt in this regard was the joint article by Robert B. Denhardt and Jan Perkins (1976), entitled 'The Coming Death of Administrative Man'. They argue that the organizational theory despite its avowed universal-neutral orientation is in 'actuality culturally masculine'.

The feminist perspective of public administration sought to interrogate the structural inequality embedded in public institutions and values. Hence, it has suggested that the core areas of public administration to be thoroughly revamped with more sensitivity towards woman's issues. Two major arguments of the feminist perspective in public administration are: (*a*) according to feminist theorists, public administration, like any other branches of social sciences, has been instrumental in systematically excluding women from the purview of public space on the pretext of biology. (*b*) Feminist thinkers have argued that in a patriarchal society, public institutions, bureaucracy, and so on, are nothing but the structure of subordination as patriarchal values are entrenched in those institutions. Therefore, to bring about gender equity, as they have suggested, attempts should be made to dislodge patriarchy from the above institutions.

The main thesis of Camilla Strivers 'gender images in public administration' is that images of professional expertise, management, leadership, and public virtue that mark justifications of administrative power contain dilemmas of gender. They not only have features

commonly and unthinkingly associated with masculinity but they also help to keep in place or bestow political and economic privilege on the bearers of masculine qualities at the expense of those who display culturally feminine ones. Far from being superficial window-dressing or a side effect, the characteristic masculinity of public administration—though far from monolithic—is systemic. It contributes to and is sustained by power relations in society at large that distribute resources on the basis of gender and affect people's life chances and their sense of themselves and their place in the world (Strivers 2002: 3).

Looking at public administration through the lens of gender, its public dimensions are revealed as gendered rather than neutral. Public administration involves the discretionary exercise of public power, and we expect public power to justify itself. Typically, this is accomplished by reference to redeeming features such as the public interest dimensions of administrative decision-making, the expertise that is said to serve the public good, the deft management skills that make possible the accomplishment of public purposes, and the necessity for administrative leadership in the era of post industrial complexity. But this publicness is problematic, because it is grounded in a historical understanding of the public sphere as a male preserve, distinct from the domestic realm that has been the primary life space and responsibility of women (Strivers 2002: 3). Thus, women have been excluded from the public sphere which is dominated by the male.

Feminist theorists have criticized the classical liberal state for its marked individualism and for the dependence of its clear boundary between public and private spheres on the exclusion of women and women's concerns from political life. Classical Liberalism, according to Camilla Strivers, has always seen boundaries around the public sphere as necessary to prevent tyranny by sheltering individual 'private' concerns from the reach of the state. But paradoxically, the viability of the economic and political activities that go on in the liberal public sphere depends on the household—on the provision of shelter, food, clothing, and the bearing and nurturing of children. Both pervasively in theory and persistently in practice, the household has been viewed as the realm of women. Women's

concerns, when they revolve around their domestic responsibilities, have been seen as private and by definition, something that is not political, and hence not of public interest. Therefore, not only the justice of household arrangements but also the division of human concerns into public and private in the first place are barred from public discussion.

Throughout history, women have been expected to handle needs related to sustenance and nurturance in order that man could have the time and energy for public pursuits. This division of labour persists today despite equal opportunity and affirmative action policies, which have simply enabled women to shoulder both household and paid work rather than to share them equally with men, and despite recommendations for shared parenting, which are honoured more in the breach than in the observance. In recent years, several theorists have suggested that the nature of the boundary between the public and private spheres is itself debatable, that is, it is a political issue. Camilla Strivers argues that if it is so, the justice of household arrangements can become a matter of public deliberation.

According to Camilla Strivers, like other public sector activities, public administration is structurally masculine despite its apparent neutrality and the presence of increasing numbers of women in federal, state, and local governments. It can go on as it does with 'business as usual' because women bear a lopsided share of the burden of domestic functions without which life would simply not be possible. Thus, justifications of public administration take place in a space that (*a*) depends for its coherence on the subordination of women through their assignment to a set of duties that, no matter how necessary, are generally regarded as less significant and (*b*) limits both women's opportunities to participate in public life and the time and energy they have to devote to it (Strivers 2002: 4). The gender dimensions of this arrangement are paradoxical. The state depends on the household but acknowledges only grudgingly the political relevance of domestic issues, throughout liberal theory women are treated as 'citizens,' but in reality their participation in public life has been restricted, either formally (in law) or practically, by the demands

of their household duties. It is this sort of gender paradox which Strivers argue constitutes a dilemma for women in the administrative state (Strivers 2002: 3).

There has been a tendency to banish norms which are culturally recognized as 'feminine', such as passivity, compliance, and vulnerability from public life, thus creating an approach wherein public administrators, both men and women, seek ways to appear technically expert, tough, and heroic; in other words, to project a more masculine 'competent image'. Strivers claims that prevailing ideas about bureaucratic competence and expertise stress a neutral objectivity that depends on a separated self-mastering nature and ideal form of knowledge as hard data; this sort of objectivity supports individual liberty valued in liberal philosophy by making the state a neutral arbiter among competing claims. The feminist perspective, however, reveals this model of knowledge to be anything but neutral, because of the centuries-old association between nature and women, the privileging in liberal thought of the public 'male' sphere over the private where the state does not arbitrate, making a firm case that a liberal state depends on the subordination of women (Strivers 2002: 132).

To sum up, feminist theory is critical of the existing reality. It views women's historical exclusion from certain human pursuits, such as politics and confinement to others such as homemaking—if not always deliberate on the part of individual men—certainly not 'natural'. Feminists argue that such arrangements make women more likely than men to encounter neglected perspectives and to ask submerged questions about the terms and characteristics of our common existence. Feminists are in general agreement that to be a feminist means to bring up these left out or ignored ideas. According to Strivers, feminist theory sees the barrier between public and private, erected ostensibly to protect the freedom of all, as supportive of the oppression of many. In a space constructed out of the exclusion of half the human race, as long as this exclusion remains unexamined no heroism of practice is possible. The most important thing in order to change the present situation is to be conscious of the need to sing different tunes from the ones currently in the repertoire.

ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE IN INDIA

In our quest for rapid industrial growth over the years, environmental quality has come to be subordinated to development goals. The existing administrative and institutional framework is too feeble and ineffective to handle the challenge of environmental protection, which threatens our very survival. Hence, there is a need to have a new environmental ethos to meet this challenge. This is precisely where the role of an activist judiciary comes in. According Justice P.N. Bhagwati, former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, 'The failure on the part of the government to respond to the emerging crisis by enacting appropriate laws and implementing them, has made judicial intervention for laying down basic principles of environmental matters crucial' (Centre for Science and Environment 1999: 203). The following sections discuss environmental governance in India, with special reference to the role of the state and the judiciary.

Legal and Constitutional Provisions for Environmental Governance in India

India is one of the very few countries of the world which has enshrined in its Constitution a commitment to environmental protection and improvement. Although, some provisions in the Constitution relating to improvement in the quality of life had been made since its proclamation in 1950, but a direct reference to environmental protection and improvement was introduced with the Constitution (42nd Amendment) Act of 1976. It was perhaps the UN conference on Human Environment held in Stockholm in 1972, which significantly influenced the government's awareness regarding the necessity of legal and organizational framework for protection of environment. It has interjected a new dimension to public responsibility by making it obligatory for the central government, state government, and every citizen to protect and improve the environment.

The 42nd Amendment Act added two-fold provisions in the Constitution. On the one hand, it directed the state for the protection of environment and, on the other, it cast a duty on every

citizen to help in the preservation of natural environment. Article 48A of the Directive Principles lays down that 'The state shall endeavor to protect and improve the environment and to safeguard forest, and wildlife of the country' (Basu 1998: 446). Article 51A(g) specifically refers to the fundamental duty regarding environment. It says, 'It shall be the duty of every citizen of India to protect and improve the natural environment including forests, lakes, rivers and wild life and to have compassion for living creatures' (Basu 1998: 447). Further, the Directive Principles of State Policy in Article 47 clearly underlines the environmental duty of the state to improve public health.

There is no direct provision for the protection of environment in the fundamental rights. But, the High Courts and the Supreme Court of India have read right to wholesome environment as part of the right to life guaranteed in Article 21 of the Constitution of India. Article 21 enunciates that no person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except according to procedure established by law. Slow poisoning by the polluted atmosphere caused by environmental pollution amounts to violation of Article 21 of the Constitution. In fact, the right to life guaranteed in Article 21 of the Constitution embraces the protection and preservation of nature's gifts without which life cannot be enjoyed. Moreover, environmental degradation has disastrous impact on the right to livelihood which is part of the right to life.

The legal sanction to protect different segments of environment in India, has been provided by successive enactments and laws. It is a well-known fact that Pandit Nehru had tremendous interest in wildlife, but the honour goes to Indira Gandhi for enacting the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972. It is clearly evident from the title of the act that its main objective is to protect wild animals and birds, particularly the rare species, such as the lion and the great horned rhinoceros, which are fast disappearing.

The Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972, was followed by the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974. This is another major and significant act in environmental protection in India. The act came into force in twelve states. The objective of the act is to prevent and control water pollution and also to maintain and restore the

wholesomeness of water. For achieving the objectives of the act, provisions were also made for setting up of central and state boards for prevention and control of water pollution in their respective areas.

Of all the environmental problems facing the country, the problem of deforestation has received maximum public attention. In order to accommodate diverse interests associated with forest resources—under the changed socioeconomic and political environment after Independence—the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980, was passed by the government. Under the act, the central government may constitute an Advisory Committee to advise the government regarding grant of approval under Section 2 and any other matter connected with the conservation of forests which may be referred to it by the central government. The central government makes rules for carrying out the provisions of the act.

The Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981, is another important act which has been passed by the Government of India. The act makes provision for prevention, control, and abatement of air pollution, for establishment of boards for conferring powers and functions relating thereto for matters connected therewith. These boards have been empowered to establish air laboratories to enable them to perform their functions efficiently.

The Bhopal Gas Tragedy of 1984 led to the speedy progress towards environmental protection in the 1980s. The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, was framed to prevent another such mishap. The act was passed for protection, regulation of discharge of environmental pollutants, handling of hazardous substances, speedy response in the event of accidents threatening environment, and giving deterrent punishment to those who endanger human environment safety and health. This is a more effective and bold measure to fight the problem of pollution as compared to all the previous laws in this regard.

Implementation Deficits

The proceeding section clearly shows that Government of India has taken a large number of steps in constitutional, legal, and administrative fields, in order to protect the environment from further degradation and pollution. In spite of such efforts made on part

of both the central and state governments, the problem of environmental degradation and pollution has not been controlled to the extent to which it can be. A number of reasons are responsible for this. First, most provisions of the administrative and legislative laws remain only on paper, or are twisted out of shape during their implementation. Second, lack of proper coordination and cooperation among the administrative institutions is an important loophole in the whole institutional set-up. A further weakness of the present official programme for environmental protection is its lack of recognition of the crucial role that NGOs can play in complementing the government's own efforts. From legislation point of view, loopholes in the environment protection acts hinder the progress of implementation.

The local power structures in India do not necessarily reflect constitutional aspirations. According to Renu Khator (quoted in Dembowski 2001: 66), this also holds true for environmental regulations. She made out five core reasons for the almost complete failure of India's environmental bureaucracy:

1. The cost of enforcement for local officials,
2. the cost of compliance for polluters,
3. conflicting interests of states and central authorities,
4. rivalry with other states or central department, and
5. the politicization of bureaucratic structures.

As the executive has repeatedly failed to secure environmental safety and protection, people seek redressal from the judiciary. Thus, the judiciary has strenuously endeavoured over the past two decades to bring in laws for the service of the poor and disadvantaged sections of society. And, with that end in view, the courts have progressively provided legitimacy to the legal mechanism called public interest litigation (PIL).

Environmental Governance and Role of the Judiciary

In the early 1980s, the role of the higher judiciary in India underwent a transformation. A new and radically different kind of case altered the litigation landscape. Instead of being asked to resolve

private disputes, the Supreme Court and High Court judges were asked to deal with public grievances over flagrant human right violations by the state or to vindicate the public policies embodied in statutes or constitutional provisions. This new type of judicial business is collectively called PIL. Most environmental actions in India fall within this category.

Thus, PIL is a process whereby the courts admit petitions filed by concerned citizens on behalf of the poor or distressed or on issues of general public concern, without following prescribed judicial procedures and charging court fees. A number of distinctive characteristics of PIL can be identified, each of which is novel and in some cases contrary to the traditional legal understanding of the judicial function. Its distinctive characteristics include:

- Liberalization of the rule of locus standi,
- procedural flexibility,
- creative and activists interpretation of legal and fundamental rights, and
- remedial flexibility and ongoing judicial participation and supervision (Pal 1999: 226).

The liberalized rules of locus standi enabled many matters come to court. This is popularly known as PIL. Upendra Baxi calls it social action litigation. He prefers the term 'social action litigations,'[13] because he sees it as primarily serving the needs of India's deprived masses. Such litigation has been against the violation of human rights, for honest and efficient governance and against environmental degradation (Baxi 1985: 107–32). In the 1990s, the emphasis shifted from governance to environment.

Today, PIL became a new mode of public protest against the blatant disregard for environment. The PIL revolution in the Supreme Court and in the High Courts are a manifestation of the public sentiment against the corrupt and complacent administrative agencies. The noticeable feature is that in most cases the official agencies were sidelined, ignored, or conceived as worthless and therefore the environmental issues which were seen as human rights issues were not left 'in consideration' or 'in pending' with

these agencies. People started approaching the courts directly. The petitioner in PIL cases was free to deal with cases going beyond personal injury and gained the right and authority to act on behalf of the underprivileged, poor, homeless and uprooted, and the voiceless inhabitants of the land.

Social action litigation has brought the Supreme Court closer to the people and has made it a powerful institution. When we allow the court to acquire so much power, the question that arises is, to whom is the court accountable and how is such accountability reinforced? A constitutional court has to continuously strive to sustain its own social legitimacy. Through impartial and principled decisions, it sustains people's faith in it. The accountability is also sustained through the courts concerned for the poor, the disadvantaged, and powerless minorities. There is always a latent communication between the people and the court; the court influences the people as much as the people influence the court. Juristic, as well as popular criticism of the court's decisions is necessary for channelizing such communication between the court and the people. However, it is true that a court is not always swayed by people's views or sentiments. Being essentially a counter-majoritarian institution, it often has to act against popular sentiments. But, a court must know what the dominant public opinion is. A constant feedback of public opinion alone will help it remain on the right track.

Public interest litigation in environmental cases

Our judiciary has exhibited an enlightened judicial creativity and foresight whenever it has had an opportunity to decide issues relating to environment. A survey of the numerous judgements of the High Courts and the Supreme Court shows that most of the technical hindrances have been brushed aside by devising new tools of legal interpretation and construction.

The landmark judgement of the Supreme Court in *Ratlam Municipality vs. Vardhichand* (AIR 1980: SC1622) is representative of the new outlook of the judiciary towards environmental conservation. In this case, the Supreme Court laid down two founding principles. First, that no municipality in India can put forth lack of money as a ground for not discharging its primary duty of looking after the health and safety of its residents. Second, the absence

of public conveniences and the prevention of industrial pollutants to the detriment of the citizens' health are violation of the human rights of decency and dignity which are non-negotiable first charges on a municipality.

In Dehradun, in a quarrying case (AIR 1985: SC652), for the first time, the Supreme Court held that the fundamental right to a wholesome environment is a part of the fundamental right to life in Article 21 of the Constitution.

The question of water pollution, especially that of the river Ganges, came up before the Supreme Court in the case of *M.C. Mehta vs. Union of India* (AIR 1987: SC463). This river passes through the industrial belt of three states and most of the industries are tanneries and leather industries. The Supreme Court ordered the closure of thirty tanneries of Kanpur which are releasing untreated effluents into the river Ganges. The court recognized that the closure of the tanneries might cause unemployment, but held that 'life, health and ecology have greater importance to the people'.

The judiciary has come up to its judicial activism by giving new dimensions to the right of life and personal liberty, as guaranteed by Article 21 of the Constitution. Right to a healthy environment has been made and construed as a fundamental right by the Apex court of the country while deciding various public interest cases filed by the Enviro-Legal expert M.C. Mehta. Article 21 which gives right to 'life' includes all attributes which are necessary for the enjoyment of life. In *Munn vs. People of Illinois* (AIR 1988: SC236), it was pointed out that by term 'life', something more is meant than mere animal existence. Pollution causes permanent disabilities leading to malfunctioning or non-functioning of the vital organs of the body which reduces a person to mere animal existence and thereby denying him the right to life.

The *M.C. Mehta vs. Union of India* (Mehta 1985) is yet another milestone of judicial concern to environmental protection. The Supreme Court, inter alia pointed out:

1. The government should evolve a national policy for location of chemicals and other hazardous industries in areas where

population is scarce and there is little risk to the community and care should be taken to minimize pollution;

2. the Government of India should set up an Ecological Science Group consisting of independent, professionally competent experts in different branches of science and technology who would act as an information bank for the court and generate new information, according to the particular requirements;

3. environmental courts should be set up with one professional judge and two experts drawn from the Ecological Science Research Group;

4. a principle of absolute liability should be there to compensate the harm caused to the persons due to environmental pollution; and

5. the measure of compensation must be correlated with the magnitude and capacity of the enterprise because such compensation must have a deterrent effect. This will also become in consonance with the legislative intention when they provided increased maximum punishment in the Environment Protection Act, 1986, for its violation.

In the Bhopal Gas Tragedy case, the Supreme Court has also played a vital role. It showed its deepest concern for the life and liberty of the people who had been affected by the leakage of the poisonous gas resulting in the pollution of the environment, affecting adversely the health of millions, the deaths of many, and incapacitating their lives forever. In the *Union Carbide Corporation vs. Union of India* (AIR 1990: SC273), the court directed the Government to immediately provide interim relief for the victims of the gas tragedy which had been directed to be released in May 1993, under the directions of the Government of India to the Reserve Bank of India. The court directed the Union Carbide Corporation to pay a sum of US $470 million to the Union of India in full settlement of all claims and liabilities related to and arising out of the Bhopal gas leakage disaster. The Supreme Court considered it a compelling duty, both judicial and humane, to secure immediate relief to the victims. The court held that right to live in a healthy environment cannot be violated by anyone

under the plea that if any harm is caused then the injured party shall be suitably compensated. The right to live in a healthy environment is supreme.

The above mentioned judgements make it clear that judiciary has exhibited its dynamism in evolving new dispensation to tackle the problem of pollution control. The doctrine of PIL, replacement of punitive sentencing policy with a new sentencing policy based on affirmative action, judicial search for less harmful alternatives of economic development plans, its attempts to encourage social activists to enforce social rights through cost awarding techniques are part of the new judicial activism.

Judicial revolution in the field of environmental litigation has taken away in its sweep out-moded doctrines and fashioned new remedies and strategies to fight environmental onslaughts. The law of public nuisance has been sharpened as a powerful weapon to promote public health and safety. The right to clean environment has been recognized as a part of the right to life guaranteed under the Constitution. A new indigenous jurisprudence of strict liability has been formulated without the guidance from a foreign legal system. The rule of *locus standi* has been relaxed to a considerable extent for clearing the pitch for judicial activism and PIL for ensuring environmental justice.

Public interest litigation, thus, provides an important forum for agents of civil society to stake their claims. It has turned the judiciary into an arena in which government lawlessness and malfunctioning are debated, providing public exposure, and, to a certain extent, relief for frustrated and even traumatized citizens. However, the impact of PIL must not be overestimated. Basically, there are three factors that put its success in doubt. The first is unreliable enforcement of court orders, the second is the limited access to a remote English-speaking judiciary, and the third is the inherently slow and onerous judicial administration. In other words, many of the phenomena of government malfunctioning reappear in connection with PIL, an instrument applied in an attempt to purge them.

Ideally, the environmental struggle should not be located in the courts. It has to be located within the administrative system. If the

regulatory system is in place, then environmental decisions should be thrashed out by decision-making bodies which are a part of the regulatory system. Cases cannot be rushed off to the court each time with expectations of a decision and it is also not correct to believe that this is a sustained method to deal with environmental questions. In principle, the object of the judiciary must be to ensure that the administration is performing its functions. The judges have to take decisions, and not become investigators and prosecutors themselves. This does not mean that the institution of PIL is not an important agent of change, but it will require considerable social and political will to make the system work. Judicial activism is not an aberration. It is an essential part of the dynamics of a constitutional court. It is a counter-majoritarian check on democracy. Judicial activism, however, does not mean governance by the judiciary. It must also function within the limits of the judicial process. Within those limits, it performs the function of legitimizing or more rarely, stigmatizing the actions of the other organs of government.

CORPORATE GOVERNANCE

The subject of corporate governance came to business limelight from relative obscurity after a string of collapses of high profile companies. Enron, the House Ton, WorldCom, and Telecom behemoths shocked the business world with both the scale and age of their unethical and illegal operations. It was clear that something was amiss in the area of corporate governance all over the world. Since then, corporate governance has become a new buzzword of corporate boardrooms across the globe. It is considered to be a necessary precondition of free market economy. Simply put, corporate governance presupposes a code of conduct for the corporate sector or corporate discipline. Keeping the house in order is perhaps at the heart of corporate governance. It can be defined as the sum total of processes and structures involved in the process of governing a corporation with an underlying objective of ensuring transparency, accountability, innovation, and social responsibility. Corporate governance is not something new,

it has always been there as a necessary mechanism of managing business. The onset of globalization and the resultant opening up of the economy has only accentuated the need for corporate governance.

The need for a self-imposed disciplinary regime is embedded in the very nature of human beings. Man by nature is insatiable and prone to human frailties like corruption, misuse of power and position for personal benefit, nepotism, and so on. Hence, a corporation made of same human beings, is always fraught with the danger of human frailty. The absence of any regulatory mechanism with the onset of free market economy has further accentuated the necessity for a self-conscious moratorium on the part of the companies for better functioning of market. Also, the immediate reason behind the frenetic search for corporate governance can be attributed to the unprecedented global crises of receding credibility of corporations. Owing to a series of corporate failures in the US and the virtual domino effect that followed in over the world has justified the urgency of having an accountability framework for corporate world. Thus, the traditional ethics and obligations of running a corporation were brought back in the new garb of corporate governance to salvage the global business. In this interconnected world of global business, no one is absolutely immune of the influence of others. In fact, any irregularities of business in one corner of the world will have definite and debilitating impact for the rest of the world. Hence, good governance is an imperative for business corporations across the globe. Some of the important features of corporate governance can be enumerated as follows:

- It helps to ensure that an adequate and appropriate system of controls operates within a company and hence assets may be safeguarded;
- it prevents any single individual having too powerful an influencial;
- it is concerned with the relationship between a company's management, the board of directors, shareholders, and other stakeholders;

- it aims to ensure that the company is managed in the best interests of the shareholders and other stakeholders; and
- it tries to encourage both transparency and accountability, which investors are increasingly looking for, both corporate management and corporate performance (Mallin 2007).

The Concept of Corporate Governance

Any attempt to define corporate governance should begin with the famous report *The Financial Aspects of Corporate Governance* or what is popularly known as Cadbury Report (1992). In fact, it is deemed as the first serious effort, which dares to encapsulate the diversified world of corporations and companies into a disciplinary framework. The Cadbury Committee defined corporate governance as 'the system by which companies are directed and controlled'. Internalizing the essence of the Cadbury Report, but in a more exhaustive manner, the OECD has defined the term in the following manner:

> Corporate governance is the system by which business corporations are directed and controlled. The corporate governance structure specifies the distribution of rights and responsibilities among different participants in corporation, such as, the board, managers, shareholders, and other stakeholders and spells out the rules and procedures for making decisions in corporate affairs. By doing this it also provides the structure through which the company objectives are set and the means of attaining those objectives and monitoring performance. (Arjoon 2005: 12)

Therefore it can be conceptualized as 'inclusive of the structures, process, cultures, and systems through which the company sets out its objectives and defines the means of attaining those objectives and monitoring its performance'.

From the above definitions it is clear that some kind of disciplinary or accountability regime is necessary to counter dubious corporate practices. But how that disciplinary regime can be put into practice is not very clear. The legal or regulatory framework, which otherwise happens to be a powerful instrument of reclaiming

obedience, cannot be a very feasible option of governing corporations. On the contrary, it calls for ethical obligations on the part of the stakeholders in a company. Corporate governance has put lot of emphasis on ethical dimension of compliance for at least for two reasons. First, a corporation by nature is a semi-autonomous body, which is governed by its own constitution or statute. Therefore, forcing a company to comply even on certain accountability parameters is nothing but a hostile inroad into its autonomy. Second, any legal framework of binding nature is impossible for the sheer magnitude of big multinational or transnational corporations. Hence, corporate governance does not rely on legal framework alone.

Major Components of Corporate Governance

Corporate governance cannot be reduced to any single principle or criteria. In fact, corporate governance includes a host of principles. The major components of corporate governance can be enumerated as transparency, leadership, internal controls, accountability, boardroom composition and structure, boardroom appraisal, development of boards, performance-based executive pay, and code of ethics.

- *Leadership* is the most important component of corporate governance. It is said that adept governance is largely contingent upon the quality of leadership. Good leadership in a company includes among others providing proper direction to the enterprise, designing strategies of innovation, organization restructuring, strategic management, stakeholders management, evaluation, and monitoring performance.
- *Accountability* is another important hallmark of corporate governance. It is considered to be the bedrock of corporate governance. Effective accountability has two components—answerability and consequences. First, answerability is the requirement for public officials to respond periodically to questions concerning how they used their authority, where the resources went, and what was achieved with them. Second,

there is a need for predictable and meaningful consequences (Campo and Sundaram 2004). Hence, a corporation should remain accountable to shareholders.

- *Transparency* is the associated part of accountability. In corporate governance, it includes among others proper financial reporting, disclosure of executive remuneration package, and so on.
- *Boardroom appraisal* is another crucial element of corporate governance. Periodic appraisal of the functioning of the corporation, especially the evaluations of the performance of the board, the CEO, and so on, is the key of good corporate governance. It enables the board as whole and the directors individually to reflect upon their actions. Boardroom appraisal facilitates learning from the past to be able to do better in the future.
- *Developing the boards*: Formation of a competent board is an equally significant part of corporate governance. Usually, a perfect combination of executive and non-executive directors is prescribed for adept governance of an enterprise.
- *Code of ethics* is perhaps the kernel of corporate governance. In fact, corporate governance presupposes an ethical code of conduct on the part of all the stakeholders of the company.
- *Performance-based executive pay* is another major challenge in implementing good corporate governance due to the disproportionate pay structure of the executive. Incidentally, the Greenbury Report (1995) may be mentioned here as it has specifically addressed the remuneration problem. The report acknowledged the importance of the remuneration package in the overall performance of the directors. However, it was equally vigilant on the astronomical increase of the executive salary, unfounded by their contribution. Hence, it was argued in the report that the remuneration packages should link rewards to performance, by both company and individual, and align the interest of directors and shareholders in promoting the company's progress (Greenbury 1995).

Evolution of Corporate Governance

As stated earlier, the notion of corporate governance was already engraved in the very formation of a corporation or company. The adherence to the regulatory framework of a company itself presumes the existence of corporate governance. For example, as Christine A. Mallin writes, corporate governance presupposes:

> … whether the company itself operates within a shareholder framework, focusing primarily on the maintenance or enhancement of shareholder value as its main objective, or whether it takes a boarder stakeholder approach, emphasizing the interests of diverse groups such as employees, providers of credit, suppliers, customers, and the local community. (Mallin 2007: 86)

However, the formal beginning of it can be traced back to the famous Cadbury Report of 1992 in the UK. The Cadbury Report had virtually opened up a floodgate of research for good corporate practices, not only in UK, but in rest of the world as well. The report was the recommendation of the Committee on the Financial Aspects of Corporate Governance, established in 1991 under the chairmanship of Adrian Cadbury to streamline corporate governing amidst a series of corruption and corporate malpractices. The report, though prepared in the context of UK, had a universal applicability as the entire world had been reeling under a chain of corporate debacles. The report had put forward a voluntary code of best practices, which, if followed properly claimed the report, would substantially restore the creditor's confidence and thereby good corporate practices.

Corporate Governance in India

The economic reforms of early 1990s created a regulatory body called the Security and Exchange Board of India (SEBI) in 1998, and gave it statutory form with the Parliament's SEBI Act in 1992. SEBI was created to replace a fragmented regulatory framework and to provide for investors protection through disclosure requirements, accounting standards, and arbitration procedure. SEBI has

three umbrella functions: draft regulations in its legislative capacity, conduct investigations and enforcement actions in its executive function, and pass rulings and orders in its judicial capacity. SEBI has introduced a rigorous regulatory regime to ensure fairness, transparency, and good practice.

Corporate governance gained importance when Indian companies started raising funds in foreign markets in 1990s. Corporate governance rules in India were first introduced by a series of committees set up by SEBI, Central Bank of India, and Ministry of Finance (MoF) with the objective of making the corporate governance rules mandatory. In tandem with the global efforts on corporate governance, the Confederation of Indian Industry (CII) has also come up with India's version of corporate governance code in 1997, entitled the Code of Desirable Corporate Governance. The major provisions of the code can be enumerated as follows:

- The full board, which should be single-tiered, should meet at intervals of two months and at least six times a year;
- the non-executive directors should comprise at least 30 per cent of the board, if one of them is the chairperson;
- the non-executive directors should comprise at least 50 per cent of the board, if the chairperson and the managing director is the same person;
- no individual should be a director on the boards of more than ten companies at any given time;
- non-executive directors should be active, have defined responsibilities, and be conversant with profit and loss accounts;
- non-executive directors should be paid, besides their sitting fees, commissions for their professional inputs;
- the board should be informed of operating plans and budgets, long-term plans, quarterly divisional results, and internal audit reports; and
- an audit committee, comprising at least three non-executive directors should be set up and given access to all financial information (Raju 2003).

Another important contribution in the direction of corporate governance was made by the Kumar Mangalam Birla Committee

(2000). The important recommendations made by the committee deserve some space here:

- The board of directors should have an optimum combination of executive and non-executive directors;
- a qualified and independent audit committee needs to be set up by the board of the company with clearly stipulated powers and functions;
- constitution of a remuneration committee by the board to determine appropriate remuneration package for the board members;
- a management discussion and analysis report should form a part of the annual report to the shareholders covering industry's structure, opportunities and threats, segment-wise or product-wise performance, outlook, risks, and concerns, internal control system, financial and operational performance, and material developments in human resource/ industrial relations;
- a board committee under the chairmanship of a non-executive director should be formed to specially look into shareholder's complaints;
- a company should arrange to obtain a certificate from its auditors regarding compliance with corporate governance provisions. This certificate should be sent to stock exchange and all shareholders; and
- a company must comply with all legal and ethical standards (Raju 2003).

The Chandra Committee (2003) issued a report on the role of external auditors. The committee also recommends that annual accounts have to be certified by Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) and Chief Finance Officers (CFOs). The Irani Committee (2003) report (Sharma and Kumar 2011: 653) suggests major amendments to the Companies Act, 1956, including a definition for independent director. An independent director is defined as a non-executive director of the company who does not have any material, financial, or transactional relationship with the company, its promoters, management, holding company, or any associate company.

To sum up, with the recent spate of corporate scandals and subsequent interest in corporate governance, there have emerged a number of corporate governance norms and standards around the globe. India has been no exception to the rule. Several committees and groups have looked into this issue. On paper, Indian legal system provides one of the highest levels of investor protection in the world, but the reality is different with slow proceedings, overburdened courts, and significant corruption. The larger companies' shareholdings remain relatively concentrated with promoters and family business groups continuing to dominate the corporate sector. The quality enforceability of the security laws has been very poor.

Despite these shortcomings the Indian economy, its financial markets have started attaining impressive growth in recent years. The reason is that India is now clearly and strongly committed to sustaining and rapidly furthering the major economic reforms initiated in the early nineties. SEBI established as a part of these reforms has a rigorous regulatory regime to ensure fairness, transparency, and good practice. The National Stock Exchange (NSE) has also been established as part of the reforms. It functions efficiently and transparently to trade among the highest number of trades in the world just behind NASDAQ and New York Stock Exchange (NYSE). All these positive developments are expected to help Indian industry to make financial gains available to their investors fairly and transparently. The long-term sustainability of the India's success story will depend critically on the state of corporate governance in the country (Sharma and Kumar 2011: 656).

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Public administration is constantly being reinvented. In the era of governance, the study of public administration involves a threadbare analysis of the environment in which it articulates its responses. In its contemporary manifestation, public administration has a wider reach and bureaucracy which remained the focus in traditional public administration is one of the many agencies/mechanisms, responsible for governance. If the twentieth century was an era of organization in

which bureaucracy symbolized the core value of public administration, the twenty-first century has ushered in an era of 'network-based-organization', based on neoliberal inspiration for market-hegemony. Globalization—the movement towards greater interaction, integration, and interdependence among people and organizations across national borders—is a catalyst in radically altering the texture of public administration. The earlier distinction between public and private administration does not appear to be as significant as in the past.

The government is now being reinvented not only structurally but also ideologically in an environment where neoliberal values seem to have triumphed. The state retreats and government withdraws from areas that were traditionally in its domain. Globalization has led to a marriage between corporate discipline and entrepreneurial spirit with government discarding its traditional image of a 'doer'. Seeking to accommodate the 'market impulse', the government has become an 'enabler'. Globalization, thus, restricts the national government and limits its policy options. A new situation has emerged and the governmental functions are redefined within the neo-conservative theoretical parameters. The corporate state has become a reality resulting in an obvious shrinkage of those roles that the state had traditionally harboured. Citizens have become clients and those involved in public administration are functionaries seeking to approximate to the corporate culture. Accountability in public bureaucracy is ascertained not only internally, but also through various external agencies, including citizen's charter. Public administration is now 'governance' which is nothing but a checklist of certain activities designed both to stabilize and also to consolidate market-driven neoliberal ethics. The 'public' in public administration, thus, no longer remains as important as in the past in conceptualizing public administration. One has to take into account a whole range of factors to actually comprehend the changing (and also volatile) nature of public administration in its present-day manifestation, and, in that sense, it will be intellectually restrictive, if not sterile, if one shuts one's eyes from the contemporary developments in public administration which may not always be directly relevant to public governance.

NOTES

1. This chapter draws on Chapters 1 and 2 of Bidyut Chakrabarty, *Reinventing Public Administration: The Indian Experience* (New Delhi: Orient Longman, 2007).

2. As mentioned, governance in contemporary academic discourses is exclusively the practitioners' contribution. However, its definition by leading institutions and studies converge on the term as referring to a 'process' through which power is exercised.

3. See also Rose and Miller (1992).

4. This section is drawn from *Human Settlements*, a report prepared by United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and Pacific, unless otherwise stated. Available at www.unescap.org/huset/gg/governance.html

5. The summary is drawn from the UNDP Report, *Governance for Sustainable Human Development*, 1997.

6. These points are drawn from Keraudran and Van Vicrlo (1998).

7. Drawn from 'Governance Barometer: Policy Guidelines for Good Governance', prepared by the National Party of South Africa. Available at www.gdrc.org/u-gov/governance-understand.html

8. This is how governance is defined by the Institute on Governance, Canada. Available at www.log.ca/about.html

9. The discussion on 'engaged governance' is drawn from Gurthrie (2003).

10. Both these terms are broad enough to include the use of ICT by government and civil society to promote greater participation of citizens in the governance of political institutions. For instance, they cover the use of internet by politicians and political parties to elicit views from their constituencies in an efficient manner or by propagating the views by civil society organizations which are in conflict with the ruling authorities. Digital/e-governmence is, by contrast, a narrowly conceptualized idea focusing only the governmental steps to improve the government functions.

11. For details of this argument, see Bhatnagar (2003: 8–9).

12. For details of the argument, see Kamarck (2004: 36)

13. Social Action Litigation is an instrument for securing socioeconomic justice for the underprivileged sections of society. Such kind of litigations are introduced in a court of law, not by the aggrieved party but by the court itself to protect the interest of the victims.

REFERENCES

Arjoon, Surendra. 2005. 'Corporate Governance: An Ethical Perspective', *Journal of Business Ethics*, 61.

Arora, Ramesh K. 2007. 'Organization Theories: Concerns and Orientations', in Rakesh Hooja and Ramesh K. Arora (eds), *Administrative Theories: Approaches,*

Concepts, and Thinkers, in Public Administration. Jaipur/New Delhi: Rawat Publications.

All India Reporter (AIR).SC 1622. 1980. *Ratlam Minicipality vs.Vardhichand.*

AIR.SC652. 1985. *Rural Litigation and Entitlement Kendra Dehradun vs. State of UP.*

AIR.SC463. 1987. *M.C. Mehta vs. Union of India.*

AIR.SC236. 1988. *Munn vs. People of Illinois.*

AIR.SC273. 1990. *Union Carbide Corporation vs. Union of India.*

Basu, D.D. 1998. *Introduction to the Constitution of India.* New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.

Baxi, Upendra, 1985. 'Taking Suffering Seriously: *Social Action Litigation* in the Supreme Court of India', *Third World Legal Studies*, Vol. 4, no. 16 (June).

Bhaduri, Amit and D. Nayyar. 1996. *The Intelligent Person's Guide to Liberalization.* New Delhi: Penguin Books India.

Bhatnagar, Subhas. 2003. 'Administrative Corruption: How Does E-government Help?' *Global Corruption Report.* New York: Transparency International.

Bhattacharaya, Mohit. 1998. 'Conceptualizing Good Governance', *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, XLIV (3).

———. 2001. *New Horizons of Public Administration.* New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers and Distributors.

Borins, S. 1995. 'The New Public Management is Here to Stay', *Canadian Public Administration*, Vol. 38, No. 1 (March): 122–132.

Brautigam, Deborah. 1991. 'Governance and Economy: A Review', Working Papers, Policy and Review Departments, The World Bank (December).

Buchanan, James M. and Gordon Tullock. 1965. *The Calculus of Consent: Logical Foundation of Constitutional Democracy.* Ann Harbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Cadbury Report. 1992. Available at http://www.ecgi.org/codes/documents/cadbury.pdf (accessed on 31 December 2011).

Campo, S. Schiaro and P.S.A. Sundaram (eds). 2004. *To Serve and To Preserve: Improving Public Administration in a Competitive World.* Manila: Asian Development Bank.

Centre for Science and Environment. 1999. *The State of India's Environment: Fifth Citizen's Report.* New Delhi: Centre for Science and Environment.

Dembowski, Hans. 2001. *Taking the State to Court.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Denhardt, Robert B. and Jan Perkins. 1976. 'The Coming Death of Administrative Man', *Public Administration Review*, 38 (July–August): 379–85.

Dey, Bata K. 2000. 'E-Governance in India: Problems, Challenges and Opportunities—A Future Vision', *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, XLVI (3, July–September).

Dunleavy, Patrick. 1991. *Democracy, Bureaucracy and Public Choice: Economic Explanation in Political Science.* London: Harvester.

Dunn, William N. and Bahman Fozouni. 1976. *Towards a Critical Administrative Theory.* Beverly Hills, London: SAGE Publications.

Eyde, Lorraine D. 1973. 'The Status of Women in State and Local Government', *Public Personnel Management*, 2 (3, May–June).

Frederickson, H. George. 1999. 'The Repositioning of American Public Administration', The 1999 John Gaus Lecture, *PS: Political Science and Politics*, December.

Ghuman, B.S. 2001. 'New Public Management: Theory and Practice', *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, XLVII (4, October–December).

Government of India. 2000. *The Information Technology Act, 2000*. Reproduced in *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, XLVI (3, July–September): 417–55.

Greenbury. 1995. Available at http://www.ecgi.org/codes/documents/greenbury.pdf (accessed on 2 January 2012).

Gurthrie, Diane M. 2003. 'Engaged Governance: An Institutional Approach to Government–Civil Society Engagement', Background Paper for United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Interregional workshop on 'Engaged Governance', Colombo, Sri Lanka, 9–11 December.

Henry, Nicholas. 2007. *Public Administration and Public Affairs* (10th edition). New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.

Hood, Cristopher. 1991. 'A Public Management for All Seasons?' *Public Administration*, 69 (1).

Israel, Arturo. 1990. 'The Changing Role of the State: Institutional Dimension, Policy Research and External Affairs', Working Paper, Country Economics Department, The World Bank (August).

Iyer, Ramaswamy R. 2004. 'The Meaning of Good Governance', *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, 50 (1).

Jayal, Nirja Gopal and S. Pai. 2001. *Democratic Governance in India*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Jreisat, Jamil. 2004. 'Governance in a Globalized World', *International Journal of Public Administration*, 27 (13–14).

Kamarck, Elaine. 2004. 'Government Innovations around the World', Faculty Research Working Paper, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, February.

Kapoor, Jagdish C. 2000. 'IT and Good governance', *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, XLVI (3, July–September).

Keraudran, Philippe and Hans Van Vicrlo. 1998. 'Theories of Public Management Reform and Their Practical Implications', in Tony Verheijen and David Coombes (eds), *Innovations in Public Management: Perspectives from East and West Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Kirlin, John J. 1996. 'The Big Question in a Democracy', *Public Administration Review* (September–October).

Kooiman, Jan. 2003. *Governing as Governance*. London: SAGE Publications.

Leftwich, Adrian. 1993. 'Governance, Democracy and Development in the Third World', *Third World Quarterly*, 14 (3).

———. 1996. 'On the Primacy of Politics in Development', in Adrian Leftwich (ed.), *Democracy and Development: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lyer, Lawrence E. Jr., Carolyn J. Heinrich, and Carolyn J. Hill. 2001. *Improving Governance: A New Logic for Empirical Research*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.

Mallin, Christine A. 2007. *Corporate Governance* (2nd edition). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Mehta, M.C. 1985. Writ Petition (civil) Ho. 13029 of 1985, *M.C. Mehta vs. Union of India*.

Michalski, Wolfgang, Riel Miller, and Barrie Stevens. 2001. 'Governance in the 21st Century: Power in the Global Knowledge Economy and Society', *Governance in the 21st Century: Future Studies*, OECD.

Minocha, O.P. 1998 'Good Governance: New Public Management Perspective', *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, XLIV (3).

Osborne, David and Ted Gaebler. 1992. *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. New Delhi: Printice-Hall.

Pal, Chandra. 1999. *Environmental Pollution and Development: Environmental Law, Policy and Role of Judiciary*. New Delhi: Mittal Publications.

Peters, B. Guy. 1996. 'Models of Governance for the I990s', in Donald F. Kitt and H. Brinton Milward (eds), *The State of Public Management*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Preston, Lewis T. 1992. *Governance and Development*. Washington DC: World Bank, Foreword.

Raju, R. Satya. 2003. 'Principles and Practices of Corporate Governance', in Alaka Dhameja (ed.), *Contemporary Debates in Public Administration*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.

Random House College Dictionary (rev. ed.). 1984. New York: Random House.

Rhodes, R.A.W. 1999. 'Governance and Public Administration', in J. Pierre (ed.), *Debating Governance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rose, N. and P. Miller. 1992. 'Political Power Beyond the State: Problematics of Government', *British Journal of Sociology*, 43 (2).

Rosenau, Jemes E. 1992. 'Governance, Order and Change in World Politics', in Jemes E. Rosenau and Ernst-Otto Czempiel (eds), *Governance Without Government: Order and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Salskov-Iversen, Dorte, Hans Krause Hansen, and Sven Bislev. 2000. 'Governmentality, Globalization and Local Practice: Transformation of a Hegemonic Discourse', *Alternatives: Social Transformation and Human Governance*, 25 (2, April–June).

Self, Peter. 1985. *Modern Theories of Government*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Sharma, Vijay Kumar and Anuj Kumar. 2011. 'Corporate Governance in India: Some Thoughts', in Mamata Mokta, S.S. Chauhan, Sanjeev Mahajan, and Simmi Agnihotri (eds), *Challenges in Governance*. New Delhi: Anamica Publishers.

Stoker, Gerry. 1998. 'Governance as Theory: Five Propositions', *International Social Science Journal* (March). Reprinted in Mohit Bhattacharaya and Bidyut

Chakrabarty (eds). 2003. *Public Administration: A Reader*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Strivers, Camilla. 2002. *Gender Images in Public Administration: Legitimacy and the Administrative State*. London: SAGE Publications.

Summary of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA). 2009. 1974 by Patrick Purcell and Jennifer Staman, *Congressional Research Service*, 2009. Available at http://aging.senate.gov/crs/pension7.pdf (accessed on 2 January 2012).

United Nations Development Programme. 1997. *Reconceptualizing Governance*, Discussion Paper 2, New York, January.

Webster's New Universal Unabridged Dictionary. 1979. London: Dorset and Baber.

World Bank. 1989a. *The Bank and the Heavily Indebted Middle-income Countries*. Washington DC: World Bank.

———. 1989b. *Sub-Saharan Africa: From Crisis to Sustainable Growth—A Long-term Perspective Study*. Washington DC: World Bank.

———. 1992a. *World Development Report*. New York: Oxford University Press.

———. 1992b. *The World Bank in Governance: The World Bank Experience*. Washington DC: World Bank.

———. 1992c. *Government and Development*. Washington DC: World Bank.

Public Policy

Public policy is a frequently used term in our daily lives. We often read in the newspaper about public health policy, education policy, environmental policy, agricultural policy, industrial policy, and so on. Public policies are primarily framed by the government to satisfy public needs and demands. They are the means by which, ends of a collective community are served. Without policy, government and administration are rudderless. Successful policies make for successful government and administration and hence there is a saying that when the policy fails, the government fails.

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section deals with the theoretical dimensions of public policy that is concept, relevance, types, models, and approaches. The second section deals

with the functional dimensions of public policy, namely, formulation, implementation, and evaluation process.

THEORETICAL DIMENSIONS: THE CONTEXT

Public policy is a relatively new subfield in political science. Its development as an area of study emerged out of the recognition that traditional analysis of government decisions were incomplete descriptions of political activities. As the relationships between society and its various public institutions became more complex and more interdependent, the need developed for more comprehensive assessments of what governments do—how and why they pursue some policy alternatives over others (Gerston 1974: 3).

Focus on the public policy process has developed with the emergence of modern society and industrialization. During the nineteenth century, representative governments began to evolve in some parts of the world. With increased political participation by larger portions of the public, government decisions assumed greater importance and legitimacy. Clashing values with respect to social, economic, and political questions have profound implications for politics and government. With these changes, governments began to focus on the problems of their citizens (Gerston 1974: 4). Contemporary public policy and policy analysis has particularly an American and twentieth-century flavour. It was in America where initiatives towards a more unified approach to the study of public problems and policy really began. The work by Harold Lasswell, *Psychopathology and Politics* (1930) and *The Analysis of Political Behavior* (1948), which culminated in the publication of Lasswell's essay titled 'The Policy Orientation', *The Policy Sciences*, co-edited with Daniel Lerner is worth a mention (Sapru 2010: 20). Harold Lasswell is the man behind the initiation of the movement on public policy. In the late 1960s, as Edward S. Quade notes, a number of converging factors, such as war, poverty, crime, race relations, and pollution could be credited for producing great interest in policy sciences (Quade 1970: 1). In recent times, the study of public policy has evolved into what is virtually a new branch of social sciences, the so-called policy sciences.

WHAT IS PUBLIC POLICY?

Before coming to the term public policy, it would be fruitful to understand its two components—'public' and 'policy'. As we know, public administration emerged as an instrument of the state to serve 'public' interest rather than 'private' interest. In this sense 'public' consists of all the people in general having something in common rather than few individuals having their personal interests. In the political life, the government is the main vehicle to serve the needs and demands of the 'public'. The term 'policy' refers to overall programmes of action towards a given goal. Robert Presthus defines policy as 'a choice made by an individual or group of individuals that explains; justifies, guides, or outlines a certain course of action' (Presthus 1975: 14). Thus, policy can be broadly defined as a proposed course of action of an individual, a group; an institution or government, to realize a specific objective or purpose; within a given environment.

As an approach to understanding political change, public policy has almost as many definitions as there are policy issues. Let us consider a few definitions to get a better understanding of the concept. Thomas R. Dye states that 'public policy is whatever governments choose to do or not to do' (Peters 1996: 4). This definition includes all actions and inactions of government as public policy. Seeking to extend linkage, B. Guy Peters adds that public policy is the 'sum of government activities, whether acting directly or through agents, as it has an influence on the lives of citizens'. James E. Anderson defines public policy as 'a purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem or matter of concern' (Anderson 1975: 3). This concept of policy focuses attention on what is actually done as against what is proposed or intended by the government and public officials and it differentiates a policy from a decision, which is a choice among competing alternatives.

Larry N. Gerston seeks a definition that responds to the actions and exchanges of both people and governments in a dynamic public policy as 'the combination of basic decisions, commitments, and actions made by those who hold or affect government positions of

authority' (Gerston 1974: 7). Yehezkel Dror defines public–policy-making as a 'dynamic process which decides major guidelines for action directed at the future, mainly by governmental organs. These guidelines (policies) formally aim at achieving what is in the public interest by the best possible means' (Dror 1974: 12). Public policies are those policies developed by governmental bodies and officials, though non-governmental actors and factors may, of course, influence policy development. The special characteristics of public policies stem from the fact that they are formulated by what David Easton has called the 'authorities' in a political system, 'elders, chiefs, executives, legislators, judges, administrators, counselors, monarchs, and the like'. These are, he says, the persons who 'engage in the daily affairs of a political system' are recognized by most members of the system as having responsibility for these matters', and take actions that are 'accepted as binding by most of the members so long as they act within the limits of their roles' (Easton 1965: 212).

On the basis of the above definitions of different scholars, we can spell out some of the implications of the concept of public policy. First, public policy is concerned with the purposive or goal-oriented action rather than random behaviour. Second, public policy is a course of action adopted and pursued by governments to serve public interest. Third, public policy is what governments actually do and what subsequently happens, rather than what they intend to do. Fourth, public policy may be either positive or negative in form. Positively, it may involve some form of government action to affect a particular problem, negatively, it involves a decision by government officials not to take action, to do nothing, on some matter on which governmental involvement is sought. Lastly, public policy has a legal and authoritative base. Members of a society accept it legitimate to pay taxes, obey traffic rules and pollution control norms because of their legal binding and coercive power.

SIGNIFICANCE OF PUBLIC POLICY

Public policy is a significant component of any political system. It is primarily concerned with the public and their problems. The

role of a public policy is to shape the society for its betterment. W. Parsons, while narrating the role of public policy says 'the wider purposes of public policy is involving enlightenment, the fuller development of individuals in society and the development of consensus, social awareness and legitimacy, rather than simply the delivery of goods and services'. Public policies, thus, involve improving the democratic and political capacities of the people, and not simply the efficiency and effectiveness of the delivery of services. This also implies that public policy has a participatory and democratic character.

Public policy also has a developmental role. Well-planned policies help in the socioeconomic development of a nation. After Independence, India formulated a number of policies aimed at socioeconomic transformation. A Planning Commission was set up and five-year plans were formulated. Policies regarding agricultural development, industrial growth, poverty eradication, rural development, and so on, were also framed. Today, we can see the positive results of these policies. Public policies also helped India in its nation-building task. India could defend itself not only from external aggression but also succeed in keeping divergent groups, caste, linguistic, and religious sects united. Thus, since Independence, public policies in India have helped in achieving socioeconomic development and maintaining national unity and integrity.

As far as the significance of public policy to the political science is concerned, Thomas R. Dye gives three reasons for the same—scientific, professional, and political purposes. First of all, public policy can be studied in order to gain greater knowledge about its origin, the processes by which it is developed, and its consequences for society. This, in turn, will increase our understanding of the political system and society in general. Public policy has professional utility also. An understanding of the causes and consequences of public policy permits us to apply social science knowledge to the solution of practical problems. Factual knowledge is a prerequisite to prescribing for the ills of society. If certain end values are desired, then the question of what politics would best implement these ends is a factual question requiring scientific study. In other words, policy studies can produce professional advice.

Finally, public policy has a political utility. It ensures that the nation adopts the right policies to achieve the right goals. It is frequently argued that political science cannot be silent or impotent in the face of great social and political crises, and that political scientist has a moral obligation to advance specific public policies. This task is accomplished by the politicians with the knowledge of public policies.

Public policy has assumed considerable importance in response to the increasing complexity of the society. It helps in explaining the causes and consequences of government activity. Public policies not only help us to understand the social ills but also provide devices and mechanisms for moving a social and economic system from the past to the future.

TYPES OF PUBLIC POLICY

In a political system, a government performs a number of activities. It regulates conflicts within society, it organizes society to carry on conflict with other societies, it distributes a great variety of symbolic rewards and material services to the members of the society, and extracts money from society in the form of taxes. Theodore Lowi (1964) suggests that policies may be regulatory, distributive, and redistributive in nature and each type of policy is associated with a particular political process.

Regulatory policies are concerned with regulation and control of individual conduct by coercive techniques. These policies deal with the regulation of trade, quality of education, safety measures, and so on. This type of regulation is conducted by autonomous institutions that work on behalf of the government. In India, Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI), Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI), the Bureau of Indian Standards, and Reserve Bank of India (RBI) are examples of regulatory agencies. Distributive policies grant goods and services to specific groups of the population. All public welfare programmes are distributive. Agricultural subsidies to the farmers, subsidized food for the poor, and government health services are examples of such policies. Redistributive policies are aiming at redistributing resources

from one group to another. The main objective of such policies is to set up an equitable society through redistribution of social and economic rewards. Income tax policies are often cited as examples of redistributive policies.

Fred M. Frohock (1979) adds two more policies to Lowi's three-fold dimension of public policy. These are capitalization and ethical policies. Subsidies and tax concessions received by the business class come under capitalization policies. Such distribution, in theory if not in practice, is aimed at increasing the productive capacity of a society's institutions. Although normally included in distributive policies, capitalization policies are not like the primary consumptive distribution of welfare programmes. Ethical policies are aimed at establishing the correct practice for some moral issues. For example, the US Supreme Court's decision in 1973 (*Roe vs. Wade*) made abortion a legally acceptable alternative in the first three months of term. The court did not settle the moral issues of abortion; many people still view abortion as morally wrong, even though it is legally permitted. But the public policies following the court's decision set out what ought and ought not to be done in an area marked off by deep moral convictions. In effect, the supreme court decision established legally permissible practices on a moral matter (Frohock 1979: 13).

Different kinds of public policies explain the varied functions performed by the government. They represent the pattern of action either to resolve conflicting claims or provide incentives for cooperation. They are basically aimed at providing air to the political life.

MODELS AND APPROACHES TO PUBLIC POLICY

Over the years political scientists have developed a number of models and approaches to help us understand political life. The purpose of such exercise according to Thomas R. Dye is to simplify and clarify our thinking about government and politics, to identify important political forces in society, to communicate relevant knowledge about political life, to direct inquiry into politics, and to suggest explanations for political events and outcomes (Bhattacharya 2008: 127). The theoretical approaches

that will come under brief examination here include system theory, elite theory, group theory, rational decision-making theory, incrementalism, game theory, and institutionalism. These models represent different ways of looking at public policy. These are of course not mutually exclusive. Each has a distinct focus and each suggests specific things about political life and policy. Based on Thomas R. Dye's classification, following is a brief description of each model, with particular attention to the separate ways in which public policy can be viewed.

Institutional Approach

Traditionally, this approach has been the basic analytical tool for studying the political activities of the government in political science. According to this view, public policies have their origin in governmental institutions such as legislatures, executives, courts, and political parties. A policy becomes a public policy, only when it is authoritatively determined by government institutions. Government gives legitimacy and universalistic character to a policy. Public policy is authoritatively determined, implemented, and enforced by government institutions. Thus, the relationship between public policy and government institutions is very close. Institutional approach is criticized for ignoring the living linkages between institutions and public policy. With the onrush of the behavioural revolutions in political science, institutional studies of the policy process were swept aside in favour of studies that relied more on the group, system, and elite–mass models.

Group Theory

Group theory believes that group interest and attitude are influential factors in determining public policies. Public policy is the product of group struggle. As Earl Latham states, '[W]hat may be called public policy is the equilibrium reached in this (group) struggling at any given moment, and it represents a balance which the contending factions or groups constantly strive to weight in their favour' (Bhattacharya 2008: 126). As different interest groups

struggle among themselves to influence public policy, actual policy-making in the government tends to tilt towards the groups that are gaining in influence. By contrast, public policy moves away from the demands of the losing groups. Thus, public policy, at any given time, will reflect the interests of the dominant groups. However, the weakness of this theory is that it overstates the importance of groups and understates the independent and creative role that public officials play in the policy process. It is also misleading and inefficient in explaining politics or policy formulation in terms of a group struggle without giving attention to other factors like ideas and institutions.

Elite Theory

This theory views public policy as the preferences and values of the governing elite. It believes that people are passive, apathetic, and ill-informed about public policy. Initiative for public policy does not come from masses. The elite actually shape mass opinion into a policy question. Thus, public policy really turns out to be the preferences of elites. Public officials and administrators merely carry out the policies decided by the elite. In this model, policies flow 'downward' from elites to masses, they do not arise from mass demands.

The elite theory has close resemblance with the group theory, as both refer to policy generation through pressures from specific interests in the society. Group theory, however, is basically plu-ralistic, whereas elite theory is essentially monistic (Bhattacharya 2008: 127).

Rational Model

This model emphasizes that policy-making is a choice among policy alternatives on rational grounds. Herbert Simon, Yehez-kel Dror, and Thomas R. Dye are the main protagonists of this model. Robert Haveman (1970) observes that a rational policy is one that is correctly designed to maximize 'net value achieve-ment'. As an intellectual endeavour, rationalism tries to learn all

the preferences existing in a society, assign each value a relative weight, discover all policy alternatives available, know all consequences of each alternative, calculate how the selection of any policy will affect the remaining alternatives in terms of opportunity costs, and ultimately select that policy alternative which is the most efficient in terms of the costs and benefits of social values (Henry 2007: 290). Thomas R. Dye (2004) equates rationality with efficiency. He says that a policy is rational when it is most efficient, that is, if the ratio between the value it achieves and the value it sacrifices is positive and higher than any other policy alternatives. Much of the rationalist paradigm deals with the construction of public policies that assure better public policies. Yehezkel Dror calls this concern 'metapolicy' or policy for policy-making procedures.

In a rational model, policy has to look logical and factual. Thus, Herbert Simon's 'rational model of decision-making', separated 'facts' from 'values' and brought into policy-making, new scientific techniques like computer and mathematical modelling. Rationality, according to Herbert Simon, is concerned with the selection of preferred behaviour alternatives in terms of some system of values whereby the consequences of behaviour can be evaluated. According to him, three kinds of activities are involved in a rational policy-making process–intelligence activity, design activity, and choice activity. Herbert Simon recognizes efficiency as the primary objective of administration, and also the limits of individuals and organizations to behave in complete rationally. The concept he develops to describe a rationality which is limited but not 'irrational' is 'bounded rationality'.

There are many barriers to rational policy-making. There are no uniform societal values. We have only the values of specific groups and individuals which are conflicting. The environment of policy-makers renders it impossible to see many societal values. Due to the cost of information gathering, the availability of the information and the time involved in its collection are barriers in collecting all the information required to know all possible policy alternatives and the consequences of each alternative. Policy-makers have personal needs, inhibitions, and inadequacies which prevent them

from performing in a highly rational manner. That is why even a rational policy scientist Yehezkel Dror wants a policy analyst to broaden their use of extra rational information including intuition and exceptional leadership with acute perception of social reality.

Incremental Model

Incrementalism views public policy as a continuation of previous government activities with only incremental modification. Charles E. Lindblom first presented the incremental model in the course of a critique of the traditional rational model of decision-making. According to Lindblom, decision-makers do not annually review the whole range of existing and proposed policies because of the constraints of time, intelligence, and cost it involves. Policy-makers generally accept the legitimacy of established programmes and tacitly agree to continue previous policies. Policy-makers accept the legitimacy of previous policies because of the uncertainty about the consequences of completely new or different policies. There are also heavy investments in existing programmes (sunk costs) which preclude any really radical change. Incrementalism is also politically expedient because it is easier to reach agreement when the matters in dispute among various groups are only modifications of existing programmes, rather than policy issues of greater magnitude or an 'all or nothing' character. Thus, incrementalism is important in reducing conflicts, maintaining stability, and preserving the political system itself.

People are essentially pragmatic, seeking not always the single way to deal with a problem but, work modestly, 'something that will work'. In most cases, modification of existing programmes will satisfy particular demands, and the major policy shifts required to maximize values are overlooked. Finally, in the absence of any agreed-upon societal goals or values, it is easier for the government to continue existing programmes rather than engage in overall policy planning towards specific societal goals. Incrementalism, in short, yields limited, practicable, and acceptable decisions. Incremental approach is conservative in nature as it prefers to continue the existing policies and has no vision for change.

Game Theory

Game theory is the study of rational decisions in a conflict situation. The idea of a 'game' is that decision-makers are involved in choices that are interdependent. Each player has its own goals or objectives. Each must consider how to achieve as much as possible; yet, each has to take into account that there are others whose goals differ from its own and whose actions have an effect on all others involved in the situation. In this game, there may be any possibility outcomes. Decision-makers are, thus, involved in a situation of interdependence. All have to make their independent choice, but the outcome would be conditioned by the choices made by each actor. This model is applicable to policy-making where there is no independently 'best' choice that one can make, where the 'best' depends upon what others do. Game theory can be applied to decisions about war and peace, the use of nuclear weapons, international diplomacy, bargaining in the UN, and a variety of other important political situations.

Game theory is more frequently proposed as an analytic tool by social scientist than as a practical guide to policy-making by government officials. The conditions of game theory are seldom approximated in real life. Yet game theory provides an interesting way of thinking clearly about policy choices in conflict situations.

System Approach

System approach considers public policy as an outcome of the political system. The political system, as defined by David Easton, is composed of those interrelated institutions and activities in a society that make authoritative decision (or allocation of values) that are binding on society. Inputs into the political system from the environment consist of demands and supports. The environment consists of all those conditions and events external to the boundaries of the political system. Demands are the claims made by individuals and groups on the political system for action to satisfy their interests. Outputs are authoritative value allocations of the system; these allocations constitute public policy. The concepts of feedback indicates that public policies may have a modifying effect on the

environment and the demands arising from it, and may also have an effect upon the character of the political system. Policy outcomes may produce new demands, which lead to further policy outputs, and so on in a continuing, never ending flow of public policy.

Thus, the system model relies on concepts of information theory, especially, feedback, input, and output and conceives of the processes as being essentially cyclical. Policy is originated, implemented, adjusted, reimplemented, and readjusted (Henry 2007: 285). The system, according to Thomas Dye, preserves itself by providing reasonably satisfying outputs, relying upon deeply rooted attachments to the system itself, and using or threatening to use force.

The usefulness of the system model for the study of public policy is, however, limited owing to several factors. It is argued that this model is too simplistic in nature. In many cases, policies do not appear to follow such a logical sequence. This model also ignores how decisions are made and policy is developed within the 'black box' called the political system. Another shortcoming of this model is that it ignores an important element of the policy process, namely, that the policy-makers, including institutions have also a considerable potential in influencing the environment within which they operate. Nonetheless, system theory is a useful aid in organizing our inquiry into policy information. It enlightens us about the role of environmental inputs to affect the content of public policy, gives answer to some significant aspects of the political process such as: What factors in the environment act to generate demands upon the political system? How is the political system able to convert demands into public policy and preserve itself over time? Thus, the system approach has been widely accepted as a useful way of looking at the policy process as it actually works out in government.

The preceding section discussed various models and approaches to get a better understanding of the public policy process. Each model provides a separate focus on political life, and each can help us to understand different things about public policy. Thus, it is not possible to say which is the 'best' or 'most satisfactory'. It would be better to use them as organizing concepts that seem most useful

for the satisfactory analysis and explanation of a particular public policy or political action. Each of the approaches can contribute to our understanding of public policy.

PUBLIC POLICY: FUNCTIONAL DIMENSIONS

Before coming to the public policy process—the central point of our discussion on the functional dimensions—it would be better to understand the environment it works in. This section will discuss the environment within which policymaking occurs and some of the official and unofficial participants who play an important role in policy formation and implementation. Here, the purpose is to give some notion of who participates in the policy process and in what ways, as well as of what factors usually influence policy behaviour.

The Policy Environment

Policy-making cannot be adequately understood apart from the environment in which it takes place. Demands for policy actions are generated in the environment and transmitted to the political system, at the same time; the environment places limits and constraints upon what can be done by policy-makers. James E. Anderson identifies two environmental factors, namely, political culture and socioeconomic variables and their influence on policy-makers. Political culture means widely held values, beliefs, and attitudes concerning governmental policies and actions.

Differences in public policy and policy-making in various countries can be explained, at least partly, in terms of political–cultural variations. Sociologist, Robin W. Williams, has identified a number of 'major-value orientations' in American society. These include individual freedom, equality, progress, efficiency, and practicality. Values such as these and others, such as democracy and individualism clearly have significance for policy-making. Political culture helps in political behaviour. Political cultural differences help ensure that public policy is more likely to favour economic competition in the US because individual opportunity is a widely held

value, while it is more likely to tolerate industrial cartels in China because economic competition has not been highly valued here.

Socioeconomic conditions also influence political activities to a great extend. Public policies can be usefully viewed as arising out of conflicts between different groups of people—private and official—processing differing interest and desires. One of the prime sources of conflict, especially in modern societies, is economic activity. Conflicts may develop between the interests of different groups. Groups that are underprivileged or dissatisfied with their current relationships with other groups in the economy may seek governmental assistance to improve their situation. Thus, it has been labour groups, dissatisfied with the wages resulting from private bargaining with employers that have sought minimum wage legislation. A society's level of economic development will impose limits on what the government can do in providing public goods and services to the community. The scarcities of economic resources will, of course, be more limiting in many of the underdeveloped countries of the world than in an affluent societies, such as the US. Social conflicts and change also provoke demands for government action. In the 1990s, there was a growing demand in India for reservation from the backward classes. They put pressure on the government to evolve a policy of reservation for the uplift of these classes. Those with conflicting interest and values opposed such demands, with the consequences that public officials found themselves hard-pressed to design acceptable policy solutions.

It can be fairly drawn from this discussion that we must consider social, economic, and political factors to understand how policy decisions are made and why some decisions are made rather than others.

The Official Policy-makers

Official policy-makers are those who possess legal authority to engage in the formation of public policy. These include legislators, executives, administrators, and judges. Each performs policymaking tasks, at least somewhat different from the others. Legislatures are concerned with the central political tasks of policy formation

and law making in a political system. In the course of approving, the legislative body performs other important functions like deliberating, scrutinizing, criticizing, and publicizing government policies and their consequences for the public on the floor of the house. Usually, it lays down the broad objectives which administration is to pursue and in more important cases also the machinery and the procedure through which they are to be pursued.

Modern governments everywhere depend vitally upon executive leadership, both in policy formulation and execution. In a parliamentary form of government, all policies must have the approval of the cabinet and the ministers of the government before introducing the Bill in the house. In developing countries, the executive probably has even more influence in policy-making than in developed countries. It is due to the lack of strong bureaucratic base and little influence of the pressure groups which facilitates greater concentration of power in governmental hands.

In the post Second World War period, the classical doctrine of politics–administration dichotomy has been proved to be an exploding fallacy. Now, there is a consensus that administrators are also involved in the policy formulation process in more than one way. In complex industrial societies, the technicality and complexity of many policy matters and the need for continuing control and lack of time and information among others, have led to the delegation of much discretionary authority to administrative agencies formally, recognized as the 'rule making power'. Public officials, today, are associated with policy formulation in three important ways. First, they supply facts, data, and analysis—regarding the workability of a policy—to the ministers or to the legislature and impart content to a policy. Second, they are constantly in touch with the public, so they have a better understanding of their problems and the solution required in the form of policies. Third, on account of lack of time and knowledge, the legislature passes 'skeletal' acts and leaves the 'body' to be filled by the administration. It is here that administrators have the maximum scope for 'policy-making'. Judiciary also plays an important role in the public policies. In countries, where the courts have the power of judicial review, they have played an important role in

policy formation. They have the power to determine the constitutionality of actions of the legislature and the executive branches and to declare them null, and void, if such actions are found to be in conflict with the constitutional provisions. They play an important role in giving direction to social, economic, and political policies of national importance.

Unofficial Participants

Besides the official policy-makers, many other unofficial players may participate in the policy-making process, like interest groups, political parties, and individual citizens and they may considerably influence policy formation without possessing the legal authority to take binding policy decisions.

Political parties

In modern societies, political parties generally perform the function of 'interest aggregation', that is, they seek to convert the particular demands of interest groups into general policy alternatives. Every political party has its own programmes or policies. These programmes, policies, or values are presented to the people in the form of manifestos (before the elections) in order to gain their support. The professional purpose of the manifesto is that it lends a promise, that in case the party comes to power, it will implement the policies promised therein. Since government is formed by the leaders of the political party that wins the majority of seats in the legislature, party cadres get involved in the formulation of policies to which they are committed.

Pressure groups

Pressure groups are organizations with formal structures whose members share common interests. They strive to influence the policies of the government without attempting to occupy political offices. The main function of these groups is to express demands and present alternatives for policy action. They constantly try to protect the interest of their members either by pressurizing the government or the bureaucracy to take decisions, which are likely to be in consonance with the interest of their members. They

employ various methods such as publicity campaigns, lobbying, personal meetings with the officials or legislatures, writing letters or memoranda, and so on, for this purpose.

Individual citizens

In the present age, it is not possible for a government to impose policies on citizens perennially, if such policies do not reflect their will. Public policies have to be consistent with the interest of the citizens. A democratic government cannot adopt policies to which a large body of citizens is opposed. Thus, the citizens exercise indirect influence on policy-making. The exercise of the right to vote enables the citizens to make a choice of public policies. Elections are opportunities for the citizens to select between the alternative policies thrown up by the political parties.

PUBLIC POLICY PROCESS

Scholars have identified various interfaces to map the stages of the policy process, thereby helping to structure its analysis. In this framework, public policy is a sequential pattern of action. These interfaces are briefly presented here:

1. *Problem Formation*: What is policy problem? What makes it a public problem? How does it get on the agenda of government?
2. *Formulation*: How are alternatives for dealing with the problem developed? Who participates in policy formulation?
3. *Adoption*: How is a policy alternative adopted or enacted? What requirements must be met? Who adopts policy?
4. *Implementation*: What is done, if anything, to carry a policy into effect? What impact does this have on policy content?
5. *Evaluation*: How is the effectiveness or impact of a policy measured? Who evaluates policy? What are the consequences of policy evaluation? Are there demands for change or repeal? (Anderson 1975: 26).

This framework has a number of advantages. In actuality, policy-making often does chronologically follow the sequence of

activities listed above. It helps to capture the flow of action in the policy process. However, in order to simplify our discussion, we will classify the policy-making process under three broad categories. These are (*a*) policy formulation, (*b*) policy implementation, and (*c*) policy evaluation. Let us examine these in details.

PUBLIC POLICY FORMULATION

Public policy formulation is a dynamic process. A number of events, actors, and political institutions take part in this process. It attempts to respond to the demands pressed by the people. James E. Anderson describes four stages in the policy formulation process. These are:

- Identifying public problems
- Putting public problems on policy agenda
- The formulation of policy proposals to deal the problem
- Making policy decisions

Public policies spring from issues that trouble a segment or segments of society to the point of taking actions. Commonly speaking, everyone has problems in the course of daily life. However, the difficulties that sow the seeds of public policy decisions fall into a unique category. The individuals or groups who suffer rely on government action to change their unfavourable condition into an acceptable situation. A public problem requiring government response is more pervasive than a personal difficulty, and the concern of large numbers of individuals with the same problem may transform that question into a public policy issue. Larry Gerston identifies four triggering factors which play a vital role in identifying and clarifying emerging issues for public policy. There are scope, intensity, time, and resources. Identification of 'public problems' is the starting point for public policy questions.

The second stage in the policy formulation process is setting a policy agenda. Of the thousands of demands made upon government, only a small portion receive serious attention from public policy-makers. Those demands that policy-makers either do

choose or feel compelled to act upon constitute the policy agenda. One possibility of this is suggested by political scientist David Truman in his book *The Government Process* (1952). Truman says that groups seek to maintain themselves in a state of reasonable equilibrium, and, if anything threatens this condition, they react accordingly. Political leadership may be an important factor in agenda setting. Political leaders, whether motivated by considerations of political advantage, concern for the public interest, or both, may seize upon particular problems, publicize them, and propose solutions. Protest activity, including violence, is another means by which problems may be brought to the attention of policy-makers and put on the policy agenda. Recently, Government of Rajasthan, had to respond positively to the demands of the 'Gujjar' community due to their long protest. They have been given 1 per cent reservation in the state services.

The media has also a long-standing reputation for placing issues on the public agenda. News reports raise the awareness of both policy-makers and their constituents. By transforming a once-private question into a public issue, media agents expand the size of the audience and thus alter the dynamics of the policy-making process.

When a problem becomes a part of the public agenda, the next stage of its journey is the formulation of policy proposals. Policy formation involves the development of pertinent and acceptance-proposed courses of actions for dealing with public problems. The government is the major source of initiative in the development of policy proposals. Many policy proposals are developed by the public bureaucracy. Special study groups or advisory commissions are also created by the government to examine particular policy areas and develop policy proposals. Setting up of the Srikrishna Commission by the Government of India for looking into the demands of the Telengana State is an example of such advisory commissions. Legislature plays an important role in policy formation. In the course of legislative hearings and investigations, through contacts with various administrative officials and interest groups representatives, and on the basis of their own interests and activity, legislators receive suggestions for action on problems and formulate proposed

courses of actions. Finally, interest groups often play a major role in policy formulation, sometimes going to the legislature with specific proposals for legislation. Or, they may also work with legislative and executive officials for the enactment of one officially proposed policy, perhaps with some modifications to suit their interest. Competing proposals for dealings with a given problem may come from these sources. Finally, what is likely to result is the adoption of some compromise course of action based on these proposals. The involvement of both public officials and private interest groups and adoption of compromised proposals are the basic characteristics of policy formulation in most of the political systems.

The final stage in the policy-making process is policy formulation. Policy formulation is in practice typically blended with the policy decision stage of the policy process. Formulation is directed towards winning approval of a preferred policy alternative; an affirmative decision is the pay-off of the entire process. A policy decision involves action by some official person or body to approve, modify, or reject a preferred policy alternative. In a positive fashion, it takes such forms as the enactment of legislation or the issuance of an executive order. Although private individuals and organizations also participate in taking policy decisions, the formal authority rests with public–officials–legislators, executive, administrators, and judges. In democracies, the task of taking policy decisions is most closely identified with the legislature, which is designed to represent the interests of the populace. Policy decisions taken by the legislature are usually accepted as legitimate, as being made in proper way and hence binding on all concerned. The policy formulation procedure is completed only after the appropriate authority has adopted the policy.

PUBLIC POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

Until the 1970s, policy analysts gave little attention to the policy implementation aspect. By the mid-1970s, it was found that many policies had not performed well. As it became apparent that policy-making in many areas such as population, health, education, and agriculture had not achieved its desired goals, researchers in

public administration and public analysis began to focus on policy implementation process.

Simply speaking, implementation is the task of putting formulated policies to practice. It represents the conscious conversion of policy plans into reality. It is the 'follow-through' component of the public policy-making process. Policy implementation reveals the strengths and weaknesses of the decision-making process. Ironically, very little work had been done in this field until 1973, when Presman and Wildavsky christened this infant area of study as 'Implementation'. While some disagreement exists over the elements that compose implementation, certain assumptions seem to have wide-spread acceptance. For implementation to occur:

- There must be an entity with sufficient resources assigned to carry out the implementation task;
- the implementing agency must be able to translate goods into an operational framework; and
- the entity assigned the implementing task must deliver its assignment and be accountable for its actions (Randall, Ripley, and Franklin 1986: 10–11).

Identification of the components necessary for implementation in no way is a barometer of success, such awareness only points to the myriad hurdles that must be overcome en route to fulfilling a policy objective.

The Implementation Process

Implementation process involves the continuation of the political process which had actually authored the policy. This is the reason why governments which have formulated a particular policy, find it easier to implement it, rather than the governments which inherit the task of implementation from the previous governments. The implementation process has the following characteristics:

1. Implementation translates the policies into collective action. It brings beneficiaries and passive people together so that the implementation can be effectively channelized.

2. Implementation deals with the problem of control and accountability in administration.
3. Implementation largely depends upon street-level discretion. Luther Gullick has found that actual discretion in administration is used at the very bottom of the hierarchy where public servants touch the public.
4. Policy implementation has no clear-cut end point which marks the end of the implementation process. The implementation of a section in a policy is the starting point of the other episode or problem area. It is an ongoing process which never ends till the policy is withdrawn or funds end.
5. Implementation involves intergovernmental bargaining. Since every policy involves the cooperative efforts of several agencies, hence their mutual understanding, cooperation in the policy execution, coordination amongst themselves, and allocation of grants plays a decisive role in getting the policy implemented.

Who Implements Policy?

Public administration is mainly a policy implementation organization. Many other actors like legislature, courts, pressure groups, and community organizations help the process. In a modern political system, public policy is implemented primarily by a complex system of administrative agencies. These agencies perform most of the day-to-day work of government and thus affect citizens directly in their actions. Administrative agencies often operate under broad and ambiguous statutory mandates that leave them with much discretion to decide what should or should not be done. Lack of time, interest, information, and expertness on the part of politicians may also contribute to the delegation of authority to these agencies. Policy implementation is not an easy task. Without cooperation of top administrators, little can be achieved. In policy implementation, administrators, especially senior executives should have the following functions:

(*a*) Administrators must clearly understand the nature and significance of policies which the political masters have set. They are responsible for advising in the formulation of policies designed

to achieve goals, and also mobilizing, organizing, and managing the resources necessary to carry through these policies. (*b*) They should assist policy-makers to avoid ambiguities and advise them on the importance of adopting policies which can be implemented. (*c*) They should be able to translate the general policies and their objectives into operational targets. This function should also include analysis of probable cost and benefit of each for achieving the operational targets. As far as possible, they should adopt a rational approach and use management techniques to implement policies. (*d*) They should be able to pay special attention to the question of coordination of policies and policy instruments. They should analyse the policy in question in relation to other policies to see if any inconsistencies exist, and examine whether it complements or supplements other policies to produce better results (Dror 1974: 12).

Bureaucratic organizations have been subjected to a number of criticisms. It is said to be afflicted with excesses of red tapism, unresponsiveness, hierarchies, and rigid-rule frameworks. Despite these maladies, it holds importance. Kenneth Meier writes, 'when faced with a cute crisis, chronic problems, or even apathy, the positive state [Government] responds, and the response usually includes a bureaucracy'. To a large extent, bureaucratic agencies are the responses to the directions of public policies.

While administrative machinery is the primary implementers of public policy, the legislative bodies are also involved in policy implementation. Though role of the legislative bodies is not very crucial, they may affect administrative organizations in several ways. It subjects administrative discretion and delegation. Parliamentary approval is required for many top-level administrative appointments, and this may be used to influence the implementation process. Judiciary also plays an important role in policy implementation. Some laws are enforced primarily through judicial action. The courts affect administration through their interpretation of statutes and administrative rules and regulations, and their review of administrative decisions in cases brought before them. Courts can facilitate, hinder, or largely nullify the implementation of particular policies through their decisions. Political parties also

affect the policy implementation process. They try to influence, both the executives and the bureaucracy, to implement policies which serve their purpose. Sometime, they prevent the implementation of a policy which goes contrary to their ideology. Civil society groups, NGOs, and community organizations also help the enforcement of implementation. The Panchayats after the 73rd Amendment Act have acted as an integrating device for grassroots agencies. In short, a variety of participants affect the implementation of a given policy.

Hurdles in Policy Implementation

Policy implementation is not an easy task. The following factors make this exercise more difficult.

- the absence of adequate financial resources;
- bureaucracy cooperates minimally in providing data to substantiate the findings;
- lack of political support and political interference;
- government agencies and pressure groups present conflicting data and rationalize their own findings;
- lack of public involvement in policy implementation programmes;
- lack of administrative will and motivation;
- poor coordination and cooperation;
- politicization of policies to pleasure the strong groups in the electorate; and
- centralization of power and hierarchical bureaucratic structure;

No doubt, implementation is a complex problem. But the success of any government and administration depends largely upon successful implementation of policies. Policy does not implement itself. It has to be translated into action. It requires strong determination, will, and action. Policies must be proposed, structured, funded, and directed so that the implementing bureaucracy has a clear framework for application. For policies to succeed, clear lines of transmission and jurisdiction must be drawn. Thus, policy-makers have to

be precise, while bureaucratic discretionary authority must be constrained. In addition, implementation requires willing cooperation by relevant actors and institutions.

POLICY EVALUATION

The final stage of the policy process is the evaluation. Simply defined, policy evaluation assesses the effectiveness of a public policy in terms of its perceived intentions and results. It is the best opportunity for those interested in knowing whether a commitment has been called out in line with its design. It is also the last major opportunity to bring the policy back into the decision-making arena, if it has been mismanaged or if it has led undesirable impacts. With its emergence in the 'back end' of the public-policy framework, evaluation has become an important element in the policy-making process, as well as a predictor of further action to come.

The main objective of policy evaluation is to reduce the problem in the face of policy delivery, and is generally used for one or more of the three purposes of assessing: policy efficiency, policy effectiveness, and policy impact. Besides these purposes, it provides reliable information about policy performance. The aim of evaluation here is to measure the impact of policies on society. It reveals the extent to which particular goals have been achieved. It helps us to understand the degree to which policy issues have been resolved.

Types of Evaluation

Policy-makers and administrators have always made judgements concerning the worth or effects of particular policies, programmes, and projects. Joseph S. Wholey has identified three types of policy evaluation activities which are as follows:

- *Type I: Programme Impact Evaluation* is an assessment of overall programme impact and effectiveness. The emphasis is on determining the extent to which programmes are successful in achieving basic objectives and on the comparative evaluation of national programmes.

- *Type II: Programme Strategy Evaluation* is an assessment of the relative effectiveness of programme strategies and variables. The emphasis is on determining which programme strategies are most productive.
- *Type III: Project Monitoring* is an assessment of individual projects through site visits and other activities with emphasis on managerial and operational efficiency (Wholey 1970: 62).

Systematic evaluation directs attention to the effects a policy has on the public problem to which it is directed. It permits at least some tentative responses to the question 'is this policy accomplishing anything?' It gives policy-makers and the general public some notion of the actual impact of policy and provides policy discussions with some grounding in reality.

Methods of Evaluation

In the past, evaluation had mostly been in terms of economic analysis of policies. Therefore, most tools of evaluation studies have been taken from economics. They have been aimed at setting up of economic targets of productivity analysis, efficiency evaluation, and the cost-benefit studies. There are three commonly used tools of evaluation.

Cost-benefit analysis

This is the most commonly used approach in evaluation studies. It employs the balancing of costs and the benefits of the policies in a manner so that the profit and losses can be assessed in purely economic terms. Basically, this method requires systematic enumeration of all benefits and all costs, readily quantifiable or difficult to measure, which will accrue if a particular project is adapted. With all this information at hand, the analyst should be able to subtract the total cost of each alternative from the total sum of its benefits and identify the net gain in each case. This was the most reliable, simple, and clear-cut system of analysis but it was incapable of evaluating policies of the intangibles, like the impact of the free meal policy for children upon their performance, at the loss of environment due to mining or the impact of oil refinery

on the coastal marine and human life. The cost-benefit analysis is incapable of assessing all these complex variables in public policy.

Programme-planning and budgeting system (PPBS)

This method has been widely adapted by government agencies in recent years. It is an attempt to rationalize decision-making in a bureaucracy. It is a part of the budgetary process but the focus is on the uses of expenditures and the output provided for, rather than an amount allocated by agency or department. The aim of PPBS is to specify the output of a government programme, and then to minimize the cost of achieving this output and to learn whether benefits exceed the cost. The first step in PPBS is to define programme objectives. The next, and perhaps critical step, is to develop measures of the level accomplishment under each programme—the 'output'. Then, the cost of the programme can be calculated per unit of output. Presumably, this enables the decision-makers to view the real cost-benefit ratio of a programme; for example, how much it costs to teach one pupil per year or keep one child in a day-care centre, and so on.

The experimental method

In this method, the basis of evaluation is an 'ideal' laboratory-like situation in which some units in a population who received some service under the policy measures have been randomly selected, while others have not received it. In evaluating the performance of such policies and programmes, samples of different groups—who have received and who have not received—are selected for comparative analysis. Relevant variables of the groups are then studied before and after, and even during the programme period, in order to find out the difference of impact. Subsequently, statistical methods are used for testing the data for significance levels.

Evaluating Agencies

Another significant area of study in the field of policy evaluation is the role of various agencies involved in it. Within the government, a few agencies of official policy evaluation are the legislatures and their committees, the audit office, commissions of enquiry, and the departmental evaluation reports.

Legislative Bodies

A common practice in democratic countries is the involvement of legislative bodies in policy evaluation. The legislative body exercises policy evaluation through the technique of questions and debates—motions like call attention, no-confidence, committee hearing and investigation—and through the budgetary process. Since the legislature is a large body and overburdened with the routine matter, it is their smaller committees, which take up detailed investigative and evaluative work. In India, for example, we have a number of such committees, like the public accounts committees, committee on the welfare of Schedule Castes (SCs), Scheduled Tribes (ST), and so on.

Audit Process

In India, the auditor's office has broad statutory authority to audit the operation and finance of the activities of government agencies, evaluate their programmes, and report their findings to the parliament. Evaluation studies may be taken up by the office of the Controller and Auditor General (CAG) on its own initiative, on the basis of directives in legislation, at the request of financial committees, or sometimes at the request of individual members of parliament. The office of the CAG of India, which is regarded as an arm of the parliament, has broad statutory authority to ensure the accountability of the executive to the parliament. It assists the legislature in the executive exercise of its financial control.

Administrative Agencies

All government departments prepare their internal evaluation reports, which provide an opportunity to appraise the working of the programmes and projects undertaken by the department. Similarly, every department while sending its own demand for grants to the finance ministry evaluates in the process its annual plans, programmes, and performance. The organization and methods division in ministries also indirectly perform the task of policy evaluation.

Commissions and Independent Agencies

From time to time, appointment of certain commission like the Planning Commission, the administrative reform commission, and various ad hoc commissions by the government play an important role in public policy evaluation by presenting their detailed research reports on the consequences and impact of particular government policies. Evaluation activity is also carried on outside the government. University research scholars, private research institutes, pressure groups, and public interest organizations make evaluation of policies that have impact on public officials to some extent. They also provide the large public with information, publicize policy action or inaction, advocate enactment or withdrawal of policies, and often effectively voice the demands of the weaker sections of the public.

Barriers in Policy Evaluation

No doubt, evaluation is an important component of the policy-making process which must be objective, systematic, and empirical. But, a number of barriers stand in the way of those who try to evaluate policies. The first problem is regarding uncertainty over policy goals. When the goals of policy are unclear or diffused, policy evaluation becomes a difficult task. In such a case, officials may define goals differently and act accordingly. Second, there is the difficulty of measuring the extent to which these goals have been achieved. Evaluators themselves may not be impartial individuals to take objective view of a policy issue. The same condition can be interpreted differently by different evaluators. Third, a shortage of accurate and relevant data and statistics may hinder the work of a policy evaluator. Official resistance is another barrier in policy evaluation, because agencies and programme officials see the possible political consequences of evaluation. If the results do not come out in their favour, they may discourage or disparage evaluation studies, refuse access to data or keep records those are incomplete. Finally, it is a general observation that organizations tend to resist change, while evaluation implies change. Organizational inertia may, thus, be an obstacle to evaluation, along with more forms of resistance.

Public policy evaluation is a very complex process. Many participants are involved and many factors influence the outcome in this process. Nevertheless, evaluation has taken its place as a vital element of the public policy process; it is a potentially powerful mechanism that compares promise with performance, as well as the linkage between the present and the future. Thus, although evaluation may seem to be an almost gratuitous 'back door' of the policy-making cycle, it also serves as the window for policy-making decisions yet to come.

PUBLIC POLICY PROCESS IN INDIA

Policy-making is a vital function of the government in a democratic country like India. The process of policy-making begins with the ideas and opinions people have about the actions they want the government to undertake. In other words, they are the demands or proposals made by civil society organizations or interest groups upon the political system for action on some perceived problem. People with demands, either supported or opposed by interest groups, seek to achieve some commitments from government to put their ideas into action (Sapru 2010: 152). In the Indian parliamentary system, the activities of the government are carried out by the council of ministers headed by the prime minister. In the council of ministers, cabinet occupies an important place, as it is the body, which takes important decisions pertaining to government policies. The cabinet formulates all the policies and sends them to the parliament for approval. The parliament consisting of the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha discusses the policy before approving it. Lot of discussions and debates take place in both houses of the parliament. However, the support of majority members paves the way for approval of the policy. Once it is cleared by both the houses, it is sent to the president for his assent. The president is free either to give his assent or withhold it. On occasions, he can send the Bill back to the parliament with his comments and recommendations. After incorporating the changes proposed by the president, the Bill is sent back to him for assent and he is bound to give the assent. The recommendations made by the president

can be ignored by the parliament if the government has a strong majority in both the houses (Dey 1989: 79). After going through this process a Bill is converted into a policy.

Another stage in the public policy process is policy implementation. The real fruits of a policy can be enjoyed when the policy is implemented effectively. In India, various institutions like the legislature, executive, judiciary, civil service, NGOs, and others, participate directly or indirectly in the process of policy implementation. The legislature plays an important role in the policy implementation process by expressing its opinion during the question hour session. Members of Parliament (MPs) can ask the government any question of importance. There are several committees, like the Public Accounts Committee, Estimate Committee, and Select Committees that enable the members to scrutinize the government's decision. Every year at the budgetary discussions, MPs can express their views. The judiciary also plays an important role in the policy implementation process. Any policy formulated by the government leading to incongruence with the Constitution is declared null and void by the Supreme Court of India. The introduction of Public Interest Litigation (PIL) also enables the Supreme Court direct the government to alter faulty policy and check the implementation of wrong policy. The role of the executive in the policy implementation process is very important. With the cooperation of the civil service, the executive is primarily responsible for implementation of the policies. Civil servants can materialize the policy in the right direction due to their skill, knowledge, and experience. Public policy is meant for the welfare of the citizens. Civil servants, therefore, maintain healthy cooperation with citizens in implementing public policy.

After being successfully implemented, a policy is evaluated in order to access its effectiveness in terms of its perceived intentions and results. In India, the official policy evaluation agencies are the legislatures and their committees, the CAG, commissions of enquiry, and the departmental evaluation reports. Evaluation activity is also carried on outside the government. University research scholars, private research institutes, pressure groups, and

public interest organizations make evaluation of policies that have impact on public officials to some extent. They also provide the large public with information, publicize policy action or inaction, advocate enactment or withdrawal of policies and often effectively voice the demands of the weaker sections of the public. Through the policy evaluation process, the policy-makers get feedback for better policy formulation.

POLICY SCIENCES AND PUBLIC POLICY PROCESS: AN EVALUATION

With the political scientist Harold Lasswell's essay on 'The Policy Orientation' authored with Daniel Lerner (1951), the study of public policies came to be newly christened as policy sciences. According to Lasswell, the policy sciences study the process of deciding or choosing and evaluate the relevance of available knowledge for the solution of particular problems. Yehezkel Dror, an authority in the field, describes policy sciences as a discipline which searches for policy knowledge that seeks general policy-issue knowledge and policy-making knowledge, and integrates them into a distinct study. The complex problems of public policy in the 1950s were left to public authorities and whomever they chose to consult. In the 1960s, more specialists entered the public policy-making arena concerned about urban problems, environmental controls, weapons systems, poverty programmes, and civil rights. In the 1970s and 1980s, much effort was devoted to expand the relevance while adhering to the scientific rigour of the policy sciences. The focus on 'sciences' as well as well as on 'democracy' by Lasswell led to the emergence of two separate approaches to the policy sciences—policy analyses and policy process. While, one emphasizes knowledge of the policy process, the other, emphasizes knowledge for use in the policy process. In the post 1990s, the policy sciences are shifting their focus on normative truths and improving its ability to serve knowledge needs of the administrative and political community in the form of directed policy inquiry. Normative values and public management are the core concerns of the present-day policy sciences.

Public policies are developed in response to the existence of a perceived problem or an opportunity. They are the products of a dynamic process. The process model is useful in helping us understand the various activities involved in policy-making. There are four main steps in the public policy process—identifying a problem, formulating a policy, implementing the policy, and evaluating the result. In this framework, public policy is a sequential pattern of action. It helps to capture the flow of action in the policy process. The first step in the public policy process is to outline the problem. This involves not only recognizing that an issue exists, but also studying the problem and its causes in detail. After identifying and studying the problem, a new public policy may be formulated or developed. This step is typically marked by discussion and debate between government officials, interest groups, and individual citizens to identify potential obstacles, to suggest alternative solutions, and to set clear goals and list the steps that need to be taken to achieve them. A new policy must be put into effect, which typically requires determining which organizations or agencies will be responsible for carrying it out. It is the conscious conversion of policy plans into reality. This is the third step of the public policy process. Policy implementation reveals the strengths and weaknesses of decision-making process. The final stage in the public policy process is known as evaluation. This step usually involves a study of how effective the new policy has been in addressing the original problem, which often leads to additional public policy changes. It also includes reviewing funds and resources available to ensure that the policy can be maintained. In the words of Thomas Dye, 'Sophisticated versions of the model portray a "feedback" linkage—evaluations of current policy identify new problems and set in motion the policymaking process once again.' Though most policy evaluations are unsystemic and impressionistic, yet, they often succeed in stimulating reforms-policy changes designed to remedy perceived mistakes, inadequacies, wasteful expenditures, and other flaws in existing policy (Dye 2004: 54).

Public policies play an important role in resolving societal problems. But, at the same time we must also recognize the limitations

of the policies in affecting societal conditions. Thomas Dye identifies a number of such limitations. First, some societal problems are incapable of solution because of the way in which they are defined. If the problems are defined in relative rather than absolute terms, they may never be resolved by public policy. For example, if the poverty line is defined as the line which places one-fifth of the population below it, then poverty will always be with us regardless of how well off the 'poor' may become. Thus, relative disparities in society may never be eliminated. Second, expectations may always outrace the capabilities of governments. Third, policies that resolve the problems of one group in society may create problems for other groups. For example, solving the problem of inequality in society may mean redistributive tax and spending policies which take from persons of above-average wealth to give to persons with below-average wealth. The latter may view this as a solution, but the former may view this as creating serious problems. Thus, there are no policies which can simultaneously attain mutually exclusive ends. Forth, societal problems may have multiple causes, and a specific policy may not be able to eradicate the problem. For example, job training may not affect the hard-core unemployment if their employability is also affected by chronic poor health. Finally, the political system is not structured for completely rational decision-making. The solution of societal problems generally implies a rational model, but government may not be capable of formulating policy in a rational fashion. Instead, the political system may reflect group interests, elite preferences, environmental forces, or incremental change, more than rationalism. Presumably, a democratic system is structured to reflect mass influences, whether these are rational or not. Elected officials respond to the demands of their constitutents, and this may inhibit completely rational approaches to public policy. Thus, public policy is a response to the societal problems, but it is conditioned by the environment in which it is framed. However, despite a number of limitations, the study of public policy enables us to understand the causes and consequences of policy decisions and improves our knowledge about the society. Therefore, public policy as an activity and area of

study continues to hold relevance as long as one finds the process of governance.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

To sum up, public policy-making is a very complex, dynamic process whose various components make different contributions to it. It decides major guidelines for action directed at the future, mainly by the governmental organ. These guidelines or policies, formally aim at achieving what is in the public interest by the best possible means (Gerston 1974: 141–42). As society becomes complex, the rush of issues to the public agenda will only increasingly test limited resources and competing values. The policy-making process is one way of understanding the means through which conflicting demands are heard reconciled and resolved in orderly, if not always satisfactory fashion. Fundamentally, it provides some explanation of the cacophony known as 'politics' in an ever changing society.

REFERENCES

Anderson, James E. 1975. *Public Policy Making*. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.

Bhattacharya, Mohit. 2008. *New Horizons of Public Administration*. New Delhi: Jawahar Publisher and Distributors.

Dey, Prabir Kumar. 1989. *Public Policy and System*. New Delhi: Pearson.

Dror, Yehezkel. 1974. *Public Policy Making Reexamined*. San Francisco: Leonard Hill Books.

Dye, Thomas R. 2004. *Understanding Public Policy* (3rd edition). New Delhi: Pearson Education.

Easton, David. 1965. *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*. New York: Wiley.

Frohock, Fred M. 1979. *Public Policy: Scope and Logic*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Gerston, Larry N. 1974. *Public Policy Making: Process and Principles* (2nd edition). New York: M.E. Sharpe, Armonk.

Haveman Robert Henry. 1970. *The Economic of the Public Sectors*. New York: John Wiley.

Henry, Nicholas. 2007. *Public Administration and Public Affairs* (10th edition). New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.

Lowi, Theodore. 1964. *The Pursuit of Justice*. New York: Mc Graw-Hill.

Meier, Kenneth. 1994. *The Politics of Sin: Drugs, Alcohol and Public Policy*. Madrid: M.E. Sharpe.

Peters, B. Guy. 1996. *America Public Policy: Promise and Performance* (4th edition). New Jersey: Chathan House.

Presthus, Robert. 1975. *Public Administration* (6th edition). New York: The Ronald Press Company.

Quade, Edward S. 1970. 'Why Policy Sciences?' *Policy Sciences*, I (Spring).

Randall, D., B. Ripley, and Grace A. Franklin. 1986. *Policy Implementation and the Bureaucracy* (2nd edition). Chicago: Dorsey Press.

Sapru, R.K. 2010. *Public Policy: Art and Craft of Policy Analysis*. New Delhi: PHI Learning Private Limited.

Truman, David. 1952. *The Government Process*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Wholey, Joseph S. 1970. *Federal Evaluation Policy*. Washington DC: The Urban Institute.

Chapter 5

Development Administration

Learning Objectives
- To understand the concept of development administration
- To trace the origin and evolution of development administration
- To examine the changing patterns of development administration

In the 1950s, development administration emerged as a vehicle to usher in speedy 'development' in the post-colonial Third World. It had its origin in the desire of the richer countries to aid the poorer countries, and more especially in the obvious needs of newly emerging states to transform their colonial bureaucracies into more responsible instruments of societal change. The simple underlying conception was that the transfer of resources and know-how would hasten the modernization process from agrarian to industrial, using government- and public-sponsored bodies as change agents (Caiden 1971: 265). For more than a decade, it captivated the minds of scholars, and various experiments were undertaken to adapt administration to the 'development' needs. The concept of development administration looked so promising that it was recognized as a sub-discipline of public administration. This chapter will highlight the genesis, conceptual framework, characteristics, and the changing patterns of development administration.

GENESIS OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

The term 'development administration' has almost exclusively been used with reference to the developing nations of the Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It was seen as a mechanism for attainment of 'socioeconomic progress' and 'nation building' in the Third World nations. However, its conceptual genre has been distinctively Western, the impetus for which can be traced to Robert Dahl's article 'The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems' in which he criticized public administration for its inability to develop a comparative perspective (Dahl 1947). The term 'development administration' was first used by an Indian Civil Servant, U.L. Goswami in his article entitled 'The Structure of Development Administration in India' in 1955 in the context of community development programmes (Sapru 1998: 769). However, the conceptualization and elaboration of the concept were done by the Western, especially American, scholars, such as George F. Gant, F.W. Riggs, Edward Weidner, Milton J. Esman, Han Bee Lee, John D. Montgomery, and Alfred Diamant. The most important single contribution in the field came from the Comparative Administrative Group in USA formed in 1961 under the aegis of the American Society for Public Administration. Disappointed with the results of the US Government's technical assistance programme for public administration in the developing countries, the members of the Comparative Administrative Group undertook research and seminars on the administrative problems of some of the Third World nations. Their research findings revealed that Western development models and concepts of public administration might not be appropriate or feasible in developing nations. This led to the search for a new administrative modal, which met the developmental needs of the developing nations.

'Third World development' became a very powerful intellectual discourse in the American social science thinking of the 1950s. Two interrelated goals for this can be identified. The first underlying proposition and latent goal was that with sufficient foreign aid and a revamped administrative system, these new nations would closely follow, if not altogether achieve, the industrial progress

of the West. The implicit goal, it now seems, was to counter the Marxist–Leninist ideological prescription, offering a classless society. New nations had to be saved from the appeals of communism. Thus, administration was looked as having system maintenance and system-stability-building potential capacity. Bureaucratization was considered a functional prerequisite for maintaining stability and legitimacy in the political order.

In short, the main reasons for the birth and growth of the concept of development administration are (*a*) the emergence of new decolonized nations after the Second World War, (*b*) the emergence of international and the US economic and technical plans for assistance to developing nations, and (*c*) the establishment of the Comparative Administrative Group and the interest shown by its members in developing nations and their administrative systems. Owing to these factors, since the 1960s, development administration has become a dominant concept and acquired immense importance in the developing nations. The key objective was transformation of existing government machinery into a new entity. This was to be accomplished through administrative development, that is, modernization of government machinery through external inducement, transfer of technology, training by foreign experts, and setting up of institutions of public administration in developing countries. Thus, development administration emerged, closely tied to foreign aid and Western formulae, for development planning which was supposed to have equal (and universal) applicability in developing nations. The following section deals with the conceptual framework of this sub-discipline of public administration.

DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION: MEANING

The administration concerned with developmental activities in the Third World nations is called development administration. The dictionary defines development administration as 'the enhancement or improvement of techniques, processes and systems organized to increase the administrative capacity of a nation, usually newly emerging nations' (Chandler and Plano 1982: 24). Martin Landau

defines it as the 'engineering of social change' (Landau 1970: 74). Development administration, according to Montgomery, is 'carrying planned change in the economy or capital infrastructure or to a lesser extent in the social services, especially health and education' (quoted in Naidu 1996: 148).

According to Merle Fainsod, development administration 'embraces the array of new functions assumed by the developing countries embarking on the path of modernization and industrialization. Development Administration ordinarily involves the establishment of machinery for planning economic growth, and mobilizing and allocating resources to expand national income' (quoted in Naidu 1996: 148). Edward Weidner, another prominent exponent of the concept, tries to introduce development administration in a proper and scientific way. He views development as a dynamic process of change or transformation from one state of being to another. The main goals of development in developing countries, according to Weidner, are nation building and socio-economic progress. Weidner defined development administration as 'an action-oriented, goal-oriented administrative system… guiding an organization towards the achievement of progressive political, economic and social objectives' (Weidner 1970: 399).

Fred W. Riggs defines development administration as 'organized efforts to carry out programmes or projects thought by those involved to serve developmental objectives' (Riggs 1970: 73). According to Donald C. Stone, 'Broadly, Development Administration is concerned with achieving national development' (Naidu 1996: 149). In his opinion, it is primarily concerned with the tasks and processes of formulating and implementing the four P's: Plans, Policies, Programmes, and Projects, in respect to developmental goals and objectives. If it is preoccupied with programmatic management, development administration may be understood as organized efforts to carry out programmes or projects thought by those in power to serve the developmental objectives of society.

Development administration, according to George F. Gant, is the term used to denote the complex of agencies, management systems, and the process a government establishes to achieve its developmental goals. It is the public mechanism set-up to relate the several

components of development in order to articulate and accomplish national socioeconomic objectives. It is the adjustment of bureaucracy to the vastly increased number, variety, and complexity of governmental functions required to respond to public demands for development. Development administration is the administration of policies, programmes, and projects to serve development purposes (Gant 1979: 20).

In brief, development administration is the process of carrying out development programmes and projects in the direction of nation building and socioeconomic progress through an administrative organization. The primary objective of development administration is to strengthen the administrative machinery, which would bring about socioeconomic change. It is concerned with the establishment of social justice through equitable distribution of social and economic benefits among the various social groups in society. Its aim is to promote economic growth by industrialization. Development administration is also concerned with political development which includes (*a*) equality, (*b*) the capacity of the political systems to produce according to demands, and (*c*) differentiation of governmental roles and organizations in the process of meeting their challenges. It attempts to bring about changes in the values and attitudes of people, which differ from the existing ones and are supportive of the developmental activities. Development administration also requires administrative modernization, that is, creation of new administrative structures and reorientation of the existing ones to suit the needs of developmental programmes. Thus, development administration aims at transforming an entire society, with social, economic, political, and administrative elements intermeshed for purposes of change.

CHARACTERISTICS OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Scholars have identified a number of features of development administration. To George F. Gant (1979), it is characterized by its purposes, its loyalties, and its attitudes. The purpose of development administration is to stimulate and facilitate defined programmes of

social and economic progress. They are purposes of change, innovation, and movement as contrasted with purposes of maintaining the status quo. They are to make change attractive and possible. These purposes are to apply policies and to conduct programmes of development specified by the people as a whole through evolving political systems of democratic decision-making. Bureaucracy is accountable to the public. Bureaucratic loyalty in development administration must be to the people and not to its own vested institutional interests nor to a non-public sovereign, such as king or empire. The attitudes of development administration are positive rather than negative, persuasive rather than restrictive. It encourages innovation and change where desirable or necessary to accomplish development purposes and discourages adherence to traditional norms and forms for their own sake. The attitude of development administration is outward reaching and not inward looking (Gant 1979: 20–21). Thus, development administration is characterized by its 'purposes' (socioeconomic progress), its 'loyalties' (accountable to the people), and its 'attitudes' (positive, persuasive, and innovative). V.A. Pai Panandiker and S.S. Kshirsagar have identified four characteristics of development administration. These are (*a*) change orientation, (*b*) result orientation, (*c*) citizen participative orientation, and (*d*) commitment to work (Panandiker and Kshirsagar 1978: 309–10). Edward Weidner, a pioneer in the field also looks development administration as 'an action-oriented; goal-oriented administrative system' (Weidner quoted in Waldo 1970: 120).

On the basis of the above remarks, a number of characteristics of development administration can be identified.

Change Orientation

Development administration is change oriented, that is, its central concern is to bring about desirable socioeconomic changes. Its aim is to bring about planned change to meet the nation's economic, social, and cultural objectives. This feature distinguishes development administration from traditional administration which is primarily concerned with maintenance of status quo. The developing nations do face the challenges of poverty, unemployment,

malnutrition, and social backwardness. The main task of administration in these nations is to bring a constructive change in such fields. After Independence, the Government of India set up the Planning Commission and formulated five-year plans to bring about planned socioeconomic changes.

Goal Orientation

Development administration is goal oriented, that is, it is concerned with achieving certain specific programmatic results. Developing countries face a number of socioeconomic problems. It is development administration through which the goals of development, namely, social justice, industrial–agricultural growth, and modernization can be achieved. For example, agricultural development was the main goal of the Indian administration during the First Five Year Plan (1951–56).

Client Orientation

Development administration is concerned with satisfying the need of its clients. It is primarily concerned with the uplift of the poor and downtrodden sections of the society. In India, SCs, STs, women, and weaker sections of society are the important clients to be served by the administration. A number of developmental schemes are introduced in order to uplift these sections of society. People are given active participation in the developmental programmes. The 73rd and 74th Amendment Acts have also reserved seats for the weaker sections of society in Panchyats and municipalities, in order to ensure their participation in the local governance.

Time Orientation

Development administration is time oriented. This means it is concerned for completion of development programmes within a time frame. Developmental goals are set, and projects formulated and implemented to achieve the goals within a specific time limit. Since the socioeconomic goals have to be brought about as quickly as possible, the timeliness of all activities assume

considerable significance in development administration. Peter Savage (1970) have well explained the temporal dimension of development administration.

Citizen-participation Orientation

Development administration requires the active participation of the citizens in the developmental programmes. Without people's cooperation and participation in the developmental tasks, the desired socioeconomic changes cannot be achieved. Therefore, public bureaucracy must involve the citizens actively into the developmental programmes. This close nexus between 'public and administration' is an essential attribute of developmental administration. That is why the involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions in planning and administration has found renewed support in the development strategy of India.

Ecological Orientation

Development administration is an open system, which actively interacts with its environment. It receives a feedback from the social system and responds to the demands upon it by the system. The changes in administration affect its environment and changes in the environment also have its bearing on administration. It requires the qualities of flexibility and responsiveness in administrative actions and methods. The credit for exploring the ecological dimension in public administration goes to Fred W. Riggs.

Innovativeness

Development administration is innovative (Katz 1970: 120), since it is concerned with societal changes in achieving developmental objectives. It is dynamic and progressive in thoughts and action. It is interested in identifying and applying new structures and methods, techniques, and policies and programmes so that the objectives and goals of development are achieved with minimum possible resources and time. For example, India has experimented with many new policies, programmes, institutions, and procedures

which can be termed as hallmarks of development administration. We have introduced various development programmes like National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA), Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP), tribal development programmes, and so on. These programmes broadly aim at removal of poverty, unemployment, and creation of job opportunities. Thus, development administration has to be innovative enough in order to realize the predetermined objectives of development.

From the above discussion, it can be derived that development administration is a dynamic concept. It is characterized by its special orientation for change, goal, client, and timeliness of its projects. It is very sensitive to the environmental factors affecting administration and involves people in its programmes and projects. These elements are inevitable for development administration in order to realize the goals of nation building and socioeconomic changes in the Third World nations.

TRADITIONAL ADMINISTRATION VERSUS DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

It is said that development administration is public administration with a difference. Scholars like George F. Gant, Ferrel Heady, and others have tried to make a distinction between development administration and traditional administration. Traditional administration is primarily identified with the maintenance of law and order, collection of revenues, and regulation of national life. In this sense, it is status quo oriented and regulatory in nature. It is based on centralized decision-making. People are not given participation in administration and the decision-making process. It is known for its rigidity, centralization of power, and procedure orientation. Development administration, on the other hand, is action-oriented and change-oriented model of development. It aims at progressive socioeconomic changes and nation building. In contrast to traditional administration, it is more dynamic, flexible, open, and participatory. Development administration is concerned with attitudes and processes rather than procedures and structures.

However, there are scholars, like W. Wood (IGNOU 1999), who do not favour separation of administration into such distinct compartments. They are of the opinion that division of government servants into developers and non-developers might result in the loss of esteem of one and gaining over-importance of the others. This would demoralize administration. There is also a possibility of negligence of innovation and new design. There is insufficient analysis of the term development 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, and it appears to have a special relationship with Independence and post-colonization. Thus, separation of administration into traditional and development would lead to demoralization of administration and neglect the possibilities of innovations in the administrative system. Panandiker and Kshirsagar (1978) observes the following commonness of both types of administration:

1. The prevailing structure of general administration has a decisive influence on the strength and weakness of development administration;
2. Both have a common source of authority within the structure of the government, for instance, cabinet responsible to a legislature; and
3. A number of key officials, like divisional commissioner and district collector, confine general and developmental functions.

As against development and non-development dichotomy, there remains a scope of both supplementing each other. A great degree of presence of non-development administration is necessary to carry out the developmental programmes; in fact, is a precondition for smooth and speedy functioning of development administration. Jagannadham believes that the contemporary distinction between developmental and non-developmental administration is 'both misleading and dangerous'. It is misleading because it gives unnecessary importance to the so-called developmental departments and encourages a tendency to neglect the

non-developmental functions and departments. It is dangerous because the neglect of non-developmental departments, such as the police and revenue, would undermine the foundations of the state and thereby discredit the government from within the core (Naidu 1996: 15).

Thus, a rigid distinction between traditional and development administration is meaningless. In fact, both are closely related and interdependent. The success of development administration depends upon the conditions created by the routine law and order administration. Development administration has assumed the responsibility of formulating and implementing various development and welfare functions because of growing complexities of administration and aspirations of people. These developmental 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, participative, innovate, and change oriented, the traditional administration has to create the conditions for the effective working of development administration. According to Mohit Bhattacharya, 'practically, the differentiation between development and non-development administration is highly artificial. In the practical world of administration, there is a lot of overlap and interdependence between the cognate arms of administration. There is therefore no development administration as a special administrative terrain' (Bhattacharya 2007: 17).

ADMINISTRATION OF DEVELOPMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF ADMINISTRATION: A CHICKEN AND EGG RELATIONSHIP

Fred W. Riggs uses the term development administration in two interrelated senses. First, 'it refers to the administration of development programmes, to the methods used by large scale organizations, notably governments, to implement policies and plans designed to meet their developmental objectives'. Second, it 'by implication, rather than directly involves the strengthening

of administrative capabilities' (Riggs 1970: 75–77). Indeed, both 'administration of development' and 'development of administration' are functionally interrelated to each other. Riggs has rightly observed that the reciprocal relatedness of these two sides involves 'chicken and egg type' 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 programmes is strengthened.

The term 'administration of development' indicates administering development. It includes organized efforts to carry out developmental programmes. Development administration, thus, becomes a means through which government brings qualitative as well as quantitative changes in an economy and society. The state plays a leading role in bringing about development through its administrative system. In order to discharge this role, it requires a distinct type of support by administration which involves, as has been observed by Swerdlow, 'special understanding of problems in the developing countries' (Swerdlow 1963: 714). Thus, development administration is simply termed as an action or functioning part of the government administration. It is action oriented and places the administration at the centre, in order to facilitate the attainment of development objectives. Thus, administration of development implies: the execution of programmes designed to bring about progressive improvement in social and economic spheres, application of innovative plans for development, and freedom of administrative machinery to express its values and beliefs, without fear or favour of different plans and programmes.

Development administration has to be effective and efficient in order to serve the people. For this purpose, it has to aim at increasing and improving the capabilities of the administrative system. It is this aspect of administration, which is called as 'development of administration'. In simple words, it means development of the administrative system, of administrative health by introducing reforms in the administrative system. This process depends on modernization of administrative structures, procedures, and positive

attitudinal and behavioural changes among the administrators. The administration should evolve so as to commensurate with social goals. In short, administrative development is concerned with:

- increasing administrative capability and capacity,
- modernizing bureaucracy by transfer of technology and training,
- administrative reorganization and rationalization,
- reorientation of established agencies and delegation of administrative powers to them,
- professionalization and specialization of its personnel, and
- encouraging administrators who can provide leadership in stimulating and supporting programmes of social and economic development.

On the basis of the above discussion, it becomes clear that administration of development and development of administration are interrelated and interdependent concepts. Administration of development is as important as development of administration. To achieve developmental objectives, it is essential that there is proper assessment of resources, proper plan formulation, evaluation and implementation, adequate involvement of people, and emphasis on technological change. At the same time, we also need an efficient bureaucracy, integrity in administration, initiative, innovativeness, delegation of powers, decentralized decision-making, and so on. Administrative development cannot take place without administrative change and reform. Both the concepts support each other. Precisely, they indicate the two important functions of development administration: one relates to realizing developmental goals and objectives, while the other relates to improving and enhancing capabilities of those involved in developmental goals and objectives.

POLITICS OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

'Development' became the centre of politics of the Third World nations in the 1950s. The underlying proposition and latent goal

was that with sufficient foreign aid and a revamped administrative system, the new nations would closely follow, if not altogether achieve, the industrial progress of the West (Dwivedi quoted in Sapru 1998: 770). The latent goal was to modernize but not uproot the existing structures and processes, thereby keeping the poor and backward societies locked into a cycle of dependence and under-development (Dwivedi quoted in Sapru 1998: 770). Another reason that can be suggested was to counter the Marxist–Leninist ideological prescriptions offering a classless society. New nations had to be saved from the appeals of communism. LaPalombara writes, 'the point is that there should be more open and conscious effort to export not merely American technical know-how, but our political ideology and reasonable facsimiles of our political institutions and practices as well' (LaPalombara quoted in Sapru 1998: 770). On the face of it, the key issue was transformation of the existing government machinery into a new entity. This was to be accomplished through administrative development that is modernization of government machinery through external inducement, transfer of technology, training by foreign experts, and reorganizing administrative set-up in the Third World nations.

Development is political as it depends on government action and is carried out by the living constitution of the nation. There-fore, it reflects the political culture of a country. It is affected by changes in the political regime, party composition of government, and personality of political leaders. Thus, development adminis-tration is fused with politics. Most of the developing nations have inherited or borrowed the Western administrative framework, although the patterns of their local cultures remain significantly different. According to Linda K. Richter, most bureaucracies in de-veloping nations continue to possess the roles and attitudes inherited from the colonial heritage. For R.P. DeGuzman and others, various Western management techniques and procedures have been adopt-ed in these countries without considering the consistency of these techniques and procedures with local customs, values, and norms (Haque 1997: 39). There are sufficient studies which stress that cul-tures in developing societies are unique and have different sets of values such as ritualism, ascriptive norms, patron–client relations,

reciprocity, caste structure, informal interaction, seniority-based authority, extended family, and collective responsibility (Haque 1997: 40). The point is that in regard to the nature of relationship between cultural and administrative realms, there is considerable disparity in developing countries between the values that are immanent in their indigenous cultures and the values that are inherent in their borrowed bureaucratic models. Scholars such as Martin Landau, O.P. Dwivedi, Keith Henderson, Cornelis J. Lammers, and David Hickson have attacked the 'myth' of the value-free administrative system, emphasized the role of cultural values in shaping the states and its bureaucracy, and highlighted the ineffectiveness of the borrowed Western administrative model in societies with different sets of value system (Haque 1997: 38).

The political role of the bureaucracy in India and in most Third World countries is subsumed in 'modernization theory' and the allied concept of 'development administration'—both developed by American social scientists, on the assumption of the need for state-directed socioeconomic changes modelled on Western liberal capitalist regimes. These sponsors of modernization and development have been oblivious of the pre-Independence bureaucratic regimes, weakly articulated political infrastructures, and highly segmented and iniquitous socioeconomic structures of most Third World countries. It is assumed that the bureaucracy would behave like Platonic guardian kings without any interest of its own. The colonial administrative structure in India was left undisturbed, by and large, even after Independence, which meant a tacit acceptance of the political role of the bureaucracy operative from crucial administrative positions, such as departmental secretary, collector, and others. Despite occasional calls for modernization, development, and poverty amelioration, the basic structure of the Indian polity has never been tampered with in any radical sense. Rather, the so-called development policy, as studies point out, has reinforced the traditional power structures in many instances. The process of socioeconomic development, instead of bringing about radical restructuring, seems to have admirably furthered the cause of the bourgeoisie, the landed interests, the bureaucracy, and the politicians. A relationship of close interdependence has

developed over the years among these groups. According to Mohit Bhattacharya, there might be occasional conflicts of interest, but these are few and far between, compared to their united stand in monopolizing the state apparatus and enjoying the fruits of development. Viewed from this angle, bureaucracy is not an autonomous class but a surrogate class; it puts on the mask of Weberian structural formalism and behavioural neutrality. But in reality, far from being neutral and rule-bound, it bends the rules with alacrity to serve the 'vested interests', which is a way of serving its own interests (Bhattacharya 2003: 326).

To sum up, a false notion of Weberian instrumental bureaucracy and the practice of state-directed development administration has stood in the way of a realistic appreciation of the political role of bureaucracy in India. The politics of the bureaucracy is not its own politics but the politics of dominant interests, of which it is an integral part. So long as the large masses remain 'culturally' out of the political process (although seasonally and ritually in politics) and the basically feudal-capitalist character of the Indian state persists, the bureaucracy will continue to have a dominant behind-the-scenes political role in furthering centralization, sabotaging decentralization, and perpetuating the iniquitous socioeconomic structure which, in turn, would facilitate the preservation of its own power position. Mohit Bhattacharya suggests that in order to understand the role of the bureaucracy, there is need to shun the conventional bureaucracy-in-administration mode of analysis and replace it by a bureaucracy-in-society mode (Bhattacharya 2003: 326).

TEMPORAL AND SPATIAL DIMENSIONS OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Administrative systems do not function in a vacuum. The environmental realities playing upon administration are crucial to both its structure and operation. The peculiar features of individual societies and cultures are reflected in some fashion or other in its administrative system and constitute the environment with which the system interacts (Savage quoted in Waldo 1970: 25). The writings

of Fred W. Riggs, especially focused on such 'ecological' factors in understanding and explaining the behaviour of the administrative systems. Besides the ecological perspective, many scholars further explored the significance of temporal and spatial dimensions for a better understanding of development administration. They were of the opinion that, to a great extent, it was due to the negligence of these variables that the Western modern administrative techniques remained ineffective and dysfunctional in the Third World nations. Thus, in order to explore the reasons for the failure of the transferred technologies to work in the Third World nations, many scholars looked into the temporal and spatial dimensions of development administration. The initiative for these studies came from the Comparative Administrative Group of the ASPA which was funded by the Ford Foundation.

Scholars like Dwight Waldo, Peter Savage, Alfred Diamant, and Hahn-Been Lee have highlighted the significance of temporal dimension in the understanding of development administration. In order to distinguish between the time perspective of traditional and modern societies, Peter Savage classifies temporal dimension into cultural and political time. Cultural time, to him comprises of the time orientations and time horizons common in society. The predominant cultural understanding of time in a society may be static, or dynamic and progressive. For example, 'the Indian conception of time is very different from what the western mind regards as intuitively obvious. In Indian thought, time, like other phenomena, is conceived statically rather than dynamically…This static conception of time permeates Indian thought' (Savage quoted in Waldo 1970: 26). Due to this static concept of time, India has not been able to make much progress. The Western conception of time, on the other hand, is progressive and dynamic and has helped a lot in its progress and development.

Cultural time is often reflected in attitudes towards and uses of the past, present, and future and in manifestations of everyday, commonplace social behaviour. J.L. Sadie observes:

A characteristic which more than anything else distinguishes the tribal people from technologically developed communities is the

absence of a regard for and concern about the future. The future as a concept is not part of their culture. The 'sufficient unto the day' approach does not make for an inclination to accumulate for the sake of sustaining life at some future time. (Savage 1970: 26)

The implication is that a predominant regard for the past rather than the future can make an administrative environment regressive and existence oriented, instead of progressive and improvement oriented.

Hahn-Bee Lee also talks about temporal dimension of development administration. To him, those who have a positive, forward-looking time orientation are developmentalists. Those who have a negative, backward-looking time orientation are escapists. Finally, those who have a present-bound time orientation are explorationists. Thus, there is a time dimension in each individual. This time dimension makes a difference between individual outlooks to developmental approach. It helps us in explaining why and which individual is change oriented.

Political time is another important source of premises affecting development administration. The political leaders and elites in the Third World nations tend to fall back on the national past to give shape to the future. On the one hand, they glorify the indigenous content of the past, and on the other hand, they condemn its colonial element. In this scheme, past is used as a means to give a new shape to the future. According to Peter Savage, this is dominated generally by a foreshortened utopianism which seems to disappear in a rhetoric in which both the time necessary and the time available for development are undervalued. The elite are obsessed with the wish to catch up with the West. They aspire to achieve everything at once. However, scant attention is paid to the temporal strategies of implementation, that is, the notions of synchronization, sequences, and rates. Thus, non-Western leaders aspire to emulate the Western model without realizing that the Western assumptions of time and temporal ordering implicit in it are quite at variance with the indigenous cultural attitude towards time. Acknowledging the necessity of proper ordering of development effort is a must, since policies often conflict and carry with them

different rates of implementation. However, there is no attempt to attune developmental goals to the social realities (Bagai 2009: 8).

To sum up, temporal perspective is an important dimension to understanding development administration. It speaks about the gap between the temporal notions in the Western and the non-Western nations. This difference has helped to understand the reasons for the failure of the Western administrative techniques in the Third World nations. In the Third World nations, administration plays an important role in the policy-making as well as policy-implementation process. Thus, it becomes the responsibility of the administrators in these nations to deal with the temporal concerns which have been ignored in the formulation of policy. They must ensure that the right time technologies are used in the developmental process. They must try to achieve policies within the limits of cultural understanding of time. Finally, the administrator, as temporal broker between the government and the people, has to convey the cultural understanding of time and achieve the desired results of development administration.

Besides the temporal dimension, many Scholars like James J. Heaphey, Henry C. Hart, Bertram M. Gross, Stanley Hoffman, and others have highlighted the significance of the 'spatial dimension' in the understanding of development administration. The spatial dimension emphasizes the need to study the impact of region and space on development. Hoffman observes that spatial dimension plays an important role in the nation-building process, but because of our primitive political perspective we have failed to realize this.

Spatially, Western culture is distinctive in its orientation to the territorial political community. What is distinctive about Western culture is the use of political community in a certain territory as a primary focus. Ancient Greeks had no word for community other than 'state' (Heaphey 1971: 9). Elites in the developing countries also consider the emergence of identity with the territory involved on the part of the people to be a sine qua non of their goal. However, the masses in these societies do not share the holistic spatial perception of the development elite. In some cases, for common masses, life space does not extend beyond the village and marketing centre, in other cases it does not extend beyond the village. For

a peasant in some developing countries, setting foot outside his own village is a step onto completely foreign ground, even though the basic features of the environment and people are the same as those in his own village (Heaphey 1971: 10). He is simply not able to connect with the space beyond his village. Thus, the country-sides of the developing countries have been referred to as 'mosaics of unrelated parts'. There is a realization on the part of the elites in the Third World nations that tribal, ethnic, and religious differences would have to give way to a unitary state at the service of an indivisible nation. The challenge for the political elites is to promote spatial consciousness among masses and develop a national culture to match territory of the state.

Besides nation building, socioeconomic development is another objective of the leaders in the Third World nations. According to Heaphey, sub-national regional planning is required, so as to prevent a situation where economic activity is concentrated in a few centres and the remaining part of the country is relegated to a second-class peripheral position (Friedmann and Alonso quoted in Heaphey 1971: 15). Decisions regarding spatial aspects of development are affected by political ideology as well as by questions of regional economic advantage, demographic clusterings, and so forth. For the political elite, unitary state is the first preference. At the same, the visions of people participating directly in the making of public decisions is not absent in these nations. Due to the spatial variables, political elites devise a number of strategies to deal with them. Regionalisation is the most important strategy to deal with spatial aspects of development which provides a focus on an area smaller than the entire country. One region can be established for one kind of production or services, another for different purposes, and so forth. Another strategy that is significant in terms of the spatial dimension is the attempt to promote participation for development at local levels. This vision is seen in the Indian model of the Panchayati Raj system. Federalism is another strategy which has been tried in many Asian and African nations. However, according to Heaphey, it has not been a successful strategy because it is a way of protecting particular segments of a country against the majority (Heaphey 1971: 21). Another way

in which decentralization occurs is through professionalization. In this scheme, technical experts are given independence in the decision-making tasks. Though this is crucial for development, the scheme is not accepted in the developing societies.

The spatial dimensions of development indicate need for flexible strategies in dealing with them. Development requires innovation and the power to innovate. It suggests a societal need to innovate and a societal ability to control, simultaneously. Thus, there is a need of an open system that has the potential for control when it is needed.

It can be concluded that temporal and spatial perspectives are significant dimensions to understand development in Third World nations. The cultural differences in the understanding of time and space can impede the transferability of models and technologies. The Western administrative doctrines are totally not irrelevant to non-Western nations. However, it is to be noted that there are some peculiar features of political and sociocultural systems which seriously restrict the relevance to their problems of the administrative practices that have been found to be quite useful in the West. Thus, there is an urgent need to give up the ethno-centric model of development and appreciate the role of local tradition, culture, and style of governance (Bagai 2009: 12). The developing countries need to evolve indigenous model of development, instead of blindly following the standard prescriptions of the West.

CHANGING PATTERNS OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Development administration, as an indispensable tool in the attainment of a good society, attracted the main stream of comparative administrators, seeking ways to improve administrative performance and strengthen the planning and execution of development programmes. It was primarily a state-led development approach, using government and public-sponsored institutions as agents of social change. It is in this historical context that one has to appreciate the natural beginning of this administrative

paradigm. The goals and contents of development administration have been changing since its beginning in the 1950s. In the post 1980s, state-led development mission has been highjacked by the 'New Right philosophy' of governance laying emphasis on state minimalism and market friendliness. It is primarily a rejection of the basic philosophy of development administration. Thus, in the following section, we shall discuss the changing pattern of development administration, primarily in the context of a state-led development model.

Beginning of Development Administration as a Demigod

Development administration was inaugurated in the 1950s, with its emphasis on economic growth and increase in the production with a view to raise people's standard of living in the Third World nations. It was to be state-led development and was conceived in technical terms. It was presumed that with sufficient technical assistance and a revamped administrative system, developing countries would follow the industrial progress of the West. Development administration was seen as concerned with the will to mobilize existing and new resources and to achieve agreed-upon developmental goals. The task of developed countries was perceived as creation of external inducements to change through technical assistance and transfer of technology and institutions.

Classical economists' view on development was an important basis of the development theory in the 1950s. The economic growth model, based on the Keynesian economic approach which paved the way to development thinking, sought to transform the ascriptive, particularistic, and functionally diffused underprivileged societies into one having modernization-achievement orientation, universalism, and functional specificity. It was the instrumental theory of administration and popular government, which occupied the front seat in the development administration model in 1950s and early 1960s. A number of techniques and programmes popularized during the 1960s, such as five-year planning, budgeting, training, and community development, reflected the bent for

external inducements towards modernization and Western-oriented administration.

During 1950s and early 1960s, which is considered as the 'technical assistance era in public administration', the US alone spent US$180 million on aid for public administration (IGNOU 1999: 29). The stress was on training of administrators to capacitate them to cope with the complex problems of development. The technical assistance programme also insisted on creating training institutions in the Third World nations on the one hand and imparting training to the people from these countries in one donor country on the other. For instance, in India, on the basis of the recommendations given by Paul H. Appleby, a consultant to the Ford Foundation, the Indian Institute of Public Administration was established in 1953. However, there was an adaptation gap between the training programmes and the needs of the recipient country.

Failure of technical assistance programme

The technical assistance programme advanced the principle of emulative development administration for building up of administrative capabilities in a prescriptive manner. It was, however, criticized by many scholars. Dwight Waldo has termed it as 'naïve' and 'sad waste of scarce human resources' (IGNOU 1999: 30). Esman has criticized the technical assistance programme on two grounds. First, neither the economic growth nor institutional modernizations were unilinear or historically inevitable. The benefits of rapid economic growth, especially, derived from the mainline urban industrial investment model, have been skewed towards a relatively small minority in the modern sector, leaving rapidly increasing majorities especially in rural areas as impoverished, insecure, and powerless as they were three decades ago. Second, the confidence in the efficacy of planning, in science and in benevolent role of state has also been shaken. Most of the states in the Third World have been taken on vast new functions in economic management and the provision of public services. The size of their bureaucracies have expanded and so have their budgets, but many have proved to be incompetent or repressive and sometime both (IGNOU 1999: 31).

The main reasons for the failure of technical assistance programmes can be summed up as follows:

1. The applicability of the development model was taken for granted in all countries, ignoring the relevance of the environmental context to administration and technology;
2. concepts like efficiency, economy, and rationality might be differently interpreted by the developing or recipient country than the meaning given to them in the West;
3. administrative reforms attempted during this period concentrated mainly on structural change and not on attitudinal change; and
4. the early development theories ignored the issues of agency–client linkages and the impact of administrative action on the clients. This approach resulted in urban bias at the cost of rural periphery.

Thus, due to a number of inherent shortcomings, the technical assistance programmes failed to produce the desired results in Third World nations. However, American scholars sustained their interest in administrative systems of the developing nations which further led to the formation of the Comparative Administrative Group.

Formation of the Comparative Administrative Group

The conceptualization of development administration is greatly indebted to the Comparative Administrative Group formed under the ASPA in 1961. The Comparative Administrative Group was put together by a small group of political scientists and students of public administration who had been frustrated and disappointed with efforts at technical assistance for public administration in developing countries. As the long-time chairman (1961–70) of the Comparative Administrative Group, Fred W. Riggs came to be regarded as the prime mover of academic interest in the field of development administration. The Ford Foundation gave financial support to the Comparative Administrative Group, which was interested in the analysis of the relations between administrative system and its sociopolitical, economic, and cultural context, especially in the developing countries.

During the 1960s, the members of the Comparative Administrative Group undertook a number of researches in the field of development administration. Their research and findings revealed that the Western developmental models and concepts of public administration were not appropriate and feasible in developing nations. These studies made it clear that in order to handle the foreign technical assistance programmes, the administrative systems and practices of the developing nations needed alteration. 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 that had cross-cultural validity. Public administration academics sought alternative approaches to development administration. They sought to examine the relationships between public administration and the social, economic, political, and cultural environment. In other words, public administration was seen in an 'ecological' perspective. Fred W. Riggs is the most renowned exponent of this approach.

The 'ecological perspective' of public administration has been explained by F.W. Riggs in his books *The Ecology of Public Administration* (1962) and *Administration in Developing Countries* (1964). Following the structural–functional approach, Riggs constructed three ideal type categories of societies: fused, prismatic, and diffracted society. He put the developing countries in the category of prismatic society, which is caught in between traditional fused and modernity diffracted and is undergoing the process of social change. He used two dimensional—differentiation and integration—approaches to explain the process of development. The 'fused society' has almost no specialization of roles. It is undeveloped because in it, there is a low level of structural differentiation with a corresponding level of integration. On the contrary, the 'diffracted society' is a developed one because it is at the high level of structural differentiation with a corresponding level of integration. The 'prismatic society' forms the intermediate category. It is a developing society because in it differentiation of structure occurs faster than their integration with the old structures. The condition of the Third World countries provided the initial impetus for the construction of the 'prismatic' model.

A prismatic society, according to Riggs, is characterized by formalism (the wide gap between the norms and reality), over-lapping (the extent to which the administrative behaviour is determined by non-administrative criteria), and heterogeneity (mixture of old and new values). The prismatic-sala model emphasizes ecology. It is on account of environmental influences that an administrative system in a prismatic society develops the features of formalism, overlapping, and heterogeneity. These three, according to Riggs, are the important features of development administration.

The prismatic-sala model of Riggs contributed to a better understanding of actual societies that are undergoing rapid socioeconomic and administrative changes. It has revealed the fact that the prismatic conditions of a developing society adversely affect the efforts of development administration. Riggs insists that those experts who would modernize prismatic societies must first acquire a new image of organizational phenomenon. They must learn to see administration from the point of view of the administrator in the transitional society, from within the prism, as it were (McCurdy 1977: 168). This model is, therefore, useful to the administrators in directing them on the right lines in their efforts to administrative problems in the transitional societies in accordance with the local conditions.

The Comparative Administrative Group helped to widen the horizon of public administration, made the scope of the field more systemic by studying different administrative systems in their ecological settings, and stimulated interest on the part of its members in the problems of development administration.

Whither Development Administration

A number of techniques and programmes popularized during the 1960s, such as five-year planning, budgeting, training and personal administration, and community development reflected the bent for external inducements towards modernization and Western-oriented administration. Throughout the 1960s, research findings under-scored the significance of administrative capacity for economic

growth. But it was realized that the necessary set of conditions for bringing about socioeconomic changes in the Third World were either missing or inconducive. These included an expanding economic base, law and order, political legitimacy, tax base, professionally trained manpower, and a politico-administrative structure capable of governing. Along with the absence of these qualities, there was the scarcity of capable personnel to manage public affairs; innovations that often originated with foreign experts were simply 'cosmetic structural changes' that brought no real alteration in the status quo. Even where a relatively large number of trained public servants existed, a premature institutionalization of the bureaucracy stifled developmental objectives. Further, the phenomenal expansion of bureaucracy in several developing countries had a fundamental effect upon the social structure. In many Asian and African countries, a new bureaucratic bourgeoisie rapidly acquired social and political currency and paramountcy. With the concentration of authority and discretionary power, the state bureaucracy found itself playing a role to advance its own interest. Thus, the Western-led development administration failed to cope with underdevelopment in the Third World countries (Sapru 1998: 771–72).

By the early 1970s, a rude awakening was noticed concerning the inadequacies of the developmentalist paradigm of public administration to cope with urgent problems. For one thing, it became evident that externally induced modernization had failed to eradicate the basic problems of underdevelopment which it purported to solve. While some significant increases of the Gross National Product (GNP) had indeed taken place, poverty, disease, and hunger had either worsened or remained unaltered. The same could be said of the growing gap between the rich and the poor nations. In many regions, incremental reformism had failed to create a more equitable socioeconomic order, and had proven to be an ineffective antidote to radical change. In fact, frustrated reformism had fuelled a revolution of rising frustrations (Dwivedi 1997: 312). Thus, the field lost its impetus and Fred Riggs admitted that Comparative Administrative Group had contributed very little to aid public administration programmes (Riggs 1970: 649). Finally, the Comparative Administrative Group was disbanded in 1973,

and its major journal, the *Journal of Comparative Administration* ceased to publish from 1974 (Sapru 1998: 772).

By the end of the 1970s, it was also clear that something had gone wrong, the Western style of economic progress was obviously not forthcoming, and instead the quality of life in many Third World countries was declining. In place of orderly change, turmoil and fragmentation proliferated throughout Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. Moreover, the recession of the late 1970s and early 1980s curved the enthusiasm of the developmental strategists of the West and created doubts in the Third World about the invincibility of Western wisdom (Dwivedi 1997: 313).

Post 1980s Trends in the Third World Development Paradigm

It may be noted that the decline of Comparative Administrative Group, however, did not signal the end of research in development administration. On the other hand, the continuity was maintained with contribution from foundation development administrationists, such as Milton Esman and Gerald Caiden (Sapru 1998: 773). With the intellectual paramountcy of neoliberal economists in the 1980s and the neoliberal approach adopted by the World Bank, a deceptively comprehensive explanation was offered on the relationship between public bureaucracy and development goals. By focusing on the nature of the Third World state and indeed, state failure, neo-liberalism seemed to fall within the political environment position of development administration.

While issues remained fraught with the neoliberal critique of state-led development and development administration, the stark reality of reconstructing public sector enterprises under the World Bank pressure in the 1980s has imparted the perspective on intellectual hegemony to it. Consequently, foundation development administrationists, such As Esman, find their research agenda set by the controversial claims of the neoliberal paradigm. Even the arch-deacon of administrative reforms, Caiden, has incorporated ostensibly anti-administration prescriptions into his toolbox of administrative reform measures (Sapru 1998: 774).

In the 1980s, developing countries were disillusioned when they found that, instead of becoming economically independent, they were forced to service their debts. Aggressive net financial transfers to developing nations had swung from a net inflow of US$36 billion in 1981 to a net outflow of some US$300 billion in 1989 (Sapru 1998: 774). Thus, in the 1980s, there were negative feelings towards the government and public sector. Most developing countries were forced to reduce the role of the public sector. They were asked to go in for structural reforms, which included privatization of public-owned enterprises and liberalization of the economy. The collapse of the centrally planned economic systems of the Eastern Bloc countries demonstrated that the solutions to the problems of poor public services required a managerial rethink in all government operations.

The World Bank's (1991) development report observed that excessive governmental intervention in the economy and society has led to misallocation of resources and creation of vested interests. It suggested for investing in people, improving the climate for enterprise, opening economies to international trade and investment, and having governments do less where markets worked or could be made to work reasonably well. The 'neoliberal model' of development accords the government a minimal role, essentially one of ensuring macro-economic stability, with an emphasis on price stability, while getting out of the way to allow trade liberalization, privatization, and getting the prices right.

In contrast to use of control mechanism, creation of administrative organizations, and administrative procedures, the newer approach emphasized on narrowing of government institutions and responsibilities. Economic liberalization, transfer of state-owned enterprises to the private sector, reduction in the size of state bureaucracies, contracting outwork, decentralization, and organizational pluralism have been placed higher on the strategic agenda. The preferred role of government has changed and is changing from acting as the large vehicle for socioeconomic development to that of guiding and facilitating that development. In brief, selective government actions dominate the trend in development administration in the 1990s.

The above discussion makes it clear that development administration which began its journey in the 1950s as a demigod in its mission of socioeconomic development of the Third World nations, showed fatigue by the end of 1970s. The reason may be both its 'Western roots' as well as lack of 'fertile soil' in the Third World nations. In the post 1980s, the 'development' mission has been highjacked by the neoliberal philosophy emphasizing on the greater role of the private players. The new developmental models undertaken in the post 1980s either in the form of structural adjustment programmes or NPM techniques do not qualify for the 'membership' of Development administration which is primarily a state-led development whereas the new models minimize the role of the state. In the words of Mohit Bhattacharya, 'the inference that can be readily drawn is that the infancy of development administration is long over and third world's "development" is fast losing its original meaning in the contemporary globalization scene of the economy' (Bhattacharya 2007: 138). P.K. Dutta goes a step further and remarks that 'development administration which was conceived in term of an instrument, as a savior like God, for development of Third World countries, has failed to live up to the expectations' (Dutta 1991: 26). He suggests that it is difficult to have a common concept of development applicable to all the developing countries under all circumstances. It would be more realistic on the part of the developing countries to have their own indigenous concept of development, which is uniquely suited to their national goals and special needs.

A CRITIQUE OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

The Comparative Administrative Group conceptualization of development administration has been reviewed and criticized for a variety of reasons. Some of the important ones can be identified as:

First, it was said that individual scholars associated with the Comparative Administrative Group did not represent a unified intellectual or organizational whole. They lacked a paradigmatic consensus on how to study comparative administration, as applied in overseas technical cooperation and assistance programmes (Sapru 1998:

772). Peter Savage says, 'Comparative administration started with no paradigm of its own and developed none' (Savage 1976: 416).

Second, the strategy of development administration has been questioned by characterizing it as the First World's diplomatic effort to stem the tide of insurgency and the communist movement in the Third World (Chakrabarty 2007: 45).

Third, Development administration has also been criticized as 'ideological' and 'Eurocentric'. The model of modernization and development is seen as an exported model of civilization that is incompatible with life in most Third World countries. Hence, there has been a persistent demand for a 'non-ethnocentric' theory of development and an alternative conception of Third World development (Chakrabarty 2007: 45).

Forth, the sub-optimization criticizm has come from developmentalists like Fred Riggs, Lucian Pye, and Samuel N. Eisenstadt, among others. They have cautioned against bureaucracy, reinforcing devices that might undermine and weaken political institutions and processes. As Riggs argued, 'The existence of a career bureaucracy without corresponding strength in the political institutions does not necessarily lead to administrative effectiveness' (Chakrabarty 2007: 44). Without firm political guidance, the argument further continues, bureaucrats have weak incentives to provide good service whatever their formal, pre-entry training, and professional qualifications be. They tend to use their effective control to safeguard their expedient bureaucratic interests-tenure, seniority, rights, fringe benefits, and the right to violate official norms, rather than advance the achievement of programme goals (Chakrabarty 2007: 45).

Fifth, it is said that development administration means increased state bureaucratic control over individual human beings. Development administration contains implicit authoritarian assumptions. The authoritarian approach of the civil servants is not likely to motivate the public to actively participate in implementing plans and programmes.

Sixth, the basic administrative structures in developing societies are not only elitist in character but also generally imitative rather than indigenous to the society. The borrowed Western model of

administration does not fit into the needs of development administration. There is a widespread discrepancy between form and reality, wide gap between government proposals and their implementation. Besides, there is the shortage of technically qualified and trained personnel capable of performing the developmental tasks.

Finally, the process of development presupposes a system of bureaucracy that accepts development as its paramount goal. But the bureaucracies in developing societies have a tendency to emphasize non-productive orientation. The behaviour of civil servants is said to have poor citizen orientation and poorer commitments to work. They lack sensitivity to the poor and their needs. Rules, regulations, and forms are given precedence over the substance. They lack the necessary skills and competence to carry out developmental tasks.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Development administration was inaugurated in the 1950s as a modernization paradigm to 'develop' the Third World along capitalist lines. Bureaucratic rationality, battery of administration reform tools, and the magic wand of management science, it was mainly believed, would together take care of development management. It was to be a state-led development. By the late 1960s and early 1970s, development administration started showing signs of fatigue and failure. The modernization drive failed to remove poverty and social inequity. There was a growing gap between the rich North and the poor South, and the latter was increasingly caught in the unavoidable debt trap. It became apparent that Western theoretical models did not successfully predict development in the Third World nations. There was the realization that 'development' was a complex job, which could be executed successfully, only with a determined political will and indigenous solutions to the problem and not just by aping the West.

In spite of a number of drawbacks, development administration has served as a useful construct to explore the dynamics of change and administration in the developing countries of the

Third World. The emphasis of development administration on the ecology of administration has not only brought to light the need for synchronization of political, economic, and sociocultural aspects of development, but also the vivid contextual character of development administration. It lays stress on developing indigenous administrative means, procedures, methods, and techniques to meet multifaceted challenges thrown by the pressing demands from the 'new environment' upon the state.

As a school of thought, development administration is a watershed in the evolution of administrative theory in three significant ways: (*a*) It led to the 'reinvention' of public administration as a field of study by shifting its focus from the Western to the developing countries that became politically free after a protracted anti-colonial struggle. (*b*) It also challenged the 'universal model syndrome' by drawing our attention to the difficulties in comprehending the situation-specific character of administration in developing countries. (*c*) Development administration is, therefore, the beginning of an effort challenging the 'catholicity' of the discipline that seemed to have its 'viability' due largely to the uncritical acceptance of Weberian conceptualization of hierarchical public administration as perhaps the only viable explanatory model. Finally, the lesson, which can be drawn from the experience of development administration, is that the days of imposition from outside are gone back in history. As the cultural and socioeconomic nature of countries differ, Third World countries cannot rely upon one single model of development. Each nation will have to innovate its own strategy on development by improving its indigenous capabilities. Before that however, Third World societies must become intellectually self-reliant by evolving their own theories and methodologies of development.

REFERENCES

Bagai, Anita. 2009. 'Development Administration: Temporal and Spatial Dimensions', *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, lv (1, January–March).

Bhattacharya, Mohit. 2003. 'Bureaucracy and Politics in India', in Bidyut Chakrabarty and Mohit Bhattacharya (eds), *Public Administration: A Reader*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Bhattacharya, Mohit. 2007. *Social Theory, Development Administration and Development Ethics*. New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers.

Caiden, Gerald E. 1971. *The Dynamics of Public Administration: Guidelines to Current Transformations in Theory and Practice*. Illinois: Dryden Press.

Chakrabarty, Bidyut. 2007. *Reinventing Public Administration: The Indian Experience*. New Delhi: Orient Longman.

Chandler, Ralph C. and Jack C. Plano. 1982. *The Public Administration Dictionary*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Dahl, Robert. 1947. 'The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems', *Public Administration Review*, 7 (1): 1–11.

Dutta, P.K. 1991. *Public Administration and the State*. New Delhi: Concept.

Dwivedi, O.P. 1997. 'Development Administration: An Overview', *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, xliii (3, July–September).

Dwivedi, O.P. and J. Nef in R.K. Sapru. 1998. 'Development Administration: Crises and Continuities', *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, xliv (4, October–December).

Friedmann, W. and J. Alonso. 1971. 'Regional Development and Planning', in James J. Heaphey (ed.), *Spatial Dimensions of Development Administration*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Gant, George F. 1979. *Development Administration: Concepts, Goals, Methods*. London: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Haque, M. Shamsul. 1997. 'Incongruity between Bureaucracy and Society in Developing Nations: A Critique', *Peace and Change*, 22 (4, October).

Heaphey, James J. (ed.). 1971. *Spatial Dimensions of Development Administration*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU). 1999. *Development Administration*, Block 1 (Concepts and Approaches). New Delhi: Indira Gandhi National Open University.

Katz. Saul M. 1970. 'A System Approach to Development Administration', in F.W. Riggs (ed.), *Frontiers of Development Administration*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Landau, Martin. 1970. 'Development Administration and Decision Theory', in Edward W. Weidner (ed.), *Development Administration in Asia*. Durham: Duke University Press.

LaPalombara, Joseph in R.K. Sapru. 1998. 'Development Administration: Crises and Continuities', *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, xliv (4, October–December).

McCurdy, Howard E. 1977. *Public Administration: A Synthesis*. Sydney: Cummings Publishing Company.

Naidu, S.P. 1996. *Public Administration: Concepts and Theories*. New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.

Panandiker, V.A. Pai and S.S. Kshirsagar. 1978. 'Bureaucratic Adaptation to Development Administration', in S.K. Sharma (ed.), *Dynamics of Development: An International Perspective*. New Delhi: Concept.

Riggs, Fred W. 1962. *The Ecology of Public Administration*. Bombay: Asia Publishing House.

———. 1964. *Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

———. 'The Group and the Movement: Notes on Comparative and Development Administration', *Public Administration Review*, 36 (6, November–December).

———. 1970. 'The Context of Development Administration', in Riggs (ed.), *Frontiers of Development Administration*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Sadie, J.L. in Peter Savage. 1970. 'Of Time and Change: Temporal Perspectives in Development Administration', in Dwight Waldo (ed.), *Temporal Dimensions of Development Administration*. USA: Kingsport Press.

Sapru, R.K. 1998. 'Development Administration: Crisis and Continuities', *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, xliv (4, October–December).

Savage, Peter. 1970. 'Of Time and Change: Temporal Perspectives in Development Administration', in Dwight Waldo (ed.), *Temporal Dimensions of Development Administration*. USA: Kingsport Press.

———. 1976. 'Optimism and Pessimism in Comparative Administration', *Public Administration Review*, 36 (4, July–August).

Swerdlow, Irving. 1963. *Development Administration: Concepts and Problems*. New York: Syracuse University Press.

Waldo, Dwight (ed.). 1970. *Temporal Dimensions of Development Administration*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Weidner, Edward W. 1970. 'Development and Innovational Roles', in Weidner (ed.), *Development Administration in Asia*. Durham: Duke University Press.

World Bank. 1991. *The Challenges of Development*. Washington DC: World Bank Publications Department.

Chapter 6

Decentralization and Local Governance

Learning Objectives
- To explore the concept of democratic decentralization and local governance
- To see how the democratic decentralization has paved the way for local governance in India
- To situate the 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendment Acts in the context of local governance in India

Decentralization is considered to be the most sought after prescription for ushering in good governance. This chapter dwells on the supposed correlation between decentralization and good governance in the light of local governance experimentations in India. India had embarked on the ambitious decentralization initiatives in the 1990s via a couple of landmark amendments to the Constitution, namely, the 73rd and 74th Constitution Amendment Acts, to reinforce local democracy by empowering local self-governing institutions, both at the rural and urban areas. The decentralization experimentations in India, popularly known as 'democratic decentralization', has enabled self-governing institutions—both in rural and urban areas—to play a pivotal role

in the provision of public services, creation and maintenance of public goods, and planning and implementation of developmental activities.

DECENTRALIZATION: THE CONCEPT

Conceptually speaking, at the heart of any decentralization scheme there is a conscious effort at decentring the power—be it administrative, political, or fiscal—with a view to improving the status of the people. Etymological root of the English word decentralization can be traced back to a Latin word, which means 'away from the centre'. It is also couched as the most valued antidote of authoritarianism and bureaucratization. As a flexible and fluid discourse, it suits every ideological pursuit. If one starts tracking the evolution of the concept of decentralization, he or she will find that the concept has no fixed ideological fountainhead. More interestingly, it has been used by both the left and right for their respective interests. While for the Rightist, decentralization is the mechanism to decentre nation states and thereby pave the way for marketization, for the Leftist, it provides the opportunity of social mobilization. Traditionally, it was conceptualized from the organizational perspective, where it was deemed as an organizational innovation to ease off the pressure of over-bureaucratized public organization. But with the onset of globalization, the concept of decentralization becomes the surrogate of market. However, it is very difficult to pin down the exact meaning of the term decentralization as the concept is often confused with a host of similar ideas like de-concentration, devolution, delegation, and privatization. Worst of all, a few commentators even viewed them as the different organizational forms of decentralization (Cheema and Rondinelli 1983).

Hence, for the sake of proper understanding, the concept of decentralization needs to be distinguished from those ideas. There is no denying that all the above associated concepts speak of sharing or transfer of administrative power or authority from the higher to the lower level. But, the nature and degree of such transfers vary from one situation to another. While de-concentration means handing over some amount of administrative authority or responsibility to

lower levels within the government ministries or agencies; delegation refers to transferring responsibility for specifically defined functions to organizations that are outside the regular bureaucratic structure and are only indirectly controlled by the central government; and devolution signifies the creation and strengthening of sub-national units of the government, activities of which are substantially outside the direct control of the central government.

Decentralization, on other hand, is a much broader concept, which encapsulates in fact all the above kinds of transfer of power. For example, Cheema and Rondinelli (1983) have defined decentralization as 'transfer of planning, decision-making or administrative authority from the central government to its field organizations, local administration units, semi-autonomous and para-statal organizations, local governments or NGOs'. Moreover, decentralization is no static arrangement of sharing administrative or fiscal authority. It is in fact a continuum, from centralization to full autonomy (Meenakshisundaram 1999). Decentralization is also seen as a process of transfer of responsibility, authority, and functions from a 'superior' governmental unit to a 'lower' governmental unit (Friedman 1983 quoted in Singh 1996: 12). These functions may relate to planning, management and resource raising, and allocation. The operational jurisdiction of the 'superior' unit is obviously large. However, the 'lower' unit may exercise some degree of autonomy from the 'superior' unit. The study team on community projects and National Extension Service appointed by Government of India in 1957 defined decentralization as a process whereby the governments diverts itself completely of certain duties and responsibilities and devolves them on to some other authority (GoI 1957: 7). A decentralized local authority, in this sense, would have a separate legal existence, its own budget and the authority to allocate substantial resources on a range of different functions, and decisions would be made by the representatives of the local people, who constitute the body.

Hence, the concept of decentralization has the following characteristics: (*a*) it is both a philosophy and institutional mechanism, which seeks to de-centre the power from its traditional centres to

far-flung areas with a view to empowering local communities. (*b*) Autonomy forms the heart of decentralization. It is the yardstick through which the nature of decentralization can be measured. (*c*) Decentralization has no fixed ideological sanctuary; it is in fact used by both the Left and the Right for justifying their respective positions. (*d*) The recent spate of enthusiasm for decentralization can be attributed to globalization. The votaries of globalization are actively advocating for localization through decentralization for development, as the beleaguered nation states of Asia, Africa, and Latin America have been virtually relegated to being mere economic agents of the global market. (*e*) Decentralization facilitates people's participation by creating new institutional space beyond the centre and thereby ensures further deepening of democracy. (*f*) Decentralization also instils confidence among local communities to govern their own affairs. Decentralization, thus, creates a sense of responsibility in local decision-making agencies with more or less independent existence and powers. The basic idea of decentralization is, therefore, sharing the decision-making authority with lower levels in organizations, thereby improving their efficiency, effectiveness, and responsiveness.

SIGNIFICANCE OF DECENTRALIZATION

Participation and control of governance by the people of the country is the essence of democracy. Such participation is possible only when the powers of the state are decentralized to the districts, block, and village levels where all the sections of the people can sit together to discuss their problems, as well as monitor the implementation of the programmes. Decentralization is a prime mechanism through which democracy becomes truly representative and responsive. Thus, it is called the crux of democratic decentralization. G. Shabbir Cheema and Dennis A. Rondenilli have identified the following advantages of decentralization:

- Decentralization can be a means of overcoming the severe limitations of centrally controlled national planning by delegating greater authority for development, planning, and

management of filed officials. Through decentralization, tailor-made plans as per the needs of heterogeneous regions and groups are possible.

- It can cut through enormous amounts of red tape and highly structured procedures. By decentralizing functions and re-assigning central officials to local levels, their knowledge of and sensitivity to local problems can be increased. It also ensures a closer interaction between government officials and local populations.

- Decentralization could allow better political and administrative 'penetration' of national government policies into the remote areas. Decentralization calls for greater representation of various political, social, ethnic, and tribal groups in decision-making. It could increase the administrative capability of local institutions—government and private—to take over some of the pertinent central government functions. It also relieves top management of its routine tasks.

- Decentralization helps in institutionalizing the participation of citizens in development planning by creating alternative means of decision-making. It leads to a more flexible, innovative, and creative administration that reduces the cost of planning and increases the number of public goods. It also ensures political stability by increasing the participation of the local people in decision-making.

Mohit Bhattacharya argues that the latest thinking on decentralization veers around power equalization and participation. Organization theory and political science, which did not meet very often in the past, have now almost come together in explaining the concept of decentralization concertedly. The concern in organization theory is increasingly about individual welfare which is considered feasible and desirable through participative management. In political science, decentralization reappears as a means to the achievement of a more participative democracy that goes beyond traditional electoral methods of intermittent representation. Contemporary thinking on decentralization can be looked at from three angles. First, it is thought of as a means

to spiritual enrichment and growth of the individual, both as a worker and citizen. Decentralization offers opportunities to participate in decision-making. For an individual, it is an aid to the growth and development of personality. Second, decentralization has an instrumental value as a means of improving organizational performance. Public administration is related to the operational aspects of government. The operations are better done through decentralization which provides access to local information and data, and creates conditions for local popular support to administrative action. Administration is opened up in a decentralized system, as it no longer remains a secretive operation of the proud specialist. Third, the current thinking, very importantly, reflects a paradigmatic shift in public administration as a discipline. The bureaucratic model which has so-long dominated the field seems inadequate to explain the contemporary politico-administrative situation. The decentralization–participation debate introduces a new perspective in public administration and calls for its reconstruction (Bhattacharya 2008: 165). Rajni Kothari sees decentralization as an alternative system of governance based on a 'people centred' approach to sorting out local-level problems. He further argues 'the entire process would be for locating people at the centre of power so that they become the basic engine of the development process and not, as hitherto, merely its beneficiaries' (Kothari 1988: 48).

APPROACHES TO DECENTRALIZATION

The different approaches to the concept of decentralization have been clearly and profoundly presented by James Fesler (1965). He views decentralization as a complex issue, both as a concept and in practice. He looks it from four perspectives: decentralization as a doctrine; as political process in a given political setting; as an administrative problem; and finally as an administrative process involving forced choices, changes in the functional and area-based administration, and between the regulatory—law and order—and development functions of appointed and elected officials. Fesler's approaches to decentralization are discussed in the following sections.

The Doctrinal Approach

The doctrinal approach seeks to treat decentralization as an end in itself through a process of 'romantic idealization'. It results on a romantic view of both the locality and the cultural region. Part of the argument is an invocation of tradition, and so of history. The strongest doctrinal case for decentralization is the one focused on the local community—the city, town, or village. There are hard facts to start with, particularly, the community's concrete reality and its possession in all countries that provide some powers to local governments. The invoking of a historical tradition of local autonomy is one indication of the role of sentiment. In India, the Panchayati Raj supposedly embodies an ancient tradition of local autonomy. Romantics are inclined to idealize. The aspiration is to turn the clock back and restore traditional values and face-to-face dealings between men. Thus, in the doctrinal approach, instead of treating decentralization as a means to the achievement of some end-values, such idealization tends it to the status of a hardened doctrine.

The Political Approach

The political approach believes that decentralization occurs in a political setting. Initiatives to decentralize and willingness to pass on powers and functions to decentralize units, and to allow these units to actually operate within a framework of autonomy, are politically determined. The objective of decentralization is certainly to transfer decision-making on certain policy matters to sub-national constituencies. Decentralization in the shape of devolution to local self-governing bodies marks an attempt to set up autonomous governments at the level of the locality. To create and maintain local governments is, thus, a major political commitment. In the absence of such commitment, devolution to sub-national governments, including local self-governing bodies, will remain more in law than in practice. Fesler points out to the problem of 'illusory decentralization' which is presented when formal powers or administrative arrangements are purportedly decentralist but politically controlled or influenced by the centre (Fesler 1965: 555). This

underlies the often sceptical reactions in the West to former Soviet and East European decentralizations. Local elections in a one-party state, if accompanied by strong hierarchical controls within the party, appear not to afford the freedom in making choices that is the essential ingredient of decentralization. Fesler calls it 'illusory decentralization'. Before the 73rd Amendment Act, 1992, the Panchayati Raj Institutions in India were very close to 'illusory decentralization'. It is only after this Amendment Act that local government institutions have been given a constitutional status with real powers and functions.

The Administrative Approach

The administrative approach to decentralization is based on the principle of efficiency and rationality. When field administrative units are set up through a process of decentralization, the measure is considered appropriate for field-level decision-making and prompt problem solving. In this process, administrative units might come up at many levels between the locality and the central (state) headquarters. With more and more demand for specialized functions, multiplicity of functional departments would appear at the field level. The administrative situation gradually presents a picture of polarization between general area-based administrative demands and specific function-centred claims of particular functional departments. Currently, district administration in India is faced with this problem of area-function duality. To promote such operational principles conscious attempts are needed to readjust from time to time the conflicting claims of area and functions in deconcentrated field administration (Bhattacharya 2008: 164).

The Dual-role Approach

The dual-role approach seeks to highlight the conflict in field administration between tradition and change. The basic conflict, according to Fesler, is between the maintenance of law and order, and the advancement of economic and social development. Most

field administration systems were developed in a simpler era, when revenue collection, maintenance of law and order, and appraisal of local opinion, were the principal responsibilities assigned to field agents. Certainly, this is the case with the field systems inherited from colonial regimes by the newly independent nations. But, the system is today expected to perform functions quite different from those for which it was originally designed. The intent is to change established ways of doing things so as to carry economic and social development rapidly. The new functions require the evocation of popular enthusiasm sufficient to build receptivity to new ways of doing things and, often, to spur substantial voluntary effort by ordinary citizens. The increased volume of work to be performed in a field area demands the field generalist to get relief by delegation to subordinate or by sharing with coordinates. Thus resolution of conflict between two different orientations in field administration calls for adaptation of decentralization to changing circumstances.

The four approaches by Fesler address different issues and challenges in the realization of decentralization. The doctrinal approach treats decentralization as an end in itself through a process of 'romantic idealization'. The political approach underscores the political character of decentralization. The administrative approach is based on the principle of efficiency and rationality and highlights the area-function duality. Finally, the reorientation of roles from status-quo to change orientation of the field administrative system is the crux of the dual-role approach.

TYPES OF DECENTRALIZATION

Decentralization takes different forms and involves different institutions and functions of government. Generally, there are four types of decentralization: political, administrative, fiscal, and functional. Drawing distinctions between these concepts is useful for highlighting the many dimensions to successful decentralization and the need for coordination among them. The following sections discuss the differences between the four types of decentralization.

Political Decentralization

Political decentralization pre-supposes the transfer of functions or authority from central levels of government to local institutions that are based on local political representations. This means that the local institutions to which tasks are devolved must be governed by locally elected representatives. It aims to give citizens or their elected representatives more power in public decision-making. It is often associated with pluralistic politics and representative governments, but it can also support democratization by giving citizens, or their representatives, more influence in the formulation and implementation of policies. Advocates of political decentralization assume that decisions made with greater participation will be better informed and more relevant to the diverse interests in society than those made only by national political authorities. The concept implies that the selection of representatives from local electoral jurisdictions allows citizens to know better their political representatives and allows elected officials to know better the needs and desires of their constituents. Greater political decentralization can lead to a greater voice for people in government decisions and also can increase the perceived legitimacy of governments. This encourages greater trust and cooperation between government agencies and citizens, leading to better policy outcomes. Such an increase in trust and legitimacy can be key to increasing political stability. Political decentralization often requires constitutional or statutory reforms, the development of pluralistic political parties, creation of local political units, and the encouragement of effective public interest groups. India has significantly increased the extent of political decentralization through the Panchayati Raj Act, 1992, which required all states to set up a three-tier system of elected local governments at district, block, and village levels.

Administrative Decentralization

Administrative decentralization means the delegation of tasks or transfer of authority from the central government to local 'branches' of the central government. It seeks to redistribute authority and responsibility for providing public services among different levels of

government. It refers to the transfer of responsibility for planning, financing, and management of fields units of government agencies, subordinate units or levels of government, semi-autonomous public authorities or corporations. The idea is that local governments have more information about local needs, and they are better placed to choose appropriate policies for the local region to or better identify the targeting of policy. For instance, in implementing a poverty alleviation programme, it is the local government that is likely to know where the poor are concentrated or have have knowledge regarding which places need an extra school and so on. An alternative channel is that local governments are better able to monitor the service providers (local teachers, nurses, and so on), and therefore can ensure delivery of public services. Thus, administrative decentralization is a mechanism to improve welfare by ensuring better policy choices and better implementation of policies.

Fiscal Decentralization

In fiscal decentralization, previously concentrated powers to tax and generate revenues are dispersed to other levels of government; for example, local governments are given the power to raise and retain financial resources to fulfil their responsibilities. Dispersal of financial responsibility is a core component of decentralization. If local governments and organizations are to carry out decentralized functions effectively, they must have an adequate level of revenues, either raised locally or transferred from the central government, as well as the authority to take decisions about expenditures. Fiscal decentralization can take many forms including:

- Self-financing or cost recovery through user charges;
- expansion of local revenues through property or sales taxes, or indirect charges;
- inter-governmental transfers that shift general revenues from taxes collected by the central government to local governments for general or specific uses; and
- authorization of municipal borrowing and the mobilization of either national or local governments' resources through loan guarantees.

In many developing countries, local governments or administrative units possess the legal authority to impose taxes, but the tax base is so weak and the dependence on central government subsidies so ingrained that no attempt is made to exercise that authority. A study on decentralization in the South Asian countries (Iyer et al. 2010: 259) reveals that India is quite decentralized compared with the world average. Sub-national (state and local) governments called for 34 per cent of all government revenues and are in charge of 52 per cent of total government expenditures. The other South Asian countries—Bangladesh, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka are extremely centralized in terms of revenue powers, with sub-national governments having the authority to collect less than 10 per cent of total revenues. Sub-national governments are responsible for a much lower proportion of total expenditures compared with India. Despite these figures, the balance of power in India is towards the national government. It is strengthened by two provisions of the Indian Constitution—all residual legislative powers have been assigned to the national government and in cases of conflict between national and state laws, the national laws is expected to prevail. Although sub-national governments have more levels such as the village-level Panchayati Raj Institutions, these lower levels currently have limited autonomy in administrative matters and few sources of independent revenue. The *Status Report* (2000) on the autonomy of the Panchatyati Raj Institutions and municipal bodies revels that none of the states in India, except Kerala, have tried to place requisites for financial decentralization, while operationalizing their respective acts. In Kerala, the funds have been devolved directly upon all the three tiers (Panchayati Raj in India, *Status Report* 2000: 14–15). Devolution of funds upon Panchayats and municipalities by the state is important in order to augment financial capacity of local self-governing institutions.

Functional Decentralization

Functional decentralization refers to the transfer of functions from central agencies to other intermediate or local bodies in order to enable them to discharge their responsibilities. For example, the

73rd Constitutional Amendment includes an 11th Schedule to the Constitution, which lists twenty-nine functions that state governments may devolve to the Panchayats. These include subjects pertaining to rural development such as agriculture, minor irrigation, animal husbandry, small-scale industries, and others; social infrastructure such as schools, and hospitals, poverty alleviation programmes, welfare of weaker sections, and the public distribution system; and civic functions such as drinking water, markets and fairs, and maintenance of community assets.

However, the 11th Schedule list is a suggestive rather than mandatory one, and basically, it is up to the state governments to decide upon the functions to be devolved. The devolution of functions is, however, a complex task. Merely allotting 'sectors' to Panchayats, such as 'school education' does not result in role clarity, as governments at various levels continue to perform different roles in a sector. For instance, in school education, so far it has been the national and state governments that have prescribed curricula, textbook, and the examination patterns but in some states, the administration of schools has been transferred to Panchayats. Precision in the devolution of function is important if it is to be given concrete shape. In practice, however, in many states, in the Panchayat acts passed after the Constitution Amendment, the subjects transferred have been listed broadly the precise activities to be taken up at various levels of Panchayats have not been defined, with the result that there is a lack of clarity about the role of Panchayati Raj Institutions. Moreover, in several state acts, even though functions devolved to Panchayati Raj Institutions are listed, they can be changed as per the executive orders of the state government. Thus, there is absence of a clear-cut functional jurisdiction of Panchayati Raj Institutions and even that is left to the discretion of the concerned state government. This also applies to the urban local bodies, which have been assigned eighteen functions by the 12th Schedule of the Constitution.

Democratic Decentralization

Addition of the value-loaded prefix 'democratic' lends a special characteristic to the concept of decentralization. This is because

decentralization does not necessarily mean democratic nor does it have any intrinsic value attached to it. It may be used by a purely regimented system for administrative convenience (Jha and Mathur 1999). Therefore, decentralization should not be treated as an end in itself. In fact, it is the democratic ambience that makes decentralization an effective tool of empowerment. Democratic decentralization in the context of developing countries has been conceptualized from two different perspectives—institutional and instrumental. From the instrumental perspective, democratic decentralization is seen as an instrument of ensuring participatory development by empowering the local communities; and from the institutional perspective, it is viewed as an institution of self-government. Hence, decentralization is the mechanism or avenue through which the nature of local governance can be ascertained.

Local Governance

Stripped of all jargons, local governance (or new local governance as a few commentators prefer to call it to distinguish it from its old variant) can be defined as a process of governing at the cutting-edge level involving a huge constellation of agencies and actors including the conventional government, non-governmental and quasi-governmental sectors, civil society organization, business elites, and so on. Decision-making process in new local governance, unlike local government, is considered to be a collaborative effort with multiple agencies involved in the process as the joint-stakeholders. In other words, it seeks to curve out a new discursive space for NGOs, self-help groups, and people's initiatives within the political society.

Based on the post-bureaucratic and post-Fordist[1] notion of organization, new local governance encouraged networking and negotiations over formalism. Moreover, in new local governance, 'the traditional conduits of local politics and policy implementation', as rightly put by Raco and Imrie,[2] 'have to coexist, collaborate and compete with a plethora of new agencies, networks and organizations, all jostling for resources, power and influence' (Imrie

and Raco 1999: 45–63). In addition to this, new local governance has also welcomed the entry of business elites at the local decision-making process, which, no doubt, is a redeeming feature of it. Business has a love–hate relationship with politics in a democratic set-up. Neither business houses nor politicians have ever felt comfortable about the interrelationship. In most cases, the relationship is kept under carpet. Local governance by allowing business elites in the decision-making process takes the curtain off the discrete[3] relationship between business and politics, and makes the process more transparent.

Moreover, the paradigm also calls for a host of structural, procedural, and attitudinal changes to streamline the process. *Structurally*, the paradigm of local governance seeks to transform the state-controlled bureaucratically managed local administration to a more flexible, market-based administration. Maximum emphasis in new local governance has been placed on decentralizing the authority to the local bodies, flattening of hierarchies, slimming of bureaucracy, and so on. Apart from the administrative overhauling of the typically centralized local government, the new paradigm is also advocating in favour of giving the local bodies an extra ounce of financial freedom[4] by slackening the stranglehold of the state over local finance. Similarly, at the *procedural* level, the new paradigm seeks to bring about several procedural changes, namely, leasing out/contracting out of services;[5] introduction of performance-measurement techniques; and introduction of quality assurance yardsticks like Quality Service Initiatives,[6] Quality Circle, Total Quality Management,[7] Citizen's Report Card,[8] and Citizen's Charter, and so on. Another important element of change that the new local governance wants to imbibe is the *attitudinal* or perceptual change in local government vis-à-vis citizens. Citizens, especially those at the post-colonial countries have so long been treated as the passive recipient[9] of goods and services. In new local governance, citizens are viewed as the centre of development discourse. Naturally, the traditional perception regarding the citizen has been redefined as 'active customers'.[10] Hence, serving the citizen has become the central focus of administration. Consequently, the gap between the public and private gets increasingly

blurred.[11] In fact, the success of local governance is largely contingent upon the attitudinal changes. However, the winds of change in local governance as sketched briefly above, do not originate overnight. Several factors are responsible for this paradigm shift in local governance. Denters and Rose (2005) have categorized those factors into two broad categories—macro environment and micro environment. In the macro environment, local governments have to encounter three major forces, namely, urbanization, globalization, and Europeanization. In the micro environment, local governments have to function within an environment of heightened customer enlightenment, leading to increasing demand overload. Almost in similar vein, Carolina Andrew and Michael Goldsmith in their article argue:

> … much of this process is the result of external changes over which individual local governments have had little influence: increasing economic interdependence; the process of globalization; changing technologies; or the fall of communism in Eastern Europe, for example…And some will be generated from within local governments themselves, be they processes on delayring, privatization and contracting out of services; attempts at improving customer care and citizen relationships. (Andrew and Goldsmith 1998)

The above factors compel local governments to reorient and reinvent themselves with the evolving environment.

DEMOCRATIC DECENTRALIZATION AND LOCAL GOVERNANCE IN INDIA

India's journey to new local governance has had a chequered history.[12] There is no denying that India has the oldest tradition of local governance[13] as the Panchayats or village councils have existed since ancient times. They were mainly the 'informal bodies of village elders from dominant castes and families', assigned with various kinds of functions like provision of goods and services, maintenance of law and order, general welfare of villagers, and

so on. These bodies enjoy a substantial amount of autonomy in terms of organization, functions, and finance, bestowed upon them by village communities. Village communities had exercised virtually unmatched freedom of action in all spheres of governance. The uniqueness of this form of governance was that it was an absolutely spontaneous development and no external authority had ever devolved power and authority to these bodies. Moreover, there was no uniform pattern of this form of governance as these village communities had no uniform pattern of organization (Srivastava 2002). The successive Muslim invasions in India and consequent beginnings of Muslim rule had very little impact on the functioning of these village communities. Even the Mughals, who had brought almost entire subcontinent under one rule for the first time, was not in the mood of unravelling the localized form of governance. Instead, they were mainly preoccupied with police and revenue matters and settled them with the village headmen. Hence, the arrangement continued unaltered till middle of the seventeenth century, despite several political vicissitudes at the central level. Even at the advent of British rule in India during the nineteenth century, this indigenous form of local governance was very much there. Sir Charles Metcalfe's famous portrayal of this form of local governance before the Select Committee of the House of Commons bears a clear testimony of this great tradition of local governance prevalent in ancient India. In his words:

The village communities are little republics, having nearly everything they can want within themselves, and almost independent of any foreign relations. They seem to last where nothing else lasts. Dynasty after dynasty tumbles down; revolution succeeds to revolution; but the village community remains the same. This union of the village communities, each one forming a separate little state, in itself, has I conceive, contributed more than any other cause to the preservation of the people of India, through all the revolutions and changes which they have suffered, and is in a high degree conducive to their enjoyment of a great portion of freedom and independence. (Metcalfe, quoted in Srivastava 2002)

But, there was no serious attempt as such to unlock the huge potential of these little village republics, either by the colonial rulers or by the post-colonial state, except a few polemics and individual efforts by a few visionary thinkers,[14] like Tagore and Gandhi. The colonial rulers in India did absolutely nothing to resurrect these 'little village republics'.[15] The colonial intervention in local governance was primarily driven by the twin motive of empire building[16] and mercantilism. The colonizers had adopted a selective approach[17] regarding local governance. In fact, in order to strengthen their objective of empire building, they built urban 'centres'[18] like Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras and left the rest of the country as a 'periphery', serving the 'centre' without having any kind of development. They were only allowed to feed on the subsistence economy of their hinterlands. Hence, the introduction of local government in rural areas through the Bengal Village Chowkidari Act, 1870, was far from the spirit of self-governing institutions. The underlying objective was solely to serve the interest of the Empire. The act was introduced at a time when the Empire was reeling under severe challenges of governance in the wake of the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857. The colonial rulers had realized the danger of leaving sensitive issues like governing at the hands of the East India Company and took over the charge of the subcontinent in 1858. The Bengal Village Chowkidari Act, 1870, should therefore be viewed as the desperate effort on the part of the Empire to fortify British rule in India. The rural local government was mainly an offshoot of the act. The real intention was to strengthen the economic and the security aspects of the Empire as the law had authorized the village Panchayats to mop up local taxes for maintaining village Chowkidars and also to set up reliable intelligence mechanism deep into the countryside to keep a tab on the activities of the people. Naturally, whatever little rural reconstruction and urban development was done during the period was basically a part of their housekeeping functions. The British colonial state as a part of its housekeeping functions had adopted several constitutional measures to streamline local self-government. Notable among them were the Ripon Resolution, 1882; the Bengal Local Self-Government Act, 1885; the Bengal

Village Self-Government Act, 1919; among others. Out of the said measures, the Bengal Village Self-Government Act of 1919 may be regarded as the beginning of local self-government in India, providing a two-tier structure—union boards at the bottom level and district boards at the higher level. However, those self-governing structures were neither self nor local as those bodies were marked by the perennial resource crunch, over-bureaucratization, and dominance of local landed gentry. They remained as mere appendage of provincial government. Independence had brought a shift in power structure, but not in the attitude regarding local governance. Despite repeated advocacy of Mahatma Gandhi for *Gram Swaraj*,[19] it remained a far cry even in Independent India. Inheriting the colonial mindset regarding local governance, the framers of the Constitution had belied the hope of strong and vibrant local governance by confining it to a non-enforceable section of the Constitution, that is, the Directive Principles of the State Policy. In this context, the comments of two major architects of modern Indian Constitution merit some space here as they adequately mirror the said elitist mentality, which prevented local governance in India the status it deserved in the Constitution. Ambedkar argues:

> The love of the intellectual Indian for the village community is of course infinite if not pathetic. It is largely due to the fulsome praise bestowed upon it by Metcalfe who described that they want within themselves, and almost independent of any foreign relation … That they have survived through all vicissitudes may be a fact. But mere survival has no value. The question is on what plane they have survived. Surely on a low, on a selfish level. I told that these village republics have been the ruination of India. I am therefore surprised that those who condemn provincialism and communalism should come forward as champions of the village. What is the village but a sink of localism, a den of ignorance, narrow-mindedness and Communalism? (Ambedkar quoted in Baviskar and Mathew 2009: 1)

Almost in similar vein, Nehru wrote 'I do not understand why a village should necessarily embody truth and non-violence. A

village, normally speaking, is backward intellectually and culturally and no progress can be made from a backward environment. Narrow-minded people are much more likely to be untruthful and violent' (Nehru quoted in Baviskar and Mathew 2009: 1). Thanks to the above sentiment,[20] India's dream of inclusive local governance had to wait almost four decades before it was finally materialized in 1993. In the meantime, there had been a few pioneering efforts, but they were mostly selective in nature, confined to provincial level. Notable among them were the Balwantrai Mehta Committee, Ashok Mehta committee, the democratic decentralization experiments by a handful of state governments like West Bengal, Karnataka, Kerala, and so on.

Balwantrai Mehta Committee (1957)

The first major headway in institutionalizing Panchayats came from an apparently non-related study by the team for the Study of Community Projects and National Extension Service in 1957, popularly christened after the name of its Chairman, Balwantrai Mehta. Though the study was originally intended to assess community development initiatives and to recommend improvement measures thereon, the findings, however, suggested the necessity of strengthening Panchayats for institutionalizing community participation in Community Development Programme (CDP). The committee had recommended a three-tier system of rural local government, that is, village Panchayats at the village level, the Panchayat Samiti at the intermediate level, and Zilla Parishad at the district level, with Panchayat Samitis being the most effective body. However, the Balwantrai Mehta Committee report failed to rejuvenate Panchayats as the institutions of local governance. A couple of factors could have been identified for that. First, the motive behind the study was more to legitimize central government-led development programmes, than to establish Panchayats as a real body of community participation. Second, the embedded elitist apathy regarding Panchayats among the government and administration was also factored in the failure of Balwantrai Mehta Committee.

Ashok Mehta Committee (1978)

Another committee, which deserves special mention in the evolution of rural local government in India, is the Ashok Mehta Committee. This committee was appointed to inquire into the working of Panchayati Raj Institutions and to suggest measures to strengthen them. The Ashok Mehta Committee felt that a combination of factors had conspired to undermine Panchayati Raj Institutions, such as an unsympathetic bureaucracy, absence of political will, lack of involvement in planning and implementation on a substantial scale, and the domination of local institutions by the economic and social rural elite (Desouza 2002: 371). The committee underscored the functional necessity of decentralization and recommended a two-tier system of Panchayati Raj Institution. The committee also recommended that the district should be the basic unit since it was a viable administrative unit for which planning, coordination, and resource allocation were feasible and for which technical expertise was available. The Ashok Mehta Committee was the first to demand constitutional recognition for Panchyats. The committee even drafted a model Bill, which they appended with the report, seeking an amendment to the Constitution along these lines (Kumar 2006: 23). The Janta Party did not stay in power long enough to implement the decisions of the Ashok Mehta Committee, and reportedly, in an initial meeting, the recommendations of the committee were not received well by the state governments. However, the influence of the report of this committee has been significant. In fact, the states of Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, and West Bengal passed new legislations based on the Ashok Mehta Committee Report. Apart from the above governmental committees, a few state governments, like West Bengal and Kerala, have done a commendable job in strengthening Panchayati Raj Institutions. In the following section, we will take up the case of West Bengal.

The West Bengal experiment

The state of West Bengal in India had adopted a participatory model of decentralized local governance—for both rural and urban areas—way back in 1977, which was based on administrative and financial

devolution. The planning process in this form of governance also got decentralized with an intention of taking the governance process to the heart of commoners. This model of decentralized local governance or what is popularly known as 'democratic decentralization' was almost emulated at the national level which transformed it into an all-India model through two Constitutional Amendment acts. Local government in West Bengal, in its true sense of the term, got started exactly a decade after Independence with the introduction of West Bengal Panchayat Act, 1957, reflecting the constitutional directives of promoting 'Panchayati Raj'. The act made it mandatory to construct a Gram Panchayat in every village, so that it would function as executive body of Gram Sabha, consisting of all the voters in a village. This act, in fact, anticipated the much-hyped Balwantrai Mehta Committee recommendations of 1957, which had virtually shaped the future course of decentralization in Independent India. Subsequently, a four-tier system of rural local government with Zilla Parishads at the apex, Anchalik Parishads at the intermediate level, and Anchal Panchayats and Gram Panchayats, respectively, at the bottom level, came into being with the passage of the Zilla Parishad Act of 1963. In the evolution of local government in West Bengal, the decade of 1960 was a volatile time as the state was reeling under several political, economic, and social crises during this phase. Consequently, elections in the local bodies remained pending. In 1973 the West Bengal Panchayat Act was passed replacing the four-tier structure by the emerging three-tier system. The act, no doubt, was an improvement on previous legislations, however, no election was held in those bodies until the ascendancy of Left in West Bengal in 1977. In June 1978, elections were held simultaneously in those local bodies for the first time under the tutelage of the Left Front government. The event had brought a qualitative transformation of sort in local governance of West Bengal. Since then, elections in those local bodies were held at regular intervals. Thanks to being in power for three consecutive decades and experimenting with local governance, the Left Front government in West Bengal has evolved a new model of decentralized local governance. The distinctiveness of the West Bengal model of local governance is largely attributed

to the Leftist ideological position. Ideologically speaking, the Leftist agenda for democratic decentralization, unlike its neoliberal opponents, is political mobilization. The West Bengal model of decentralized local governance is unique in several counts. First, the model of decentralized local governance is brought into being by a Leftist government, ideologically inclined to democratic centralism. Ideological underpinnings of choosing democratic decentralization for the Left were almost diametrically opposite to the neoliberal positions. The Leftist government in West Bengal has opted for decentralization as an alternative policy option. It was a part of social engineering' within the overarching liberal structure of Indian state, analogous to an overall socialist position. Interesting part of the story is that while a Leftist government had embarked upon decentralization as a part of its socialist mobilization and picked up the Panchayat Raj system to operationalize it way back in 1978, the Government of India had to wait till 1990s for the same and that to as a part of fund bank directives. Second, the Left in West Bengal has successfully amalgamated democracy with development in their experiment with decentralized local governance, braving the popular Western discourse on democracy, which believes democracy, is a luxury for the developing world, especially for those who are very keen in projecting their country in growth trajectory. The West Bengal model of decentralized local governance, democratically constituted through direct election, has the following features, namely, administrative/functional autonomy, financial autonomy, decentralization of the planning process, democratic elections, people's participation, and so on.

RURAL LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Panchayati Raj Institutions

Panchayati Raj Institutions, as stated earlier, are the institutionalized pan-Indian form of rural local governance that came into existence with the passage of the 73rd Constitution Amendment Act, 1992. The act has heralded a three-tier structure of rural local governance—Gram Panchayat at the bottom level, Panchayat

Samiti at the intermediate level, and Zilla Parishad at the highest level.

The 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act, 1992

The 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act, 1992, is considered to be a watershed in the history of local government in India. It has virtually salvaged the age-old tradition and institution of local governance from a dependent status to one of self-reliance by conferring the much-coveted constitutional status on it. Until the passage of the 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act, states were the only subnational units, officially recognized by the Indian Constitution. The provision for local government remained under the state list and hence there was no uniform pattern of it across the country. The act has heralded three-tier Panchayati Raj Institutions across the country. The functional domain of rural local bodies was limited largely to the provision of some core services such as water supply, sanitation, local roads, and so on. The 'developmental' activities were limited to the role of implementing developmental schemes sponsored by either central or state governments. The passage of the act has empowered the local bodies to formulate and implement development plans of their own.

The context

The legislative origins of the 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act can be traced back to the 64th Constitutional Amendment Bill, which was introduced in the Parliament in 1989 by the government of the then Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi. The introduction of the Bill was perhaps the first attempt to confer constitutional status on rural local governments. Though the Bill failed to clear the test of the Rajya Sabha, its broader objective of reviving the country's century-old institution of rural local self-government was highly appreciated. The major reservation against the said Bill was that it provided a very little space for the state governments regarding local governance. However, after much deliberation the issue of conferring constitutional status on rural local governments came into being with the passage of the 73rd Constitution Amendment Act, 1992. Though the manifest reason behind the act was to bring about an efficient delivery mechanism for development, there were serious

political compulsions before the political leadership to bring forward the issue of local democracy. The decades of 1970s and 1980s had witnessed several anti-establishment movements on the basis of ethnic, religious, and linguistic identities across the country. The militant secessionist movements of north-eastern states, Punjab, and northern hilly tract of West Bengal, as also the demand for separate statehood in Bihar and Uttar Pradesh had challenged the credibility of Indian state to govern. Under the circumstance, sharing the power with communities at the grass-roots level was conceived as a desperate attempt to release the mounting pressure on the Indian state. Moreover, this policy of decentralization was hailed because that would substantially downsize the powers of the opposition-ruled recalcitrant and demanding state governments, and establish a direct linkage with district collectors and the Panchayat Raj bodies, bypassing state governments. Whatever be the motive behind the constitutionalization of Panchayats, the act has changed the very contour of local governance at the rural level. Some of the redeeming features of the act are as follows:

- The act has heralded a three-tier Pachayati Raj Institutions with Zilla Parishad at the top, the Panchayats Samitis at the intermediate level, and Panchayats at the bottom.
- The act has clearly devolved power, authority, and responsibilities to rural local bodies to enable them to function as the institutions of self-government (Article 243G).
- The act has made it mandatory for all levels of Panchayati Raj Institutions to conduct periodic elections every five years. In case of early or premature dismissal of the Panchayati Raj Institution, elections are to be held within a period of six months, with the newly elected members serving out the remainder of the five-year term (Article 243E).
- The act has also made provisions for the reservation of seats for SCs and STs in all Panchayats at all levels in proportion to their respective shares in the Panchayat concerned. In addition to that, the act has also made mandatory reservation of one-third of all seats in all Panchayats at all level for women, of which one-third to be reserved for the women

belonging to SCs and STs. The constitutional provision for the reservation of seats for SC and ST also extends to position of Panchayat chairperson at all three tiers and one-third mandatory reservation is earmarked for them.

- The act has stipulated the constitution of a state level Election Commission for a period of five years to ensure free and fair elections in local bodies.
- The act has also empowered the state government to constitute another independent state-level commission, that is, the Finance Commission, for a five-year review of the overall financial position of local bodies and recommend principles that should govern the allocation of funds and taxation authority to local bodies. The governor of the state is entrusted with the power of constituting the finance commission, which will review the financial positions of the Panchayats and make recommendations thereon to the governor.
- The act has also made provision for the constitution of *Gram Sabha*, the body of the electorate of the Gram Panchayats and established a more direct channel of people's participation. The underlying rationale was that the *Gram Sabha* would function as a fulcrum of developmental process, where the community would participate both at the formulation and the implementation of developmental plans. Moreover, this body would function as organs of local accountability and oversight.

  The 11th Schedule (Art 243G) has been added which gives the list of twenty-nine functions to be performed by Panchayati Raj Institutions.

According to Article 243(G) of the Act, 'Panchayats shall be given powers and authority to function as institutions of self-government'. This would be done by delegating powers and responsibilities to Panchayats at the appropriate level such as (*a*) preparation of plan for economic development and social justice and (*b*) implementation of scheme for economic development. Article 243(H) authorizes a Panchayat to levy, collect, and appropriate

taxes, tolls, and fees. These two articles clearly lay out the powers, authority, and responsibilities of Panchayats vis-à-vis state governments. They empower rural local bodies to play pivotal role in the provision of public services, creation and maintenance of local public goods, and planning and implementation of developmental activities and programmes to alleviate poverty and promote distributive equality.

Assessment of the functioning of the Panchayati Raj system since 1992

It is evident from the above discussion that there are some radical provisions in the 73rd Amendment Act. They seek to address some of the problems encountered by Panchayati Raj Institutions in previous years, such as (*a*) granting Panchayati Raj Institutions a constitutional status; (*b*) empowering socially and economically disadvantaged groups, like the Dalits, Adivasis, and women; (*c*) ensuring free, fair, and regular elections; (*d*) keeping terms fixed; (*e*) identifying a list of items which would fall under the jurisdiction of Panchayati Raj Institutions; and (*f*) addressing the issue of Panchayati Raj Institution finances (Desouza 2002: 379). Thus, the act has provided for a significant degree of fiscal, administrative, and political decentralization from the state to local levels.

Now that the democratic decentralization experiment is with us for more than two decades, it is necessary to evaluate the experiment, which is often euphemistically called the 'silent revolution'. It is to, therefore, interrogate the democratic decentralization experiment by asking a few important questions: Are we really ready for decentralization? Is democratic decentralization an end in itself? Does democratic decentralization truly empower local community? These questions require a lot of introspections. This section critically appraises the role of democratic decentralization in delivering development and social justice.

Despite much accolade and fanfare, Panchayati Raj Institutions have failed to bring about the much-needed transformation in India's society and polity. In fact, several shortcomings have surfaced within a decade of its functioning. First, Panchayat,

as the institution of local self-governence has been suffering from an identity crisis as the meaning of self-governence has not been clearly articulated. Second, Panchayati Raj Institutions have inherited a culture of subservience, which was deliberately inculcated by the colonial era, and this has gone against the fullest realization of decentralization in post Independent India. Third, though the new Panchayati Raj Institutions have an avowed stand on gender empowerment—as the 73rd Constitution Amendment Act has envisaged one-third reservation for women—in actuality, however, Panchayats are witnessing a typical phenomenon of proxy participation, where male family members of the women candidate wield power on her behalf. The infamous *pradhan-pati* syndrome is a case in point. Fourth, another major weakness of this system is the over-politicization of the Panchayats. In a parliamentary democracy, thanks to it being in power for many years, often Panchayats administration and party administration have become identical and inseparable, leading thereby to an overlapping of responsibilities. Consequently, Panchayat administration became the extended branch of party administration as the same set of persons simultaneously discharge both the duties, leading thereby a lot of confusion. However, politicization is nothing unique, as the Indian Panchayati Raj system has allowed political mobilization. In a democratic system, competitive political mobilization could have enhanced the status of the community, if political parties are allowed to mobilize freely. For, in this system political parties are always wanted to outpace their contenders by improving the quality of services. Distortions occur only when any political parties or combination of parties hold powers unilaterally for a long time. Fifth, overreliance on the Panchayati Raj Institutions, as the institutions of local governance, often leads to 'system overload' as too many developmental projects vying for attention in the Panchayats. Sixth, a strong centralizing tendency with the centrality of development state has been implicit in the decentralization initiatives in Independent India. Starting from the Balwantrai Mehta Committee to the recent 73rd Constitution Amendment Act, there has been a distinct tradition of centrality of nonetheless.

The functioning of the new Panchayati Raj system reveals the fact that though the legislative and electoral formalities have been completed in almost all the states, at the operational level, there are large variations among them. The twenty-nine subjects mentioned in the 11th Schedule do not give power to legislate the local bodies, but only to take decisions. The State Finance Commissions recommendations are not mandatory in nature. It is completely up to the state government to devolve or not to devolve, functions, functionaries, and resources on the local bodies as per the constitutional scheme. As of 2007, only three of India's twenty-eight states had passed executive orders devolving all twenty-nine functions to the local level, as required by the Constitutional Amendment. The high handedness of bureaucracy, with a few exceptions, over the local autonomy still prevails. The experience gained so far is that, at the district level, various department and agencies still implement programmes and functions under the overall supervision and control of the district collectors. The Panchayati Raj Institutions, therefore, have to be content with backseat driving (Vithal 1997).

The experience of democratic decentralization makes it clear that it cannot be a solution to one and all ills of governance. Rigid patriarchal structure inhibits the participation of backward castes and women in village governance. The 73rd Amendment stipulates that one-third of all Panchayat seats are 'reserved' for women, with a similar provision for SCs and STs. In north India, where caste and gender inequalities are particularly resilient, the local elites have tended to adapt to this requirement by putting up 'proxy' candidates from the required group, and continuing to wield power through them. The submissive female Sarpanch, sitting quietly in a corner while her husband (often initially mistaken for the Sarpanch) answers the questions, is a familiar figure in the critical literature on Panchayati Raj in north India (Drèze and Sen 2002: 362). Moreover, majorities of the elected representatives are first timers with little or no prior knowledge of functioning of Panchayati Raj Institutions. It is not easy for the weaker rural section to actively participate in the development

process. The literacy level among SC, ST, and women are quite low. The distribution of rural assets and powers is heavily skewed in India—the bottom 39 per cent of rural households (belonging to lower castes) own only 5 per cent of all assets, while the top 5 per cent own 46 per cent. This makes opportunities and social choice shrink for the really deprived villages at the grass roots level.

Inadequate financial resources are another crucial constraint in effective functioning of decentralized governance. The Panchayats have to depend on the devolutions and the grants-in-aid from the state governments and they have not developed any independent sources to raise revenues. Besides, most of the states have not transferred funds for the subjects transferred to these local bodies. A study of twelve states has shown that, in nine of these, the tax revenue of the local bodies—both Panchayats and urban local bodies—was less than 5 per cent of the total tax revenue of the state government (National Commission to Review the Working of the Constitution 2001: 29). The limited fiscal autonomy of Panchayats render them excessively dependent on the central and state governments.

The constraints and problems that mark democratic decentralization initiatives are many, but this should not create a panic situation, as we are passing through a transitory phase and any kind of transition takes time to show positive results. It is a fact that a silent revolution in taking place in rural India where people are becoming conscious of their rights. One of the most heartening aspects of the Panchayati Raj experiment has been the inclusion and participation of variously disadvantaged groups such as Dalits, Adivasis, and women. It is unarguable that the provision of quotas has generated widespread awareness. Studies have shown that the developmental outcomes in Panchayats headed by women are impressive, even if empowerment impacts have been rather slow in materializing (Jayal 2007: 13). The renewed movement towards democratic decentralization has eroded the bureaucratic monopoly over the development processes and has shifted the locus of power to those who matter at the grass roots level. The new Panchayati Raj system represents an institutional watershed

which has bought the 'people' back into the political process at the grassroots level. People have been given a voice. This voice, even in a situation of pervasive asymmetric power, will result in a flattening of the asymmetry, a process that can have only emancipatory consequences. To paraphrase B.B. Baviskar 'the 73rd Amendment Act can rightly be termed as a "silent revolution", which in many respect salvaged the institution of self government from a mere "agent" of provincial government to one of "self reliant" one' (Baviskar and Matthew 2009).

URBAN LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

Structure and Function

Unlike rural governance, urban governance is not hierarchical. Article 243Q of the 74th Amendment Act, 1992 (came in force in 1993), stipulates that there shall be three types of urban local bodies in India, namely, the Nagar Panchayat, for the transitional areas; municipal councils or municipalities for smaller urban areas; and municipal corporations for larger urban areas. State governments are allowed to design their own municipal acts in accordance with the broad parameters outlined in the 74th Amendment Act.

Functions

Article 243W of the Constitution deals with the 'power, authority and responsibilities of municipalities', which clearly lays out the functions of municipality including the list of functions enumerated in the 12th Schedule. The details of these functions are stipulated in the 12th Schedule of the Constitution. These are urban planning, including town planning; regulation of land-use and construction of buildings; planning for economic and social development; roads and bridges; water supply for domestic, industrial, and commercial purpose; public health, sanitation, conservancy, and solid waste management; fire services; urban forestry, protection of the environment, and promotion of ecological aspects; safeguarding the interests of weaker sections of society, including the handicapped and mentally challenged;

slum improvement and upgradation; urban poverty alleviation; provision of urban amenities and facilities such as parks, gardens, and playgrounds; promotion of cultural, educational, and aesthetic aspects; burials and burial grounds; cremations, cremation grounds, and electric crematoriums; cattle pounds; prevention of cruelty to animals; vital statistics including registration of births and deaths; public amenities including street lighting, parking lots, bus stops, and public conveniences; and regulation of slaughter houses and tanneries.

The 74th Amendment Act, 1992

The 74th Amendment Act, 1992, has ushered in a new phase of urban governance in India. However, it has a striking similarity with the 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act, 1992. This act is incorporated in Article 243, Part-IX A, of the Indian Constitution. Major provisions of the act are as follows:

- Urban local bodies, to be known as Municipal Corporation, Municipal Councils, and Nagar Panchayat depending on the population, shall be constituted through Universal Adult Franchise in each notified urban area of the country;
- these shall be constituted for a period of five years;
- not less than one-third of total number of seats in each urban local body shall be reserved for women;
- these bodies shall be endowed with power and authority to formulate and implement schemes for economic development and social justice on eighteen subjects;
- in order that the urban local bodies can perform the functional assigned to them, the legislature of a state shall assign them specific taxes, duties, tolls, and levies and authorize them to impose, collect, and appropriate the same;
- each state shall also constitute a finance commission which shall review the financial position of the urban local bodies and recommend the principles which should govern the devolution of resources including grant-in-aid from the consolidated fund of the state of these bodies;

- the superintendence, direction, and control of the preparation of electoral rolls for, and the conduct of, all election to the urban local bodies shall vest in the State Election Commission;
- the act has made provision for the constitution of Ward Committee in all municipalities with a population of 3 lakhs and more; and
- District Planning Committee and Metropolitan Planning Committee shall be constituted to prepare a development plan.

The 74th Amendment Act, thus, gives a constitutional status to the municipalities. It seeks to redefine their role, power, function, and finances. This has ushered in a new era of urban governance and urban management in India. The act is significant because apart from the traditional functions it has also allocated the municipal bodies the function of economic development and social justice, which suggests their elevation from mere instrumentalities for 'agency functions' to responsible bodies for development planning. The provision of state-level finance commission is a landmark step in the direction of providing financial autonomy to the urban local bodies. Reservation of seats, especially for women, ensures the participation of socially deprived sections of society. The new act has become an instrument of political education. In the context of urban politics, people are learning to organize, to question established patterns of authority, to demand their rights, to resist corruption, and so on. This learning process enhances their preparedness not only for local democracy alone, but also for political participation in general.

The 74th Amendment Act has surely revived the urban local bodies of India, but they still face a number of problems. The first and most serious problem facing the urban local bodies is the acute scarcity of finance. In the absence of proper funds, powers become meaningless because the same cannot be translated into real efforts and outcomes. The new act provides for the constitution of a State Finance Commission to look into the financial sources of local bodies, but the recommendations of the commission are not binding

on the respective states. People's participation in urban bodies is still negligible. A major cause of this attitude is that people look towards the municipal bodies with inherent suspicion and take it for granted that their problems and grievances will not be taken care of. Moreover, like the 11th Schedule, there is no clear demarcation of functions between different local units of the urban local government, leaving it to the respective state. This has given the states the liberty to impose their own choices in this regard, which has at times created more confusion than order, regarding what is to be delegated and what is not. In the changing scenario, the urban local bodies need to exclusively devote themselves to the task of development, and therefore should enjoy a large measure of autonomy. But the ground reality depicts a contrary picture. Criticizing the 74th Amendment Act, Nirmal Mukherjee argues that 'it is almost a carbon copy of the 73rd Amendment Act' and 'a hasty afterthought'. Comparing with the 73rd Amendment Act he further notes that 'it looks as if some independent thinking went into the panchayat law and then, one day, the *municipality-wallah*s suddenly woke up and said "we too, please" and were simply served the panchayat dish with municipal sauce'. Second, it 'thoughtlessly constitutionalizes as artificial dichotomy between rural and urban when all previous thinking has stressed a continuum between the two' (Mukherjee 1999). Another myopia with the act is that of the 'panchayats for rural areas' bias or panchayats are locked into a 'rural only' bind.

IMPLICATIONS OF 73RD AND 74TH AMENDMENT ACTS

The acts as mentioned earlier are phenomenal in many respects. In this section, we will specifically highlight some of the implications:

1. *Constitutionalization*: The first and foremost implication of the 73rd and 74th Amendment Acts, it is the conferment of constitutional status on local government. Initially, the Constitution of India did not confer any special status on local

government; except an entry in the state list of the 7th Sched-
ule of the Constitution and a specific article in the Directive
Principles of State Policy, expecting state governments to
take initiatives for organizing Panchayats. Until recently, there
was no uniform pattern of local self-governments across the
country. Formation and nurturing of local governments was
absolutely a matter of goodwill on the part of state govern-
ments. With the passage of the acts, it has become manda-
tory for state governments to construct rural and urban local
governments. Hence, the constitutionalization of rural and
urban local governments has engendered an exclusive leg-
islative domain for the local governments or what is known
as a 'third stratum' of government (Mukherjee 1999), paving
the way for a direct linkage between the governance process
and the community per se.

2. *Administrative Autonomy*: The acts have provided much-
needed administrative autonomy in terms of functional
devolution to both the urban and rural local bodies. Before
this, local bodies were considered as the mere 'agents' of the
state governments. They did not have any authority of taking
administrative decisions independent of state control. But
the new acts have enabled the local governments to manage
their own affairs. For instance, the authority of local bodies
to superintend overall development of the area concerned
may be mentioned, which includes among others, the prep-
aration of plans for economic development and social jus-
tice, implementation of various developmental schemes, or
any other developmental initiative as the local bodies deem
necessary.

3. *Financial Autonomy*: Another important implication of the
said acts is financial autonomy. Financial autonomy is the sine
qua non of any organization. Local bodies in India were known
for their perennial financial stringency. The acts have virtually
salvaged the cash-strapped local bodies—including both the
urban and rural institutions—with substantial financial au-
thority. For example, the new acts have allowed Panchayats
and municipalities to mobilize their own resources, apart

from the normal sources of finance, that is, the grants-in-aids, which they usually receive from the government. In addition, the acts have also the provisions for mandatory constitution of State Finance Commission by the state governments once in every five years to review comparative financial positions of the local bodies and to make recommendations to the state government on the following issues: (*a*) the distribution between the state and the local bodies (Panchayat and municipalities) of the net proceeds of the taxes, duties, tolls, and fees leviable by the state, which may be divided between them under this part and the allocation between the local bodies (Panchayats and municipalities) at all levels of their respective shares of such proceeds; (*b*) the determination of the taxes, duties, tolls, and fees which may be assigned to, or appropriated by the local bodies (Panchayats and municipalities); and (*c*) the grants-in-aids to the local bodies (Panchayats and municipalities) from the consolidated fund of the state.

4. *Transparency in Governance*: Nowadays, transparency has become a buzzword. It is now considered to be a necessary precondition for ensuring integrity in local governments and an inseparable element of good governance. Thus, the fourth significant implication of the acts is that they have brought transparency in governance. The acts under consideration have also given due importance to this transparency factor. The Article 243J of the 73rd Amendment Act and the Article 243Z of 74th Amendment Act have mentioned the provisions for the mandatory audit of accounts of Panchayats and municipalities, respectively.

5. *Accountability in Governance*: As a result of these amendments, the local bodies are now accountable to fulfil the aspirations of the people. They have been assigned powers and functions to solve the problems at the grassroots level.

6. *Deepening of Democracy*: It is often said that the secret formula behind the success of Indian democracy lies in the embeddedness of the democratic spirit of Indian society. The new acts, by setting up of an all-inclusive popular body, that

is the *Gram Sabha* at the bottom level (and *Gram Samsad* below the *Gram Sabha* in case of West Bengal) in case of Panchayats and Ward Committee in case of municipalities, have paved the way for greater penetration of democracy into interstices of Indian society. Moreover, the new acts have regularized the election process across the country. Prior to the acts, elections in these local bodies were more or less voluntary. Barring a few instances, it was in most cases occasional and sporadic. The new acts have clearly stated that the elections to the local bodies are to be held every five years. If a Panchayat or municipality is dissolved prematurely, elections must be held within six months, with the newly elected members serving out the remainder of the five-year term.

7. *Gender Empowerment*: Another redeeming feature of the new acts is the institutionalization of women participation via reservation of seats at the local bodies. Women folk in India, especially in rural India, have been subject to a systematic and systemic exploitation by the patriarchy. They have been systematically 'excluded' from the corridors of power. The acts have substantially elevated the status of Indian women from a subjugated status to a self-reliant one. They have stipulated in categorical terms that 'not less than one-third of the total number of seats to be filled by direct election in every Panchayats shall be reserved for women'. There is no denying that in an unequal patriarchal society like ours, reservation of seats for women has invariably uplifted the status of women. However, it should not be taken as *the* way of empowering women. It is only a step towards empowerment, not empowerment in itself, as it is often mistakenly equated. The issue of reservation boils down to an irreducible duality between differences versus equality. The feminist epistemology seems to have been caught in this perennial dilemma. Putting it bluntly, the debate is centring round whether women should struggle for equal rights or if they should valorize their differences from men folk, and thereby ask for preferential treatment.

8. *Social Justice via Empowerment of Least Advantaged*: It is quite fashionable these days to talk about 'inclusive development', which calls for an all embracing formula and framework of development so that the disadvantaged section is not left out at the margin. Modern political philosophers like Ronald Dworkin, John Rawls, and others, have justified, at least in essence, the necessity of an inclusive development in their argument for equity and social justice. Our Constitution has devoted considerable portion of it for the uplift of the SCs, STs, and OBCs. In addition to that, the new acts have enabled the least advantaged section—the SCs and STs—to have the greater chance of representation at the local bodies by reserving one-third seats for them in both the urban and rural local bodies.

9. *Popular Participation*: The said acts have institutionalized popular participation in local governance. The introduction of the 'participatory development' as an alternative paradigm of development in the 73rd and the 74th Constitutional Amendment Acts, 1992, is a case in point. The acts have formalized popular participation through the mandatory construction of *Gram Sabha* or Ward Committee at the bottom level.

10. *Decentralized Planning*: Another important hallmark of the new acts is the introduction of a decentralized planning process. So long, planning was couched as a highly technical job to be done by a group of seasoned mandarins. But of late, the notion of planning has undergone a sea change as we are now favouring a 'bottom–up' approach instead of the conventional paradigm of the 'top–down' model. The government's efforts of decentralizing the planning process are evident in both rural and urban local bodies. In case of rural local bodies, the state-initiated rural development through scheme-based activities with the participation of the people in implementing the activities has been reversed and replaced by people-initiated rural development programmes with the participation of the government (Palanithurai 2005). People are now couched as the

stakeholders of development. Article 243G of the Constitutional Amendment Act, for example, has recognized the Panchayats as 'institutions of self-government' and entrusted to them the responsibilities of preparing plans for promoting economic development and social justice. The State Panchayat Act has, at least formally, given necessary powers and functions to the Panchayats to formulate plans. However, barring a few states like Kerala, Karnataka, and Tamil Nadu, the track record of grassroots planning in the rest of the country is anything but inspiring. In fact, Kerala has taken a giant stride in this direction. For example, Kerala's much-hyped 'people's campaign for the Ninth Plan' may be mentioned. Under the programme, the Panchayats have been entrusted to prepare and prioritize projects in an integrated and scientific manner. The programme also ensured maximum participation of local people at every stage of the planning process. The decentralized planning model is not confined to Panchayats alone. The 74th Amendment Act has also made some provisions for decentralized planning via a few structural innovations like the Metropolitan Planning Committee and the District Planning Committee.

THE 73RD AND 74TH AMENDMENT ACTS: A CRITICAL APPRAISAL

In this section, we will critically apprise the 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendment Acts.

1. The clear definition of the term 'self' government, which is necessary for the devolution of power, authority, and responsibility, is conspicuous by its absence in the above mentioned amendment acts.
2. There is no clear-cut demarcation of power, functions, and responsibilities between rural and urban local bodies on the one hand and the state government on the other in Part IX and IX A of the Constitution.

3. The lack of clarity with regard to tax assignments and expenditure responsibilities is also another major shortcoming of the acts. Designed in the line of a healthy federal system, the Constitution has categorically distinguished the expenditure responsibilities and fund-raising domains between the union and states. However, the incorporation of 11th and 12th Schedules as the third stratum of the Indian federation has not mentioned any resource-raising assignment, implying that it would be decided by state governments.

4. It was argued that the separate Constitutional Amendment Acts for rural and urban areas have 'thoughtlessly constitutionalized' an 'artificial dichotomy between rural and urban when all previous thinking has stressed a continuum between the two' (Mukherjee 1999). Citing the observations made by the Rural–Urban Relationship Committee of 1963, originally set up to make recommendation on the supposed relationship between urban local bodies and the Panchayati Raj Institutions, Nirmal Mukherjee has justified his argument. Hence, segregating rural and urban local bodies would unnecessarily compartmentalize local development.

PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN RURAL AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

People's participation has been given utmost priority both in urban and rural development. Instead of imposing development from the above, nowadays, development is promoted from below.

Rural Development: Role of NGOs

Rural development has a typical statist bias. Until recently, it was considered as a state-led and state-induced development programme. But, of late, courtesy the neoliberal 'recipe' of rolling back the state and the consequent unification of market, it was found that state was no longer in a position to carry forward the huge task of community development single handedly. Confusions reigned supreme as a virtual battery of scholars soon plunged into the

scene. A host of possibilities were conjured up, which were ranging from 'rural development sans state paradigm' to an eventual eclipse of rural development. But, history proved those 'prophecies' false as rural development as a policy had shown no sign of recession, even though countries like India had already entered the third generation of economic reform. Quite to the contrary, rural development in India has been experiencing an altogether new paradigm of the government-organized non-governmental organization (GONGO) people-centric model, ever since she has plunged into a free market economy. Under the new circumstances the importance of NGOs or civil society organizations (to stretch the ambit of NGOs a bit further) has increased exponentially. A brief discussion on this new paradigm of rural development deserves some space here. Under this paradigm, NGOs and people are taken as joint stakeholders of development along with its seasoned campaigner state. Traditionally, the interaction between the state and voluntary organizations was either absent or was more of a regulatory nature. They were not considered as 'equal partners' in the nation-building process. Their activities remained confined to relief and welfare activities alone. However, the new paradigm calls for a consortium of government and non-governmental institutions with their common pool of resources to cater rural people. Non-governmental organizations are, therefore, supposed to supplement and complement the state in the process of rural development. Together, they can effectively attain the larger goal of people's empowerment and integrated rural development for which the country has been struggling for decades. The 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act, 1992, further endorsed the 'complementarities' between voluntary organizations and Panchayats in rural development. In essence, the role of NGOs in rural development can be summarized as follows: (*a*) to help the people help themselves in their endeavours to progress; (*b*) to promote the growth of inherent potentials among the people; (*c*) to initiate a progress of participatory development; (*d*) to bring about social justice for poor and create awareness about their rights and duties; (*e*) to promote growth in social, political, and economic aspects of life in rural areas; and (*f*) to devise policies through

networking with national and international agencies for sustainable development and facilitate the practice of the same.

National Policy on the Voluntary Sector, 2007

The Government of India has finally come out with a formal policy to deal with the voluntary sector, especially to figure out the supposed role of the voluntary sector in development. Until recently, this sector, especially its relations with the government, was dominated by a lot of ad hocism. The formulation of this new policy on voluntary sector has envisaged a road map of sorts for future development. The policy has acknowledged the partnering role of voluntary sector—including community-based organization, NGO, civil society organization, and so on—in the national development. This policy recognizes three instruments of partnership: (*a*) consultation, through a formal process of interaction at the centre, state, and district level; (*b*) strategic collaboration to tackle complex interventions where sustained social mobilization is critical over the long term; and (*c*) project funding through standard schemes. The government will ensure that these three instruments of partnership are given due attention in annual plans prepared by the ministries and states.

Role of NGOs and Citizen Groups in Urban Development

The very contour of urban governance has also undergone a sea change over the last couple of decades, thanks to the sweeping economic, political, and social transformation in the wake of globalization. With the progressive dissolution of trade and tariff barriers across the globe and the resultant networking of global market, cities are now emerging as 'management hubs' or 'logistic centres' (Harris 2003) in this *Borderless World* (Ohmae 1994). Hence, urban governance, which has so long been considered as an exclusive preserve of state, is now being seen as a collaborative effort of all the stakeholders in the urban space, having their respective roles to assert. The underlying impetus, however, is coming from

the NPM and its prescription of 'rolling-back the state'. Hence, there has been a partnership between the state and market and the NGO sector in the name of public–private partnership (PPP).

MAJOR RURAL AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES AND THEIR MANAGEMENT

In this section, we will cast some light on the major rural development programmes and their managements. The first part presents an overview of rural development programmes undertaken by the Indian state since Independence, while the second part of it critically analyses its management.

Community Development Programme

'There can hardly be a text without context.' Beginning with this modernist assumption, we can say that the community development programme (CDP) did not originate in 1952 itself. Rather, the contextual reference of a comprehensive community development plan can be traced back as early as 1943 and to be more specific in the campaign for increased food production in the wake of the devastating famine of 1943, which subsequently took an organized form in the Grow More Food Campaign (GMFC) since 1947. The GMFC had a two-pronged approach. First was to put more and more potentially productive land under agriculture and the second was to induce farmers to increase farm production. In the meanwhile, a couple of committees, namely, the Takurdass Committee and the Krisanamachari Committee were formed to review the GMFC programme, which in the process underlined the importance of a comprehensive rural development programme. Thus, it came into being in 1952 with a view to bringing about rapid transformation in the rural areas. Originally, it began with fifty-five projects across the country and covering a population of about 200,000 people. Soon, it became a national symbol of rural reconstruction and nation building. Even though, CDP put a lot of emphasis on agriculture, but it never lost sight of other allied aspects of rural living like communication, education, health,

training, social welfare, supplementary employment, housing, and so on. An elaborate organizational structure was put in place with the prime minister as the chairman of the central committee and the chief minister of state as the chairman of the state development committees. Moreover, to penetrate the development programmes at the grassroots level , districts were also divided into three tiers: district organization under the leadership of the district magistrate, block organizations under the sub-divisional officers, and village organizations under ten *Gram Sevak*s and two *Gram Sevika*s. The CDP also coincided with a not-so-ambitious scheme entitled National Extension Services Scheme (NES) launched in 1953 to supplement socioeconomic development in the rural areas, originally envisaged in CDP.

Intensive Agricultural District Programme

The Intensive Agricultural District Programme (IADP) was introduced in 1960 with an intention to correct the CDP's relative priority on agriculture. The rationale behind the introduction of IADP was the acute food crisis during late 1950s and the consequent recommendations by an Agricultural Production Team from the Ford Foundation, USA, for a matched effort to enhance agricultural produce on an exigency basis. The team submitted its report 'India's Food Crisis and Steps to Meet It' to the Government of India in 1959 and accordingly the IADP came into being in 1960. Self-reliance in food production was the guiding motive of this programme. Initially, seven districts were identified for implementation of IADP. These were Thanjavur (Tamil Nadu), West Godavari (Andhra Pradesh), Shahabad (Bihar), Raipur (Madhya Pradesh), Aligarh (Uttar Pradesh), Ludhiana (Punjab), and Pali (Rajasthan). It was further suggested that the programme would be subsequently implemented in one district in each of the fifteen states of the country. Since augmentation of agricultural production formed the core of IADP, naturally farm planning including identification of appropriate modalities for management became an inseparable part of it. Moreover, to facilitate increased farm production, a host of measures were taken under the programme,

some of which were accessibility of easy credit; availability of production requisites such as fertilizers, pesticides, and high yielding seeds; arrangements for marketing the farm produce through cooperatives; ensuring adequate storage facilities; strengthening transport facilities; and so on. Under the said programme, an effort was also made to train manpower associated with the implementation of the programme. However, IADP failed to live up to the expectation and it was felt that it required to be supplemented with another programme directed towards the same goal. Accordingly, a new programme of intensive agricultural development called the Intensive Agricultural Areas Programme (IAAP) was introduced in 1964. Together, they introduced a new strategy for increased agricultural development. The distinguishing features of this new strategy are (*a*) stress on high yielding varieties; (*b*) optimum utilization of production in areas with assured irrigation and rainfall by higher inputs through the intensive agricultural programmes; (*c*) introduction of short duration crops; and (*d*) effective utilization of the irrigation potential. This strategy is still in operation.

Specific Group and Area-specific Programmes

The origin of specific group and area-specific approach can be traced back to the failure of the growth-oriented strategy of the 1960s. Despite a lot of expectations, most of the growth-oriented strategies of 1960s failed to penetrate the structured poverty and unemployment in the rural heartlands. Consequently, a host of special programmes were launched from 1970s onwards with an intention to target the weaker sections of the rural population and backward areas. Notable among them were the Small Farmer Development Agency (SFDA), the Marginal Farmers and Agricultural Labourers (MFAL) programme, the Drought-prone Area Programme (DPAP), the Desert Development Programme (DDP), the Hill Area Development Programme (HADP), the Tribal Area Development Programme (TADP), the Crash Scheme for Rural Employment (CSRE), the Food For Work (FFW) programme, and the National Rural Employment Programme (NREP).

The Small Farmer Development Agency

The objective behind the formation of SFDA was to give a breather to the small farmers, who could not capitalize the fruits of green revolution and were compelled to lead a life in utter penury. The need for such agency was mooted by the All India Rural Credit Review Committee (1969) in its recommendation. The Fourth Five Year Plan put sincere efforts in this regard and lead to its birth during 1971–72.

The Marginal Farmers and Agricultural Labourers scheme

The MFAL scheme sought to bail out marginal farmers and agricultural labourers from the vicious circle of low productivity and consequent meagre incomes through a number of schemes like crop husbandry including multiple cropping; water harvesting techniques; minor irrigations; animal husbandry including livestock, poultry, and fishery; and so on. This project was financed partly in the form of subsidies and partly in the form of loans from cooperative and commercial banks.

Command area development authorities

This programme was introduced in 1974 with a view to modernizing scientifically the utilization of available water resources in irrigated areas under various irrigation projects launched after Independence.

The Drought-prone Area Programme

Considering specific climatic and topographical specificities, it was felt that ordinary rural works programme were not suitable enough to meet the challenges of rural development in drought-prone areas. Hence, a special area development approach, popularly known as the DPAP was put in place at the time of the mid-term appraisal of the Fourth Five Year Plan. The programme sought to reduce the severity of the impact of drought along with restoring ecological balance and income stabilization of the people. In this connection, a number of measures were earmarked. These were (*a*) development and management of water resources; (*b*) soil and moisture

conservation; (*c*) afforestation; (*d*) restructuring the cropping pattern and pasture development; (*e*) changes in agronomic practices; (*f*) livestock and dairy development; and (*g*) development of small farmers, marginal farmers, and agricultural labourers.

The Desert Development Programme

With a view to containing further desertification in the states, especially those covered by deserts and to bring down the adverse impact of drought on flora and fauna, the DDP came into being in 1977–78. The DDP, however, had differentiated desert areas into two categories—hot desert areas, that is, the hot arid areas of Rajasthan, Gujarat, and Haryana; and the cold desert areas, that is, the cold arid areas of Jammu and Kashmir and Himachal Pradesh and crafted the rural development strategies and programmes accordingly. The activities initiated under this programme were those of afforestation, water harvesting, rural electrification, animal husbandry along with sand dune stabilization, and shelter belt protection in the hot desert areas.

The Hill Area Development Programme

The hilly areas call for a special type of policy package for development. Hence, the HADP was initiated to bring about all-round development of the people residing in those rugged terrains.

Wage employment and infrastructure development programmes

The above-cited area development approaches notwithstanding, the problem of structured rural unemployment refused to die down. Hence, the government has initiated concerted efforts in this direction and accordingly several supplementary employment generation schemes like the Rural Works Programme (RWP), the Crash Scheme of Rural Employment (CSRE), Employment Guarantee Scheme (EGS), National Rural Employment Programme (NREP), Food for Work (FFW) programme, Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP), and others were introduced. Among the said programmes, a few are being discussed here.

Crash Scheme of Rural Employment

The crash scheme of rural development, as the name suggests, involves a considerable effort over a short period of time in order to achieve quick improvement in rural employment scenario. It was introduced in 1971. The central objective of this programme was to alleviate rural poverty along with generating durable assets in the rural areas.

The Food for Work Programme

The uniqueness of this programme was that under this programme, surplus foodgrains were used as wage payment at a subsidized rate. This system no doubt assured the minimum consumption for individuals and thereby minimum nutrition to the beneficiaries. The programme continued till 1980.

The National Rural Employment Programme

This programme was introduced during the Sixth Plan period with an avowed anti-poverty tilt. The major objectives of this programme were: (*a*) generation of additional gainful employment for the unemployed and underemployed men and women in the rural areas; and (*b*) generation of durable community assets to strengthen the rural infrastructure, which would lead to rapid growth of the rural economy, a steady rise in the income level of the rural poor, and an improvement in their nutritional status and living standard (Singh 1996).

Jawahar Rozgar Yojana

It was launched in 1989 via an amalgamation of the two ongoing employment generation schemes, that is, the NREP and RLEGP. It sought to provide additional employment opportunities to unemployed rural people during the lean season. Initially, though the programme targeted people below poverty line, but eventually SCs, STs, and freed bonded labourers were brought under its cover. The major components of JRY are (*a*) creation of physical assets; (*b*) creation of additional employment; (*c*) Indira Awas Yojana; (*d*) Million Well Scheme; (*e*) wage should comply Minimum Wages Act; (*f*) foodgrain distribution as one of the wage component under JRY; and (*g*) Operation Blackboard.

Operation Flood

'Operation Flood', as it was popularly known, came into being in 1970, with a view to achieve self-sufficiency in milk and milk products. About 10 million rural milk-producing households across the country were brought under its fold which ushered in a 'white revolution' of sorts. The origin of this programme can be traced back to 1964 when the Kaira (Kheda) District Cooperative Milk Producers' Union Ltd, better known as Anand Milk Union Ltd (AMUL), established the country's first-ever sophisticated computerized cattle feed-plan at Kanjari village. The programme laid emphasis on the following areas:

- It sought to upgrade dairy-processing facilities and capacities of the produce, including the setting up of new city milk plants;
- it sought to put a major portion of the urban market under the coverage of modern dairies;
- it sought to develop the basic transportation infrastructure along with strengthening the storage network to overcome regional and seasonal shortfall of milk production;
- it sought to improve milk procurement system in rural areas;
- finally, it sought to bring about an overall improvement of dairy farming through an improved programme of feeding and management, animal breeding, veterinary services, feed supplies, and related extension services.

Operation Flood sought to replicate the AMUL model of dairy development across the country. This saga of success is still continuing

Antyodaya Programme

'Antyodaya' literally means the 'development of the last man in the row'. This special programme of poverty alleviation was first launched in Rajasthan in 1977, which was subsequently emulated by the other states. The scheme was originated on the basis of field-level data gathered from a survey of 125 families drawn from twenty-five villages situated in five agro-climatic regions of Rajasthan. The scheme had a number of distinguishing features like universal area coverage; uniform coverage of the poorest of

poor; focus on a small denomination of the poor called poorest of the poor at a time, rather than concentrating the entire group of rural poor; focus on identification of poor families instead of treating the poor as an abstract category; roping in of village communities for the identification of the beneficiaries of the scheme. The programme also co-opted the beneficiary families in deciding upon the assistance package for them. The scheme was solely relied on the economic criteria for the selection of beneficiary families. Under the scheme, interest subsidy was provided by the state on loans taken from the cooperatives and assistance provided mostly in kind rather than in cash. Finally, the programme was made flexible.

Integrated Rural Development Programme

The IRDP is considered to be the single largest poverty eradication programme in India. It was launched in 1978–79 in 2,300 odd blocks which was subsequently extended to all the blocks in the country.

The programme sought to salvage rural poor from the scourge of structured poverty. Hence, an annual target of elevating 600 households to above poverty line was earmarked under the programme. By October 1980, the programme was further extended to cover all the 5,011 blocks throughout the country. The programme was basically an amalgamation of the various approaches tested and found effective in India's rural development programmes. They were the IADP's package approach, the Small Farmers and Marginal Farmers Development Agency's target group approach, the Drought-Prone Area Programme's and the Command Area Development Agency's cluster approach, the Antyodaya Programme's *antyodaya* approach, and others. The programme has applied a two-pronged approach in selecting the villages and the beneficiaries therein for its successful implementation, namely, a cluster approach for the selection of villages and an *antyodaya* approach, that is, selection of the poorest of the poor first, for the selection of beneficiaries.

The programme seeks to achieve enhanced rural production, greater socioeconomic equality, a spatial balance in social and economic development, and broad-based community participation in the process of development.

Training of Rural Youth for Self-employment

As an inalienable part of the IRDP programme, the Training of Rural Youth for Self-employment (TRYSEM) was introduced in 1979 to eliminate increasing unemployment among the rural youth. Under the programme, rural youth in the age group of 18 to 35 years were targeted for necessary training of skill improvement so that they could earn their livelihood. The scheme includes a modest stipend during training along with financial assistance for self-employment venture afterward.

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005, is considered to be a milestone in the history of rural development in India. It was brought into force by the union government in 2006. Unlike the previous employment generation schemes, NREGA for the first time legally guarantees employment to India's poor population. The act guarantees 100 days unskilled jobs per rural household. It further states that if the government fails to ensure employment to the rural poor, it has to dole out unemployment allowance to them. The underlying objective of the act is to eradicate poverty from various pockets of rural hinterland and to make villages self-sustaining through the creations of productive assets such as water tanks, soil conservation works, and so on. Initially, 200 most-backward districts of twenty-seven states were identified for the implementation of the programme. According to the Union Rural Development Ministry's figures, more than 1.36 crore people—above 1 per cent of India's total population—have been given jobs under the act. Schedule I of the act enumerates eight categories of work that are supposed to be the 'focus of the scheme'. Some of these are:

1. Water conservation and water harvesting; drought proofing (including afforestation and tree plantation), irrigation canals (including micro and minor irrigation work);
2. Provision of irrigation facility to land owned by households belonging to SCs and STs or to land of beneficiaries of land reforms or that of the beneficiaries under the Indira Awas Yojana of the Government of India;

3. Renovation of traditional water bodies (including desilting of tanks);
4. Land development;
5. Flood control and protection works (including drainage of water-logged areas);
6. Rural connectivity to provide all-weather access.

In addition, there is a residual nine category, that is, any other work which may be notified by the central governement in consultation with the state government.

Under the act, each state is supposed to formulate a Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme within six months of its enactment. Broadly speaking, the village and intermediary Panchayats are entrusted with the task of implementation activities, while coordination activities are left to the district level. Planning, supervision, and monitoring take place at all levels. The government decided to extend the act throughout the country from April 2008.

Major Urban Development Programmes

In this section, we have identified some important urban development projects, namely, the Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNURM), the Nehru Rozgar Yojana; Urban Basic Services for the Poor; and the Environmental Improvement of Urban Slums.

Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission

It is an enormous city modernization scheme undertaken by the Government of India way back in 2005. It earmarks a total investment of a whooping US$20 billion over a period of seven years. This flagship scheme was launched by the Prime Minister Monmohan Singh in 2005 with a view to improving the quality of life and infrastructure in the cities. Assistance provided under the JNNURM project can grouped into two categories—financial assistance and area assistance. This project has two sub-missions:

1. *Sub-mission for Urban Infrastructure and Governance*: This include projects relating to water supply and sanitation, sewerage, solid waste management, road network, urban

transport, and redevelopment of old city areas with a view to upgrading infrastructure therein, shifting industrial and commercial establishments to conforming areas, and so on.

2. *Sub-mission for Basic Services to the Urban Poor*: The main thrust of this sub-mission will be on integrated development of slums through projects for providing shelter, basic services, and other related civic amenities with a view to providing utilities to the urban poor.

Objectives

Major objectives of JNNURM, as identified in the project document, can be summarized as follows:

- Focused attention to integrated development of infrastructure services in cities covered under the mission;
- establishment of linkages between asset-creation and asset-management through a slew of reforms for long-term project sustainability;
- ensuring adequate funds to meet the deficiencies in urban infrastructural services;
- planned development of identified cities including peri-urban areas, outgrowths, and urban corridors leading to dispersed urbanization;
- scale-up delivery of civic amenities and provision of utilities with emphasis on universal access to the urban poor;
- special focus on urban renewal programme for the old city areas to reduce congestion; and
- provision of basic services to the urban poor including security of tenure at affordable prices, improved housing, water supply and sanitation, and ensuring delivery of other existing universal services of the government for education, health and social security.

Evaluation

Rural development gets optimum priority in India's overall national planning. More than fifty years down the line, ever since it was first introduced in 1952 in the form of CDP, it has been

continuing as an inseparable part of our planning process. The priorities, however, keep changing from time to time depending upon the socioeconomic context and obviously the political complexion at the centre. Any cursory glance at our five-year plans would corroborate the fact. For example, the CDP was the central concern of the First Five Year Plan, which embodied country's obsession about nation building with equity. The rural development programmes during the Second Five Year Plan, however, had to suffer a huge set back as the national priority was tilted towards rapid industrialization. Consequently, agricultural productivity, which was the mainstay of the first plan, had to suffer a massive deficit. By the middle of the second plan, coupled with the spectre of an emerging food crisis, the need for a new approach of increased food production was doing rounds in the administrative circuits. In the meantime, a group of the Ford Foundation sponsored American agricultural scientists had mooted the issue of an alternative programme of intensive agricultural production to compensate the shortfall and to avert the crisis. Accordingly, the IADP was born. Initially, it was launched in seven selected districts as a package programme, but by 1960–61, eight more districts were brought under its fold. Unlike the equity-based criterion of the CDP, IADP employed the concentration principle in deploying resources. The major objective of this programme was to augment agricultural productivity through the use of complementary inputs and services at the farm level. Farm planning, therefore, constituted the core of IADP. By the late 1960s, a host of growth-oriented agricultural development programmes like IAAP, the High Yielding Variety Programme (HYVP), and Intensive Cattle Development Programme (ICDP) were initiated to substantiate the shortfall of agricultural products. But eventually, it was found that the growth-oriented programmes of 1960s failed to reduce rural poverty. Hence, a host of special programmes like the SFDA, MFAL, DPAP, TADP, and others, were directed towards 'weaker sections' and 'economically depressed areas' with a view to bringing down rural poverty and backwardness through self-employment. In the meantime, an intervention in terms of Minimum Needs Programme (MNP) was made to supplement other income

generation programmes along with provision of civic amenities and communal facilities. However, rural poverty refused to die down despite above efforts. The IRDP was basically a desperate effort on the part of the government of India to banish poverty forever. The programme, however, failed to make any major headway in the overall situation of rural India. In the meanwhile, some new programmes were introduced while a few old were discarded and the experimentations continued. Moreover, political interventions further complicated the situation as political parties with their own agendas do often intervene in the rural development and try to build their own constituency. Examples galore when some rural development programmes took political overtones.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

In the foregoing analysis, an attempt has been made to situate the wave of decentralization that has swept the country since the 1990s. Decentralization has been identified as one of the important prerequisites of good governance. From a totalitarian regime to one of professed democratic system, all seem to have taken refuge behind this capacious term. As a flexible and fluid discourse, it suits every ideological pursuit. If one starts tracking the evolution of the concept of decentralization, he or she will find that the concept has no fixed ideological fountainhead. More interestingly, it has been used by both the Left and Right for their respective interests. Traditionally, it was conceptualized as an organizational innovation to ease off the pressure of over-bureaucratized public organization. But, with the onset of globalization, the concept of decentralization has become the surrogate of the market. India has embarked upon decentralization experiments in 1992, through a couple of path-breaking legislations. The 73rd and the 74th Amendment Acts have been appreciated for bringing about a kind of tectonic shifts at the subterranean level of Indian polity. They have transformed the very complexion of local governance from a subjugated status to that of a self-reliant one. These amendments have accorded constitutional recognition to rural and urban local bodies. They

have addressed the persistent problems of irregular elections, suppression, inadequate representation, insufficient devolution of powers, lack of administrative and financial autonomy, and inadequate resources. The new process has democratized the local self-governments at rural and urban areas and brought substantive democracy at the grassroots level.

Though India's decentralization initiative coincided with India's entry into the free-market economy, it was not driven by the force of globalization. There were serious political compulsions before the political leadership, which had forced them to bring forward the issue of local democracy. This is as the decades of the 1970s and 1980s had witnessed several anti-establishment movements on the basis of ethnic, religious, and linguistic identities across the country. The militant secessionist movements of north-eastern states, Punjab, Northern Hilly Tract of West Bengal, and the demand for separate statehood in Bihar and Uttar Pradesh had challenged the credibility of Indian state to govern. Under the circumstances, sharing power with communities at the grassroots level was conceived as a desperate attempt to release the mounting pressure on the Indian state. Moreover, it was thought that the policy of decentralization would have substantially downsized the powers of the opposition-ruled recalcitrant and demanding state governments, and would help the centre to establish a direct linkage with district collectors and the Panchayat Raj bodies, bypassing state governments. The expectation was that the acts would transform the very complexion of local governance. However, reality resurfaced soon after the initial hype died down in the form of over-politicization, lack of accountability, lack of clarity in delegation of power and authority, state intervention, and the resultant lop-sided developments. Hence, to make local governments true self-governing institutions, the following steps need to be taken: First, the people need to be properly mobilized to shoulder the responsibility of governing themselves. In most cases, the necessity of self-rule was felt by the academicians or planners, and then imposed upon the people from the above. Hence, to make local governance truly participatory, the opinion of the people concerned needs to be honoured. Second, the so-called third stratum needs

to be strengthened by ushering in a multi-level partnership at the sub-state level by harnessing several stakeholders of development, like the government, non-governmental sectors, civil society organizations, and private business houses. Third, the local governance needs to be seen from a holistic perspective, where rural and urban self-governing institutions should not be treated in a compartmentalized way. This is because rural and urban development cannot be conceptually segregated, as the success of one is squarely contingent upon the success of the other. Hence, we should look beyond the 'rural or urban only bias' of the Constitutional Amendment Acts.

NOTES

1. The post-Fordist notion of organization, unlike the Fordist notion of organization based on

   > … mass production of standardized product at a price that would generate mass consumption, capital intensive large plant, rigid hierarchical and bureaucratic managerial structure, use of semi-skilled labour, strong unionization etc., refers to new form of organization based on smaller enterprise, catering for segmented market by flexible production of specialized goods and services. (Jary and Jary 2000)

   The distinguishing features of the post-Fordist organization are decline of old large manufacturing units (smoke stack industries) and rise of 'sun-rise industries', more flexible, decentralized forms of labour process and of work organization, decline of blue-collar unionism and dominance of white-collar workers, change in the nature of consumption by customizing product in accordance with individual life style, and so on. For details see Jary and Jary (2000).

2. Imrie and Raco (1999) have elucidated the concept of local governance. For details, see Imrie and Raco (1999).

3. Business and politics have had a discreet relationship in India. It has been a hush-hush affair in Indian polity. Despite having close rapport, neither business houses nor politicians feel at ease about this relationship.

4. Financing local bodies is the most contested terrain, as local bodies are perennially complaining of resource crunch and asking for more liberal release of funds. The introduction of local governance is said to have substantially improved the situation by allowing the local bodies to mobilize their own funds.

5. Contracting out of public services to the private service providers through competitive bidding has become the most common technique of public sector reform across the globe. This technique has now been widely used

to bail out loss-making public sector enterprises by infusing a spirit of competitiveness.

6. Quality service initiatives include Total Quality Management (TQM), counter services, Citizen's Charter, and others.

7. TQM seeks to provide customers with fast, accurate, and fair services in a courteous manner. It has now become synonymous with quality assurance declaration. The origin of the concept can be traced back to W. Edward Deming, who has been instrumental for the revival of the Japanese industrial system.

8. Citizen's Report Card is also a commonly used technique to judge people's opinion regarding a particular product or service, where the citizens are asked to vote on the quality of services through a questionnaire.

9. Traditionally, citizens are considered as the passive recipient, who cannot have their choices. Thanks to NPM, this perception has undergone a sea change.

10. Today, citizens are couched as active customers to be always kept in good humour.

11. Local governance is now conceptualized as a joint venture, where public–private–NGO have come into close interface.

12. Though local governance has a rich legacy in India, it had to wait till 1992 to get constitutional status. The colonial rulers were more preoccupied with the interest of the Empire. Hence, the formal institutional beginning since era of Lord Ripon had failed make much progress as it remained mostly an administrative enterprise. Local people were mostly remained at the margin. No serious attempt was made to integrate them into a system of local governance. Even after Independence, the status of local governance had not changed substantially. The only difference was the change of guards, not the change in the spirit of governance. Consequently, the issue of governance had converted into an ornamental part of the Constitution. It was only in 1992, under the Narashima Rao government, that the issue of local governance got its much coveted constitutional status.

13. Local governance in Indian tradition of local democracy is as old as Indian civilization itself. There had been a vibrant tradition of local democracy for centuries together in India, remained almost unaffected and self-sufficient, despite the vicissitude of political empires at the central level. However, no serious effort had been made to unlock the spirit of these 'little village republics', barring a few visionary personalities like Mahatma Gandhi, Tagore, and others.

14. Several visionary thinkers like Tagore and Gandhi have tried in their own capacity to resurrect this tradition for the betterment of this country.

15. Little village republics had demonstrated remarkable forms of governance.

16. The basic objective of the colonial government was not to govern India, but to expand the British Empire. Hence, absolutely no attempt was made on the part of the colonial government to improve the quality of governance in the colony, barring a few steps to sustain the interest of the colonizer.

17. The colonial government was pretty selective in providing local governance. The colonial government had introduced local government, that too in the urban areas, especially in a few pockets of European settlement to cater army and the Europeans.

18. The colonial administration for the interest of the Empire had centralized the colonial administration by establishing three metropolitan centres or presidencies in Madras, Bombay, and Calcutta with urban local governance and left the entire country as the hinterland.

19. The concept of *Gram Swaraj* forms the heart of Gandhi's social reconstruction programme. The idea of *Gram Swaraj* literally means 'village self-rule'. Gandhi viewed that the idea of freedom was a holistic scheme, which should not be confined to mere change of guards. It invariably included freedom from reliance and dependence. He wanted thousands of Indian villages to be self sufficient, so that each village could fulfil all its necessities of life—food, clothing, clean water, sanitation, housing, and education—on its own.

20. The framers of Indian Constitution had shared an inherent antipathy towards the village republics. As the torch-bearers of Western modernity, they thought elevating village republics to be the forms of self governance would be myopic. Hence, they strongly argued against it.

REFERENCES

Andrew, Caroline and Michael Goldsmith. 1998. 'From Local Government to Local Governance: And beyond?', *International Political Science Review*, 19 (2, New Trends in Municipal Government, April): 101–17.

Baviskar, B.S. and George Mathew (eds). 2009. *Inclusion and Exclusion in Local Governance: Field Studies from Rural India*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Bhattacharya, Mohit. 2008. *New Horizons of Public Administration*. New Delhi: Jawahar Publisher.

Cheema, G.S. and D.A. Rondinelli (eds). 1983. *Decentralization and Development: Policy Implementation in Developing Countries*. Beverly Hills, California: SAGE Publications.

Denter, Bas and Lawrence E. Rose. 2005. *Comparing Local Governance: Trends and Developments*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Desouza, Peter Ronald. 2002. 'Decentralization and Local Government: The "Second Wave" of Democracy in India', in Zoya Hasan, E. Sridharan, and R. Sudarshan (eds), *India's Living Constitution: Ideas, Practices, Controversies*. Delhi: Permanent Black.

Drèze, Jean and Amartya Sen. 2002. *India: Development and Participation*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Fesler, James W. 1965. 'Approaches to the Understanding of Decentralization', *Journal of Politics*, 27 (3): 536–66.

GoI. 1957. 'Committee on Plan Projects: Study Team' (Chairman: Balwantrai G. Mehta). New Delhi: Planning Commission, Government of India.

Harris, Nigel. 2003. 'Globalization and the Management of Indian Cities', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 38 (25, 21 June).

Imrie, Rob and Mike Raco. 1999. 'How New Is the New Local Governance? Lessons from the United Kingdom', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, New Series, 24 (1): 45–63. Available at http://www.jstor.org/stable/623344 (accessed on 6 May 2008).

Iyer, Lakshmi, Ejaz Ghani, and Saurabh Mishra. 2010. 'Is Decentralization Helping the Lagging Regions?', in Ejaz Ghani (ed.), *The Poor Half Billion in South Asia: What Is Holding Back Lagging Regions?* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Jary, David and Julia Jary. 2000. *Collins Dictionary of Sociology* (3rd edition). Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers.

Jayal, Nirja Gopal. 2007. *Local Governance in India: Decentralization and Beyond*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Jha, S.N. and P.C. Mathur (ed). 1999. *Decentralization and Local Politics*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Kothari, Rajni. 1988. *State against Democracy: In Search of Human Governance*. New Delhi: Ajanta.

Kumar, Girish. 2006. *Local Democracy in India: Interpreting Decentralization*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Meenakshisundaram, S.S. 1999. 'Decentralization in Developing Countries', in S.N. Jha and P.C. Mathur (eds), *Decentralization and Local Politics*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Mukherjee, Nirmal. 1999. 'The Third Stratum', in S.N. Jha and P.C. Mathur (eds), *Decentralization and Local Politics*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

National Commission to Review the Working of the Constitution. 2001. 'Review of the Working of the Constitutional Provisions for Decentralization (Panchyats)', Consultation Paper, New Delhi.

Ohmae, Kenichi. 1994. *The Borderless World: Power and Strategy in Global Marketplace*. London: HarperCollins.

Palanithurai, G. 2005. 'Development Roles Reversed: People's Initiative and Government's Participation', in L.C. Jain (ed.), *Decentralization and Local Governance*. New Delhi: Orient Longman.

Rondinelli, D.A., J.R. Nellis, and G.S. Cheema. 1984. *Decentralization in Developing Countries*. Washington: World Bank.

Singh, Baldev. 1996. *Decentralization, Panchayati Raj and District Planning*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publisher and Distributers.

Singh, Katar. 2009. *Rural Development: Principle, Policies and Management* (3rd edition). New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Srivastava, Ravi. 2002. 'Evaluation of Anti-Poverty Programmes in Uttar Pradesh: Study Report'. New Delhi: Planning Commission.

Vithal, B.P.R. 1997. 'Evolving Trends in the Bureaucracy', in Partha Chatterjee (ed.), *State and Politics in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Chapter 7

Social Welfare Administration

Learning Objectives
- To understand the concept of social welfare and social welfare administration
- To illustrate the structure and functions of social welfare administration
- To elucidate the role of social welfare administration in protecting the weaker sections of society in India
- To critically examine effectiveness of welfare programmes in India and suggest the ways to make them more effective and fruitful

The concept of 'social welfare' has developed in connection with the social problems of the industrial society. Poverty, sickness, suffering, and social disorganization have existed throughout the history of mankind, but the industrial society of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries had to face so many social problems that the older human institutions—family, neighbourhood, church, and local community—could no longer adequately meet them. The need for a broader system of social services was required. Since that time, the government has taken an increasingly greater responsibility for the well-being of the citizens. This chapter will primarily discuss the concept of 'social welfare', social welfare administration, and its role in protecting the weaker sections in India.

CONCEPT OF SOCIAL WELFARE

Social welfare refers to the organized provisions and services for the society to deal with social problems. This broad definition of social welfare is also corroborated by some distinguished writers on the subject. According to Walter A. Friedlander, 'Social Welfare is the organized services and institutions, designed to aid individuals and groups to attain satisfying standards of life and health, and personal and social relationships which permit them to develop their full capacities and to promote their well-being in harmony with the needs of their families and the community' (Friedlander 1967: 4). Richard Tutmus defines social welfare as 'all collective interventions to meet certain needs of the individual; and or to serve the wider interests of society'. Harold Wilensky and Charles Lebeaux define social welfare as those formally organized and socially sponsored institutions, agencies, and programmes which function to maintain or improve the economic conditions, health, or interpersonal competence of some parts or all of a population (Wilensky and Lebeaux 1958: 17). According to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (1972: 389), social welfare 'is a system of laws and institutions with which a government attempts to protect and promote the economic and Social Welfare of its citizens, usually based on various forms of social insurance against unemployment, accident, illness and old age'.

Social welfare, in a broad sense, encompasses the well-being and interest of a large number of people, including their physical, mental, emotional, spiritual, and economic needs. In other words, social welfare includes the basic institutions and processes related to facing and solving social problems; those problems which affect large number of people and which require some kind of concerted group effort to resolve. The purpose of welfare is to assist individuals in need. The ultimate goal is to lift the welfare recipients out of adverse situation and make them self-sufficient. Amartya Sen argues that enhancing an individual's capabilities results in the greater likelihood for individual success and society's success. Enhancing freedoms is one means for development (Sen 2000). Sen argues that many people around the world suffer from varieties of 'unfreedoms', which can be in the form of famine, lack of health

care, and gender discrimination. In this regard, welfare provides individuals with the basic needs necessary to live a healthy life with the capability to enjoy the freedoms that are inherently available to all. Therefore, it is essential to note the importance of welfare for underprivileged individual who need governmental assistance in the form of welfare. Andrew Heywood gives the following arguments in favour of welfare:

- It promotes social cohesion and national unity, in that it gives all citizens a 'stake' in society and guarantees at least basic social support;
- it enlarges freedom in the sense that it safeguards people from poverty and provides conditions in which they can develop and realize their potential;
- it ensures prosperity by countering the effects of social deprivation and helping those who cannot help themselves; and
- it serves as a redistributive mechanism that promotes greater equality and strengthens a sense of social responsibility (Heywood 2005: 152).

APPROACHES TO SOCIAL WELFARE

In their classic analysis of social welfare, Wilensky and Lebeaux (1967: 23) define two conceptions—the residual and institutional. The first holds that social welfare institutions should come into play only when the normal structures of supply, the family, and the market, break down. The second, in contrast, sees the welfare services as normal, 'first line' functions of modern industrial society. These are the concepts around which drives for more or for less welfare services that tend to focus. They represent a compromise between the values of economic individualism and free enterprise on the one hand and security, equality, and humanitarianism on the other.

The residual concept is based on the premise that there are two 'natural' channels through which an individual's needs are properly met—the family and the market economy. These are the preferred structures of supply. However, sometimes these institutions do not

function adequately; family life is disrupted, depressions occur, or sometimes the individual cannot make use of normal channels because of old age or illness. In such cases, according to this idea, a third mechanism of need fulfilment is brought into play—the social welfare structure. This is conceived as a residual agency, attending primarily to emergency functions, and is expected to withdraw when regular social structure—the family and the economic system—is again working properly. The residual concept was more popular in the US before the Great Depression of 1929 than it is now.

The institutional notion views social welfare as a necessary ongoing function of a complex, interdependent society, and as a normal social institution to help individuals realize their potential and make optimum use of available resources. It disavows the notion that social welfare is primarily a crisis service. Social welfare becomes accepted as a proper, legitimate function of modern industrial society in helping individuals achieve self-fulfilment. The complexity of modern life is recognized. The inability of the individual to provide fully for himself, or to meet all his needs in family and work settings, is considered a 'normal' condition, and the helping agencies achieve 'regular' institutional status.

While these two views seem antithetical, in practice American social work has tried to combine them, and current trends in social welfare represent a middle course. Paul Weinberger is of the opinion that neither ideology exists in a vacuum, each is a reflection of broader cultural and societal conditions, and with further industrialization the second is likely to prevail.

SOCIAL WELFARE AND RELATED CONCEPTS

Social welfare is generally confused with 'social service', 'social work', and 'social security'. This confusion and ambiguity has arisen because of the fact that they all have an identical and similar aim, namely, well-being of the people. However, they have different meaning and connotations. Social work is a professional service, based upon scientific knowledge and skill in human relations, which assists individuals, alone or in groups, to obtain social and personal satisfaction and independence. It is usually performed by

a social agency or a related organization. The term 'social welfare' has a broader implication than professional social work. By 'social security', we understand a programme of protection provided by the society against those contingencies of modern life—sickness, unemployment, old age dependency, industrial accidents, and invalidism—which the individual cannot be expected to protect himself and his family by his own ability or foresight. This general goal of social protection is secured through the various forms of public assistance—social insurance and preventive health and welfare services. In general use, private social welfare activities are, however, an important part of the system of social welfare in most countries. Finally, 'social services' are those which are meant for the normal population. They seek to meet the basic needs of the people and include services for health, education, housing, and so on, which would be available to all irrespective of their economic status. Their aim is to develop the human resources of the country. Social welfare services on the other hand, are those which are required by the vulnerable sections of the society and include services for the traditionally underprivileged groups such as women, children, and backward classes. In other words, they are enabling services for persons and groups that cannot take full advantages of the services available for the normal population.

The terms 'social service', 'social work', and 'social security' are directed towards the welfare of people. It would be appropriate to designate social welfare as the major activity for the well-being of citizens of a country, and the other activities as its means and approaches to subserve the primary objective of securing welfare of the people concerned in the respective lands.

MAJOR TRAITS OF SOCIAL WELFARE

Wilensky and Lebeaux (1967: 25) identify five major traits which, taken together, distinguish and constitute the substance of social welfare. These traits are as follows:

1. *Formal organization:* Social Welfare activities are formally organized. Individual charity, though they may increase or

decrease welfare, are not organized. Modern social welfare has really to be thought of as help given to the stranger, not to the person who by reason of personal bond commands it without asking. It assumes a degree of social distance between helped and helper. Welfare services are a different kind of 'help'. They consist of regular, full-time, and recognized agencies that carry on the welfare business.

2. *Social sponsorship and accountability*: Social auspices refer to the existence of socially sanctioned purposes and methods, while formal accountability is the crucial element in social welfare service. Some mechanism for expressing the public interest and rendering the service accountable to the larger community is an essential part of social sponsorship. For public services in a democratic society, the mechanism is simply the representative structure of government. For voluntary agencies accountability is typically, though less certainly, achieved through a governing board. The principle of accountability is acknowledged in privately as well as publically sponsored organizations.

3. *Absence of profit motive*: Absence of profit motive is a dominant programme purpose of social welfare. The services and goods produced by the market economy and purchased by the individuals with many derived from competitive participation in that economy are not social welfare. Profitable and most fee-for-service activities are excluded. Social welfare objectives can be intimately associated with what is basically profit-making enterprise, as when a private business provides recreation facilities, pension plans, or nurseries for its employees. Since such services attend human wants quite peripheral to the purpose of the organization, they neither share in nor alter the nature of the underlying profit-making activity. The latter remains non-welfare, while the former are essentially social welfare programmes under business auspices. This view gain support from the observation that separate structures for the administration of welfare services often develop within the business enterprise, and constitute a kind of 'social auspice'.

4. *Functional generalization*: Since, almost the entire gamut of culturally conditioned human needs may be unfulfilled and since human capacities that can be developed are many, welfare services to meet these needs and enhance capacities will subsequently be varied. Placing babies in foster homes, operating a recreation programme, administering social insurance, developing medical service in a rural community—the substantive activities here have little in common. A great variety of activities are properly described as 'functionally generalized', that is, welfare services are found attached to, or performing in place of, medical institutions, the family, education, industry, wherever there is unfulfilled need. From this characteristic derives, in part at least, the comprehensive view of human needs and personality that distinguishes social work from other professions.

5. *Direct concern with human consumption needs:* Government welfare services can be distinguished from other governmental services as they provide direct services to meet immediate consumption needs of individuals and families, rather than the needs of the general society. Soil conservation and development of water power resources that ultimately result into human welfare, are not typically defined as social welfare, but feeding the hungry and finding homes for dependent children, are so defined. Thus, welfare services have direct effects on welfare of individuals and families.

SOCIAL WELFARE AND THE WELFARE STATE

A welfare state is a concept of government where the state plays the primary role in the protection and promotion of the economic and social well-being of its citizens. It is based on the principles of equality of opportunity, equitable distribution of wealth, and public responsibility for those unable to avail themselves of the minimal provisions for a good life. The sociologist T.H. Marshall (1950) identifies the welfare state as a distinctive combination of democracy, welfare, and capitalism. Interest in welfare emerged

during the nineteenth century as industrialization created a spectre of urban poverty and social division that, in different ways, distributed conservative, liberal, and socialist politicians.

It was predominantly in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that an organized system of state welfare provision was introduced in many countries. Germany is generally held to be the first social welfare state. Bismarck (1815–98) introduced for the first time a nationwide system of social insurance. Dramatic changes took place in the aftermath of the First World War. The Russian Revolution of 1917 led to the abolition of private property and institutionalized the ascendancy of the state through central planning and thus made the state control all economic activity. The US did not have an organized welfare system until the Great Depression, when emergency relief measures were introduced under President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The government was concerned with the growing public uprising against capitalism, so it established a system to assist families with little or no income. During the great depression, the welfare state was seen as an alternative 'middle way' between communism and capitalism.

In the UK, the beginning of the modern welfare state was in 1911 when David Lloyd George introduced the National Insurance System which was later expanded by Clement Attlee. The Beveridge Report (Beveridge 1942) is another landmark in the history of social welfare in the UK. This was a report, proposing social welfare provisions for the entire population of a country from 'cradle to the grave'. In pursuance of the report, Britain developed a comprehensive social security system to fight what Beveridge has called the five giant evils—disease, ignorance, squalor, idleness, and want. It gave priority to family allowances, tax-supported comprehensive health services, and a universal scheme of national income support insurance which was to provide subsistence income in unemployment, sickness, and retirement and was also to cover maternity, widowhood, and funeral costs.

Another event was unleashed by the Second World War leading to the collapse of the colonial rule in the world and the emergence of the newly developing nations of Asia and Africa. These newly decolonized nations were clamouring for social insurance. This

heralded the advent of the activist state for governance. Although a welfare consensus developed in the early post 1945 period as paternalistic conservatives, modern liberals, and social democrats unified in support for at least the principle of welfare, the 1980s and 1990s witnessed a general retreat from welfare, even among socialist, brought about in part by the pressures of economic globalization. Nevertheless, welfare remains one of the central fault lines in ideological debate, dividing pro-welfarist social democrats and modern liberals from anti-welfarist libertarians and supporters of the New Right.

SOCIAL WELFARE ADMINISTRATION

Administration is of crucial importance, as a method of social welfare, since all the policies and programmes formulated for the welfare of people and the financial allocations made for their implementation, would be of little avail unless adequate administrative mechanisms and processes, manned by properly trained and motivated staff are also given due importance and recognition. Social welfare administration can be defined as the process of transforming social policy into social services; it is the process of implementation and of translating policies into action programmes. According to Arthur Kruse (1960), the administrative process seeks to mobilize the total resources of the agency to the end that its purposes are translated into efficient and effective services. Forder (1974: 1) holds the view that social administration is concerned with the study of welfare system and particularly the government-sponsored social services.

Richard Titmus defines social administration as:

… study of social services whose object is the improvement of the conditions of life of the individual in the setting of family and group relations. It is concerned with the development of these services, both statutory and voluntary, the moral values implicit in social action, the roles and functions of the services, their economic aspects and the part they play in meeting certain needs in the social process—all are important and need to be explored in social welfare administration. (Titmus 1985: 14–15)

John Kidneigh defines social welfare administration as 'the process of transforming a social policy into social services—a two way process of transforming policy into concrete social services and the use of experience in recommending modification of policy' (Kidneigh 1959: 58). This definition encompasses the idea that administration is the process of implementation and translating policies into action programmes. Rosemary Sarri and Arthur Dunham list out the following activities of social welfare administration:

- Translation of social mandate into operational policies and goals to guide organizational behaviour;
- design of organizational structures and processes through which goals can be achieved;
- securing resources in the form of materials, staff, clients, and social legitimation necessary for goal attainment and organizational survival;
- selection and engineering of the necessary technology;
- optimizing organizational behaviour directed towards increased effectiveness and efficiency; and
- evaluation of organizational performance to facilitate systematic and continuous problem solving.

In brief, social welfare administration refers to the process of applying professional standards, competence, and resources to secure successful implementation of the targeted programmes of social welfare through various social agencies—officials, and voluntary—for the fulfilment of the ideals, goals, and aspirations. In order to make an agency more effective to render social welfare services to community, it has to adopt certain administrative, financial, and procedure modifications which every official and worker in the agency has to understand.

Social welfare administration constitutes a branch, subdivision, or a sub-set of public administration. Its scope extends from the diagnosis of the emergence of social problems in all time, initiating measures to eradicate them through social legislation and the creation of public awareness, to the provision of social welfare services for the deprived, disadvantaged, and underprivileged

sections of society with a view to alleviate their sufferings and to ameliorate their lot. Both as a discipline and a profession, it is yet in its nascent stage. It is apparent that the charity organization movement helped to bring into existence schools of social work that taught knowledge and skills related to administration. The beginning of formal education started in 1898, when the New York charity organization society established a summer school for volunteers and others who wanted to 'deepen their understanding of the poor people they were dedicated to helping'. In 1904, this offering was extended to a one-year programme and to a two-year programme in 1910. At about the same time, educational innovations were appearing in other parts of the country. At the University of Chicago in 1901, a series of courses in social welfare were offered under the extension department. This programme was formalized in 1908 with the incorporation of the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, the forerunner of the school of Social Service Administration. The courses and programmes in these pioneering schools of social work provided students with some knowledge about and skills related to administration as part of general, total curriculum. At first, administration was not considered to be separate from direct services and practice. By 1914, however, a course in administration was offered by at least one school of social work. The First World War and the Great Depression gave added stimulus to more formal education for those who would provide leadership in administering social service programmes. In 1936, a paper on administration was presented for the first time at the National Conference on Social Work. By 1944, enough interest in administration had developed, so that when the new curriculum for the schools of social work was agreed upon, administration was included as one of the 'basic eight' adopted by the American Association of School, which is substantiated by the fact that the American National Conference on Social Work (1946) sponsored a section on administration for the first time.

In order to meet the requirement of education and training in social welfare administration in India, Sir Dorabji Tata Graduate of Social Work, Mumbai (which now is known by Tata Institute of Social Science), was the first to be founded in 1936, to be followed

by Delhi School of Social Work in 1947–48, School of Social Work at the University of Baroda, and thereafter, a large number of departments of social work in various universities and post-graduate colleges were started. These included social welfare administration as a major component in their curriculum and some universities and institutes like the Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai, have also started independent courses in social welfare administration.

PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL WELFARE ADMINISTRATION

The following principles are generally recognized as being in accordance with social welfare practices and experiences and are observed by all well-administered social agencies:

- The objective and functions of a social welfare agency should be clearly defined;
- its programme should be based upon actual needs; it should be limited in scope and territory to a field in which it can operate effectively;
- the agency should be soundly organized; it should have a clear-cut distinction between policy-making and execution, units of command, and effective coordination of all organization units and staff members;
- the agency should operate on the basis of sound personnel policies and good working conditions. Personnel should be employed on the basis of their professional qualifications, should be paid adequate salaries, and be adequate in quantity and quality to meet the needs of the agency;
- the work of the agency should be characterized by a basic desire to serve human beings, an understanding of the individuals whom it seeks to serve, and their needs;
- the agency should operate on the basis of an annual budget, it should have an adequate accounting system, and its accounts should be audited annually by a competent professional authority; and

- the agency should put itself to the test of a self-appraisal at appropriate intervals to take stock of its successes and failures in the past year, its present status and programmes, and the next steps it ought to take to achieve better performance in the service of its clientele.

SOCIAL WELFARE ADMINISTRATION AND PROTECTION OF WEAKER SECTIONS IN INDIA

It was after the attainment of Independence that social welfare was given its due place in the objectives to be pursued by the government for the welfare of the people of India. The fathers of the constitution had come to appreciate the role that the state was expected to play in the promotion of people's welfare and had, therefore, included certain provisions in the Constitution of India for the attainment of the ideal of a welfare state. The basic aims of a welfare state are clearly foreshadowed in the Preamble of the Constitution and in virtually all of Part-IV, containing the Directive Principles. The significance given to the concept of the welfare state by the Constitution makers can also be visualized in Part-III concerning Fundamental Rights and special provisions made for SCs, STs, and backward classes in the Constitution.

In India, the term 'social welfare' has come to be used in a restricted sense. Provision of social welfare services are for the underprivileged groups—SCs, STs, widows, orphans, women and children, socially maladjusted, beggars, prostitutes, delinquents, physically and mentally disabled—and so social welfare programmes are directed to ameliorate their conditions (United Nations 1970: 65). The Indian Constitution has made a number of provisions related to social welfare. Article 15 of the Constitution prohibits discrimination on grounds of religion, race, caste, sex, or place of birth; Article 16 provides for equality of opportunity in matters of public employment; Article 17 prohibits untouchability; under Article 38, the state is directed to secure a social order for the promotion of the welfare of the people; Article 42 directs the state to make provision for securing just and humane conditions of work and maternity relief; Article 46 promotes

the educational and economic interest of the SCs, STs, and other weaker sections of society. The IX Schedule lays down the Illustrative List of 257 enactments to protect the interest of SCs and STs. Article 164 provides for a minister in-charge for the welfare of SCs, STs, and other backward classes (OBCs). Articles 330, 334, and 335 describe the provision for reservation of seats for the SCs and STs in the Parliament, legislative assemblies of states, and in services and institutions. Articles 338–339 has provisions for the setting up of a National Commission for the SCs and STs by the President of India. Article 340 relates to the appointment of a commission to investigate the conditions of backward classes.

The government has enacted various legislative measures to combat social evils and to protect weaker sections of society against social injustice as these are felt to be indispensable to supplement the programmes being implemented for their welfare. Some of these laws are the Schedules Castes and Scheduled Tribes (prevention of atrocities) Act, 1989; the Equal Remuneration Act, 1976; the Child Marriage Restraints Amendment Act, 1978; the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 (Amended in 1984); Suppression of Immoral Traffic in Women and Girls Act, 1956 (Amended in 1978); the Commission of Sati (prevention) Act, 1987; Juvenile Justice Act, 1986; the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986; the Maternity Benefit Act, 1961 (Amended in 1976); the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948; the Employees Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952; the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972; and so on.

SOCIAL WELFARE MINISTRY IN INDIA

Realizing the importance of social welfare administration, Government of India set up a Ministry of Welfare in 1985. The name of the ministry was changed to the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment in 1998. The responsibility for implementation of social welfare schemes is shared between the central and state governments. The central government is responsible for formulating the policies and programmes besides coordinating and promoting implementation of allied services by the states. Earlier the ministry

was also responsible for the welfare of women, children, and SCs, but in 2007, the child development division was merged with the Ministry of Women and Child Development. In 1999, the Tribal Development Division was moved out to form a separate Ministry of Tribal Affairs. The ministry is entrusted mainly with the task of empowerment of the following disadvantaged and marginalized target groups:

- Scheduled Castes (SCs)
- Other Backward Classes (OBCs)
- Persons with Disabilities (PWDs)
- Senior Citizens
- Victims of substance abuse

The ministry performs its tasks through legislations, schemes, and activities of:

1. Educational and economic development and social empowerment of SCs and OBCs;
2. rehabilitation, as well as educational and economic development and social empowerment of persons with disabilities;
3. support to senior citizens by way of their maintenance, welfare, security, health care, and productive and independent living; and
4. rehabilitation through 'whole person recovery' of victims of substance abuse (Government of India 2010: 1).

The ministry is the nodal organization for formulation of social welfare policies and programmes and ensuring their implementation. The ministry is assisted in its functioning by a number of subordinate organizations—national commissions and national institutes—over which the ministry exercises administrative control. These are the National Commission for Schedule Castes; National Commission for Backward Classes; National Commission for Safai Karamcharis; Commission for Economically Backward Classes; Rehabilitation Council of India; Dr B.R. Ambedkar Foundation; National Institute for the Orthopedically Handicapped;

National Institute of Rehabilitation, Training and Research; and the National Institute of Social Defence. The Ministry of Welfare, since designated as Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment in 1999, is headed by a cabinet minister who is assisted by two ministers of state. The ministry has a secretary assisted by an additional secretary, four joint secretaries and one deputy director-general in the rank of joint secretary who heads the bureaus of scheduled castes development, backward classes, social defence, disabilities and planning, research, evaluation, and monitoring. There is also one post of economic advisor in the rank of joint secretary.

Welfare Provision for Scheduled Castes

The Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment is the nodal ministry to oversee the interests of the SCs. According to 2001 Census, they constitute 16.2 per cent of population in the country. They fall in the category of weaker and marginalized sections of society. The constitution prescribes protection and safeguards for these castes by the way of insisting on their general rights as citizens with the object of promoting their educational and economic interests and removing social disabilities. The main safeguards are:

1. The abolition of untouchability and the forbidding of its practice in any form (Article 17);
2. the promotion of their educational and economic interests and their protection from social injustice and all forms of exploitation (Article 46);
3. the removal of any disability, liability, restriction, or condition with regard to access to shops, public restaurants, hotels, and places of public entertainment or the use of wells, tanks, bathing ghats, roads, and places of public resort maintained wholly or partially out of state funds or dedicated to the use of the general public (Article 15[2]);
4. special representation in the Lok Sabha and State Vidhan Sabhas to Scheduled Castes and Tribes till 25 January 2010 (Articles 330, 332, and 334);
5. permitting the state to make reservation for the backward classes in public services in case of inadequate representations

and requiring the state to consider the claims of the SCs and STs in the making of appointments to public services (Articles 16 and 335); and

6. special provision for the administration and control of scheduled and tribes areas (Article 244 and Fifth and Sixth Schedules) (Sachdeva 2010: 418).

Under Articles 330 and 332 of the Constitution, seats are reserved for SCs and STs in the Lok Sabha and State Legislative Assemblies in proportion to their population. At present, 120 out of 543 Lok Sabha seats, 1,081 out of 4,091 assembly seats of different states belong to reserved categories (Sachdeva 2010: 419). Following the implementation of 73rd and 74th Amendment Acts, 1992, safeguards have been provided for proper representation of members of SCs and STs by reserving seats for them in both rural and urban local self-governing institutions in proportion to their population in the respective areas.

As per the provision of Article 335 and 16(4) of the Constitution, 15 per cent vacancies have been reserved for the SCs in All India Services for which recruitment is done through open competition. Reservation in direct recruitment to Group C and D posts, which normally attract candidates, is fixed in proportion to the population of SCs and STs in the respective states and union territories. Reservation is also made at 15 per cent of the vacancies for the SCs in promotion of the result of the competitive examinations limited to departmental candidates in Group B, C, and D. Reservation has been provided for these castes in promotion on the basis of seniority subject to fitness in Group A, B, C, and D posts (Sachdeva 2010: 419).

In pursuance of the Constitution's 65th Amendment Act, 1990, a National Commission for Scheduled Castes was constituted in 1992 with wide functions and powers. The commission consists of a chairperson, vice-chairperson, and five other members. Their tenure is of three years from the date of joining. The main functions of the commission are (*a*) to investigate and monitor all matters relating to the safeguards provided for the SCs under the Constitution; (*b*) to enquire into specific complaints with respect

to the deprivation of rights and safeguards of the SCs and STs; (*c*) to participate and advise on the planning process and socioeconomic development of SCs and STs; (*d*) to present to the president annually and at such times as the commission may deem fit, reports upon the working of those safeguards; (*e*) to make in such reports recommendations as to the measures that should be taken by the union or any state for the effective implementation of those safeguards and other measures for protection, welfare, and socioeconomic development of SCs; and (*f*) to discharge such other functions, in relation to the protection, welfare, and development and advancement of SCs as may be thought proper by the central government. The commission has been conferred powers of a civil court.

To promote and safeguard the interest and rights of safai karamcharis or sweepers, the National Commission for Safai Karamchari was constituted in 1994. Its main function is to recommend to the central government, specific programmes for the elimination of inequalities in status, facilities, and opportunities for safai karamcharis under a time-bound programme. It is empowered to investigate specific grievances and matters relating to implementation of programmes and schemes for the welfare of scavengers. The commission is consulted on major policy matters affecting safai karamcharis, who suffer social humiliation and inhuman atrocities. The National Safai Karamcharis Finance and Development Corporation has been established in order to empower the safai karamcharis and their dependents to break them away from their traditional occupation and to provide leverage to them to work their own way up the social and economic ladder with dignity and pride. The corporation provides financial assistance at concessional rates of interest for any income-generating activity to the scavengers.

Welfare Schemes for the Scheduled Castes

The Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment has implemented a number of schemes for the development of SCs.

Educational development

To provide financial assistance to SC students studying at post matriculation stage, there is a scheme of Post-Matric Scholarship for

SC students launched in 2003. The financial assistance includes maintenance allowance, reimbursement of non-refundable compulsory fee charges by educational institutions, book-bank facility, and other allowances. Other schemes are Pre-Matric Scholarships for children of those engaged in unclean occupation, hostels for SC boys and girls, the book-bank scheme, and free coaching for SC students.

For encouraging the SC students to pursue higher education, there is a scheme called the Rajiv Gandhi National Fellowship. The scheme provides financial assistance to SC students for pursuing research studies leading to MPhil, PhD, and equivalent research degrees in universities, research institutions, and scientific institutions. Another important educational fellowship is National Overseas Scholarship. It is meant to provide assistance to selected SC students of master courses and PhD programmes abroad in specified fields of engineering, technology, and science only. The scheme provides for fees charges by institutions as per actual monthly maintenance allowance, passage visa fee and insurance premium, annual contingency allowance, incidental journey allowance, and so on.

In 2001, the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment launched a scheme of Coaching and Allied Assistance for weaker sections including SCs. The objective of the scheme includes providing quality coaching for group A and B examinations conducted by UPSC, SSC, Railway Recruitment Boards, and the State Public Service Commission; Officers' Grade Examination conducted by banks; and public sector undertakings and training for finishing courses/job-oriented courses for employment in the private sector like IT, bio-technology, and so on, who are in need of soft skills as well. The scheme is implemented through reputed coaching institutions run by the state government, universities, and private sector organizations.

Economic empowerment

In order to promote economic development of the SCs, special control assistance was started in 1980. Main thrust of the scheme is economic development of the SC population in order to bring them above poverty line through self-employment or training.

Amount of subsidy admissible under the scheme is 50 per cent of the project cost, subject to a maximum of ₹10,000 per beneficiary. In 1989, the Government of India set up the National Scheduled Castes Finance and Development Corporation. The broad objective of the corporation is to provide financial assistance in the form of concessional loans to all the SC families living below double the poverty line (presently, ₹40,000 per annum for rural area and ₹55,000 per annum for urban areas) for their economic development uplift and economic empowerment through various schemes. Between 1 April 2004 and 31 December 2009, the corporation has disbursed an amount of ₹845,00 crore covering 2.86 lakh beneficiaries (Government of India 2011: 985–86).

Welfare of Other Backward Classes

Ever since the Mandal Commission Report highlighted the problems of backward classes, a new category called OBC has emerged in welfare administration of the country. The Mandal Commission had estimated OBC population at 52 per cent of the total population. In pursuance of the Supreme Court judgement, popularly known as the Mandal Judgement (1992), the National Commission for Backward Classes was set up in 1993, as a permanent body for entertaining, examining, and advising the government on request for inclusion and complaints of over inclusion and under inclusion in the lists of OBC citizens. As per the provision of the act, the advice tendered by the commission shall ordinarily be binding upon the government.

After the judgement given by the Mandal Commission in 1992, the government started providing 27 per cent reservation in vacancies of civil posts and services under the central government in favour of the OBCs. On 25 January 1995, the government issued instructions relaxing the upper age limit for OBC candidates in direct recruitment by three years and the number of attempts has been increased to seven in respect of civil service examinations. Any attempt in improving the social and economic status of backwards communities lies in improving their access to education and assisting them by upgradation of merit through special coaching

programmes. To ensure educational development among OBCs, a number of schemes have been launched by the government, like the pre-matric examination coaching and hostels for OBC boys and girls. National Backward Classes Finance and Development Corporation has been established with the objective of providing concessional finance to the members of backward classes living below the poverty line.

Welfare of Persons with Disabilities

The government has taken up a number of programmes for the welfare of persons with disabilities. A comprehensive law—Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995 was created and enforced in 1996. The law deals with both preventive and promotional aspects of the rehabilitation, such as education, employment and vocational training, provision of rehabilitation services for persons with disabilities, and grievance redressal machinery, both at the central and state level. The office of the Chief Commissioner for persons with disabilities is an important statutory functionary responsible for coordinating the work of state commissioners for persons with disabilities, monitoring of utilization of funds disbursed by the central government, taking steps to safeguard rights and facilities made available to persons with disabilities, and also to look into complaints with respect to deprivation of rights of persons with disabilities.

Under the scheme of National Scholarship for persons with disabilities, every year scholarship to 500 students is awarded for pursuing post-matric, professional, and technical courses. The scheme of assistance to disabled persons for purchase/fitting of aids/appliances (ADIP scheme) is to assist the needy physically handicapped persons with durable, modern, and standard aids and appliances, which can promote their physical, social, and psychological rehabilitation. The government has set up the National Handicapped Finance and Development Corporation (NHFDC), an apex-level financial institution for extending credit facilities to persons with disabilities for their economic development. In order to effectively

deal with the multidimensional problem of the disabled population, the government has set up national institutes in each major area of disability; important among them are National Institute for Visually Handicapped, Dehradun, and National Institute for Orthopedically Handicapped, Kolkata. These institutes are mainly responsible for conducting innovative research, organizing training programmes for manpower development, and delivering services for disabled people in the country.

Welfare of Scheduled Tribes

The tribal people of India, who come under the category of Scheduled Tribes, constitute 8.2 per cent of the population of the country, as per the 2001 Census. The union government has a Ministry for Tribal Welfare constituted in 1999, which is also a nodal agency for overall policy planning and coordination of programmes and projects for the welfare of the members of SCs. The Constitution provides various safeguards for promotion and protection of the interests of the STs. Provisions contained in Articles 19, 46, 146, 244, 330, 332, 334, 338, 339, 342 as well as the 5th and 6th Schedules of the Constitution are relevant in this regard.

Tribal development has been, from the beginning, based on a two-pronged policy, namely, (*a*) protection and promotion of their interest through legal administrative support and (*b*) implementation of development schemes to raise their level of living. The Tribal Sub-Plan (TSP) concept evolved and implemented during the Fifth Five Year Plan period continues to be the main instrument for development of tribal people and tribal areas. The TSP is in operation in seventeen states and two union territories. The TSP is funded through resources drawn from (*a*) state plans, (*b*) special central assistance, (*c*) centrally sponsored programmes, and (*d*) institutional finance. Under the centrally sponsored schemes, the programme of girls hostels for STs is in operation since the Third Five Year Plan and has considerably helped promotion of girls amongst tribal communities. Tribal research institutes have been set up at Hyderabad, Guwahati, Ranchi, Ahmadabad, Bhopal,

Kozhikode, Pune, Udaipur, Lucknow, Imphal, and Kolkata. These institutions are subsequently contributing to the developmental efforts through research, evaluation, collection of data, training, and providing professional inputs in the preparation of tribal sub-plan documents.

In order to promote education among STs, the government has introduced a number of programmes. The post-matric scholarships has been started to provide financial assistance to students belonging to STs pursuing post-matriculation courses. The scheme of Ashram School has as its objective the establishment of residential schools for STs in an environment conducive to learning, to increase the literacy rates among the tribal students. In 2009, a programme of strengthening education among ST girls in low literacy districts was also introduced. To encourage higher education among STs, the Rajiv Gandhi National Fellowship has been started. The objective of the scheme is to provide fellowship to students belonging to STs to pursue higher studies. The fellowship follows the pattern of University Grants Commission (UGC) fellowships awarded to research students pursuing regular and full-time MPhil and PhD courses. A sum of ₹45 crore was allocated under the scheme during 2009–10. The Ministry of Tribal Affairs has introduced a new scheme of top class education for ST Students from 2007 to 2008 with the objective of encouraging 57 meritorious students for pursuing studies at degree and post-degree level. The ST students will be awarded scholarship covering full tuition fee and other non-refundable dues in respect of government/government-funded institutions (Government of India 2011: 997).

Women's Empowerment

Women empowerment refers to increasing the social, economic, and political capability of women. Empowerment as a concept was first brought at the International Women's Conference in 1985 at Nairobi. The conference concluded that empowerment is a redistribution of power and control of resources in favour of women through positive intervention. The Action Programme of

the International Conference on Population and Development (1994) held at Cairo mentioned five components of women's empowerment:

- Women's sense of self-worth;
- their right to have and to determine choices;
- their right to have access to opportunities and resources;
- their right to have the power to control their own lives, both within and outside the home; and
- their ability to influence the direction of social change to create a more just social and economic order, nationally and internationally.

The Cairo conference called attention to women's empowerment as a central focus and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) further developed the Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) which focuses on the three variables that reflect women's participation in Society—political power or decision-making, education, and health. The Beijing Conference (1995) identified certain qualitative and quantitative indicators of women empowerment. These are (*a*) increase in self-esteem; (*b*) individual and collective confidence; (*c*) increase in articulation; (*d*) knowledge and awareness on health, nutrition, reproductive rights, law, and literacy; (*e*) change in roles and responsibility in family and community; (*f*) visible changes in women's participation level attending meeting, participation and demanding participation; (*g*) awareness and recognition of women's economic contribution within and outside the household; and (*h*) women's decision-making over her work and income.

Promotion of gender equality and women's empowerment is one of the goals of the UN Millennium Development Goals Report, 2011, released by the UN in June 2011. The report indicates that girls are gaining ground when it comes to education, though unequal access persists in many regions. In the developing regions, ninety-six girls were enrolled in primary and in secondary school for every 100 boys in 2009. This is a significant improvement since 1999, when the ratios were ninety-one and eighty-eight,

respectively. However, only three regions—the Caucasus, Caribbean, and South East Asia—have achieved gender parity in primary education (defined as a gender parity index between 97 and 103). Exceptionally, in Eastern Asia, girls slightly outnumber boys in primary school. Progress for girls has lagged in most other parts of the developing world, and equal access to education in the early years remains a distant target in Northern Africa, Oceania, Southern Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, and Western Asia. The report also says that following significant job losses in 2008–09, the growth in employment that occurred during the recovery in 2010, especially in developing regions, was lower for women than for men. Women employed in manufacturing industries were especially hard hit. As far as political representation is concerned, the report says that despite growing numbers of women parliamentarians, the target of equal participation of women and men in politics is still far off. By end-January 2011, women held 19.3 per cent of seats in single or lower houses of parliament worldwide. This is an all-time high. Still, it confirms a pattern of slow progress over the past fifteen years from a world average of 11.6 per cent in 1995 (United Nations 2011: 20–23). In this background, the report suggests for eliminating gender disparity in education, access to economic opportunities, and equal participation of women in politics as paramount in enhancing women's empowerment to be achieved by 2015.

Women Empowerment in India

Women constitute 48 per cent of the total population of India (Government of India 2011) The development of women is of paramount importance and sets the pace for overall development. Since 1985, there has been a separate department of women and child development functioning as part of the Ministry of Human Resources Development to look into matters related to women and children. Keeping in view its importance, a separate Ministry of Women and Child Development came into existence from 30 January 2006. The vision of the ministry is to have empowered women living with dignity and contributing as equal partners

towards the development of the country in an environment free from violence, and providing opportunities for their growth and development in an environment free from exploitation.

From time to time, several acts of parliament have provided the direction for the welfare of women, like the Suppression of Immoral Traffic in Women and Girls Act, 1956; Hindu Succession Act, 1956; Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961; Maternity Benefit Act, 1961; Equal Remuneration Act, 1976; Sati (Prevention) Act, 1987; Pre-natal Diagnostic Techniques (Regulation and Prevention of Misuse) Act, 1994; Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005; Protection against Sexual Harassment of Women at Work Place Bill, 2005. The most revolutionary of all is the Supreme Court judgement in the case of *Geeta Hariharan vs. Reserve Bank of India*, 1999 which has made it mandatory for all the departments of the Government of India to consider the name of the mother along with the father for all practical purposes such as school admissions, bank accounts, passports, and so on.

The National Commission for Women (NCW) was set up in 1992 to deal with all facets of women's empowerment. The main task of the commission is to study and monitor all matters relating to the constitutional and legal safeguards provided for women and to review the existing legislations and suggest amendments, wherever necessary. The commission also ensures speedy redressal of grievances of women. The Ministry of Women and Child Development is charged with the nodal responsibility to implement and coordinate programme of women's welfare and development. The ministry is implementing a number of schemes for the welfare of women.

Support to Training and Employment Programme for Women

Support to Training and Employment Programme for Women (STEP) was launched in 1987. It seeks to provide updated skills and new knowledge to poor and assetless women in the traditional sectors such as agriculture, animal husbandry, dairying, fisheries, handlooms, handicrafts, *khadi* and village industries, social

forestry, and sericulture for enhancing their productivity and income generation. It has made a significant impact on women in traditional sectors by upgrading skills and by mobilizing them into viable groups, arranging for marketing linkages, support services, and access to credit. During the period 2009–10, 21,963 poor women have been benefited from this scheme.

Swadhar

The Swadhar scheme was launched during the year 2001–02, as a central sector scheme for providing holistic and integrated services to women in difficult circumstances, such as destitute, widows deserted by their families, women prisoners released from jail and without family support, trafficked women/girls, victims of sexual crimes who are disowned by family, and so on. The project is implemented through social welfare and women and child development departments, reputed public–private trusts or voluntary organizations, and so on, provided they have the needed experience and expertise in the rehabilitation of such women. During the year 2009–10, 16,860 women have benefited by this scheme.

Working women's hostel

The scheme of assistance for construction or expansion of hostel buildings for working women with day-care centres for children is being implemented since 1972–73. Under this scheme, financial assistance is provided to NGOs, women's development corporations, local bodies, universities, and others, for construction of buildings for working women's hostels. By 2009, 887 hostels have been sanctioned throughout the country benefiting 64,922 women.

Short-stay homes

The scheme of short-stay homes launched in the year 1969, is meant to provide temporary accommodation, maintenance, and rehabilitative services through voluntary organizations to women and girls rendered homeless due to family discard or crime. Under the programme, temporary shelter to needy women and girls is given for six months to three years. Children accompanying the mother or born in the home may be permitted to stay in the home

up to the age of seven years, after which they may be transferred to children institutes or foster care services.

Family counselling centres

The scheme was introduced by the Central Social Welfare Board in 1983. The centres provide counselling, referral, and rehabilitative services to women and children who are victims of atrocities, family maladjustments, and social ostracism and also provide crisis intervention and trauma counselling in case of natural disasters. The centres also create awareness and mobilize public opinion on social issues affecting the status of women.

Rashtriya Mahila Kosh

The National Credit Fund for women known as Rashtriya Mahila Kosh (RMK) was set up in 1993 as a national level organization under the Ministry of Women and Child Development to meet the credit needs of the poor and assetless women in the informal sector. The RMK extends micro-finance services through a client friendly and hassle free loan mechanism for livelihood activities, housing, micro-enterprise, family needs, and so on, to bring about socioeconomic uplift of poor women.

Gender budgeting

Gender budgeting is a powerful tool for achieving gender mainstreaming so as to ensure that the benefits of development reach women as much as men. It seeks to ensure equality of outcomes and not equality of opportunities. The Ministry of Women and Child Development as the nodal agency for gender budgeting has taken great strides towards promoting gender budgeting across sectors and at different levels of governance. A powerful impetus to the process was provided by the Ministry of Finance in 2004, when it mandated the setting up of Gender Budget Cells in all ministries and departments. So far, fifty-six ministries and departments of the Indian government have set up gender cells.

National Mission for Empowerment of Women

The government launched the National Mission for Empowerment of Women (2010–15) on 8 March 2010, with a view to empowering women socially, economically, and educationally. The mission

shall monitor and review gender budgeting by ministries and departments as well as effective implementation of various laws concerning women.

The 73rd and 74th Amendments (1993) to the Indian Constitution have served as breakthrough towards ensuring equal access and increased participation in political power structure for women. Now, there is a provision of 33 per cent reservation for women in the local self-governing bodies. This has been hailed as a watershed achievement in empowerment of women, as over one million rural women have joined village Panchayat posts as Sarpanch or Adhyaksha or members of community administration. The money and muscle power associated with the electoral process inhibits a large number of women from joining politics. Restriction on mobility, lack of control over resources, and low literacy are well-known obstacles but recent Panchyat elections have evidenced a phenomenally large number of elected leaders, much beyond reserved 33 per cent seats. Realizing the significance of women's participation in the political process, states like Uttarakhand and Jharkhand have reserved 50 per cent of its Panchayat seats for women. It has in a sense given woman a position of strength, recognition, and a legal endorsement of their position to participate in governance.

The Ninth Plan (1997–2002) made two significant changes in the conceptual strategy of planning for women. First, 'empowerment of women' became one of the nine primary objectives of the plan. To this effect, the approach of the plan was to create an enabling environment where women could freely exercise their rights both within and outside home, as equal partners along with men. Second, the plan attempted 'convergence of existing service', available in both women-specific and women-related sectors. To this effect, it directed both the centre and the states to adopt a special strategy of women's component plan (WCP) through which not less than 30 per cent of funds/benefits flow to women from all the general development sectors. It also suggested that a special vigil be kept on the flow of the earmarked funds through an effective mechanism to ensure that the proposed strategy brings forth a holistic approach towards empowering women (Goel 2010: 111–12).

In the Eleventh Five Year Plan (2007–12), for the first time, women are recognized not just as equal citizens but as agents of economic and social growth. The approach to gender equality is based on the reorganization that intervention in favour of women must be multi-pronged and it should provide women with basic entitlements. It also emphasizes on strengthening existing institutional mechanisms and creating new ones for gender mainstream and effective policy implementation.

The Government of India declared 2001 as the Year of Women Empowerment. In order to bring about the advancement, development, and empowerment of women, a National Policy for the Empowerment of Women was passed in 2001. The main objectives of the policy (Government of India 2001) include:

- Creating an environment through positive economic and social policies for full development of women to enable them to realize their full potential;
- the de jure and de facto enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedom by women on equal basis with men in all spheres—political, economic, social, cultural, and civil;
- equal access to participation and decision-making by women in social, political, and economic life of the nation;
- equal access for women to health care, quality education at all levels, career and vocational guidance, employment, equal remuneration, occupational health and safety, social security, and public office;
- strengthening legal systems aimed at elimination of all forms of discrimination against women;
- changing societal attitudes and community practices by active participation and involvement of both men and women;
- mainstreaming a gender perspective in the development process;
- elimination of discrimination and all forms of violence against women and the girl child; and
- building and strengthening partnerships with civil society, particularly women's organizations.

The Constitution of India grants equality to women in various fields of life, yet a large number of women are either ill-equipped or not in a position to propel themselves out of their traditionally unsatisfactory socioeconomic conditions. They are poor, uneducated, and insufficiently trained and are often absorbed in the struggle to sustain the family physically and emotionally and as a rule are discouraged from taking interest in affairs outside their homes. Oppression, discrimination, and atrocities on women are still rampant. Patriarchy continues to be embedded in the social system in many parts of India, denying a majority of women the choice to decide on how they want to live. The overriding importance of community in a patriarchal sense ensures that women rarely have an independent say in community issues. Female infanticide continues to be common. Statistics show that there is still very high preference for the male child in India leading to an imbalance in the male–female ratio in some states. Domestic violence is also found to be widespread, despite the enactment of the Domestic Violence Act, 2005, and dowry-related crimes are still rampant in society. Except for a meagre number of urban and sub-urban women, Indian women are still crying out for social justice.

Welfare of Children

Children (0–18 years) constitute roughly 23.14 per cent of the Indian population as per 2001 Census. The Indian Constitution contains several provisions for the protection, development, and welfare of children. Article 24 prohibits employment of children in any factory or mine or in any other hazardous occupation. To substantiate it, Articles 39(e) and (f) lay down that the state shall direct its policy in a manner that the tender age of children is not abused. Keeping in mind this spirit of the Constitution, the National Policy on Children was adopted in 1974 and the Integrated Child Development Services (ICDS) became operational in 1975. For the holistic development of a child, this has proven to be the world's largest and most unique programme providing a package of services comprising of supplementary nutrition, immunization,

health check-up, as well as health and nutrition education. Ministry of Women and Child Development has launched a new centrally sponsored scheme called the Integrated Child Protection Scheme (ICPS) from the year 2009–10. The objectives of this scheme are to contribute to the improvement in the well-being of children in difficult circumstances, as well as the reduction of vulnerable situations and actions that lead to abuse, neglect, exploitation, and separation of children from parents.

To respond to the emergency needs of the children in difficulty, the government has started child line services. The child line has an exclusive dedicated number '1098', which is a 24-hour toll free telephone service available to all children in distress. In order to provide non-formal education and vocational training to working children, the scheme for welfare of working children was commenced in January 2005. The Ministry of Women and Child Development launched a new pilot scheme 'Dhanlakshmi: conditional cash transfer for girl child with insurance cover' in 2008. The objective of the scheme is to provide financial incentive for families to encourage them to retain the girl child and educate her. A National Commission for Protection of Child Rights was set up on 5 March 2007 for proper enforcement of children's rights and effective implementation of laws and programmes relating to children.

POLICIES OF SOCIAL WELFARE

The Government of India, from time to time has formulated a number of social welfare policies. In the following section, we will discuss three important social welfare policies concerning employment, education, and health.

Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act

The National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA), 2005, is considered to be a milestone in the history of rural development in India. It was brought into force by the union government

in 2006. The law was initially called the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) but was renamed as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) on 2 October 2009. This act was introduced with an aim towards improving the purchasing power of rural people, by providing primarily semi- or unskilled work to people living in rural India, whether or not they are below the poverty line. Unlike the previous employment generation schemes, MNREGA for the first time legally guarantees employment to India's poor population. The act guarantees 100 days unskilled job per rural household. It further states that if the government fails to ensure employment to rural poor, it has to dole out unemployment allowance to them. The underlying objective of the act is to eradicate poverty from various pockets of rural hinterland and to make villages self-sustaining through the creation of productive assets such as water tanks, soil conservation works, and so on.

The MNREGA was launched on 2 February 2006 from Anantapur, Andhra Pradesh, and initially covered 200 of the 'poorest' districts of the country. The figures by the Ministry of Rural Development show that initially more than 1.36 crore people, that is above 1 per cent of India's total population were given jobs under this act. In 2008–09, it provided employment opportunities to more than 4.47 crore households. Schedule I of the act enumerates eight categories of work that are supposed to be the 'focus of the scheme':

- Water conservation, water harvesting, drought proofing (including afforestation and tree plantation), irrigation canals (including micro and minor irrigation work);
- provision of irrigation facility to land owned by households belonging to SCs and STs or to land of beneficiaries of land reforms or that of the beneficiaries under the Indira Awas Yojana of the Government of India;
- renovation of traditional water bodies (including desilting of tanks);
- land development;
- flood control and protection works (including drainage in water-logged areas);

- rural connectivity to provide all-weather access; and
- in addition, there is a residual category, that is, any other work, which may be notified by the central government in consultation with the state government.

Under the act, each state is supposed to formulate a Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme within six months of its enactment. Broadly speaking, the village and intermediary Panchayats are entrusted with the task of implementation activities, while coordination activities are left for district level. Planning, supervision, and monitoring takes place at all levels. The government decided to extend the act throughout the country from April 2008 onwards. The act was implemented in a phased manner—130 districts were added in 2007–08. With its spread over 625 districts across the country, the flagship programme of the UPA Government has the potential to increase the purchasing power of rural poor, reduce distress migration, and to create useful assets in rural India. Also, it can foster social and gender equality, as 23 per cent workers under the scheme are SCs, 17 per cent are STs, and 50 per cent are women.

Despite its achievements, the MNREGA has been criticized on a number of grounds. There are many reports which speak of corruption and misuse of the funds provided for the scheme. Another important criticism is that the public works schemes' completed products (for example, water conservation, land development, afforestation, provision of irrigation systems, construction of roads, or flood control) are vulnerable to being taken by over wealthier sections of society. A monitoring study of MNREGA in Madhya Pradesh showed the types of activities undertaken were more or less standardized across villages, suggesting little local consultation. Further concerns include the fact that local government corruption leads to the exclusion of specific sections of society. Local governments have also been found to claim more people have received job cards than people who actually work in order to generate more funds than needed, to be then embezzled by local officials. Bribes as high ₹50 are paid in order to receive the job cards. There is criticism from construction companies that

MNREGA has affected the availability of labour as labourers prefer to working under MNREGA to working under construction projects. It is also widely criticized that MNREGS has contributed to farm labour shortage. In July 2011, the government has advised the states to suspend the MNREGS programme during peak farming periods.

To sum up, in a country with rampant rural poverty and unemployment, the scheme has been able to achieve two objectives—rural development and employment. Focusing on the rural areas, it has been able to involve local people in activities that help them directly—water conservation and harvesting, afforestation, rural connectivity, flood control, construction and repair of embankments, and so on. Considering these facts, the scheme has been a great success.

Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan

Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) or 'Education for All' is a Government of India flagship programme for achievement of Universalization of Elementary Education (UEE) in a time bound manner, as mandated by 86th Amendment to the Constitution of India, making free and compulsory education available to children between the age group of six and fourteen years. A the Fundamental Right to Education, SSA is being implemented in partnership with state governments to cover the entire country and address the needs of 192 million children in 1.1 million habitations. The programme seeks to open new schools in those habitations which do not have schooling facilities and strengthen existing school infrastructure through provision of additional class rooms, toilets, drinking water, maintenance grant, and school improvement grants. Existing schools with inadequate teacher strength are provided with additional teachers, while the capacity of existing teachers is being strengthened by extensive training, grants for developing teaching–learning material, and strengthening of the academic support structure at a cluster, block, and district level. SSA seeks to provide quality elementary education including life skills. It has a special focus on girl's education and children with

special needs. The programme also seeks to provide computer education to bridge the digital divide.[1]

There are a number of challenges in the effective implementation of the SSA. Will we ever achieve the goals of SSA if we do not focus on the reform and decentralization agenda, school autonomy, and institutional development thrust? The answer according to Amarjeet Sinha is an emphatic 'no'. The challenge of SSA is to change the mindset of education bureaucracies and teachers, to make them responsible for meeting the learning needs of all children after providing the resources at their command to do so. The challenge is to create basic minimum learning conditions for all children in all schools, learning centres, and all habitations. The apathy of the state reflects in the slow pace of effective decentralization and community control for local level accountability of the school system. With the proliferation of private unaided schools and the parental preference for such schools, government-funded schools today are catering largely to the poor. Any significant improvement in their performance, therefore, will have positive consequences for poverty reduction. The withdrawal of children of the elite from government schools has also led to their decline as those charged with maintaining government schools do not suffer if the school functions irregularly or ineffectively. Sinha warns that the children who are not in school are from poor families in rural and urban India, mostly girls and children from Dalit, minority, and tribal households, eking out a living as agricultural labourers, migrant labourers, construction workers, as destitute women, or as lowly paid seasonal labourers. Even they have demanded quality schooling for their children. He hopes that the democracy will not fail them. Thus, the success of the programme will also improve the lives of the poor and the weaker sections of society.

National Rural Health Mission

The National Rural Health Mission (NRHM) was launched by the central government in April 2005. Its detailed framework for implementation which gave it the mandate for large-scale

health sector reforms was approved in July 2006. The design of the NRHM was a very inclusive process. A large number of task forces were set up with the best of public health experts, civil society representatives, and government servants to look at some of the key areas where interventions were required. These task forces examined issues like health financing, primary health structure, partnership with non-governmental organizations, medical and nursing education, role of rural health practioners, and so on. It was through this consultative process that the framework for NRHM was finalized. Following are the main features of the mission:

1. It provides support to states for strengthening systems of health care in rural areas through provision of physical infrastructure, human resources, equipment, emergency transport, drugs, diagnostics, and other support;
2. covers all programmes in health sector except HIV/AIDS, mental health, and cancer;
3. provides untied funds to all health facilities starting from village health and sanitation committees to district hospitals;
4. provides management support to strengthen capacity for decentralized management of health;
5. provides for a constitution of community institutions at health-facility level;
6. provides a community worker called ASHA in every village; and
7. allows states to innovate and promotes flexible financing to allow local decision-making.

In its journey of last seven years, NRHM has tried to push reforms with resources in partnership with the state and UTs in bringing about reform and improvement in health indicators. The NRHM framework for implementation has pushed communitization of facilities, adequate and flexible financing with community accountability, monitoring progress against Indian public health standards, innovations in human resources, engagement and building of capacity at all levels for effective and efficient decentralized

management of the health system. Based on a careful evidence based assessment of progress as recorded by independent studies and review missions, it is clear that NRHM has led to increase in out-patient cases, in-patient cases, institutional deliveries, availability of ambulances, presence of community health workers in every village, better availability of drugs and diagnostics, and most importantly a sincere effort to craft a credible public health system.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Social welfare administration constitutes a branch or a subdivision of public administration. Its scope extends from the diagnosis of the emergence of social problems in all times, initiating measures to eradicate them through social legislation and the creation of public awareness and to provide social welfare services for the deprived, disadvantages, and underprivileged sections of society with a view to alleviate their sufferings. It has come to acquire a systematic body of knowledge, specialized skills and unique methods, and techniques to deserve entitlement to distinct discipline and profession. But, it has not yet been able to acquire the status of an independent discipline with its own identity. It is a new evolving discipline and it will have to go a long way to get recognition as an independent discipline.

The development of social welfare in post Independence India has been phenomenal in terms of provision of administrative machinery, financial outlays, and expansion of social welfare programmes for numerous sections of disadvantaged and underprivileged people. The setting up of a Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Ministry of Women and Child Development, and Ministry of Tribal Affairs as full-fledged ministries as well as organizations subordinate to them like National Commission for Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, Minorities Commission, National Institute for the Handicapped, and National Institute of Public Cooperation and Child Development constitute great landmarks in the development of social welfare. Numerous projects

and programmes initiated and developed by these bodies are re-markable.

The achievements made through multipronged attacks against poverty, inequities, and injustice though impressive, yet leave much to be desired. They touch only the tip of the iceberg. Still one-third of the world's hungry live in India. We have failed dismally in providing two square meals a day to well over 30 per cent of our population. Child labour still constitutes one-fourth of the country's total workforce in which 44 million children live in subhuman conditions and about 3 lakh girls are engaged in flesh trade. The goal of universal primary education appears successful only on paper. The girl child continues to be discriminated and women are being denied their legitimate rights of equality with men and subjected to atrocities including infliction of death due to non-fulfilment of dowry demands. Though women have been given 33 per cent seats in Panchayats, but still they are directed by their male partner. The incidences of atrocities on Dalits are mounting. Tribal people are being displaced in the name of developmental projects. The weaker sections of society suffer indignities and humiliations. The gap between very rich and very poor is devastatingly widening (Sachdeva 2010: 122).

It is, therefore, desirable that the deficiencies and inadequacies afflicting the social welfare be given a higher planning priority, the planning machinery for welfare services at the state and district level be suitably strengthened, and administrative infrastructure especially at the state, district, and local level streamlined. Welfare measures, particularly social security measures, need to be extended to the unorganized labour, monitoring of the welfare programmes is to be undertaken by various state and voluntary agencies with a view to assess their performances within stipulated periods and to check the leakages of funds by middlemen and to ensure that the services actually reach the beneficiaries. Social legislation has to be given teeth, and executed with strong political will and, atrocities on children, women and SCs; have to be checked with appropriate strong measures including Special Courts and Special Police Force. Tribes are not to be alienated by encroaching upon their indigenous way of living, traditions

and values on the pretext of their development. Finally, the states should not be looking to the centre for guidelines and funds for central and centrally sponsored scheme, they should be encouraged to take initiatives and own responsibilities for policy formulation and implementation in accordance with the peculiar needs of their respective areas and population.

NOTE

1. Refer to the Sarva Siksha Abhiyan website for more details. Available at www/http://ssa.nic.in/

REFERENCES

Beveridge, William. 1942. *Social Insurance and Allied Services*. New York: Macmillan.

Encyclopaedia Britannica. 1972. *Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc.* (Vol. 23). Chicago.

Forder, Anthony. 1974. *Concepts in Social Administration*. London.

Friedlander, Walter A. 1967. *Introduction to Social Welfare*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.

Goel, S.L. 2010. *Social Welfare Administration* (Vol. 2, Social Justice and Empowerment). New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications.

Government of India. 2001. *National Policy for the Empowerment of Women 2001*. Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.

———. 2010. *Annual Report 2009–10*. Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Government of India.

———. 2011. *India 2011*. Publication Division, Government of India.

Heywood, Andrew. 2005. *Key Concepts in Politics*. New York: Palgrave Micmillan.

Kidneigh, John C. 1959. 'Social Work Administration: An Area of Social Work Practice', *Social Work Journal*, 31 (April).

Kruse, Arthur. 1960. *Administration of Social Welfare Agencies* (Social Work Year Book). New York: National Association of Social Work.

Marshall, T.H. 1950. *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

National Rural Health Scheme. Available at http://mohfw.nic.in/nrhm/documents/5 years-nrhm-final.fdf

Sachdeva, D.R. 2010. *Social Welfare Administration in India*. New Delhi: Kitab Mahal.

Sarva Siksha Abhiyan. Available at www/http://ssa.nic.in/

Sen, Amartya. 2000. *Development as Freedom*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Sinha, Amarjeet. 'Is It Really Possible?' Available at www.india-seminar.com/2004/536/amarjeetsinha.htm

Titmus, Richard M. 1985. *Essays on the Welfare State*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

United Nations. 1970. *Social Welfare Planning in the Context of National Development Plans*. New York: United Nations.

———. 2011. *UN Millennium Development Goals Report, 2011*. New York: United Nations.

Wilensky, Harold L. and Charles N. Lebeaux. 1958. *Industrial Society and Social Welfare*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

———. 1967. 'Concepts of Social Welfare', in Walter A. Friedlander (ed.), *Introduction to Social Welfare.* New York: Prentice-Hall of India.

Chapter 8

Citizens and Administration

Learning Objectives
- To understand the interactions between citizens and administration
- To describe the pre-conditions for citizen-centric administration
- To examine the people's participation in administration
- To discuss administrative accountability in India
- To illustrate public grievance redressal machinery in India

Being a citizen is more than a status; it is about the entitlement of rights and privileges of a person that ensures a quality life. So, citizenship is more than a set of rights and obligations, it is an innate orientation on the well-being of state and society. The ancient Greeks realized this, and the polity of Athens institutionalized citizenship through its diverse associations, councils, and authorities within the urban framework. In that environment citizenship, in principle, meant participation in the co-production of policies. At the bottom of this participation, stood a belief in the 'happy versality' of man. However, in modern times, the status aspects of citizenship are stressed heavily and the qualitative aspects of citizenship appear to be grossly underestimated. Public administration as a discipline, was, until recently, more focused on the improvement of state apparatuses than on the development of citizenship and the involvement of citizens in the making of governmental policies

(Rouband 1999). This dominant trend is responsible for the alienation of citizens and a consequent increase in citizens' grievances against administration. With this background, the present chapter deals with some significant dimensions of interaction between citizens and administration, namely, citizens' perception about administration, pre-conditions for citizen-centric administration, people's participation in administration, forms of public accountability, and the role of public grievance redressal machinery in India.

INTERACTIONS BETWEEN CITIZENS AND ADMINISTRATION

In a democracy, the administration–citizen relations are significant because the support and consent of the governed is a prerequisite for the sustenance of representative government. The state, and in actual terms, the administration has the major responsibilities of providing major amenities of life—education, health, employment opportunities, improved means of transport and infrastructure, and so on—to the citizens. All this affects the individual and collective life of a very large numbers of people concerned. In public administration, two noticeable trends have emerged in recent times. First, there has been a large growth in the size of governmental administration as well as vast expansion in its powers and activities. Second, in the wake of spread of general education, political and social awakening, there has been a rise in the expectations of people from administration (IGNOU EPA-01: 59).

The relationship between law and public opinion in a democracy was discussed by A.V. Dicey about the end of the twentieth century (Dicey 1948). The importance of the subject grew sharply after the Second World War, thanks to the growth of welfare as well as socialist ideologies in the new states. People in affluent societies are less concerned about the old concept of liberty than a love of material comfort and pleasure. The focus of relationship between state and society has shifted from political liberty to economic prosperity and social justice. The state has expanded its

political base through universal adult franchise. Administration has, therefore, of necessity penetrated into every aspect of civic life. The bulk of the citizens who are voters and beneficiaries of state services are keen to get services supplied than learning the subtle aspects of how they get them (Agarwal 2004: 270). Position of the citizens from being mere recipients of the administrative help and services has now shifted to their being the prime movers in the affairs of governance.

There are different ways in which citizens interact with the administrative agencies in their day to day life. Mohit Bhattacharya illustrates five categories of such interactions. These could be in the form of:

- *Clients*: In this form, citizens seek to obtain benefits or services from governmental agencies. For example, a patient visits a governmental hospital for medical check or treatment.
- *Regulatee*: As regulatee, the public interacts with many government agencies like the police, income tax authorities, licensing authorities, and so on.
- *Litigants*: As litigants, the public moves the court against 'unjust' actions of public agencies. For example, people seek redressal from the court when a motor vehicles authority may be delaying issuance of car licence.
- *Participants*: In this form, people become direct participants in decision-making in public agencies at different levels. For example, parents become members of a school's guardians' committee, an irrigation project associates the farmers with the different decision-making processes of the project.
- *Cutting-edge encounters*: In this form, people approach agencies which are responsible for day to day primary services and facilities for the public. For example, people approach to the municipal employees for water, electricity, and sanitation facilities (Bhattacharya 2008: 248–49).
- *Protesters*: There could be another form of interaction, that is, of people as protesters. People often interact with government agencies on public policy as protesters, opposing

the injustice in government policy and action. For example, people oppose the construction of a dam in their locality.

Thus, citizens in their day to day life constantly interact with administration. The purposes of contact may be varied, for example, it may be for getting basic services like water, electricity, and health services or it may be for getting driving licence or income tax returns from income tax department. Sometimes, people get an opportunity to directly participate in policy-making and implementation of a governmental agency or project. When people do not get services in time or harassed by public authorities they seek redressal of their grievances from the court and when they do not see justice coming from any side, they resort to protest or criticize the unjust policy and action of the government. Through these happy or unhappy interactions, citizens form their opinion about public administration.

CITIZEN'S PERCEPTION ABOUT ADMINISTRATION

Though ideally speaking, the interaction between citizens and administration is supposed to be trustworthy and purposeful, in reality, it is observed that this is always plagued by conflicts, stresses, and strains. Discontent among the citizens which is due to the result of a wide disparity between the performance of administration and popular expectations has become a normal feature. The general feeling which persists among the people is that the policies are not cumbersome, or the processes of administration are unjust. Yet another important problem is the deterioration in the standards of honesty and integrity in both, politics and administration due to corruption. Rigid observance of rules and regulations, non-acknowledgement of complaints, and inordinate delay in disposal of various matters account for lack of faith of public in administration.

Research findings on citizens–administration relations in India reveal interesting data and information. Studies on 'Police Administration' by Davis H. Bayley (1969), 'Rural Development' by Rakesh Hooja (1978), and 'Urban Government' by V. Jagannadhan

(1978), reveal citizens perceptions about public administration in India. According to Mohit Bhattacharya, the general perceptions of the people about administration that emerge out of these studies include:

- Inordinate delay and waiting period;
- favouritism in administration;
- need for middlemen (brokers) to get things done;
- unhelpful attitude of officials especially lower level functionaries;
- citizens' ignorance about procedures involved in getting things done; and
- rich–poor discrimination in administration with the rich having access to administration and the general tendency of officials to avoid the poor and underplay their needs and interests (Bhattacharya 2008: 257).

A recent study by the Centre for Media Studies (CMS) shows that a majority of citizens are not satisfied with the delivery of public services. In seven out of the eleven departments covered in the study, less than one-third of the citizens are satisfied with the services delivered. In fact, in most need-based services such as the police, judiciary, and municipalities—which enjoy a greater discretion and power—not even 20 per cent of the households are satisfied with their services. Even in essential services, such as the Public Distribution System (PDS), hospitals, and electricity and water supplies, a mere 30–40 per cent of the households are happy with the services (Second Administrative Reforms Commission 2009).

Thus, administration in India is generally perceived to be unresponsive, insensitive, and corrupt. W.A. Robson observes:

In mind of average citizen, bureaucracy still suffers from traditional defects associated with it. These are an excessive sense of self-importance on the part of officials or an undue idea of the importance of their office, an indifference towards the feelings of the convenience of the individual citizens, mania for regulations, formal procedures, a failure to recognize relations between the governors and the governed as an essential part of democratic process.

The Sixth Central Pay Commission's (2008) comments in this connection are worth noting:

> For the common man, bureaucracy denotes routine and repetitive procedures, paper work and delays. This, despite the fact that the Government and bureaucracy exist to facilitate the citizens in the rightful pursuit of their legal activities. Rigidities of the system over centralization of powers, highly hierarchical and top–down method of functioning with a large number of intermediary levels delaying finalization of any decision, divorce of authority from accountability and the tendency towards micromanagement, have led to a structure in which form is more important than substance and procedures are valued over end results and outcomes. Non-performance of the administrative structures, poor service quality and lack of responsiveness, and the subjective and negative abuse of authority have eroded trust in governance systems which needs to be restored urgently. (Government of India 2008: 365)

The Second Administrative Reforms Commission (ARC) (2009) during its visits to the states had several occasions to meet and hear from the public. Most of the observations by citizens were about the poor quality of services provided by the government, the indifferent attitude of government servants, corruption, and abuse of authority and lack of accountability. A common complaint pertained to excessive red-tapism and the long time taken to get even routine work done. The commission in its 12th Report on citizen-centric administration identifies the following five barriers in citizen-centric administration in India:

- Wooden, inflexible, self-perpetuation, and inward-looking attitude of the civil servants;
- Lack of accountability of civil servants;
- Red-tapism;
- Ineffective implementation of laws and rules; and
- Low levels of awareness of the rights and duties of citizens (Second ARC 2009: 14–16).

Thus, the reason for administration not being citizen-centric can be attributed to the attitude and work of some government

servants, the deficiencies in existing institutional structures, and also to the lack of awareness about rights and duties on the part of the citizens.

PRECONDITIONS FOR CITIZEN-CENTRIC ADMINISTRATION

The poor image of the government in the minds of large sections points towards inefficient and ineffective administration. This highlights the need for substantially reforming our governance systems. Prime Minister, Manmohan Singh, in his civil services day speech (2007) observed:

> It is in this context that 'reform of government' becomes relevant. 'Administrative Reforms' is a phrase that has been used widely to mean many things. It is used by some to mean change of any kind to deal with government problems of any description. Some regard administrative reform merely as a means of 'making the government work' better. Others in fact see 'reform' as 'less government'. I view the reform of government as a means of making citizens central to all government activities and concerns and reorganizing government to effectively address the concerns of the common people. (Second ARC 2009: 17)

An analysis of the barriers to citizen-centric administration reveals that there are several pre-conditions which must be fulfilled in order to make administration citizen-centric.

Accountability

Accountability is defined as the state of being accountable, liable, or answerable. To be accountable means to be obliged to report, explain, or justify something. It ensures that something is carried out as expected. Accountability is a key requirement of good administration. It means public servants must be accountable to the public. They are not only accountable to the questions asked by the people but also they have to respond to demands and provide services to the people.

Accessibility

A good administration has to be accessible by the people. If people have any problem, administrative officials should be ready to listen to them and accordingly respond to their problems. There has to be no fear in the mind of the people regarding the status and rigidity of the bureaucracy. It also requires that there should be no discrimination and the poor have an easy access to administration.

Transparency

Transparency is an essential pre-condition for good administration. It is antonym of secrecy, which is the traditional hallmark of public administration. It implies that the governmental policies and functioning be known to the larger society. Transparency means that information is freely available and directly accessible to those who will be affected by such decisions and their enforcement. It also means that the information is easily understandable. Transparency enables citizens to keep themselves informed about the policies of the government, the rights that they have, and what they should expect as service from the government. Right to information and citizens' charter are means of ensuring transparency in administration.

Participatory

Promoting citizen-centric administration also implies giving a voice to citizens in the governance process. It means involvement of people in administrative activities particularly participation of beneficiaries of the developmental activities, both at the formulation and implementation stage, for the success of programmes. People's participation is also an important safeguard against the abuse of administrative authority. It is a method of tapping human and material resources for development. Meaningful participation by citizens in governance can be promoted through Panchayati Raj Institutions, Bhagidari programmes, and involving citizens groups in certain aspects of governance.

Responsiveness

Responsive administration is an apparently moral concept in public administration in as much as it calls for public functionaries' accountability directly to the people. It is a micro-level concept deriving its credibility and validity from the delivery system of a country's public administration. By being responsive, governmental institutions gain 'legitimacy' in the public realm, which will automatically ensure their wider acceptance and, thus, effectiveness in governance. Responsive administration entails a mechanism of redressal of grievances also.

Effectiveness and Efficiency

Success of an administrative system also depends on the effective and efficient delivery of services to the people. Effectiveness is the extent to which an objective or goal is achieved. If an organization has successfully achieved its objectives, it is considered effective. Effectiveness is, thus, a matter of comparing results with intentions. Efficiency on the other hand refers to the process by which the organization maximizes its objectives with the minimum use of resources.

In addition to the above-mentioned necessary pre-conditions of citizen-centric administration, decentralization and delegation of policies, adoption of modern technology, and process simplification and integrity of civil services are other features and norms of successful administration. In this connection, Dr S. Radhakrishnan's (former Vice President of India) discussion on the occasion of the First Annual day of the Indian Institute of Public Administration on 20 November 1959 are worth noting. He wanted administration 'to be fair in all manners to the people' and that the administrators must feel that they are not there merely to rule over the people but 'they are essentially servants of the people'. He also stated that 'administrators are not to regard themselves as a privileged class. They are not to grow into bureaucracy'. The higher civil servants, Dr Radhakrishnan said 'must understand the needs and aspirations of the common man and woman and try to protect them from the petty officials who are inclined to harass them and show their authority'. Above all he said, 'it is my great anxiety that in this

country we should have administrative integrity first, efficiency next, economy third'. With these conditions, 'we will be able to build a happier Indian society'. He, thus, placed integrity in administration above all other requirements for better governance (Agarwal 2004: iii–iv).

PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN ADMINISTRATION

People's participation in the administrative process is very basic to its success. It means the direct involvement of citizens in the process of administrative decision-making, policy formulation, and implementation. Peoples' participation also means collective and continuous efforts by the people themselves in setting goals, pooling resources together, and taking action which aim at improving their living conditions. To William Morrow, the term citizen participation means the direct participation of ordinary men and women, in contrast to public and private elites, in policy-making. Furthermore, it is employed to focus on the direct participation of the underprivileged and unfranchised in decisions that affect their lives (Morrow 1980: 190).

Citizens' participation in governance embodies a shift in the development paradigm from citizens as the recipients of development to one that views them as active participants in the development process. Equally, it involves a shift from a 'top–down' to a 'bottom–up' approach to development involving increasing decentralization of power away from the union government and closer to the grassroots levels. The concept of citizens' participation in governance is essentially based on the premise that citizens have a legitimate role in influencing the decision-making process that affects their lives, businesses, and communities. In other words, citizens' participation refers to the mechanism and modalities by which citizens can influence and take control over resources and decision-making that directly impacts their lives. At the ideological level, direct citizens' participation in governance is seen as contributing to a healthy democracy because it enhances and improves upon the traditional form of representative democracy to transform it into more responsive and participative grassroots

democracy. It is now widely accepted that active citizens' participation can contribute to good governance in the following ways:

- It enables citizens to make government accountable, more responsive, efficient, and effective;
- It helps to make government programmes and services more effective and sustainable;
- It enables the poor and marginalized to influence public policy and service delivery to improve their lives;
- It helps the individual develop a sense of civic maturity. They become more educated, tolerant, and compassionate, which finally helps in improving the quality of policy;
- It helps in recognizing that citizens have vital contribution to make the betterment of public policy;
- It helps to promote healthy grass roots democracy; and
- It develops better understanding between government and the people.

Peoples' participation in administration is not free from barriers. One of them being, the existence of widespread inertia in the larger society resulting in apathy and passivity. In addition, under the name of people's participation, what may happen is a situation, which William Morrow calls 'abdication', 'pacification', 'cooperation' and 'client-building'. Citizens' participation does not necessarily lead to the leaders representing their constituencies. Rather, they strike a tie-up with the local bureaucracy, which may silence them. The representatives, when interfacing with the bureaucrats represent their individual interest, not their constituencies' cause. It has also been observed that citizens' participation, when not prudently directed, may add to unnecessary delay in decision-making and implementation, and finally increase the red tape (IGNOU 2005: 136).

The fact that participatory efforts occasionally are perverted does not mean that the perversions make the participatory movement meaningless to its original purposes. Citizens' participation demands certain preconditions which have been laid with a view to making it more effective. Some of the important ones are: (*a*) enlightened political leadership; (*b*) citizens should be acknowledgeable and

competent; (*c*) conscientious civil servants; (*d*) an informed and cooperative general public; (*e*) ensuring that information required for taking decisions are clear and precise; (*f*) a well-organized communication network; (*g*) both authority and citizens must demonstrate willingness to take responsibility; (*h*) conducting a practical survey of the environment for which it is intended; and (*i*) participation at all levels—both rural and urban (Avasthi and Maheshwari 2010: 643).

ADMINISTRATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY

Accountability is an essential feature of all forms of democratic governments. The concept of accountability refers to the liability of government servants to give a satisfactory account of the use of official power or discretionary authority to the people. This is considered as an effective safeguard against the misuse of power and abuse of public authority. The substance of accountability, according to Mohit Bhattacharya, places at least four requirements on public administrators:

- Make laws work as intended with a minimum of waste and delay;
- Exercise lawful and sensible administrative discretion;
- Recommend new policies and propose changes in existing policies and programmes as needed; and
- Enhance citizen confidence in the administrative institutions.

The notion of accountability carries two basic connotations—answerability, which stands for the obligation of public officials to inform about and explain what they are doing, and enforcement, that is, the capacity of accounting agencies to impose sanctions on power holders who have violated their public duties.

Administrative Accountability in India

Administrative accountability in India is enforced by means of various controls. The purpose of control is to ensure that the public servants exercise their powers and discretion, in accordance with

laws and regulations. Broadly speaking, there are two types of administrative control, namely, internal and external control. The internal control operates from within the administrative machinery. The techniques of internal control are budgetary system, hierarchical order, enquiries and investigations, pressure groups, press, and annual confidential reports. The external accountability over administration in India is maintained through legislative, executive, and judicial control.

The administration is made responsible towards elected representatives because in a democracy people are supreme. Thus, the legislature has been given certain powers through the Constitution and through conventions so that it is able to keep an effective check upon the malpractice and abuse of authority by administration. The legislature applies a number of methods for controlling administration. Some of these are asking questions during question hour, parliamentary discussions, parliamentary audit, non-confidence motion, and complaints to ombudsman. Executive control over administration is another potent instrument in responsible government. The executive exercises control over administration through a number of means and techniques, like, power of appointment and removal, rule-making power, ordinances, civil service code, delegated legislation, budgetary system, and making appeal to public opinion. Another important instrument through which administrative accountability is ensured is judicial control it may take the shape of judicial review, statutory appeal to the suits and writs against the government. The primary objective of judicial control over administration is the protection of the rights and liberties of citizens by ensuring the legality of administrative act (Singh 2002: 216–17).

Governance and the Changing Notion of Accountability

The accountability question needs to be seen in the background of the paradigm shift that has taken place in public administration. In the practical world of public administration today, two closely competing but contemporary paradigms seem to hold sway: one is

'new public management' and the other is known as 'good governance'. Historically, as we have already discussed, the liberal democratic set-up evolved basic mechanism of accountability such as ministerial control, parliamentary debate, legislative committees, and the ombudsman system. In recent times, there have been some major changes—a sort of paradigmatic shift—in the mode of public governance under the rubric of 'new public management', and 'good governance'.

In contemporary public administration, what is being advocated is a market-centred, neoliberal approach to governance under which its objectives are shifted to economic growth and productivity and its normative standards are redirected towards efficiency, competition, profit, and value for money. This is a radical departure from the traditional norms and objectives of governance enhancing human progress, removing poverty and unemployment, and safeguarding citizens' rights, and guaranteeing justice and fairness. There has, thus, emerged a unique set of challenges to the realization of accountability in the current phase of public administrative changes everywhere. According to Haque, the contemporary changes in governance towards efficiency, outcome, competition, value for money, and customer-orientation pose formidable political, managerial, and methodological challenges to accountability in terms of three specific dimensions:

- The standards of accountability (accountability for what?)
- The agents of accountability (accountability for whom?)
- The means of accountability (how is accountability ensured?) (Haque 2007: 131)

So far as standards of accountability are concerned, these have, under the current mode of governance, become instrumental in nature, placing emphasis more on procedural and economic criteria such as efficiency and productivity than on substantive concerns like equality and representation. In other words, the accountability of public governance for market-based economic performance does not connote its accountability for welfare and justice. Second, under the new dispensation, public governance is accountable for

the effective delivery of its services to customers who can pay, while it may remain indifferent towards low-income or poor citizens who are not in a position to use such services due to their financial incapacity. Accountability under this consumerist mode of governance is to the private affluent customer rather than to the collective public, and as a consequence, the economically underprivileged citizens, who often depend on the state for basic services do not qualify as customers since they are not able to afford user charges. So, the customer view tends to diminish citizens rights vis-à-vis the state and excludes common citizens from the equation of public accountability. The third dimension—the means of accountability— has been under challenge in the context of neoliberal mode of governance. Recent policy to do away with the permanent tenure of civil servants and introduce contract-based appointments makes public servants more vulnerable to political executives exercising control over job contracts and careers; ministerial control, as a means of accountability makes public servants extremely loyal to ministers ignoring their accountability to the common people.

Thus, the issue of accountability in the context of the World Bank strategy of governance reveals the extent to which this idea is linked with the developed world. The primary concern here is to do away with 'dysfunctional and ineffective public institutions-broadly defined to include all institutions that shape the way public functions are carried out—[that] are seen to be at the hearth of the economic developmental challenge' (Chakrabarty 2007: 133–34). In a nutshell, in the era of governance, accountability of administration has shifted from common people to customers who can afford user charges.

MACHINERY FOR REDRESSAL OF PUBLIC GRIEVANCES

According to the Chambers dictionary, grievance means 'a ground of complaint, a condition felt to be oppressive or wrongful'. A grievance may arise out of non-fulfilment of certain demands and expectations. Mere demands may be related to policies of the government or to the performance of the administration in the

implementation of policies framed by the government. A grievance is, thus, any sort of dissatisfaction, which needs to be redressed. Some of the common grievances against the administration may be delineated in the following groups:

- *Corruption*: Demand and acceptance of bribery for doing or not doing things.
- *Favouritism*: Doing or not doing things for obliging people in power or people who matter.
- *Nepotism*: Helping the people of one's own kith or kin.
- *Discourtesy*: Use of abusive language or other types of misbehaviour.
- *Neglect of Duty*: Not doing things which the law requires.
- *Discrimination*: Ignoring poor and uninfluential citizens' genuine complaints.
- *Delay*: Not doing things at the appropriate time.
- *Maladministration*: Inefficiency in achieving the targets.
- *Inadequate Redressal Machinery*: Failure to attend to public complaints against administration (IGNOU EPA-01: 13).

The basic principle of a grievance redressal system is that if the promised level of service delivery is not achieved then it is a right of a citizen that he should be able to take recourse to a mechanism. This mechanism should be well-publicized, easy to use, prompt and, above all, citizens must have faith that they will get justice from it.

GRIEVANCE REDRESSAL MECHANISM IN INDIA

The Government of India, state governments, as well as various organizations under them have set up grievance redressal mechanism to look into the complaints of citizens. At the national level, there are primarily two designated nodal agencies in the union government that handle grievances.

1. Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances, Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pension, and
2. Directorate of Public Grievances, Cabinet Secretariat.

Besides these nodal agencies, there are other institutional mechanisms like the Central Vigilance Commission and the Lokayuktas which have the mandate to look into complaints of corruption and abuse of office by public servants. Many organizations, for example, the Reserve Bank of India, have set up ombudsman to look into grievances. Institutions such as the National and State Human Rights Commissions, National and State Women Commission, the National Commission for Scheduled Castes, and the National Commission for Schedules Tribes also look into the complaints from the public in their prescribed areas. Today, with the increased awareness levels, the aspirations of citizen have gone up as also the demand for prompt and effective resolution of their grievances. The role of some of the important institutions and other initiatives for redressal of public grievance in India are discussed in the following sections.

The Central Vigilance Commission

On the basis of recommendations made by the Committee on Prevention of Corruption, popularly known as the Santhanam Committee, the Central Vigilance Commission (CVC) was set up by the Government of India in 1964. The CVC advises the union government on all matters pertaining to the maintenance of integrity in administration. It exercises superintendence over the working of the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI)—the principal investigating agency of the union government in anti-corruption matters—and also over the vigilance administration of various ministries and other organizations of the union government.

Lokpal and Lokayukta

The first ARC had recommended the setting up of the Lokpal. The Lokpal Bill has been introduced several times in the Parliament, but due to various reasons it has not been enacted into a law. The Lokpal is supposed to be a watchdog over the integrity of ministers and the MPs. The Lokpal Bill provides for constitution of the Lokpal as an independent body to enquire into cases of corruption against public functionaries, with a mechanism for filing complaints and conducting inquiries.

After the recommendations of the first ARC, many states have constituted 'Lokayuktas' to investigate allegations or grievances arising out of the conduct of public servants including political executives, legislators, officers of the state government, local bodies, public enterprises, and other instruments of the government. A member of the public can file specific allegations with the Lokayukta against any public servant for enquiry. The Lokayukta can also initiate suo-motu inquiry into the conduct of public servants.

Main features of the Lokpal and Lokayukta Bill, 2011

The following are the main features of the Lokpal and Lokayukta Bill, 2011, tabled in the Lok Sabha on 22 December 2011.

- The Lokpal Bill has two parts:

  ° Part one is a Constitution Amendment Bill which seeks to provide constitutional status to Lokpal.
  ° Part two seeks to set up the institution of Lokpal and Lokayuktas, which will act as anti-corruption agencies in states.

- Lokpal will have nine members including a chairperson who is or has been a Chief Justice of India, or has been a judge of Supreme Court, or an eminent person.
- Fifty per cent of the members of Lokpal shall be persons belonging to SC, ST, OBC, and women.
- The prime minister will be chairperson of the selection committee which will appoint Lokpal and its members. It will comprise of the Speaker of the House, Leader of Opposition, Chief Justice of India or a Judge of Supreme Court nominated by him, one eminent jurist nominated by the president.
- The Lokayukta in every state will consist of a chairperson and eight other members.
- Lokayukta and other members will be appointed by the governor of which the chief minister of the state will be chairman of the selection committee.
- The Lokpal will be accountable to the Parliament.
- The CBI will not be controlled administratively by Lokpal.

- Lokpal shall constitute as an inquiry wing—provided that till such time it is constituted central government shall make available such number of officers and other staff from its ministries or departments.
- Lokpal shall also constitute as a prosecution wing—provided that till such time it is constituted central government shall make available such number of officers and other staff from its ministries or departments.
- Lokpal cannot have power to initiate proceedings against an officer on its own; a complaint has to be lodged with the ombudsman before it orders an inquiry.
- Jurisdiction of Lokpal to include the prime minister, ministers, MPs, Groups A, B, C, and D officials of the central government.
- Lokpal will have no jurisdiction as far as the prime minister is concerned with issues related to international relations, external and internal security, public order, atomic energy and space.
- Lokpal has the power to recommend central government transfer and suspension of public servant with allegation of corruption.
- Lokpal can recommend corruption cases to agencies like the CVC and will have to submit report to Lokpal after an inquiry.

The Bill was passed by the Lok Sabha, but it could not get a majority in the Rajya Sabha. Anti-corruption activist Anna Hazare termed the Bill as a betrayal and cruel joke on the citizens of India. He is insisting for a Jan Lokpal Bill. The Jan Lokpal Bill, also referred to as the Citizen's Ombudsman Bill, is a *draft anti-corruption Bill* drawn up by prominent civil society activists seeking the appointment of a Jan Lokpal, an independent corruption investigation body. This draft Bill has also proposed improvements to the Lokpal and Lokayukta Bill, 2011, tabled in the Parliament in December 2011.The prefix *Jan* signifies the fact that these improvements include inputs provided by 'ordinary citizens' through an activist-driven, non-governmental public consultations.

Table 8.1
Comparison: Jan Lokpal Bill and Government Lokpal Bill

Jan Lokpal Bill (Citizen's Ombudsman Bill)	Government's Lokpal Bill (2011)
Lokpal will have powers to initiate suo-motu action or receive complaints of corruption from the general public.	Lokpal will have no power to initiate suo-motu action or receive complaints of corruption from the general public. It can only probe complaints forwarded by the Speaker of the Lok Sabha or the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha.
Lokpal will have the power to initiate prosecution of anyone found guilty.	Lokpal will only be an Advisory Body with a role limited to forwarding reports to a 'competent authority'.
Lokpal will have police powers as well as the ability to register FIRs.	Lokpal will have no police powers and no ability to register an FIR or proceed with criminal investigations.
Lokpal and the anti corruption wing of the CBI will be one independent body.	The CBI and Lokpal will be unconnected.

Table 8.1 shows the main differences between Jan Lokpal Bill and the Government Lokpal Bill 2011.

E-Governance: Bringing People Closer to Administration

E-governance is the short form of 'electronic governance'. If governance is done through the use of ICT, it is said to be e-governance. Thus, in general, e-governance denotes use of ICT in any organization, that is, governing through an electronic mode. Increasingly, e-governance is used to refer to the performance of governmental function through the application of ICT, the most well-known part of which is the internet. Thus, e-governance is about a process of reform in the way governments work, share information, and deliver services to internal and external clients. Specifically, e-government harnesses information and communication technologies, such as the internet, the web, and mobile phones, to deliver information and services to citizens and businesses. As a first step, information about

services is published on a website and citizens can interact with the site to download application forms for a variety of services. The next stage involves the use of ICT in the actual delivery of services, such as filing a tax return or renewing a licence. More sophisticated applications can process on-line payments (Bhatnagar 2008: 247). E-governance, thus, provides citizens the ability to obtain government services through electronic means, enabling access to government information and completion of government transactions on an anywhere, anytime basis. The idea is simply to create the capability for providing citizens' access to government departments through electronic networks. Thus, through e-governance, the aim of SMART governance is achieved, that is:

- *Simple*: There are no elaborate procedures, no paper work, and no need for frequenting government offices;
- *Moral*: The system is cleaned up of corruption and other unethical practices;
- *Accountable*: Since all the information is in public domain, the government's accountability enhances;
- *Responsiveness*: Through the use of ICT, the government can be in regular touch with the masses and get their feedback; and
- *Transparency*: The information which was shrouded in secrecy within dark file chambers will become available to all on the click of a mouse.

E-revolution in ICT has the potential of elevating the governance process to new levels. ICT facilitates efficient storing and retrieval of data, instantaneous transmission of information, processing information and data faster than the earlier manual systems, speeding up governmental processes, taking decisions expeditiously and judiciously, and increasing transparency and enforcing accountability. It also helps in increasing the reach of government, both geographically and demographically. Recognizing the increasing importance of electronics, Government of India established the Department of Electronics in 1970. The subsequent establishment of the National Informatics Centre (NIC) in 1977 was the first step

towards e-Governance in India as it brought 'information' and its communication in focus. Several important initiatives were also undertaken by the union and the state governments in the 1990s. All these culminated in the launch of the National e-Governance Programme in 2006.

In the developed countries, governance is a well-established mode in which governmental services are made available to citizens through internet portals. In India, digital governance has been legalized by the Information Technology Act of 2000. The act provides

> legal recognition for transaction carried out by means of electronic data interchange and other means of electronic communication, commonly referred to as 'electronic commerce' which involve use of alternatives to paper-based methods of communication and storage of information, to facilitate electronic filling of documents with the government agencies.

Legally endorsed, this act is a watershed in conceptualizing administrative reform in India. More importantly, governance is certainly an attack on bureaucratic red tapism, which causes unnecessary delay and corruption. It is a tool for achieving 'good governance especially with regard to improving efficiency, transparency and making interface with government user friendly'. Thus, the citizens can not only view on-line the governmental acts, they can also provide significant inputs through e-mails and electronic devices. Technology is, thus, an important tool for integrating citizens' input and transparency into one model (Chakrabarty and Bhattacharya 2008: 52).

The ICT-based e-governance has ushered in a new era in government innovations with capacities to, (*a*) reduce the cost of the government, (*b*) increase citizens' input into government, (*c*) improve public decision-making, and (*d*) increase the transparency of government transactions. The object of e-governance is 'to arm the citizens to act as watch dogs to government'. In view of these well-defined functional characteristics, the governance is also a very meaningful step towards combating corruption. By reducing

discretionary powers it curbs opportunities for arbitrary action. It also empowers the citizens by making their intervention in the transactions of governmental business regular through ICT. The project e-Sewa (service) that began in West Godavari district of Andhra Pradesh, India, is a good example to cite here. The project is a tool 'to bridge the digital divide in the rural areas' through extensive use of information technology 'for providing access to various citizen to citizen (C2C) and citizen to government (C2G) services to the people in rural areas'. Managed by a women's self-help group, the project is a class by itself as it enables 'the local women-participants' to emerge as 'information leaders', who remain critical in realizing the goal of e-Sewa (Chakrabarty and Bhattacharya 2008: 53).

Drawing from ICT, e-governance articulates public administration in a refreshing new way. It seeks to forge a link between citizens and government in terms of electronic public service. By doing so, it creates conditions for strong citizen's participation in the government's decision-making process. The successful induction of e-governance requires a change of mindset. This, in turn, requires great political will and determination and a clear-headed and decisive leadership.

Citizens' Charters

The Citizens' Charter is an instrument which seeks to make an organization transparent, accountable, and citizen friendly. The Citizens' Charter scheme in its present form was first launched in 1991 in the United Kingdom. The aim was to ensure that public services were made responsive to the citizens they serve. A Citizens' Charter is basically a set of commitments made by an organization regarding the standards of service which it delivers. It is a public statement that defines the entitlements of citizens to a specific service, the standards of the service, the conditions to be met by users, and the remedies available to the latter in case of non-compliance of standards. The charter concept empowers the citizens in demanding committed standards of service. Thus, the basic thrust of the charter is to make public services citizen-centric

by ensuring that these services are demand driven rather than supply driven. In this context, the six principles of the Citizens' Charter movement as originally framed were:

- *Quality* by improving the quality of services;
- *Choice* for the users wherever possible;
- *Standards* specifying what to expect within a time frame;
- *Value* for the taxpayers' money;
- *Accountability* of the service provider (individual as well as organization); and
- *Transparency* in rules, procedures, schemes, and grievance redressal (Second ARC 2009: 34).

The Citizens' Charter, when introduced in the early 1990s, represented a landmark shift in the delivery of public services. The emphasis of the Citizens' Charter is on citizens as customers of public services. So far 111 central ministries/departments/organizations have formulated Citizens' Charters in India.

Right to Information: Emerging Mechanism to Redress Public Grievances

Right to Information means the freedom of people to have access to government information. It implies that the citizens should have free access to all files and documents pertaining to the governments working process. Right to information has been seen as the key to strengthening participatory democracy and ushering in people-centred governance, as access to information can empower the citizens to demand and get information about public policies and actions, thereby leading to their welfare. Transparency in government organizations makes them function more objectively, predictably, and also enables citizens to participate in the governance process effectively. In a fundamental sense, right to information is a basic necessity of good governance.

In recognition of the need for transparency in public affairs, the Indian Parliament enacted the Right to Information Act on 11 May 2005. The act provides for the proactive disclosure of information,

establishment of the Information Commission, appointment of public information officers, procedures for getting information, and so on. It is a path-breaking legislation empowering people and promoting transparency. It provides for the setting up of a practical regime to enable and empower citizens to secure access to information under the control of public authorities. The act gives citizens the right to request and access information held by the government at different levels, and places a corresponding duty on the government to provide information proactively and on request. The act defines 'information' broadly to include, not only information kept in all forms of print and electronic media, but also physical samples of works. In terms of scope, the act covers the whole of India (except the state of Jammu and Kashmir), specifically, it gives to citizens right to information held by public authorities established, owned, or substantially financed by the central government, the state governments, and the administration of the union territories. This includes Panchayats, municipalties, and other local bodies (Sharma and Devasher 2007: 356).

The act lays down the time limit as thirty days for normal applications and forty days where a third party submission is to be called for. In a novel approach, these time limits are reduced to a mere forty-eight hours where information sought 'concerns the life and liberty of a person'. The application fee is ₹10 per request and no fee is charged from people living below the poverty line. It provides for the appointment of Public Information Officers (PIOs) in all administrative units/offices, as may be necessary to provide information to persons requesting it. Assistant IPOs are also to be appointed at each sub-divisional or sub-district level. These provisions are designed to bring access closer to the people by ensuring that applicants can submit requests in their local areas. Every PIO can be penalized ₹250 per day, upto a maximum of ₹25,000, for not accepting application, delaying information without reasonable causes, and providing incomplete, incorrect, and misleading information. Information must be in writing, including e-mails, and the request must be submitted to the PIO. Where no response is received, this will be deemed to be refusal. But, applications must be rejected in writing with appropriate reason.

The act also defines ten categories of information that are exempted from disclosure because of their sensitive nature. These are information related to national security, information given in confidence by a foreign government, cabinet papers, and trade and commercial secrets. Central Intelligence agencies and security agencies like the Intelligence Bureau (IB), Research and Analysis Wing (RAW), Directorate of Revenue Intelligence, Central Economic Intelligence Bureau, and special frontier forces like the BSF, CRPF, ITBP, CISF, and so on, are also excluded from this act. But information relating to corruption and human rights must be given but only with the approval of Central or State Information Commission as the case may be. The act provides for the establishment of an Information Commission at the centre and in all states comprising Chief Information Commissioner and ten Information Commissioners. The commission can make any order required to bring about compliance with the law, including releases of documents, appointment of PIOs, and publication of specified information. The act says that the Central Chief Information Commissioner will be appointed by a committee consisting of the prime minister, leader of the opposition, and a union minister nominated by the prime minister.

The Right to Information Act, 2005, is one of the most empowering legislations available to the citizens of India. It facilitates specific action towards solving existing and emerging problems. The act should not be taken as a negative measure but rather a positive approach to improve the machinery of governance at every level. It is expected to keep the civil services active through the feedback of the people through information sought by them. Information asked by the people can also help the civil servants in ascertaining the satisfaction of the people. However, it is also to be kept in mind that mere conferment of the Right to Information without changing the prevalent style of governance would make the entire exercise futile. In the context of our present scenario characterized by the lack of political will and reluctant attitude of bureaucracy to recognize the people's right to information, the role of civil society organizations would be crucial and significant in ushering in a new era of open, transparent, and accountable governance. The

more these organizations come forward to enlighten and mobilize the people at the grass roots, the more would be the realization of the immense potential of the right to information.

Role of Voluntary Agencies

Non-governmental organizations also play a very important role in supplementing government efforts in redressing grievances. In the Seventh Five Year Plan, great emphasis was laid on the involvement of voluntary agencies and other interest groups in making the bureaucracy more responsive to legitimate demands of citizens. They create an awareness of the rights of public and interact with administrative departments/ministries for formulation of policies and action programmes. They also provide counselling and spokesman services. The Standing Committees of Voluntary Agencies (SCOVA) have already been set up in various departments, such as Youth Affairs; Sports, Pension and Pensioners; and Welfare and Health and Family Welfare. In India, Seva Mandir (Udaipur), Saheli (Jaipur), Aastha (Udaipur), and Sulabh International (New Delhi) are some of the NGOs working in the field (Ahuja and Ojha 2008: 186).

In view of the gradual withdrawal of the state from the social sector, voluntary organizations have grown in importance, not only as an alternative to what is being pursued as development but also as a relatively new experiment in which the role of the conventional agencies is largely being eclipsed. They play the role of activists, executing programmes and delivering services and also as 'the mobilizers of opinions, awareness and support of the people concerned with and affected by social, economic and political problems'. The role of voluntary agencies is, thus, increasingly being recognized because they have the special advantage of the knowledge of local conditions, not only to design the programmes better but also monitor them effectively. Even their contribution in making people aware of various developmental schemes, adopted by the state is now highly appreciated. This suggests a clear shift in the government's attitude towards the voluntary agencies and vice versa.

Civil Society: Promoting People-centric Governance

The governance paradigm has challenged state-centric public administration. The inadequate state-directed development paradigm has given rise to an approach involving local people and local resources in a decentralized, people-centric self-development mode. What is critical in this conceptualization of development is civil society that has emerged as the third sector along with the state and the market. Significant departure from the conventional conceptualization of public administration, civil society-centred governance creates spaces for voluntary action in areas where the state has already retreated. Civil society gains salience in developing countries presumably because the state-directed development paradigm fails to a large extent to eradicate poverty and also to contain the emergence of an 'insensitive' and also mechanical bureaucracy. Civil society contributes to the consolidation of the decentralized bottom–up, people-centric grassroots governance.

Public administration, in its new avatar of governance, articulates a trilogy of state, market, and civil society. Governance is not merely governmental, but a design which is both market-driven and civil society-induced. The market redefines citizens as clients or consumer while civil society expands the public sphere by including a whole range of civic actions that hardly figure in the bureaucratic model of public administration. Civil society can, thus, be most effective in governance by mediating between the citizen and the state, articulating citizens' interests to the government, inculcating participatory norms, and restricting government through citizens' involvement in its day-to-day functioning. Drawing from the shared accountability of stakeholders, the new governance paradigm secures accountability by reducing discretion or delegation in public bureaucracy through collaborative governance. This also makes participation meaningful and effective in the sense that the involvement of the stakeholders in decision-making brings about changes in the organizational structure from a hierarchical, centralized to a more decentralized and flexible form for enhancing self-management. Civil society, thus, makes participation in governance people-centric and also development-oriented.

GOVERNANCE DISCOURSE AND THE CHANGING ROLE OF CITIZENS

The concept of citizenship is a key component in public administration. It fosters concern for public interest and plays an important role in the creation of a harmonious society. However, the governance discourse which is a neoliberal response to public administration is radically changing the role of the citizens. It is providing diverse channels for articulating and aggregating their interest in a democracy. Also, it is enabling them to act in different capacities as citizens, voters, consumers, clients, or members of interest groups. It speaks for the empowerment of customers, not citizens, increased choices for citizens, and an empowered government providing public choices in meeting the needs of the customer. The significance accorded to the consumer represents an economic view of human behaviour. There is a stark distinction between a citizen and a client or customer. A citizen is an individual in a constitutional state, a repository of rights and duties endowed upon him by law, rules, and regulations, whereas, a customer or client functions in a market atmosphere, holding certain rights and responsibilities, and is willing to pay for the services received (Medury 2010: 159). The governance approach gives primacy to consumers instead of citizens, to their rights and participation in public services.

Most contemporary movements in public administration advocate increased citizen participation or involvement in administrative governance, yet have significantly different definitions of citizen participation. NPM advocates participation from a managerial perspective, building citizen participation into managerial techniques, often drawn from TQM and similar management movements in private sector (Osborne and Hutchinsons 2004: 15). In these models, citizens are the consumers or customers of government services and their input is important in order to deliver high-performance products and services. Citizen participation is encouraged in the form of citizen satisfaction panels or surveys, and in performance measurement. Citizens, in the present model, are one of the inputs of the managerial process. What is important here is to see that participation is defined as inputs and as one of

the pieces of raw material used in the production process, separate from the machinery that produces the public or civic good (Box 2007: 78).

'Public' in public administration seems to have lost its significance and the market has acquired salience in governance. Citizens have, thus, become clients, guided largely by neoliberal individualism. Bureaucrats are 'rent-seekers' and not society's 'benevolent guardians', as Bentham believed. Explaining the distortions in public bureaucracy within the 'public choice' perspective, governance provides a conceptual framework to define collective behaviour in terms of 'methodological individualism' in which the selfish interests of individuals seem to be the driving force in whatever they undertake in society. Public administration is now 'governance' which is nothing but checklists of certain activities designed both to stabilize and also to consolidate neoliberalism. In the changed circumstances, the citizen is a client or a customer—you have to pay the price for the services you use. According to Uma Medury, the relationship between the state and the citizen, which has always been dialectical, now appears to be morphing into a relationship between a producer of services and customers. The goal of administration tends to be the satisfaction of the needs of these consumers through their participation and consultation. This sort of situation poses questions as to whether it is possible to transform a fundamentally political and dialectical relationship, and whether client satisfaction can diminish the dissatisfaction of citizens and restore confidence in the government (Medury 2010: 160).

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

It may be concluded that the position of the citizens from being mere recipients of the administrative help and services has now shifted to their being the prime movers in the affairs of governance; a change from local beneficiary status to active 'participant status'. In a democracy, the main purpose of public administration is to serve the people. An accountable, accessible, transparent, participative, and responsive administration is inevitable to

address the problems of the people. There are different ways in which citizens interact with the administrative agencies in day-to-day life. Through these interactions people have observed that administration in India is generally unresponsive, insensitive, and corrupt. Thus, citizens' grievances against administration are on an increase and at the same time concerted efforts are being made by the government to reduce the growing discontent among the citizens by providing various channels for redressal of their grievances.

REFERENCES

Agarwal, U.C. (ed.). 2004. *Public Administration: Vision and Reality*. New Delhi: Indian Institute of Public Administration, p. 270.

Ahuja, Kanta and A.K. Ojha. 2008. *Governance and Reforms*. Jaipur: Aalekh Publication.

Avasthi, A. and S. Maheswari. 2010. *Public Administration*. Agra: Lakshmi Narain Agarwal.

Bhatnagar, Subhash C. 2008. 'E-Government: Building a SMART Administration for India's States', in Bidyut Chakrabarty and Mohit Bhattacharya (eds), *The Governance Discourse: A Reader*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Bhattacharya, Mohit. 2008. *New Horizons of Public Administration*. New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers and Distributors.

Box, Richard C. (ed.). 2007. *Democracy and Public Administration*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.

Chakrabarty, Bidyut. 2007. *Reinventing Public Administration: The Indian Experience*. New Delhi: Orient Longman.

Chakrabarty, Bidyut and Mohit Bhattacharya (eds). 2008. *The Governance Discourse: A Reader*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Dicey, A.V. 1948. *Lectures on Relation between Law and Public Opinion in England During the Nineteenth Century* (2nd edition). London: Macmillan.

Government of India. 2008. *Report of the Sixth Central Pay Commission*. New Delhi: Government of India, p. 365.

Haque, M. Shamsul. 2007. 'Significance of Accountability under the New Approach to Public Governance', in Bidyut Chakrabarty (ed.), *Reinventing Public Administration: The Indians Experience*. New Delhi: Orient Longman.

IGNOU. *Citizen and Administration*, EPA-01 (Administrative Theory). New Delhi: IGNOU.

IGNOU. 2005. *State, Society and Public Administration* (MPA-011). New Delhi: IGNOU.

Medury, Uma. 2010. *Public Administration in the Globalization Era: The New Public Management Perspective*. New Delhi: Orient Black Swan.

Morrow, William L. 1980. *Public Administration: Politics and the Political System*. New York: Random House.

Osborne, D. and Hutchinsons. 2004. *The Price of Government: Getting the Results We Need in an Age of Permanent Fiscal Crisis*. New York: Basic Books.

Rouband, Luc (ed.). 1999. *Citizens and the New Governance*. Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Second Administrative Reforms Commission (ARC). 2009. *Citizen Centric Administration: The Heart of Governance*. Government of India.

Sharma, Pradeep K. and Mandakini Devasher. 2007. 'Right to Information in India: Legislation and Beyond', in Satyajit Singh and Pradeep K. Sharma (eds), *Decentralisation: Institutions and Politics in Rural India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Singh, Amita. 2002. *Public Administration: Roots and Wings.* New Delhi: Galgotia Publishing.

Public Administration in India[1]

Historically, public administration as practised in India has been bearing the imprint of British colonial administration which is of immediate scholarly interest. The pre-British, particularly Mughal, administrative forms and functions were, to some extent, absorbed by the imperial rule. But, what continues even today is, in most parts, the lingering structure of colonial administration. The secretariat organization and practices, the district administrative structure, and the superior civil services have continued uninterrupted even after Independence, and not much change has really been effected in the long phase of post Independence administrative life of the nation. Eminent historians have ably dealt with historical account of administrative evolution.[2] The aim of the present chapter is to (*a*) identify and analyse the major landmark events in the evolution of public administration in India and (*b*) focus on significant contributions to Indian administrative

thought that serve to illuminate and critically analyse the structures and processes of the multi-level complex of Indian administration, including its impact on society, polity, and economy.

Public administration in India is rooted in British colonial rule.[3] There are, however, administrative practices that had pre-British legacies, including the administrations that preceded British rule in India. The nature of the British administration also varied; under the East India Company, the Crown was not directly involved in administration, it was peripherally linked as the supreme authority controlling the company that functioned under the overall administrative jurisdiction of the British queen. Empowered by the Crown, two institutions were entrusted with the operation of the company in India—the Court of Proprietors and the Court of Directors. These two courts were largely independent and decided the course of action for the company in India. The Queen's charter authorized the courts to fulfil its goal in India without almost any restriction. The company functioned in a ruthless manner, guided solely by its commercial interests. Although, there were attempts by the company rulers to bring about reforms in administration, they remained largely academic in nature. Complaints against the 'misrule' of the company poured in and as a result, the House of Commons appointed a Committee of Secrecy to look into the authenticity of the complaints. The findings of the committee went seriously against the company. The result was the adoption of the Regulating Act of 1773, the first formal articulation of the British supremacy over a part of India that abolished the dual government of the Company.

THE REGULATING ACT, 1773

This act was the first measure of the British Parliament that directly intervened in the affairs of the company. Although, the power of the company's directors remained unaltered, the regulation that the company was required to keep the Treasury Bench informed, and this reduced its independence drastically. The Governor of Bengal, Warren Hastings, was now designated as the Governor General who would be assisted by a council of four

members, recommended by the Crown. According to the Act, the supreme authority rested not with the Governor General, but with the council, guided by the principle of majority while taking a decision vis-à-vis India. While in India, the council remained supreme, but it had to function under the supervision, direction, and control of the Court of Directors in London.

The act was a major milestone in India's public administration for four specific reasons: First, by restraining the company, the act simply endorsed the important values in administration. As the company was involved in public administration in India, it hardly could avoid its obligations to the ruled. The intervention by the Crown clearly suggests that the British government was not at ease with the way, company was managing its affairs in India. So, the act was largely an outcome of an ideological concern of the rulers in England for the governed in India. There is no denying the fact that colonial interests remained paramount though the act contributed to a social and political ambience that led to the adoption of ameliorating legal enactments in course of time. Second, rejecting the individual-based administration, as epitomized by the governor, the act also made the council accountable to the Crown. This was a significant break with the past because public administration was not merely governance, but governance with a purpose. So, apart from laying the structure of administration, the Regulating Act, 1773, sought to change the ideological basis of company rule that was now guided by the well-established principles of administration, evolved in the long tradition of Westminster democracy under the Crown. Third, the act marked the beginning of centralization. The Governor-General-in-Council became the supreme ruler in India and the governors of three presidencies of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay were reduced to subordinate governments. Within the overall control of the governor general, the act, however, demarcated administrative domains of the governors of the presidencies that was critical to the evolution of public administration in India. By involving the council in administration, the act also inaugurated a new trend in the company's rule that no longer, remained, at least theoretically, as arbitrary as before. The governor general was required to consult the council and was

also made accountable to the British Parliament. Finally, the most outstanding feature of the act was the establishment of a Supreme Court in Calcutta. This court was founded under the Letters of Patent with Elijah Impey as the Chief Justice and three other judges. Primarily a court of record, it also had civil, criminal, ecclesiastical, admiralty, equity, and supervisory jurisdiction over the whole Presidency and any person in the employment of the company even outside the Presidency.

As evident, the act was most critical to public administration in India because (*a*) it laid down the skeleton of the governmental system of modern India and (*b*) all subsequent enactments can be said to have either enlarged or amplified the basic text of the 1773 Act. Despite its limited appeal in today's context, the act was certainly radical in its approach and content. By holding the company responsible to the Parliament, the act sought to shape company's administration in accordance with principles of 'formal' democracy. Although the act recommended unitary command by suggesting the supremacy of the Governor-General-in-Council, it was also a device for 'limited' decentralization because the governors of the presidencies remained independent, at least administratively, within their respective domains.

The Regulating Act of 1773 was not sufficiently equipped to address the administrative distortions in India under the company's rule. The parliamentary committee under Edmund Burke exposed the arbitrary functioning of the governor general and chief justice and recommended for their recall. But, this was not possible because the Board of Proprietors refused to respect the recommendation. This led to a constitutional crisis because it also demonstrated the lack, if not absence, of parliamentary control on the company's rule in India. In response, the Pitt's India Act of 1784 was enacted. According to this act, the Court of Directors were allowed 'free hands' to manage the commercial affairs of the company in India while in political sphere, the authority was vested in a new body, known as the Board of Control comprising of six commissioners. Appointed by the King, the board had in it the Chancellor of the Exchequer, a Secretary of State, and four Privy Councilors. The board retained full powers of 'superintendence, direction and,

control' of all operations of the civil and military governments of the British territorial possessions in the East Indies. The Court of Proprietors lost its hegemony in company's affairs except in the election of directors who were given the authority to make appointments of all posts in India though the Crown was authorized to recall any person in the employment of the company.

In the evolution of public administration in India, the Pitt's Act was an important benchmark for two reasons: First, the act established the supremacy of the British Crown in territories controlled by the company. Administration was now an elaborate arrangement involving those, appointed by the King and accountable to the parliament. Through various structural mechanisms, the British government sought to create a system of governance in India which was qualitatively different from any of the preceding administrations. Second, this act introduced a new policy in relation to the Indian Princes by laying down that the Company should follow a policy of 'non-interference' in their affairs. In other words, the company was restricted to those areas which were already under its control. The non-intervention policy was short-lived and by the end of the eighteenth century, especially with the arrival of Wellesley as Governor General, the British Empire in Indian was transformed into the British empire of India. Wellesley accomplished his task both by military stringency and strategic 'subsidiary alliances' with the Indian princes. What was remarkable about Wellesley, apart from his role as an empire-builder, was his concern for an efficient administration because he believed that without skilled administrators the empire could not survive. With this intent, he founded a college at Fort William for the training of the company's civil servants. From here, one can trace the genesis of Indian Civil Service that was to be founded soon.

THE CHARTER ACT, 1833

Of all the acts, enacted by the British Parliament to govern the East India Company in India, the Charter Act of 1833 is perhaps the most watershed legislative intervention in India's public administration. Why was such an act necessary? The administration, both

in India and Britain, confronted new circumstances following the rapid expansion of the British Empire in India. The administrative machinery was not adequate in holding the empire together. In Britain, parliamentary reforms led to a new form of governance, largely due to the influence of Enlightenment philosophy with its emphasis on enlightened liberalism. There was a clamour for free trade with India, unrestricted immigration of Europeans into India, reform of laws, and improvement of education in India. Two ardent liberals who set forth the changes in the British attitude during this period were Macaulay and James Mill; while the former, also a parliamentarian, was the Secretary to the Board of Control and latter was the Examiner of Indian Correspondence at India House.

As the company lost its commercial monopoly in India following the acceptance of the Charter Act, all restrictions to European immigration into India were removed. Besides, the act introduced new devices of administrative control in India which are as follows: First, the Governor General, now designated as Governor General of India was vested with supreme authority in so far as civil, military, and revenue administration were concerned. In the centralized administration, the governors of other provinces were subordinates to the governor general who became the pivot of the British administration in India. Second, all decisions of the Governor General and governors overriding the decisions of their respective Executive Councils were to be supported by recorded statement of reasons. This was a rider in the stipulation to restrain those holding supreme authority. Third, all legislative powers were vested in the Governor-General-in-Council and the provincial governments lost their legislative powers. Laws approved by the Governor-General-in-Council came to be designated as acts and the endorsement of the Supreme Court for their validity was withdrawn. These acts were applicable to all courts. Fourth, a law member who was to be an English Barrister was to be appointed to the Governor-General-in-Council in an advisory capacity. This appointment was certainly a significant step in the constitution of the Imperial Legislative Council. Macaulay, the first Law Member, was also entrusted with the task of codifying laws for India in

his capacity as the President of the Indian Law Commission that came into being at the behest of the Governor General. Finally, the Charter Act was also a powerful statement against discrimination in employment under the company due to religion, place of birth, descent, colour, or any of these. Although this principle was theoretically endorsed, the practice was otherwise for reasons connected with colonialism.

Public administration in India gradually became complex with the expansion of the British Empire. While the 1773 Regulation Act ushered in an era of centralized administration of the company, the Charter Act, 1883, marked the culmination of that process by establishing the authority of the Crown over the administration in India. The governor general became supreme along with council. As evident, the Indian administration was largely Weberian in spirit and content; it was hierarchical and centralized involving various layers of administration within the overall structure of British rule. Its purpose was defined by colonialism that remained a determining influence, for obvious reasons, until India's Independence in 1947.

THE ACT FOR 'GOOD GOVERNANCE' IN INDIA, 1858

Perhaps the most distinctive act that radically altered the nature of public administration in India was the act of 1858 which brought the East India Company's century-old rule to an end. In order to strengthen the colonial rule in the aftermath of the 1857 abortive revolt of the Indian army, which is characterized as the first war of Independence, this act stipulated devices to improve the administrative machinery by which the Indian government was to be superintended and controlled by the Crown in England. As the 1858 Queen's proclamation that led to the adoption of this act underlines:

> [T]he Queen appoints Viscount Canning as 'the First Viceroy and Governor-General in and over our said territories, and to administer the government in our name, and generally to act in our name

and on our behalf, subject to such orders and regulations as he shall, from time to time, receive through one of our Principal Secretaries of State'.

Furthermore, 'when, by the blessing of Providence, internal tranquility shall be restored, it is our earnest desire to stimulate the peaceful industry of India, to promote works of public utility and improvement, and to administer the Government for the benefit of all ours subjects resident therein. In their prosperity will be our strength, in their contentment our security, and in their gratitude our best reward'.

As evident, the proclamation provides significant inputs to the act of 1858. By abolishing the Court of Directors and the Board of Control, the act transferred the government, territories, and revenues from the company to the Crown. India was to be governed by the English Sovereign that, by implication, suggests the importance of the British Parliament in governance in India. As the pivot of colonial administration, the Secretary of State for India discharged all powers vested earlier in the Board of Control and Court of Directors. As a member of the cabinet, the Secretary of State drew his salary from the revenues generated from India. He was authorized to place the annual statement of accounts of all government revenue and expenditure in India and to submit a report of all moral and material progress in India. To assist him in the discharge of his constitutional and administrative responsibilities, he was provided with a parliamentary and permanent under-secretary. A council, designated as the India Council, was constituted to help him perform his duties most efficiently. The council was mainly an advisory aid and its role was, thus limited though on various occasions it acted in a decisive manner to influence the decisions of the governor-general through other constitutional bodies.

The Act of 1858 was not qualitatively different from the earlier acts in the sense that it made no spectacular changes in the colonial administration except that it vested the entire revenue of the country in the Governor-General-in-Council. The provincial governments became totally subsidiary to the council. Another paramount

act which introduced non-official members in the administration was the 1861 Indian Councils Act. The function of the council was limited to legislation and had no authority to control the executive though it empowered the provincial governments to legislate on provincial matters. The Executive Council was expanded to include the Advocate General of the provinces, in addition to four non-official members who were invariably Indians.

The Indian Councils Act is a remarkable piece of legislation for two important reasons: First, it was certainly an important step towards decentralization of power and in that sense it was a break with the past. For the first time, steps were taken to provide an alternative to centralized British administration. Second, it also introduced Indians in the administration by recommending the inclusion of non-official members. It was a deliberate political design to accommodate the elite Indians in public administration that had an enormous impact, especially in the aftermath of the 1857 uprising. Although, those who were nominated were either Indian princes or big land owners, it was undoubtedly a significant beginning towards involving Indians in public administration.

In the early part of the Crown administration, two processes seem to have worked. On the one hand, attempts were made to strengthen the Governor-General-in-Council and there were steps, on the other hand, towards devolution, especially of, financial power. In this connection, the 1870 Mayo Resolution is most remarkable which stated:

> Local interest, supervision and care are necessary to success in the management of funds devoted to education, sanitation, medical charity and local public works. The operation of the resolution in its full meaning and integrity will afford opportunities for the development of local self government, for strengthening municipal institutions and for association of the natives and Europeans to a greater extent than before in the administration of affairs.

Several acts were enacted to constitute municipalities in Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras. The most eventful development in this

regard, was undoubtedly, the 1882 Ripon Resolution that defended the introduction of the local self-government by underlining that it was introduced 'not primarily with a view to improvement in administration. It is chiefly desirable as an element of political and popular education'. In pursuance of this goal, the 1885 Bengal Local Self Government Act was adopted that led to the formation of district local boards in Bengal.

The trajectory of the British rule in its initial phase suggests the phased decentralization of administration and also the growing involvement of Indians in administration. Two substantial events changed the course of colonialism: (*a*) the founding of the universities of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay helped develop an articulate opinion of the educated Indians on the British rule. It captured the growing discontent among the Indians who always remained, for obvious reasons, peripheral in administration; and (*b*) the inauguration of the Indian National Congress in 1885 created a new platform to ventilate the grievances of the ruled. This also became a forum for the Indians to articulate demands for better rule. The outcome of which was the 1892 Indian Councils Act. As the act underlines, its aim:

> to widen and expand the functions of the Government of India, and to give further opportunities to the non-official and native elements in Indiana society to take part in the work of the Government, and in that way, to lend official recognition to that remarkable development both of political interest and political capacity that had been visible among the higher classes of Indian society since the Government of India was taken over by the Crown in 1858.

The act provided for the enhanced membership of the councils. It was mandatory for the government to consult the representative bodies and institutions, approved by the government, before selecting nominees for the councils. Besides legislative powers, the councils were also empowered to pull the Executive on financial matters, though it had no power to either revise or reject decisions on this matter. However, the growing weightage of the councils is

indicative of a sea change in colonial rule. As Morley, the Secretary of State, articulated:

> [T]here are two rival schools of thought, one of which believes that better government of Indian depends on efficiency, and that efficiency is, in fact, the end of British rule in India. The other school, while not neglecting efficiency, looks also to what is called political concessions.

This declaration laid the foundational principles of British administration in India. As a first step, a Royal Commission was appointed in 1907 to look into the administration that seemed to have lost its viability in the context of growing discontent among the ruled. The aim of the commission was to provide an administration which was adapted to the changed social, economical, and political realities of India. While recommending the corrective measures, the commission was guided by the following factors: (*a*) the difficulties of ruling the vast subcontinent from a single headquarter and the inevitable failure of the statesmanship and efficiency in administration; (*b*) the difficulties of applying uniform schemes of development for the provinces which are socioculturally diverse; (*c*) to instil a sense of responsibility among those engaged in provincial and local administration; and (*d*) to strengthen colonial rule by educating people in the values of strong administration. On the basis of the recommendation of the commission, a Bill was introduced in 1908 which became the 1909 Morley-Minto Reforms. As a political scheme seeking to strengthen colonial rule in India, the 1909 Act introduced a profound change with long-term effects in representation of communities in councils. Once the Muslim League was founded in 1906, there were demands for 'separate electorate' for the Muslims. In his plea to the governor general, the Muslim League chief, Aga Khan, defended separate electorate for the Muslims on the basis of their 'numerical strength', 'political importance', and 'contribution' which they made to the 'defence of the Empire'. Endorsing the argument, Minto assured Aga Khan that the Muslims 'may rest assured that their political rights will be safeguarded'. So, the 1909 act is remarkable in the

history of representation in India. Muslims were recognized as a separate community and their electoral rights were also guaranteed accordingly. The British policy of 'divide and rule' was, thus, formally articulated. Public administration continued to remain partisan, for obvious reasons. Meanwhile, the nationalist movement gained momentum and the political atmosphere in India changed. The 1909 Morley-Minto Reforms failed to address the genuine grievances of the ruled. Various other acts were enacted to reinforce the repressive system of governance that was articulated by the 1909 reform scheme.

With the outbreak of the First World War, a change in the attitude of the British government was visible which was largely 'strategic' to solicit the support of the Indians in its war effort. The result was the adoption of the 1919 Montague-Chelmsford Reform scheme which was guided by the committed goal of the government 'to increase association of the Indians in every branch of the administration and the gradual development of self-governing institutions in India'. On the surface, the reform scheme, appears to be novel and drew on the commitment to make public administration India-friendly, as the major principles that formed the core of the scheme, suggest:

1. There should be, as far as possible, complete popular control in local bodies and the largest possible independence for them of outside control.
2. The provinces are the domain in which the earlier steps towards the progressive realization of responsible government should be taken. Some measures of responsibility should be given at once, and the aim of the British government is to provide complete responsibility to the Indians in their governance to the extent possible under the present circumstances.
3. The Government of India must remain wholly responsible to the parliament and saving such responsibility, its authority in essential matters must remain indisputable pending experience of the effect of changes now to be introduced in the provinces. Meanwhile, the Indian legislative council should

be enlarged and made more representative and its influence in the processes of policy-making needs to be enhanced.

There is no denying that the 1919 act was a politically appropriate strategy, in a context when the nationalist movement was growing in importance, especially after the arrival of Gandhi on the scene. Although the administration was guided by the colonial spirit, by involving the loyalist Indians in governance, the British rulers provided a new design of public administration in India. In the new dispensation, structural changes in administration were made. The most remarkable step was the adoption of dyarchy. The dyarchy was an administrative device that demarcated functions between those which were to be given to popular control and those which must continue to remain with the British rulers: the former were called 'transferred subjects' and the latter 'reserved subjects'. The Governor-General-in-Council was in charge of the reserved subjects while governors, acting with the ministers in the provinces, remained supreme in so far as the transferred subjects were concerned.

Despite being unique, the dyarchy was doomed to fail simply because of its ideological roots in colonialism. Even the Alexander Muddieman-led committee which was constituted to examine the functioning of dyarchy concluded that it crumbled because of its inherent weaknesses and dissensions due to the following factors: (*a*) the demarcation of authorities between reserved and transferred was meaningless since the de facto power always rested with the former; (*b*) as a result, there was hardly effective dialogue between the provincial ministers and the governors or the governor-general; (*c*) the Indian ministers were further handicapped since Indian civil service officers hardly cooperated with them; and (*d*) the excessive control by the finance department of the Government of India over the transferred subjects.

As evident, public administration was constantly being restructured to placate the Indians in governance. Although the actual power rested with the British authority, dyarchy was a critical step towards administrative devolution that radically altered the complexion of the British power in India that largely revolved around Governor-General-in-Council. Dyarchy empowered the

governors who exercised independence in regard to transferred subjects in the provinces. Furthermore, the involvement of the Indian ministers had introduced changes, though cosmetic in character, in public administration. Apart from gaining experience in administration, the Indian ministers acquired a first-hand knowledge of how the administration functioned in most a partisan manner. This helped them articulate a nationalist agenda which was now readily acceptable to the people at large since it was experience-based. So, dyarchy was very critical to conceptualizing the changing nature of public administration in British India, at least in the first two decades of the twentieth century.

THE 1935 GOVERNMENT OF INDIA ACT

Colonialism and centralization of power seem to go hand in hand though public administration in British India underwent changes at least in its content. A change is visible if one follows the evolution of public administration since the adoption of the 1772 Regulating Act. Perhaps, the most (and last) significant constitutional measure in India during the British rule is the 1935 Government of India Act that drew on the inputs from the Indian Statutory Commission, the All Parties Conference, the Round Table Conferences, and the Joint Parliamentary Committee of the British Parliament. Seeking to establish a federal form of government in which the constituent provinces had autonomous legislative and executive powers, the act paved the way for a parliamentary form of government in which the executive was made accountable within certain bounds to the legislature. This had radically altered public administration in India, including the civil services in the country. Although the well-espoused federation never came into being, the act was nonetheless a powerful comment against the integrated administrative system of the colonial variety. A perusal of the act draws our attention to the following features:

1. Provincial autonomy was recognized by giving the provinces a separate legal identity and liberating them from central control except for certain specific purposes.

2. A Federation of India was established demarcating domains between the provincial governments and the federal central government.
3. Dyarchy, discontinued in the provinces, was introduced at the centre. Subjects of foreign affairs and defence were 'reserved' to the control of the Governor General, and the other central subjects were transferred to ministers subjects 'safeguards' in the provinces.
4. The federal principle was recognized in the formation of the lower house of the central legislature, though the de facto ruler remained the Governor General.
5. Separate electorate was retained following the distribution of seats among the minority communities, as devised by the 1932 Communal or MacDonald Award.

The act redefined the 'public' in public administration. Introduction of provincial autonomy enabled Indian ministers to directly involve in administration, though they had to function under the overall restriction of colonialism. Hence, it was characterized as 'a gigantic constitutional façade without anything substantial within it'. The act was also a sign of the determination of the British government to warp Indian question towards electoral politics. By involving Indians in administration, the act had brought more players in the arena of public administration. There is no doubt that it introduced the Indian politicians to the world of parliamentary politics and as a result of the new arrangement, stipulated by the act, politics now percolated down to the localities which had largely remained peripheral so far. The available evidence also suggests that the act was the price the British paid for the continuity of the empire. What, thus, appears to be a calculated generous gesture was very much a politically expedient step. In fact, the surrender of power, though at the regional levels, caused consternation among the votaries of the British power in India who saw an eclipse of British authority in this endeavour.

An uncritical look at these selective, but major, landmark constitutional initiatives during the colonial rule may lead one to conclude that these were initiated by the British for the Indians.

Hence, the spirit of nationalism is underrated. If one goes beyond the surface, what is evident, is that public administration underwent changes largely because of the British effort to defuse popular discontent. Hence, the argument that every constitutional drive was initiated by the Raj is totally unfounded. History reveals that there were situations which forced the British authority to adopt measures to control agitation. For instance, the Congress campaign in the 1880s contributed a lot to the introduction of the 1893 reforms. Behind the 1909 Morley-Minto Reforms lay the *Swadeshi* Movement and revolutionary terrorism. Similarly, the 1919 Mont-Ford Reforms were attempts at resolving crises that began with the Home Rule League and climaxed with the 1919 Rowlatt *Satyagraha* and the Non-Cooperation Movement of 1910–21. To a large extent, the Gandhian Civil Disobedience Movement (1930–32) accounted for the introduction of constitutional measures seeking to involve Indian politicians in public administration.

Furthermore, the interpretation of these constitutional designs remains partial unless linked with the broader socioeconomic and political processes in which they were conceptualized. An attempt to analyse the structure and dynamics of constitutional politics without reference to the broader social matrix and economic nexus is futile because the political–constitutional structure reflects economic and social networks, religio-cultural beliefs, and even the nationalist ideology which impinged on the organized world of administrative and constitutional structure. So, an urgent and unavoidable task for an analyst is not to completely ignore the broader socioeconomic context but to ascertain its relative importance in shaping a particular constitutional initiative. For instance, the 1932 Communal Award was believed to have been initiated by the British to expand political activity among the Muslims in Bengal and Punjab. But, as studies have shown, it was also a concession the British was forced to grant in order make the maintenance of the empire easier. The sharing of power with the native elites was, thus, prompted by considerations other than merely British initiatives.

ALL INDIA CIVIL SERVICES AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

All India civil services in India—their structure, role, behaviour, and interrelationships—had evolved over a long period in history since the designing of the system about the middle of the nineteenth century.[4] The 'Macaulay Committee Report' (1854), is a watershed in the growth of bureaucracy in India. By recommending a civil service based on the merit system, the committee sought to replace the age-old patronage system of the East India Company.[5] Defending the idea of a generalist administrator—'all rounder'—the Fulton Committee 'portrayed the ideal administrator as a gifted layman who, moving from job to job irrespective of its subject matter, on the basis of his knowledge and experience in the government' (quoted in the *Fulton Committee Report* 1975: 125). The efficiency of the members of the ICS as administrators may have been exemplary, but there is no doubt that they were motivated primarily by imperial interests and hence 'the interests of the country were too often postponed to the interests of the [Crown]'.[6] Furthermore, there was a Weberian aspect to the ICS. Drawn from the well-off sections of the society, the civil servants were trained in some of the best universities and were chosen on the basis of a competitive examination. Those within the ICS were, therefore, secluded from the rest given their exclusive class, caste, and educational backgrounds. In other words, they had a special status within the society that Weber felt was essential to a true bureaucracy. Given their peculiar characteristics, the British officials in India formed a most unusual kind of society with no organic links with the society they were to serve.[7] The ICS held a pivotal position in the system of administration that flourished during the colonial rule. Recognizing its immense importance in sustaining the empire, Lloyd George, thus, declared in the House of Commons in 1922 that '[t]hey are the steel frame of the whole structure. I do not care what you build it—if you take the steel frame out, the fabric will collapse'.[8]

The Government of India Act, 1919, introduced administrative decentralization by transferring certain powers to the Indian

ministers in the provinces. The dyarchy gave further impetus to the demand for indianization of civil services. In 1921, only about 13 per cent of the officers were Indians. This challenged the spirit of the Reform scheme. As against the demand for indianization of the superior services, the serving European officers sought to scuttle the move by submitting a memorandum to the British Prime Minister, Lloyd George. In his response, Lloyd George made his celebrated 'steel frame' speech. As he emphatically argued, he could foresee no period when 'they [those in service] can dispense with the guidance and assistance of a small nucleus of British civil Servants'. He further elaborated:

> I do not care what you build on it. If you take the steel frame out, the fabric will collapse. There is one institution we will not interfere with, there is one institution we will not deprive of its functions or of its privileges, and that is that institution which built up the British Raj—the British Civil Service in India.

The issue of retention of the all India service was always controversial, as the nationalist leaders considered the retention of these services as 'anachronistic' and 'incompatible' with the provincial self-government. The nationalist members of the Reforms Inquiry Committee of 1924 and the members of the Indian Central Committee, 1928–29, who were constituted to liaise with the Indian Statutory Commission sharply argued for the abolition of central services and underlined the significance of 'provincialization' of civil service. The Joint Committee on Indian Constitutional Reform did not, however, endorse this point of view and the all India services remained integral to the Raj.

The question of retention of all India services had again figured prominently in the discussion in the Constituent Assembly in Independent India. Although, there were some dissenting voices, the nationalist leaders, including Jawaharlal Nehru and Vallabhbhai Patel, were keen to continue with the steel frame. The stock argument ranged around the highest standard of efficiency, progressive and wide outlook, freshness and vigour in administration, and efficiency at different levels (centre, province, and district) that

could be maintained if the all India service was retained. As Patel argued, in defending the continuity of the services,

> as a man of experience, I tell you, do not quarrel with the instruments with which you want to work. It is a bad workman who quarrels with his instruments. Take work from them. Everyman wants some sort of encouragement. Nobody wants to put in work when everyday he is criticized and ridiculed in public.

In Independent India, the Indian Administrative Service (IAS) succeeded the ICS.[9] Despite its imperial roots, the Indian political leaders chose to sustain the structure of the ICS, presumably because of its efficient role in conducting Indian administration, in accordance with prescribed rules and regulations supporting a particular regime. However, during the discussion in the Constituent Assembly, the house was not unanimous as regards the fate of ICS. The argument opposing its continuity was based on its role as an ally of imperialism. Shibban Lal Saksena states, 'The Civil Service as the Steel Frame … enslaved us [and] they have been guilty of stabbing Nation during our freedom struggle. [W]e should not, therefore', as the argument goes, 'perpetuate what we have criticized so far' (*Constituent Assembly Debate* 1949).[10] Vallabhbhai Patel was probably most vocal in defending the ICS and its steel frame. Since they were 'patriotic, loyal, sincere [and] able', Patel was not in favour of tampering with bureaucracy, especially when the country was reeling under chaos towards the close of the British rule. As early as 1946, he convened the provincial Premier's Conference to evolve a consensus on the future of which was then All India Services (AIS). In view of their long association with public administration, officers belonging to the AIS 'are most well-equipped to deal with new and complex tasks'. Not only 'are they useful instruments, they will also serve as a liaison between the Provinces and the Government of India and introduce certain amount of brashness and vigour in the administration both of the Centre and the Provinces' (Patel quoted in Maheshwari 1984: 211). Later, while speaking in the Constituent Assembly, he categorically stated that, '[y]ou will not have a united India if you do not have a good all India service' which had the independence to speak out

its mind and enjoyed a sense of security. He also attributed the success of the Constitution to the existence of an all India service by saying that, 'if you do not adopt this course, then do not follow this Constitution … This Constitution is meant to be worked by a ring of service which will keep the country intact. If you remove them', Patel thus apprehended, 'I see nothing but a picture of chaos all over the country' because he believed:

> an efficient, disciplined and contented civil service assured of its prospect as a result of diligent and honest work is the hallmark of a sound administration under a democratic regime even more than under authoritarian rule. The civil service must be above party, and we should ensure that political considerations either in its recruitment or in its discipline and control are reduced to the minimum if not eliminated altogether.[11]

Even Jawaharlal Nehru who was very critical of the ICS for its role in sustaining the imperial rule in India,[12] was persuaded and supported its continuity for 'the security and stability of India … including coping with the slaughter and its aftermath in Punjab, crushing opposition in Hyderabad, and containing it in Kashmir'.[13] Patel's views were translated in Article 311 of the Constitution of India that stated that no civil servant shall be dismissed or removed or reduced in rank except after an enquiry in which he has been informed of the charges and given a reasonable opportunity of being heard in respect of those charges.[14]

So, an instrument that consolidated the imperial rule in India 'with so slight use of force'[15] survived in completely different political circumstances,[16] primarily because there was continuing support for it, first from the British government and then the from Congress government in Independent India. Furthermore, its continuity did not pose any threat to the dominant classes that reigned supreme following the transfer of power in India in 1947. The new civil service for all practical purposes was, as a former bureaucrat comments, therefore, 'the continuation of the old one with the difference that it was to function in a parliamentary system of government, accepting the undoubted primacy of the political executive which in turn was responsible to the people through their elected

representatives in the legislature' (Alexander 1998: 62). Besides its structure, which is more or less, an expansion of the steel frame, the continuity is at a deeper level. While the colonial civil servants had a paternalistic attitude towards the people, and ruled largely by negative discretionary powers, '[t]heir successors, noting the vast unmet development needs of the people, substituted positive discretionary powers of patronage and subsidies, reinforcing the colonial syndrome of dependency on the *mai–baap* state' (Sudarshan 1999: 111).

Apart from its functional utility, the steel frame was retained more or less *intact* was due to fact that, as B.P.R. Vithal, himself an IAS officer, argued, 'the Congress leaders who took office … shared the social background of the senior civil servants whom they inherited from the colonial state' (Vithal 1997: 224). Thus, for example, Nehru felt at ease while working with senior civil servants. Similarly, Rajagopalachari felt more at home with the ICS officers who were placed with him when he was the Prime Minister of Madras (1937–39) than with certain persons in the Congress party. The political processes subsequent to Independence gave rise to changes in the class composition of the political executive that was far-reaching and rapid than changes in the social composition of the civil services. While the political executives, trained in vernacular education, came largely from rural and semi-urban areas, those in the steel frame were generally urban-based and English-educated. The growing disparity between the class background of the political executive and the civil servants led to frequent frictions between the administrators and politicians in the Westminster parliamentary system of governance when the latter had assumed a leading role in building a new nation.

Following Independence, government functions have also expanded in scope and content. With the introduction of the parliamentary form of government and the setting up of people's institutions right down to the village level, there has been an inevitable rise in the level of expectations and performance have widened. People's institutions were set up with the objective of creating self-governing institutions at the village level. The objective remains distant forever. Similarly, Independence and Five Year Plans were perceived by people as

synonymous with economic and social equity and well-being, and freedom from want and oppression. In the early days of the planning era, people did not crib much about the shortage which they confronted with fortitude because the future held hope and promise for them. With the passage of time, they felt their hopes were 'belied' and they were 'nowhere near the promised land of honesty, plenty and happiness'. The ethos of self-governance, decentralization, and community development were flagged in with considerable élan and fanfare. For example, the three tiers Panchayati Raj system and the urban local bodies were conceived of as a properly meshed network of institutions to accelerate the development process.[17] The recent 73rd and 74th Amendments (1992) to the Constitution seek to advance the concept of 'self-governance' by providing for (*a*) regular elections, (*b*) minimal suppression of Panchayati Raj bodies through an administrative fiat, and (*c*) regular finances through statutory distribution by state finance commissions. The aim, argues, Kuldeep Mathur (1999: 22), 'is to reduce the margin of political and administrative discretion and to allow the decentralised institutions to gather strength on the basis of people's involvement'.[18] But, due to various reasons, the political process became what may be termed as 'reversed' and highly centralized and personalized systems of government developed, both at the central and state levels. There has been a massive erosion of institutions, whether the Parliament and parliamentary institutions, or the party system and democratic procedures in the running of parties, or the judiciary, or indeed the press. Describing the crisis and erosion of institutions as 'the natural and expected consequences of a political process that has undermined both the role and authority of basic institutions' (Kothari 1988: 287), Rajni Kothari has sought to grapple with a peculiar reality in which public administration appears to be largely de-linked with the basic institutions of democratic system that has flourished in India following Independence.[19]

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Taken together, the pre-Independence and post-Independence career of Indian bureaucracy—particularly the higher echelons at the central and state levels—makes interesting readings, both

socio-historically and managerially. Indian historical experience, both during the British period and its immediate aftermath, has led to the emergence of a public administration that was ill-suited to needs and aspiration of the people. The reasons are not difficult to seek as studies have shown that the bureaucrats who have been brought up and trained in the colonial administrative culture are wedded to the Weberian characteristics of hierarchy, status, and rigidity of rules and regulations, and concerned mainly with the enforcement of law and order and collection of revenues. For the colonial regime, this structure was perhaps most appropriate while its utility seems undermined and its ability to discharge the functions in the changed environment stands questioned. As the government becomes the key institution for development in the democratic set-up of India after Independence, the role of the officials has undergone transformations. Their prime objective was to 'emphasize results, rather than procedures, teamwork rather than hierarchy and status, [and] flexibility and decentralization rather control and authority' (Bhatt 1979: 259). Seen as 'the development administrator', the bureaucrat is therefore characterized by 'tact, pragmatism, dynamism, flexibility, adaptability to any situation and willingness to take rapid, ad-hoc decisions without worrying too much about procedures and protocol' (Bhatt 1979: 281).

Conceptually, public administration in Independent India draws on the Weberian theoretical model. What is critical in governance, is bureaucracy, which is both an instrument and an institution, rationally articulating its behaviour. The 1950 Constitution of India seems to have been influenced by the latter because Article 311 provides 'immunity' to those recruited under the all India services. Although Weberian, both in structure and spirit, public administration in India is dramatically metamorphosed, for obvious reasons, following the 1947 transfer of power when its 'purpose' was no longer guided by colonial interests. A developmental state emerged drawing on the 'state-directed development' paradigm. As an instrument that adapted to the changed socio-political milieu, public administration seemed to have fulfilled its role, at least immediately after Independence, in translating the ideological goal of those who presided over India's destiny. This

is one part of the story suggesting changes while the other part articulates continuity because the centralized all India services sustained the unitary bias of the Indian state that left no stone unturned when there was a threat to its existence. In fact, this is a powerful legacy of the colonial past when the British bureaucracy was an impediment to provincial autonomy despite its endorsement by both the British Parliament and the Crown. What it suggests is that public administration is both a continuity and break with the past. So, it would be wrong to characterize public administration as 'stationary' or 'static' given the adaptability to the changed social, economic, and political circumstances. Instead, it is constantly being 'reinvented' redefining its ideological contour and functional manifestation.

NOTES

1. This chapter is an extension of Chapter 4 of Chakrabarty (2007). I am thankful to Orient Longman for being supportive to our academic endeavour.
2. See Chanda (1967: 15–42); Mishra (1977); Mishra (1996: 1–36); and Potter (1996).
3. The discussion in this section draws on these books unless otherwise stated. For details, see Pylee (1965: 47–117); Maheshwari (2003: 13–28); Maheshwari (2000); and Bhattacharya (2007, chapter 2, pp. 15–26).
4. For a detailed account of the civil service in India during the British rule, see Mason (1997).
5. As the report underlined, '[h]enceforth, an appointment to the civil service of the Company will not be matter of favour but matter of right. He who obtains such an appointment will owe it solely to his own abilities and industry.' The Macaulay Committee Report (1854: 125).
6. Trevelyan (1907: 6–7) quoted in Cohn (1990: 545). Given their stake in the British administration, it is but natural that whatever they did, they were simply acting in the imperial interests and in the process preserving or enhancing their superior positions. However, there is a school of thought defending that the imperial logic never appeared crucial in administration since 'the ICS [was] Jeremy Bentham's prototype of the benevolent social guardian committed to achieving the common good'. For details, see Stokes (1959: 159).
7. While explaining the nature of the British civil servants Bernard S. Cohn developed this argument further by drawing upon their post-recruitment training first at the Haileybury School and later in Oxbridge colleges that hardly took into account the rapid socio-structural shifts in India during the

colonial rule. Bernard S. Cohn, *An Anthropologist among the Historians and Other Essays*, pp. 500–53.

8. George, quoted in Mason (1997: xv). Duffrin was probably more categorical in appreciating the role of the Indian civil service. According to him, '[t] here is no service like it in the world. If the Indian civil service were not [as they are], how could the government of the country go on so smoothly? We have 250 million subjects in India and less than 1,000 British civilians for the conduct of the entire administration' (Duffrin quoted in Jagmohan, 'Riveting the Steel Frame of the ICS', *Hindustan Times*, 1 November 1998).

9. For a succinct account of the evolution of the Civil Service in India, both during the British rule and its aftermath, see Rao (1968, chapter 23, pp. 708–23).

10. Prominent among those who criticized the decision to retain the ICS was M. Ananthasaynam Ayyanger, who failed to understand the logic of providing 'guarantee to those persons who have played into the hands of others [and] cared only for money and the salaries they got'. See Ayyangar's statement in the debate (1999: 42).

11. Vallabhbhai Patel's speech in the Constituent Assembly. See *The Constituent Assembly Debates* (1949: 48–52). Seeking persuade his colleagues in the Constituent Assembly, he further argued:

> if these service people are giving you full value of their Services and more, then try to learn to appreciate them. Forget the past. We fought the Britishers for so many years. I was their bitterest enemy and they regarded me as such … What did Gandhiji teach us? You are talking of Gandhian ideology and Gandhian philosophy and Gandhian way of administration. Very good. But you come out of jail and then say, 'These men put me in jail. Let me take revenge'. That is not Gandhian way. It is going far away from that. (*Constituent Assembly Debates* 1949: 52)

12. As late as 1934, Nehru characterized the Indian civil service as 'neither Indian nor civil nor service [and] it thus essential that the ICS and similar services disappear completely' (Nehru 1941: 445).

13. Jawaharlal Nehru's speech in the Constituent Assembly. See *The Constituent Assembly Debates* (1947: 793–23).

14. For a detailed discussion in the Constituent Assembly during the preparation and finally acceptance of Article 311, see Rao (1968: 713–23).

15. While explaining the continuity of the steel frame for almost two hundred years, Philip Mason stated that the administration in India:

> … had the immense advantage over those in the later African territories that it was possible to set up the framework of government before the invention of the electric telegraph and close control of

England. Use was made of Akbar's machinery and whatever local institutions could be adapted. The whole was controlled by a cadre of district officers, rigorously picked, but trained almost wholly by doing what in fact they were learning to do. Because they were so few they had let their subordinates do their own work. Confidence that they would be backed up from above was hall-mark of their profession and they acquired a confidence in themselves and a confidence that they would be obeyed, which meant that they were obeyed. Few administrators can have ruled so many with so slight use of force. Everything was done through Indians and by Indians to whom power was delegated. (Mason 1997: 345–46)

16. P.C. Alexander, himself an IAS, thus, argues, '[t]he new civil service for all practical purposes was the continuation of the old one with the difference that it was now to function in a parliamentary system of government accepting the undoubted primacy of the political executive'. See Alexander (1998: 62).
17. For an interesting, though slightly dated account of the Panchayati Raj system in West Bengal, Uttar Pradesh, and Karnataka, see Kohli (1987) and for studies of urban government of Delhi, see Mehra (1991).
18. According to Mathur (1999: 22):

    [T]he success of the Seventy-Third and Seventy-Fourth Amendments making decentralised structures part of the Constitution has yet to be seen, not only because they were only instituted in 1993, but also because the states have shown little evidence of implementing the requirement through their own statutes.

19. The process, known as 'deinstitutionalization' invariably leads to a non-policy government that 'operates by means of spoils and preferments that take into account the particular situations of persons and communities'. Very common in the sub-Saharan Africa,

    such government tends to be 'private government' both in the sense that government offices are treated as private property and in the sense that spoils, unlike policies, must be managed in a discreet and even clandestine fashion. They cannot be advertised, nor can they be publicly debated. (Hyden 1997: 252)

REFERENCES

Alexander, P.C. 1988. 'Civil Service: Continuity and Change', in Hiranmory Karlekar (ed.), *Independent India: The First Fifty Years*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, p. 62.

Bhatt, Anil. 1979. 'Colonial Bureaucratic Culture and Development Administration: Portrait of an Old-fashioned Indian Bureaucrat', *Journal of Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, 17 (3): 259.

Bhattacharya, Mohit. *Indian Administration*. Calcutta: World Press, Chapter 2, pp. 14–26.

Chakrabarty, Bidyut. 2007. *Reinventing Public Administration: The Indian Experience*. New Delhi: Orient Longman.

Chanda, Ashok. 1967. *Indian Administration*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Cohn, Bernard S. 1990. *An Anthropologist among the Historians and other Essays*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Duffrin quoted in Jagmohan. 1998. 'Riveting the Steel Frame of the ICS', *Hindustan Times*, 1 November.

Hyden, Goran. 1997. 'Democratization and Administration', in Axel Hadenius (ed.), *Democracy's Victory and Crisis* (Nobel symposium no. 93). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kohli, Atul. 1987. *The State and Poverty in India: The Politics of Reform*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kothari, Rajni. 1988. *State against Democracy: In Search of Human Governance*. New Delhi: Ajanta.

Maheshwari, S.R. 2000. *Public Administration in India*. New Delhi: Macmillan.

———. 2003. *Administration of India*. New Delhi: Macmillan, pp. 13–28.

Mason, Philip. 1997. *The Men Who Ruled India*. Calcutta: Rupa & Co., reprint.

Mathur, Kuldeep. 1999. 'Strengthening Bureaucracy: State and Development in India', *Indian Social Science Review*, 1 (1, January–June).

Mehra, Ajoy K. 1991. *The Politics of Urban Development: A Study of Old Delhi*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Mishra, B.B. 1966. *Government and Bureaucracy in India*, *1947–76*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

———. 1977. *The Bureaucracy in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Nehru, Jawaharlal. 1941. *An Autobiography: With Musings in Recent Events in India*. London: John Land the Bodley Head, reprint.

Potter, David C. 1996. *India's Political Administrators, from ICS to IAS*. Oxford University Press, reprint.

Pylee, M.V. 1965. *Constitutional Government in India*, Part II. London: Asia Publishing House, pp. 47–117.

Rao, B. Shiva. 1968. *The Framing of India's Constitution (select documents)*, Vol. V. New Delhi: IIPA.

Stokes, Eric. 1959. *The English Utilitarians of India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sudarshan, R. 1999. 'Governance of Multicultural Polities: Limits of the Rule of Law', in Rajeev Bhargava (ed.), *Multiculturalism, Liberalism and Democracy*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

The Constituent Assembly Debates, Vol. X, 10 October 1949. Lok Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi, 1999 (third print).

The Constituent Assembly Debates, Vol. 1, 1947.

The Fulton Committee Report, Vol. 1. 1975. London: HMSO, p. 125.

The Macaulay Committee Report. 1854, in *The Fulton Committee Report*, Vol. 1 (London: HMSO, 1975).

Trevelyan, George. 1907. *The Competition Wallah* (2nd edition). London, quoted in Bernard S. Cohn. 1990. *An Anthropologist among the Historians and Other Essays*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Vithal, B.P.R. 1997. 'Evolving Trends in the Bureaucracy', in Partha Chatterjee (ed.), *State and Politics in India*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Chapter 10

Budget and Financial Administration in India

Learning Objectives
- To understand the concept of budgeting
- To familiarize with the different types of budgeting
- To examine the process of budgeting in India
- To evaluate the financial administration in India

Like many other countries in the world, the systems of budget and finance in India are jointly denoted by the term financial administration for the sake of brevity and conceptual clarity. In turn, given the centrality of finance in every activity of life and budget as the medium of stipulations for generation and allocation of resources in society, financial administration stands out as a core component of public administration in all the countries. For instance, in India, financial administration encompasses the core functions of generation, regulation, and distribution of the monetary resources in order to sustain and foster the growth in the country. Thus, the financial administration is a significant subsystem of the administrative system of India which itself constitutes an integral component of the socioeconomic and political system of the country. The purpose of the chapter, therefore, is to delineate the vital aspects of financial administration within the

rubric of the Indian administrative system. The chapter begins with an explanation of the concept and types of budget and the importance of budgeting. Besides, providing a trajectory of the budgetary policy orientations over the years, the chapter elucidates the basic features the budgetary process and the system of management of finances in India. Finally, evaluating the budgetary and financial reforms, it concludes with an analysis of their implications for India as well.

CONCEPT OF BUDGET

Budgeting is concerned with allocating limited resources to problems that governments and other public organizations face. Budget refers to the estimated receipts and expenditure of the government. The word 'budget' is derived from a French word 'bougette' which means a leather bag or sack. The term was used in its present sense for the first time in the year 1733 when the British Finance Minister Sir Robert Walpole opened his bag to take out budget proposals in the House of Commons, and some members cried out, 'bougette is opened'. Since then, the term 'bouget' began to be used for a financial statement. Now, the term 'budget' refers to financial papers, certainly not to the pouch of leather!

Budgeting is the heart of financial administration. Leroy Beaulieo defines budget as 'a statement of the estimated receipts and expenses during a fixed period'. According to Remo Storm it is 'a document containing a preliminary approval plan of public revenue and expenditure'. According to Willoughby:

> budget is something more than a mere estimate of revenues and expenditures. It is, or should be, at once a report, an estimate, and a proposal. It is, or should be, the document through the chief executive … comes before the fund raising and fund granting authority and makes full report regarding the manner in which he and his subordinates have administered affairs during the last treasury, and on the basis of such information sets forth his programmes of work for the year to come and the manner in which he proposes that such work shall be financed. (*Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*, p. 39)

The budget is, thus, a plan of action and manifests the programme of the chief executive for the ensuing financial year. It is an instrument through which the several operations are correlated, compared, and examined at one and the same time. The real significance of the budget system lies in providing for the orderly administration of the financial affairs of a government (*Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*, p. 39). It is, thus, much more than a mere statement of revenue and expenditure of the government.

SIGNIFICANCE OF BUDGETING

Budget is one of the major instruments for the expression of a government's programmes. It has a vital role to play in the economy of a welfare state. Through a budget, citizens are benefited from various plans and programmes of the government. The government tries to narrow down the class distinctions and inequalities through its taxation policy. The budget policy of the government aims at removal of poverty, unemployment, social, and economic inequalities in society. By imposing heavy taxation upon articles of consumption, it can encourage investment, and thus, promote the economic growth of the nation. By taxing the rich, it can mitigate economic inequality. The signs of the welfare state are reflected in the budget with its heavy outlay on social services and the like. In this way, it is an instrument of socioeconomic change.

Budget also acts as an allocator of social resources. Because people cannot always acquire all goods and services that they need for themselves; they must rely on others for help. It is the government which allocates society's resources by mandating that taxes be collected and then by deciding where those taxes are spent. Governmental allocations are necessary because the market mechanism is not adequate to serve all societal needs. Services and goods that cannot be divided or assigned a cost to individuals—these are called collective goods—will not be provided by a profit-driven market. Also, where price is not a good indicator of the value of a service, the private sector is unlikely to provide the service. Educational programmes for the mentally challenged fit into this category. Similarly, goods and service provisions where

extraordinary risks are involved will not find free enterprise operating except in partnership with the public sector (Cox III, Buck, and Morgan 1994: 45). In all such cases, the government is expected to use its power to ensure that certain resources are allocated to provide those services. In this way, the budget acts as an allocator of social resources.

Budgeting is the heart of administrative management. It serves as a powerful tool of coordination, an effective device of eliminating duplication and wastage. These ends are served by devices, such as, justification of estimates, supervision of the use of appropriated funds, timing of the rate of expenditures, and the like. Budgeting also presents an opportunity for evaluating programmes and policies, thereby, identifying obsolete or unnecessary activities and giving a call for their discontinuance. Budgeting, thus, disciplines and streamlines administration, and goes hand in hand with programme planning. To sum up, the budget is many things—an economist views it as a device of influencing the country's economy, the politician employs it for defending or criticizing the government, the administrator uses it as a framework for communication and coordination as well as for exercising administrative discipline throughout the administrative structure (Maheshwari 2010: 530–33).

TYPES OF BUDGET

The objectives of all budgets include regulating unnecessary government spending and waste. However, different types of budgets vary in their spending provisions.

Line-item Budget

This is the earliest system of budgeting which was designed to control governmental expenditure and activities. A line-item budget is simply the allocation of resources according to the cost of each item, from paperclips to personnel, used by a government agency. It operates on a pay-as-you-go basis and is designed to reveal exactly how much has been spent on what. Generally, only

an approved sum can be spent for each item, other expenses cannot be introduced until money has been appropriated, and funds cannot be transferred within an organization. This type of budget is advantageous from an accountability perspective, that is, the amount that will be spent on x, y, and z is clearly delineated to keep spending under control. It a simple tool for keeping tabs on where money goes, and ensuring that funds are spent appropriately. A major disadvantage of the line-item budget is that it is not tied to performance. However, the rigidity of line-item budgeting has led to the use of performance budgeting.

Performance Budgeting

Performance budgeting includes a narrative describing an agency's work in progress, and accomplishments and aims to provide policymakers with data for measuring work-load and activity costs and to tell the public whether they are getting their money's worth. The idea behind performance budgeting is that how much you spend on department x is tied directly to how well department x is performing. Performance budgeting requires the establishment of performance levels and the collection of information that tells weather those performance levels have been met. The most common types of performance indicators are outputs and outcomes. Output indicators report units produced or the quality of services provided by a department, an agency, or a programme. They reflect how well a government entity is meeting its goals and objectives. These indicators are designed to answer questions that deal with the quality and impacts of government service delivery. The central points of performance budgeting are:

- The amount of work that is done is measured,
- The quality or the results of that work is measured, and
- This impacts how much money a department will receive in the future (Holzer and Schwester 2011: 300).

Departments that over-perform may receive more money, while those that under-perform may receive less. Critics argue that using performance measurement as a basis for determining budgets is

counter-intuitive, because taking money away from a struggling department is likely to make matter worse. Also, some might argue that measuring performance is inherently problematic, that is, designing performance indicators is subjective, and collecting data can be time-consuming and expensive.

Planning, programming and budgeting system

The planning, programming and budgeting system (PPBS) emerged as a reaction to the unscientific and disjointed planning in preparing the budget. The PPBS evaluates policy by dividing it into separate programmes and quantifying their gains and losses. A basic element of programme budgeting—cost-benefit analysis—systematically weighs the cost of a project against the amount of benefit—in terms of money or material saved or earned—that an agency or department can expect in return. The PPBS selects those programmes that achieve the desired goals at the lowest costs. It is one of the rational approaches to budget preparations. The PPBS offers great flexibility because they allow any combination of expenditures that will achieve a programme's objectives and yield the greatest benefits for the costs involved. This approach enables policy-makers to assess a project's potential success or failure before it is implemented.

Zero-based budgeting

The traditional practice is to allocate funds on an incremental basis every year to all schemes agreed upon and approved by the government, irrespective of their operational evaluation. This leads to the arbitrary increase in allocations which keep multiplying year after year. A stage comes when financial accountability of operative agencies becomes an arduous task, if not impossible. Contrary to this, the zero-based budgeting (ZBB) is the allocation of resources to agencies on the basis of those agencies periodically re-evaluating the need for all of the programmes for which the agency is responsible and justifying the continuance or termination of each programme in the agency budget proposal. This leads the allocating agencies to warn such funding schemes which are sick or irrelevant to the ground realities of socioeconomic life. The ZBB attempts to bring the expenditure of such schemes down to zero or in other words

to a reduced level of expenditure so that a proper evaluation of the scheme could be possible (Singh 2002: 200–01). In other words, an agency reassesses what it is doing from top to bottom from a 'hypothetical zero'.

The ZBB is advantageous in that it allows department heads to set priorities, letting the budget makers know where cuts are more acceptable and where increases would be desirable. It makes sense to allow department heads to set these priorities, given that they are in a position to know how beat to carry out a department's programmes. A disadvantage of ZBB deals with its labour intensiveness. Preparing and ranking the decision packages can be overwhelming. Additionally, the way in which the decision packages are ranked can be highly subjective (Holzer and Schwester 2011: 301–03).

Gender Budgeting

Gender budgeting is a process that entails incorporating a gender perspective at various stages of budgeting, that is, planning, policy formulation, assessment of needs of target groups, allocation of resources, implementation, impact assessment, and repriorotization of resources. The main objective of gender budgeting is to bring out a gender-responsive budget. Gender budgeting is understood as a dissection of the government budget to establish its gender-differential impacts to translate gender commitments into budgetary commitments. Thus, gender budgeting:

- looks at the government budget from a gender perspective to assess how it addresses the needs of women in all sectors,
- it does not seek to create a separate budget, instead it seeks to provide affirmative action to address the specific needs of women, and provides a way for assessing the impact of government revenue and expenditure on women (Government of India 2008: 103–06).

Gender budgeting lends itself to strengthening administrative processes and actions to achieve the targets for improvements in the position of women. It not only entails a look at allocation of

resources for women but goes beyond to cover tracking of the utilization of allocated resources, impact analysis, and beneficiary-incidence analysis of public expenditure and policy from a gender perspective. Hence, gender budgeting is not an accounting exercise as commonly perceived and understood. It encompasses incorporating a gender perspective and sensitiveness at all levels and stages of the developmental planning, processes, and implementation. An important outcome of the application of gender budgeting is that it paves the way for gender mainstreaming in the developmental process and in understanding how the needs of women can be addressed in a better way (Goel 2010: 247).

Gender budgeting is a powerful tool for achieving gender mainstreaming so as to ensure that the benefits of development reach women as much as men. It seeks to ensure equality of outcomes and not equality of opportunities. In India, the Ministry of Women and Child Development, as the nodal agency for gender budgeting has taken great strides towards promoting gender budgeting across sectors and at different levels of governance. A powerful impetus to the process was provided by the Ministry of Finance who in 2004, mandated setting up of Gender Budget Cells in all ministries and departments. So far, fifty-six ministries and departments of Government of India have set up gender cells.

Besides gender budgeting, *green budgeting* is another budgeting innovations. It believes in protecting the ecology in the process of development. It is not a separate budget, but focuses on the environmental considerations in the budgetary allocations. Due to ecological considerations, now, it has become mandatory to all development projects to go through 'environmental impact assessment'. It is a process in which the ecological impact of a project is assessed before its implementation. Thus, such budgetary innovations are trying to address to the emerging socioeconomic and ecological challenges.

BUDGET POLICY ORIENTATIONS IN INDIA

The present budgetary system of India owes its origin to the colonial period when the Finance Department was established in

1843 to look after the financial affairs of the government. But the budget, per se, was presented for the first time in 1860 to herald the system of laying down the annual estimates of revenues and expenditures and their consideration and approval by the legislature. With minor modifications and sometimes additions in the existing system, the budgetary system of India, by and large, remained the same throughout the colonial rule in India. However, the two debilitating features of the colonial budgetary system in India were absence of popular control over the budget and lack of a socioeconomic developmental perspective in the budgetary allocations. The colonial budgetary system was, therefore, given a go-by after Independence and replaced by a responsive and development-oriented budgetary system under the provisions of the Constitution of India.

The budget policy orientations during the early times of Jawaharlal Nehru remained confined within the prescriptions of the Indian Constitution as stipulated under the provisions of Article 112. Without affecting any drastic break with the colonial line-item budgeting system, the budgetary policy of Nehru got enriched with the initiation of planning as a vital component of the economic development in India. Gradually, as the plan allocations started outweighing the non-plan component of the governmental economic stipulations, the budget appeared to have increasingly got reduced as an instrument of taxation rather than a policy document. Moreover, in the budget, the expenditure side of the estimates was accorded high status without matching accountability and result-orientation. In Nehru's times, therefore, the budget policy could not emerge as a formidable tool of socioeconomic development of the country along with acting as an effective instrument of ensuring efficiency, economy, and effectiveness in enormous government expenditures.

To eradicate the obvious flaws in the existing system of budget, a number of appreciable policy measures were introduced during the times of Indira Gandhi in the budgetary system of the country. Owing to its superior technical value, the demand for the introduction of performance budgeting was raised from a number of quarters, including the Estimates Committee and Administrative

Reforms Commission. But, a precondition for the introduction of performance budgeting was a sincere reform in the accounting system so as to make it a tool of administrative efficiency. Hence, the government took the landmark step of separating the audit from accounts in 1976, undoing a long-standing colonial feature of the budget system in the country. Subsequently, the system of performance budgeting was introduced in select developmental departments of the central government in 1977–78. Above all, instead of allowing planning to dominate the budgetary process, the idea of the PPBS was accepted as way to integrate planning with budgeting in India.

With the dawn of economic liberalization in the country since early 1990s, the policy orientations behind budget in India appear to have undergone subtle transformations manifested in three ways. First, despite remaining an inalienable part of the overall budgetary process, the component of planning lost its commanding position in determining the focus and locus of the budget. Now, planning got reinvented to act only as a guiding instrument to indicate the broader contours of socioeconomic development plans of government to be reflected in the budgetary provisions. Second, in order to bring about efficiency and economy in the financial functioning of the government, a number of managerial innovations and improvisations have also found ready acceptance in the budgetary procedures. For instance, a quite effective measure of cost-cutting in the government departments has been the technique of the ZBB which has been borrowed from the private sector of the United States. Finally, amidst the continuing populist and bureaucratic underpinnings in the budget, a subtle move has been in place to bring about some degree of fiscal discipline through budgetary techniques. Through such a move, not only would the unproductive fiscal profligacy of the governmental agencies be minimized, the money so saved could be reinvested in the newly prioritized social sector development.

Quite evidently, thus, the trajectory of the budget policy orientations in India has apparently been guided by the administrative expediency and ideological moorings of the governments. Taking budget mainly in its instrumentalist value, the governments over

the years sought to utilize the budgetary formulations to secure money for certain programmes and projects rather than using it as a policy instrument. The primary reason for this seems to be the advent of planning as the predominant determinant of the policy perspectives of the government on socioeconomic development of the country. Nevertheless, the urge for economic prudence and fiscal discipline led the governments at various times to go for subtle improvisations in the budgetary and accounting procedures. As a result, the budget probably inadvertently got salience in the realm of the policy-making of the government as the free-play of the market forces in the country led to increasing reduction in the overarching role of planning. In the contemporary times, budget seems to have regained its status as the major instrument of policy pronouncements on the socioeconomic development of the country.

MAJOR ACTORS IN BUDGETARY PROCESS IN INDIA

The budgetary process in India is quite a complex one involving a number of actors and agencies at various stages. Given the democratic nature of the Indian polity, such a cumbersome process and multitude of agencies are obvious as they perform distinct functions crucial to the successful and responsive functioning of the budgetary system. What is unique in such a system, just as in case of other democratic systems, is that apart from stipulating money, what is equally, if not more, important, is the system of accountability for spending such money. Significantly, the intimate relationship between the legislature and executive by dint of parliamentary democracy in India, the legislature shares a number of substantive financial functions along with the executive. At the same time, the autonomous institution of audit also joins the other agencies to provide a logical input in the overall functioning of the financial administration of the country. What follows is a brief elucidation of the major actors or agencies in the budgetary process in India.

Parliament of India may be taken as the lead actor in the budgetary process of the country. In consonance with the norms of the

parliamentary democracy, the parliament is entrusted with the primary responsibility of acting as the custodian of the public money in the country. Consequently, by way of discharging its onerous responsibilities as fund-raising and fund-granting agency, it exercises almost absolute control over the budget of India through its powers of levy, abolish, or decrease any tax or other budgetary allocations. Indeed, such a commanding position to the Parliament has been accorded by the Indian Constitution itself. Hence, under Article 112 of the Constitution, the president has been vested with the responsibility of causing to be laid before the houses of Parliament, the 'annual financial statement', the constitutional terminology for budget. However, of the two houses of Parliament, it is the lower house or the Lok Sabha that holds absolute control over the budgetary process with just nominal role assigned for the upper house or the Rajya Sabha.

An equally important actor in the budgetary process of India is the executive. In fact, the theoretical monopoly of the Parliament over the budget, boils down to the monopoly of the executive itself, under the dynamics of the parliamentary democracy. In other words, as the executive commands an absolute majority in the Lok Sabha, it is but natural that the wishes of the former are unhesitatingly fulfilled by the latter as the two are staffed by the people belonging to the same party or ideological persuasions. Another reason for the dominance of the budgetary process by the executive is its role as the administering agency for the budgetary proposals. In this capacity, the executive, even in theory, has been assigned the role of evolving the proposals for demand of money from the Parliament, keeping in view the policies and programmes for socioeconomic development, in addition to the other routine expenses such as defence and administration of the country. The budgetary process in India, therefore, seems to be a fine example of the harmonious and cooperative functioning of the two pivotal institutions of constitutional governance in the country.

As the core unit of the executive entrusted with the task of managing the operational dynamics of the budget, the Ministry of Finance may arguably be taken as the nodal agency of the

budgetary process in India. Indeed, to a layman, the Ministry of Finance epitomizes the financial administration of the country in its entirety. Though technically untenable, yet such a notion is attributed to the Ministry of Finance, keeping in view its role in managing the finances of the country. For instance, right from estimating the final figures of the revenues and expenditures of the government for presentation before the parliament, the ministry is vested with the task of ultimately ensuring that the finances of the country are managed properly. The major contours of the functioning of the ministry are discerned from its structural divisions in the three departments, that is, Department of Economic Affairs, Department of Revenue, and Department of Expenditure. Such an overarching role in the management of the finances of the country has made the Ministry of Finance one of the key ministries of the Government of India.

An indirect, yet, democratically unavoidable actor in the budgetary process of democratic societies is the institution of independent audit. In India, such a function is discharged by the constitutional authority called the CAG of India. Envisaged under the provisions of Article 148 of the Constitution, 'the office of CAG is meant to introduce the rigour and uniformity of government accounts on the one hand and to carry out the responsibility of conducting independent audit on the other' (Chakrabarty and Pandey 2008: 157). The CAG conducts such an audit on behalf of the parliament to investigate and report on the fidelity, legality, and efficiency of all the financial transactions carried out by the government departments. The criticality of the role of CAG in the budgetary process of India has been a byproduct of the parliamentary democratic system of governance provided for under the Constitution. Over the years, it has emerged as one of the most stringent checks on the financial impropriety and profligacy of the government, though critiques have argued against such a role of audit in India.

Finally, the parliamentary committees constitute the last set of actors playing significant role in the budgetary process of the country. The role of these committees exposes the inadequacy of

the control exercised by the parliament over the finances of the government due to paucity of time and lack of expertise. Previously, there used to be only two committees, that is, the Estimates Committee and the Public Accounts Committee of Parliament to discharge the necessary functions of legislative control. But, in recent times, with the creation of the departmentally related standing committees of Parliament, the role of the Parliament in the functioning of the various departments of the government has become more comprehensive and focused. Nonetheless, the role of these committees is distinct in relation to the budgetary process. The Estimates Committee, for instance, suggests economies in estimates of expenditures of various government departments in order to make them more realistic and economical. On the contrary, the Public Accounts Committee carries out a post-mortem of the appropriation accounts in the light of the audit report of the CAG. In the process, it attracts the attention of the legislature to financial irregularities, if any, and suggests remedial measures for the same. In distinction with others, the departmentally related standing committees carry out not just financial control over the concerned departments but also scrutinizes their overall functioning from time to time.

In nutshell, the major actors or agencies in the budgetary process of India are numerous and varied, owing to the variety of functions each of them is supposed to perform. Such functions may be classified in three groups with each having their critical value in the smooth functioning of the budgetary system. Hence, while the broad functions of parliament as the fund-raising and fund-granting agency is well-established, the role of executive and its sub-agencies such the Ministry of Finance as the proposer of financial estimates is equally universally accepted. What is, however, unique to India is apparently its elaborate system of legislative control over the budget through the mechanism of its own committees as well as the institution of an independent audit. Indeed, the successful functioning of the financial administration in India is credited to the reasonably satisfactory role played by these actors in the budgetary process of the country.

BUDGET SYSTEM IN INDIA

This section explains the budget system of India, with reference to its classification, formation, and composition.

Budget classification, generally, is considered as a useful tool to provide meaningful information on the activities of the government and sets out the form and structure to provide for closer analysis and utilization by the policy-makers. In other words, budget classification serves the purpose of presenting the maze of data in such a simple and systematic way that the non-technical parliamentarians are able to understand the niceties of the budget and meaningfully take part in the deliberations on it. Keeping that in mind, the budget classifications in various countries of the world are carried out in two distinct ways. First, the traditional method of budget classification, also known as line-item method of budget classification, provides for the arrangement of data on the basis of the departments that are supposed to incur the expenditure. On the contrary, the second method, also called the performance budgeting method or functional classification method, seeks to classify receipts and expenditures on the basis of functions, projects, programmes, and activities of the various departments.

Budget classification in India, for a long time even after Independence, continued to be carried out in the format of the line-item method, maintaining the opaqueness of the budgetary provisions and rendering their proper evaluation almost inscrutable. Hence, following the recommendations of a number of committees and commissions as well as persuasions from development economists, the government decided to switch over to the functional classification of budget in 1974. Consequently, now instead of just naming the department for budget classification, the government activities are categorized into three broad groups of General or Regulatory Services, Social and Community Services, and Economic Services. Even within these groups, the budgetary allocations are further classified under five heads, known as sectoral head, major head, minor head, sub-head, and detailed heads of account.

For purposes of budget classification, General Services include those regulatory or routine services of the government that do not involve any productive or developmental activities. These services

are further clubbed together under six broad groups: (*a*) organs of state such as parliament, head of state, judiciary, audit, council of ministers, and elections; (*b*) fiscal services including the agencies for collection of taxes; (*c*) interest payments and debt services; (*d*) administrative services, such as public service commissions, general administration, police, and so on; (*e*) pension and miscellaneous general services; and (*f*) defence services.

As against the General Services, the Social and Community Services consist of such programmes and activities that aim at providing basic social services to the people. Forming core of the social development programmes of the government, these services include education, health, housing, drinking water, social security including old-age pension, welfare of the SCs, STs, women, minorities, and other marginalized sections of the society. Besides, in recent times, under this head the government has initiated a number of flagship schemes such as *Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan* (Education for All), Mid Day Meal Scheme, National Rural Health Mission, Total Sanitation Campaign, National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, Integrated Child Development Services, Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission, and Pulse Polio Programme aimed at bringing about a turnaround in the fortunes of the masses of the country (*The Times of India* 2009).

Lastly, the economic services cover those sectors of the government functioning that are involved in productive and manufacturing activities including trade and commerce. These services are further classified into seven sub-groups: (*a*) general economic services including foreign trade and export promotion, (*b*) agriculture and allied services such as cooperation, minor irrigation, animal husbandry, fisheries, forests, soil conservation, dairy development, and so on, (*c*) industry and minerals including heavy and medium industries, village and small-scale industries, mines and minerals, (*d*) water resources and power development, (*e*) transport and communications including civil aviation, road transport, ports, lighthouses and shipping, (*f*) railways, and (*g*) posts and telegraphs. However, with the separate presentation of the railways budget, the clubbing of railways under the head of economic services does not carry much weight in normal times.

After the streamlining of the budget classification through the adoption of the techniques of performance budgeting system, the formation of budget has become quite meaningful and accountable in India. The formation of budget follows the cycle of the financial year from April to March each year. However, owing to the cumbersome procedures involved in the final formation of the budget, the process for the same begins around the month of September or October. Initiating the process, the Ministry of Finance issues a circular to the various ministries and departments inviting their estimates for the coming year. This is in accordance with the general principle of budgeting that he who spends the money should also prepare the estimates in advance for presentation before the legislature. These estimates are subsequently transmitted to the controlling officers of the respective departments who are assigned the responsibility of giving final shapes to the budget estimates of the department. The controlling officers, therefore, are empowered to scrutinize the estimates and either give their approval for the same or revise the estimates, if necessary, giving reasons for the same. Approved and consolidated, thus, the estimates of various ministries and departments then go to the Ministry of Finance during the period of November–December. By the end of January or early February, the Ministry of Finance is able to prepare a consolidated statement of revenues and expenditures, which is further fine-tuned by the third week of February to culminate the process of formation of budget.

The completion of the process of budget formation results into the final product, technically called the 'annual financial statement'. The composition of this statement or budget is, in the main, marked by the items of income and expenditure that are presented in the following format:

1. Actual figures of the previous three years;
2. the sanctioned budget estimates for the current year;
3. revised estimates of the current year;
4. proposed estimates for the next financial year, with explanatory notes for any increase or decrease in estimates; and

5. actuals of the current year available at the time of prepara-
    tion of the estimates and actuals for the corresponding pe-
    riod of the previous year (Thavaraj 1987: 496).

In order to provide for a ready-recknor of the budgetary provi-
sions, the budget document contains the broad description of the
receipts and expenditures of the government. The total receipts of
the government is the sum total of the revenue receipts and the
capital receipts. Similarly, the total expenditures of the govern-
ment are calculated by summing up, both the plan as well as the
non-plan expenditures. A remarkable feature of the budget docu-
ment, indicating the health of the government finances, has been
the two deficit indicators. While the revenue deficit indicates the
excesses of revenue expenditures over revenue receipts, the fiscal
deficit denotes the totality of revenue receipts and certain non-
debt capital receipts as well as the total expenditures including
loans, net of repayments, and others. The difference between the
two gives the figures of fiscal deficit which also indicates the total
borrowing needs of the government from all sources to meet the
above mentioned difference.

The niceties of the budget system of India, therefore, get reflect-
ed in the classification, formation, and composition of the bud-
get. Though most, if not all, of the aspects of the budget system
in India drew their lineage from conventions and rules rooted in
the colonial framework, a number of modifications brought about
over the years have added new vibrancy and coherence in them.
The budgetary system in India, thus, appears to be a good example
of continuity and change keeping in view the requirements of the
changing times.

BUDGETARY PROCESS IN INDIA

While the budget process in any country is a complex and time-
taking activity, the dynamics of a number of unconventional fac-
tors such as planning and parliamentary democratic polity in
India did not make the matter any easier. Indeed, the budgetary
process in the country appears to have become a round-the-year

affair as one or the other aspect of the process is always in motion, keeping the budget officials on their tenterhooks. For instance, the initiation of the budgetary process by the third quarter of the year does not get completed with the enactment of the budget proposals by the Parliament in the month of March. Parliamentary approval is followed by the onerous task of budget implementation which, within its ambit, also combines the responsibility of budget accounting as well. The final act in the budgetary process is enacted by the audit of the appropriation accounts maintained by the spending departments which in itself is an activity having its own follow-up actions. Hence, what follows is a brief narration of the various significant activities involved in the budgetary process in India, right from the stage of budget planning and moving through the stages of scrutiny, implementation, accounting to reach the final stage of audit.

Budget Planning

The stage of budget planning involves numerous intricate activities that go into making the budget before its presentation to the Lok Sabha. To set the stage for budget planning and to accommodate the plan objectives for development in the budget provisions, a detailed discussion takes place between the officials of the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance. In this discussion, the two crucial issues are finalized which include the gross budget support for plans and ministry/department-wise plan allocation (Thavaraj 1987: 496). Such an exercise appears to be a crucial step in the budget planning of India, given the predominant position accorded to planning in chartering out the long-term policies and programmes for the socioeconomic development of the country. However, this is also argued as a weak point of the Indian budgetary system which is alleged to have been reduced to not more than an instrument of overaching planning apparatus of the country. Nonetheless, irrespective of the merit of such a critique, it may be argued that since planning has become well-entrenched in the economic system of the country, it would not be possible to overlook the same. The only way

out, therefore, is to go for a coordinated approach on incorporating the plan considerations in the budgetary provisions. Hence, once the issues of plan concerns are addressed, the onus falls on the Ministry of Finance to set the ball rolling for the formation of the budget to be presented before the Parliament.

Budget Scrutiny

The scrutiny of budgetary proposals in India takes place at two levels—administrative and legislative. Administrative scrutiny refers to the scrutiny carried out by the higher echelons of a particular department as well as the Ministry of Finance. For instance, the budgetary proposals emanating from the base estimating authorities are, as a norm, scrutinized by the Financial Advisor and head of the department. Only when the administrative approval of these officials is obtained, such proposals become part of the departmental budget. Further, if the proposal involves construction works, it needs to be submitted for scrutiny to the Public Works Department which may then give the technical approval to the proposal. As the final step in the administrative scrutiny, all the departmental budgets, particularly the 'new items' thereof, are minutely scrutinized by the Ministry of Finance and its decision becomes the final word on the subject.

After presentation of the budget in the Parliament, the stage of legislative scrutiny begins. Previously, the legislative scrutiny of budgetary proposals in India was more generalized and formalistic, given the technical nature of the subject and paucity of time at the disposal of the parliament to go into the details of the budget. But, with the inauguration of the system of departmentally related standing committees in 1993, the legislative scrutiny of budget has become more focused and sharp. However, bringing another aspect of this system, a commentator argues, '[T]his is a valuable contribution to legislative scrutiny of budget proposals but the public focus of debate on the floor is now lost' (Prasad 2006: 147). In the end, the debates and discussions on various aspects of the budget culminate in its approval by the Parliament.

Budget Implementation

The nodal agency for budget implementation in India is the Ministry of Finance. Following the passage of the Appropriation Act, the Ministry of Finance issues advisories to the spending ministries, intimating the quantum of allocated funds to them. Thereafter, the responsibility comes on to the controlling officers—who ordinarily are the heads of the departments—to allocate money to the numerous disbursing officers of the department. However, the disbursing officers are given the right to spend money only to the extent permitted, going beyond which would necessarily require the permissions of the competent sanctioning authorities. At the same time, it is also mandatory for each spending department to maintain the records of payments and receipts in the prescribed method of accounting. Thus, the system of budget implementation in India essentially involves, at the ground, functionaries such as the controlling officers, competent officers to accord financial sanctions, drawing and disbursing officers, and an efficient structure of accounts to keep record of payments and receipts. In the process of budget implementation, the concerned officers are expected to exercise the highest degree of continuous vigilance and financial prudence in order to have an economical, efficient, and effective utilization of the public money.

Budget Accounting

Constitutionally, the budgetary accounting in India is the responsibility of an independent and constitutional authority called the CAG of India. In fact, the method and form of keeping the accounts of the central as well as the state governments are prescribed by the CAG with approval of the president of India. Hence, the office of CAG happens to be the custodian of accounting and audit system in the country, thought the audit and accounts were separated in 1976 to provide for better administrative expediency and accountability. 'Under the Controller and Auditor General there is an Accountant General in each state, in whose office the accounts of the transactions [Central as well as State], which take place within the territorial limits of the state, are kept' (Prasad 2006: 147). The

uniqueness of Indian accounting, thus, lies in making it an executive function, despite retaining it under the overall monitoring and guidance of the legislative-constitutional office of the CAG.

Budget Audit

Budget audit is the exclusive function of the CAG of India. Given the value and sanctity of the function, the office of CAG has impliedly been made analogous to that of a judge of the Supreme Court of India in terms of its independence and functional autonomy. Audit is, in fact, visualized as an extension of the legislative control and accountability over the financial administration of the country. Audit in India is more sharp and focused with regard to the expenditures which is called the Appropriation Audit. The objective of the Appropriation Audit is

> to ensure that the funds voted by the legislature are utilized by the executive for the purposes for which they were intended with due regard to economy and efficiency. It comprises [of]:
>
>   1. audit from the point of view of accountancy and classification;
>   2. audit from the point of view of authority;
>   3. audit of appropriation and finance accounts; and
>   4. audit from the point of view of propriety. (Thavaraj 1987: 644)

In brief, the budget process in India appears as an integrated entity, reflecting the nature and structure of the socioeconomic and politico-administrative set up of the country. For instance, budget planning is arguably a standard statement on the budgetary dynamics of the socioeconomic development goals and methods of their achievement. However, in order to provide for wisdom, faithfulness, economy, and accountability, an elaborate system of administrative and legislative scrutiny has been put in place. Also, the budget implementation illustrates the maturity and autonomy of administrative apparatus in India, with a view to facilitate the highest degree of initiative, enterprise, and innovation in administering the development of the country. Lastly, the budget accounting and audit have become the hallmarks of

financial accountability in true spirit of the parliamentary democratic system of governance in India.

FINANCE MANAGEMENT IN INDIA

The management of finances in India involves a complex set of activities right from the generation of resources to their proper management for the socioeconomic development of the country. In fact, finance probably constitutes the most significant aspect of the budget. The government policies and programmes designed to bring about socioeconomic development of the people get functional dynamism only through the support of the finances. Indeed, budget and finance may be taken as two sides of the same coin.[1] In this regard, the Ministry of Finance functions as the nodal agency to manage the finances in conjunction with certain other bodies like the Planning Commission. Two core issued involved in the finance management of India are the generation of the revenues and the proper expenditure of the same in such a manner that the socioeconomic development of the country may be maximized to the greatest possible extent. However, a common tendency evident in the finance management in most of the developing countries appears to be the notion of deficit financing. Though in many cases, deficit financing is ordinarily used as a means of augmenting the resources of the government to be used for productive purposes, this usually does not become the case in India. While taking recourse to deficit financing, the government is often seen spending the resources for the unproductive purposes. This appears to be a significant aspect in the management of finances in India.

Size of Finance

The size of finance in India is usually reflected through the estimates presented in the annual budgets. The figures in the Table 10.1 demonstrate the broad trends in the varying size of public finance in India over the past sixty years. Bracketed in two basic accounts of revenue and capital, difference between the receipts and expenditures of the two accounts gives the overall health of

Table 10.1
Size of Finance in India since 1950–51 (₹ in crores)

	1950–51 Actuals	1980–81 Actuals	2001–02 Actuals	2008–09 Budget
Revenue Account				
Receipts	406	12,830	2,01,450	6,02,935
Expenditures	347	14,540	3,01,610	6,58,120
Revenue Surplus (+)				
Revenue Deficit (−)	+59	−1,710	−1,00,160	−55,185
Capital Account				
Receipts	120	8,770	1,61,000	1,57,950
Disbursements	182	9,630	60,840	92,765
Deficit/Surplus	−62	−860	+1,00,160	+55,185
Overall budgetary deficit	−3	−2,570	Nil	Nil

Source: Datt and Sundharam (2008: 895).

the government finances. As the figures indicate, there has been progressive increase in the various heads of the government finance over the years demonstrating the growing size of the Indian economy. For instance, while the revenue account receipts in 1950–51 was just ₹406 crore, its galloping to the level of ₹6,02,935 crore in 2008–09 indicate an mammoth increase. Similar type of manifold increase can also be seen in the other heads of the government finance.

Finance Revenue and Expenditures

The revenue component of public finance in India consists of the receipts on both the revenue or current as well as capital accounts. In turn, the revenue receipts are further divided into tax revenue and non-tax revenue. Accounting for the major chunk of the finance revenue of the government, the tax revenue is drawn mainly from three types of taxes: taxes on income and expenditures, taxes on property or capital assets, and taxes on goods and services. While the first two set of taxes are known as direct taxes, the last category of tax is called the indirect tax. Of the direct taxes,

the income tax constitutes the backbone of the finance revenue in India. The other components of the taxes on income and expenditure include the corporation tax and the interest tax. Two key components of the taxes on property comprise of the wealth tax and the give tax. Within the category of indirect taxes, customs duties, central excise duty, and the recently introduced service tax constitute the nucleus of the account. In contrast to the tax revenue, the contribution of the non-tax revenue to the body of finance revenue is not that remarkable. It is drawn mainly from routine governmental enterprises such as currency, coinage, mint, interest receipts, dividends, and miscellaneous non-tax revenues.

Capital account receipts of the government are drawn from four sources: (*a*) net recoveries of loans and advances made previously to state governments, union territories, and public sector undertakings; (*b*) net market borrowings, that is, gross borrowings from the market less repayment of public debt; (*c*) net small savings collections, like gross collections less share of the states; and (*d*) other capital receipts such as provident funds, special deposits, and so on (Datt and Sundharam 2008: 894–95).

On the expenditure side, the government has gone for a new classification under the heads of non-plan expenditure and plan expenditure from the financial year 1987–88. Accordingly, the non-plan expenditures are again sub-divided into revenue expenditures and capital expenditures. Hence, the revenue expenditure consists of revenue payments, defence revenue expenditure, subsidies in the fields in the areas of fertilizers, food, and export promotion, debt relief to farmers, postal deficit, police, pension, other general services such as organs of state, tax collection, external affairs, and likewise. It also goes to finance the social services such as health, education, social security, employment guarantee schemes, mid day meal scheme, and so on, in addition to making massive outlays for the core sectors of the economy such as agriculture, industry, power, transport, communications, science and technology, mining, and other infrastructural development projects. Finally, grants to the states and the union territories as well as grants to the foreign countries are also disbursed from the revenue expenditures corpus of the government.

As referred to earlier, the capital non-plan expenditure is mainly meant for the financing of the activities such as defence capital expenditure, loans to public sector enterprises, loans to the states and the union territories, apart from the loans and grants to the foreign governments.

As against the non-plan expenditure, the plan expenditure is visualized to provide for financing of long-term infrastructure development projects in the sectors such as agriculture, rural development, irrigation and flood control, energy, industry, mining, minerals, transport, communications, science and technology, environmental protection, social services, and social security. Significantly, the key to understand the plan expenditure is the prior stipulations for such expenditures in the five-year plan documents with appropriate division of the sum total of expenditure in a particular sector over the span of five years. Besides, the financing of the central projects, another critical aspect of the plan expenditure happens to be the central assistance for the plans of the states and the union territories. The finance expenditure component of the public finance in India, therefore, consists of both the non-plan as well the plan expenditures with the budgetary provisions just giving a detailed description of these heads for a particular financial year.

Funds and Government Bonds

As part of the management of the public finances, Government of India maintains its corpus of funds under three specific-purpose accounts called funds and account. First, the Consolidated Fund of India, set up under the provisions of Article 266(1) of the Indian Constitution, acts as the fund to finance, among others, the expenditures called 'charged expenditures' in the conduct of the operations of the vital organs of the state such as judiciary and other constitutional offices. It consists of all the revenue receipts by the government by way of taxes such as income tax, central excise, customs, and other non-tax revenues. Further, all the loans raised by the government both from within and outside the country are also credited into this fund. This fund also feeds all the expenditures of the government with proper authorization from

the Parliament. Second, under the provisions of Article 267 of the Constitution of India, the Contingency Fund of India has been set up with a corpus of ₹50 crore to meet the expenses arising in emergency and unforeseen circumstances. Interestingly, once the Parliament sanctions money for the said emergency circumstances, the advance made from the Contingency Fund is reimbursed to it. Thus, this fund is supposed to act as some sort of cushion to provide the government finance resilience in times of crisis. Finally, the Public Account, constituted under Article 266(2) of the Constitution, is meant to service the transactions relating to debt other than those included in the Consolidated Fund of India. As such transactions do not constitute the normal receipts of the government, no parliamentary authorization is required for payments to be made from this account. Thus, in brief, the Consolidated Fund of India, the Contingency Fund of India, and the Public Account form the core of what may be called as government funds in India.

The government bonds also constitute a significant component of the public finance system in India. Technically, a government bond is a bond issued by the Government of India denominated either in the country's own currency or in foreign currencies in which case they are called sovereign bonds. Such bonds are issued to raise money in order to finance the spending of the government given the insufficiency of funds being raised from sources like taxation. The Government of India, for instance, proposed to borrow ₹4,50,000 crore in 2009–10 (*Hindustan Times* 2009: 21) from the market to funds its massive socioeconomic developmental programmes. In fact, a high fiscal deficit existing in India means a higher government borrowing, primarily, if not exclusively, through the means of the government bonds.

In sum, the management of public finance in India turns out to be a complex and technical exercise requiring a high degree of managerial skill and financial prudence in the persons concerned. Being the operational part of the economic system of the country whereby the real challenges of generating, maintaining, and spending the financial resources are to be met, the finance management has always remained a prime concern of the government. Moreover,

acknowledging the vitality of the activity, several definite provisions have also been made in the Constitution in order to provide for certain basic formulations on the issue. The inherent logic behind such constitutional provisions seems to be the concern of the framers of the Constitution to confine the management of the finances within the parameters of the democratic governance in the country. Clearly, therefore, barring few financial crises erupting occasionally, the overall management of finances in India remained on sound footing, bearing testimony to the prudence and farsightedness of the fathers of the Indian Constitution.

BUDGET SYSTEM REFORMS IN INDIA

The inheritance of a budgetary process designed to suit the requirements of a colonial economy would definitely not have been appropriate for the needs of a newly Independent and development-oriented economy like India. Over the years, therefore, numerous subtle reform measures were initiated in the budgetary process of the country in order to bring it in sync with the requirements of a nation embarking on the path of rapid socioeconomic development within the norms of a democratic polity. So, the basic contours of reforms in the budgetary process revolved around the themes of relocating its orientations from a colonial economy to that of a development oriented one; making *budget a tool of socioeconomic development of the country*; reorienting its focus from outlays to outcomes; designing budget as an instrument of ensuring effective politico-administrative accountability of administration to the legislative and executive bodies; and bringing about suitable technical reforms, say, in the system of accounting and audit.

To ensure that the budget system reforms do not cause any rupture in the smooth functioning of the financial administration of the country, such reforms have been introduced in a piece-meal and evolutionary manner. Three distinct phases of the process of budgetary reforms may be discerned in India. First, with the inauguration of India as an Independent nation, her budgetary system was subjected to deep-seated reforms, more in reorienting it to the

development and accountability imperatives of a developing economy and fledgling democracy than to bring about a radical change in the technical format of the budget. Second, in the wake of the recommendations of the First Administrative Reforms Commission (1968), a number of far-reaching changes were introduced in the technical format of the budget on the lines of the performance budgeting, accounting reforms, and so on. Finally, in the contemporary times, with the strengthening of the forces of liberalization and privatization, the parliamentary control over the budgetary process is also sought to be streamlined and deepened with the creation of a number of parliamentary standing committees to closely scrutinize the budgetary allocations of various ministries and departments.

As explained earlier, the contents of the budgetary reforms in India have encompassed almost the entire gamut of the budgetary process. The beginning, in this regard, seems to have been made by ideological reorientations in the budgetary outlook from being a colonial subject to becoming development-oriented. Further, in order to make such reorientation bear fruit, the line-item format of budget preparation was replaced by the performance budgeting system in 1977–78 for most of the developmental ministries of the Government of India. Moreover, as a preparatory move to introduce performance budgeting, and also to streamline the audit and accounting system, the audit and accounts which were hitherto managed as an integrated system, were separated in 1976. At certain times, suggestions were also made to introduce the format of ZBB in India. But, such suggestions could not cut much ice given the complexity of the development imperatives of the country. The last substantive reform in the budgetary process of the country came in the form of the standing committees of the Parliament to insightfully and closely monitor the functioning of the concerned ministries and departments (Kashyap 1999: 3247). As a result of such reforms in the budgetary process, the performance of the budgetary system in India has undergone remarkable improvements. For instance, the budget has not only emerged as a strong tool of socioeconomic transformation, it has also made the public authorities responsible for the execution of budgetary

allocations more accountable and sharp-focused in attaining the stipulated objectives. Yet, there still exist a number of grey areas where the budgetary reforms have not been able to make much difference, such as rising fiscal deficit. As a result, the budget in India still remains burdened by the over-bearing fiscal deficit casting doubts on its ability to discipline the government expenditure. Moreover, in order to take the process of budgetary reforms in India to logical conclusion, the focus areas now need to be raising governmental revenue, increasing work efficiency, limiting subsidies to the poor, sorting out the power sector complexities, right sizing government, prioritizing governmental expenditures, and linking agricultural and health policies (Vyasulu 2009: 21–23).

FINANCE SYSTEM REFORMS IN INDIA

Technically, the financial system in India consists of a myriad of institutions, activities, and products having a strong bearing on the country's economy. The key functions of the financial system are taken to be the channelization of domestic savings and foreign capital into productive investment for the economy on the one hand, and efficient delivery financial services such as payment, savings, insurance, pension, and so on, to the mammoth populace of the country, on the other. Hence, in post Independence times, the Indian financial system was built up to serve the twin purposes of propelling the growth trajectory as well as providing social and economic stability to the life of the people. The context and nature of financial system reforms in India, therefore, hover around the idea of bringing the system in sync with the fast-changing dynamics of the global economy without causing a sudden and untoward upheaval in the lives of the common people.

Given the complexity of the task in hand as well as the problem of stemming the tide of public outcry over the nature and product of the financial system reforms, the government thought it convenient to move in phases in so far as finance system reforms in India are concerned. So, the first phase of these reforms began in the context of the unprecedented economic crisis the country faced in the early 1990s in the wake of a massive balance of

payment crisis. With a government favourably disposed towards the financial reforms placed at the helm of affairs at the centre, global financial institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development found it convenient to press for fundamental reforms in the Indian financial system. As a result, a policy called Structural Adjustment Programme was initiated under the close monitoring of the global financial institutions with a view to dismantle whole structures and processes created to construct a socialistic pattern of society in India during the early of the Independence of the country. Besides, focus during this phase of reforms was also on liberalization of interest rate and directed credit. However, as most of the reforms in the first phase were macro in nature, they were criticized for focusing on the big picture that could bog down progress in the country. Hence, an International Monetary Fund Report lists a number of specific (micro) steps that could get the reforms going and build up some momentum as people see the benefits. For instance, it was suggested that converting trade receivable claims to electronic format and creating a structure to allow them to be sold as commercial paper could greatly boost the credit available to small and medium-sized enterprises (Prasad and Rajan 2008: 37). Hence, with the dawn of the new millennium, the stage was set for the onset of the second phase of financial system reforms in India.

With the basic groundwork being done in the first phase, the stage was now set for the initiation of the most comprehensive and penetrating reforms in the financial system of India. Given the complexity and the proportion of the areas and issues to be covered in this phase, an indicative list of such spheres may include:

1. reducing the fiscal deficit to reduce the risk of macroeconomic instability and to increase the availability of finance to the private sector;
2. improving the legal, regulatory, and supervisory frameworks, in order to improve banks' credit and risk management;
3. improving systems for dealing with weak banks; developing capital markets further;

4. developing pensions and insurance to increase finance for long-term investments, including infrastructure;

5. improving financial services to improve the welfare of customers and meet the challenge of globalization of financial services; and

6. managing links to external capital markets (Hansen and Kathuria 1999: 9).

In sum, the second-generation financial reforms in India are bound to be focused on the monetary and financial sectors despite the political sensitiveness of these areas. Indeed, without drastically reforming the monetary and financial sectors of the economy, the real fruits of the liberalized economy could not be reaped by the people in the long term (Reddy 2004: 64). Such reforms are likely to be more in the structural dispensation of the financial sector than in the operational policy orientations. Indeed, the government is faced with the formidable challenge of containing the worrisome fiscal deficit while continuing to provide a necessary fiscal stimulus to revive the economy. It has also to institute a fiscal restructuring programme towards achieving fiscal consolidation in the medium term. The programme should draw lessons from the past and redesign the fiscal restructuring plan for the centre as well as the states. The experience shows that a mere passing of legislation does not necessarily bring about fiscal discipline. It needs to be matched by the political will to ruthlessly implement such legislation, irrespective of the storms created by the unscrupulous people with vested interests in continuing with the existing system (Rao 2009: 85).

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Public budgeting seems to be the most difficult act in governance because it involves making and carrying out decisions regarding acquisition, allocation, and utilization of resources, particularly money, by the government. The reasons are not difficult to seek. Besides, the technical expertise in addressing the critical areas of public concern, the governmental authority preparing the budget

needs to take into account the ideological priorities of the regime. Budgetary decisions are therefore a meaningful socioeconomic index of knowing the nature of the polity, both from the point of view of its economic health and political direction. This is also a clear device to identify the gaps between what the budget suggests and what it accomplishes.

There is no doubt that budget is a time-tested mechanism in financial management which is governed by certain well-defined principles drawn on the economic priorities and the ideological predilections of the government in power. Budget seeks to capture the concern of the stakeholders underlining the sociopolitical agenda of the government. What is most critical in this process is the overwhelming importance of 'democracy' as an aspired ideal. And, hence, despite socio-cultural differences, the most significant aspect of the entire processes of budget preparation and implementation happens to be 'the unambiguous role of the public'. It is true that due to peculiar circumstances, the public may not be as visible as is expected, but, in the long run, the neglect will cost dearly to the decision-makers unless this is meaningfully addressed. What is basic to this argument is the importance of ideology in shaping the budget drawing on the political priorities, as defined by the government in power. The stakeholders seem to propel the government to action in accordance with what they consider as 'ideological priorities'. This is what separates India from other types of political systems where 'people' appear to be 'mere cogs' in the entire process of making and implementing the budget without a meaningful voice. This is also what makes the study of budgetary processes in India so interesting and revealing because not only will this set in motion studies on the complexities of the entire exercise, but will also provide inputs for an enriching comparative analysis involving different socio-culturally opposite polities in the world.

NOTE

1. For a *lucid account of the concepts and functioning of budget and fina*nce and their mutual relationship, see Asian Development Bank (2009).

REFERENCES

Asian Development Bank. 2009. *Macroeconomic Management and Government Finances*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Chakrabarty, Bidyut and Rajendra Kumar Pandey. 2008. *Indian Government and Politics*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Cox III, Raymond W., Susan J. Buck, and Betty N. Morgan. 1994. *Public Administration in Theory and Practice*. India: Pearson.

Datt, Ruddar and K.P.M. Sundharam. 2008. *Indian Economy* (58th edition). New Delhi: S. Chand and Company.

Goel, S.L. 2010. *Social Welfare Administration*, Part II. New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications.

Government of India. 2008. *Annual Reports, 2007–08*. Ministry of Women and Child Development, Government of India.

Hansen, James A. and Sanjay Kathuria. 1999. 'India's Financial System—Getting Ready for the Twenty-first Century: An Introduction', in James A. Hansen and Sanjay Kathuria (eds), *India: A Financial System for the Twenty First Century*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Hindustan Times (New Delhi), 8 July 2009, p. 21.

Holzer, Marc and Richard W. Schwester. 2011. *Public Administration: An Introduction*. New Delhi: PHI Learning.

Kashyap, Subhash C. 1999. 'A New Parliamentary Initiative: Subject-based Standing Committees of Parliament', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 6 October: 3247.

Maheshwari, Arasthiand. 2010. *Public Administration*. Agra: Lakshmi Narain Agarwal.

Prasad, Eswar S. and Raghuram G. Rajan. 2008. 'Next Generation Financial Reforms in India', *Finance and Development*, 45 (9, September): 37.

Prasad, Kamala. 2006. *Indian Administration: Politics, Policies and Prospects*. New Delhi: Pearson Longman.

Rao, M. Govind. 2009. 'The Fiscal Situation and a Reform Agenda for the New Government', in *Economic and Political Weekly*, 20 June.

Reddy, Y.V. 2004. 'Monetary and Financial Sector Reforms in India: A Practitioner's Perspective', in Kaushik Basu (ed.), *India's Emerging Economy: Performance and Prospects in the 1990s and Beyond*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Singh, Amita. 2002. *Public Administration: Roots Are Wings*. New Delhi: Galgotia Publishing.

The Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, vols. III and IV.

The Times of India, 3 June 2009 (New Delhi edition).

Thavaraj, M.J.K. 1987. *Financial Administration of India* (2nd edition). New Delhi: Sultan Chand and Sons, p. 496.

Vyasulu, Vinod, 2009. 'Budget 2009–2010: Beyond Fiscal Rectitude', *Economic and Political Weekly*, August 1: 21–23.

Chapter 11

Administrative Reforms in India

Learning Objectives
- To understand the concept of 'administrative reform'
- To analyse the administrative reforms in the post Independence India
- To explain the changing pattern of reforms in the post-liberalization era in India

Public administration is a continuous process and in this sense it is always undergoing reform. So, in public administration 're-form is a journey rather than a destination' (Governance in Transition 1995: 2). Reforms are an obvious response to the new challenges confronting state institutions managing public affairs. At the root of such an exercise lies the effort at enhancing administrative capability in the changed scenario. The problem of administrative reform has received continuing attention in India, both at the centre and in the states. Since Independence, there have been a large number of changes in the structure, work methods, and procedures of the administrative organizations. Although these changes have been gradual, at times not too perceptible, they do indicate the efforts made by the government to affect procedural and policy innovation in the administrative system and to keep pace with the changed situations, growing needs, and exigencies of the government. With this

background, the present chapter makes an attempt to understand the concept of administrative reform, to analyse the initiatives of reforms after Independence, and understand the changing patterns of administrative reforms in India in the post-liberalization era.

Public administration was born out of a zeal for reforms, and since the publication of Wilson's founding easy in 1887, change and reform have remained a constant refrain of administrative analysis. The initial impulse came from reformers' interest in separating politics from administration to rid the latter of corruption and to professionalize it. Successive efforts in disciplinary growth were aimed at 'organizing' decision-making and policy refinement, behavioural reorientation of employees and managers, and public administration more and more towards the open system, environment-sensitive, and client-responsive direction. A major breakthrough in recent years was the 'public choice' perspective, posing the market-versus-state issue, relocating the discipline in a neoliberal political economy perspective. In the 'third' world, public administration became development administration with a new focus, objectives, and modalities of functioning. The development-reform nexus has spawned a variety of responses from international agencies, like the World Bank as well as from developing countries themselves. Good governance, participative developments, and de-bureaucratization have gained in importance in conceptualizing contemporary public administration.

THEORETICAL UNDERPINNING OF ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS

Public administration as an academic discipline was born with a bias towards change and reform. The term 'reform' literally means forming again. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines 'reform' as 'to convert into another and better form, to amend or improve by some change of form, arrangement or composition; to free from previous faults or imperfection'. Following this definition, 'administrative reform' is to convert public administration into a better, improved form. In other words, administrative reform is a deliberately planned exercise to improve public administration

(Maheshwari 2002: 2). Gerald Caiden defines administrative reform as 'the artificial inducement of administrative transformation, against resistance'. According to him, 'it is artificial because it is manmade, deliberate, planned, it is not natural, accidental or automatic. It is induced because it involves persuasion, argument, and the ultimate threat of sanctions; it is not universally accepted as the obvious or true course' (Caiden 1969: 65). What is striking in Caiden's formulation is the importance of the political ambience in shaping the nature and meaning of administrative reform. To Hann-Bee, administrative reform is an 'effort to apply new ideas or combinations of ideas to an administrative system for positive goals of national development' (Lee 1976: 114). Arne Leemans describes administrative reform as 'induced change in the machinery of government undertaken in an effort to bridge a gap between reality and desirability' (Leemans 1976: 65). Although there is no universally accepted definition of administrative reform, there is fundamental agreement among scholars that is meant to improve administrative capability and capacity, for the purpose of achieving national goals effectively. In other words, it is meant to encourage an effective administration to enhance and increase the quality of public services and deliver such goals and services to citizens more economically, efficiently, and effectively.

Administration is dynamic and its role is being constantly redefined in response to the changing circumstances in which it is located. Hence, Caiden argues that administrative reform is based on the premise that governments need effective machinery to operationalize their policies and that effective machinery can be designed on rational principles. What it suggests is that (*a*) administrative reform is about deliberate planned change affecting the society in purview; (*b*) it is synonymous with innovation; (*c*) improvements in public service efficiency and effectiveness are the intended outcomes of the reforms; and (*d*) the reforms are justified by the need to cope with the uncertainties and rapid changes in the organizational environment.

The need for administrative reform arises from the malfunctioning of the natural processes of administrative change. Reform movements begin with the intention of removing obstacles to

change or of improving on the results of change where it is being accommodated. The objective of administrative reform, thus, is to improve on the status quo by removing alleged defects, ending evil or wrong ways, and curing administrative faults. In this sense, Caiden (1969: 65) believes that administrative reform has a moral purpose. Briefly, administrative reform is needed where administrative change is insufficient to keep an administration abreast of developments, and performance gaps appear. This means that it is, 'a significant discrepancy exists between what it is doing and what it "ought" to be doing' (Downs 1967: 191). According to Caiden, administrative reform is needed in the following circumstances:

1. When the administration is obviously failing to meet the demands put on it;
2. when the administration with reserve capacity is unable to anticipate future demands;
3. when the administration with reserve capacity is unable to anticipate future demands; and
4. when the administration that does have reserve capacity and the ability to anticipate future demands does not adopt the most effective methods (Caiden 1969: 131).

Thus, the inability of the administration to meet the present demands and anticipate future demands makes a space for administrative reforms. The administration has to adapt to the new role. This need for change in turn necessitates reforms. And, the fundamental objective of such reform is the improvement of administration, variously described the cure of maladministration; the attainment of efficient performance at minimum expenditure of resources, and the development and implementation 'of whatever changes are required to enable administrative organs to execute public policies in an effective and responsible manner' (Fiana and Dean 1969: 142). Mosher (1969) identifies four major sub-goals of administrative reform:

1. Changing operating policies and programmes;
2. improvement of administrative effectiveness;

3. higher quality personnel and more effective staff performance; and

4. anticipating outside criticism or threat.

Administrative reform is episodic in character. Reform is aimed at improving the status quo and it therefore marks a departure from the prevalent set-up. Here, Caiden's distinction between 'reform' and 'change' seems relevant. While the latter is a self-adjusting organizational response to changing conditions, reform is a device to remedy the malfunctioning of the natural administrative process. Reform, unlike change, is therefore a continuous activity seeking to transform the structure, process, and behaviour of administration. Attempts at reform are, thus, directed towards three elements wither separately or jointly.

- *Structural reform* is very common in public administration. The basic concern here is with division of work, delegation, and decentralization, as well as the creation of autonomous agencies and setting up of coordinating mechanism to harmonize the actions of interdependent units.
- *Procedural reform* is also frequently suggested and pursued in government organizations. This may involve changes in financial rules, alteration of work procedures (changes in filing methods, forms, and so on), and general attempts to avoid red tape. Application of a battery of management techniques to different administrative situations also belongs to this category of reform.
- *Behavioural reform* is a relatively new dimension in administrative reform. Here, the focus is on public bureaucracy that has been criticized for its impersonal character and dehumanizing consequences. Behavioural changes have, therefore, been suggested to improve inter-personal and inter-group relationships within the bureaucracy. Also, such changes are advocated to make the administration serve the public better. Participative management and sensitivity training have gained wide currency in recent times in public administration.

Given its wider concern, administrative reforms are very difficult to implement as they represent real or perceived shifts in prevailing authority relationships. As far as implementation of reforms is concerned, Caiden (1969: 145–54) refers to four methods of implementation:

1. Reforms imposed through political revolution;
2. reforms introduced to remedy organizational rigidity;
3. reforms through the legal system; and
4. reforms through changes in attitudes.

Political revolution is a particularly dramatic technique by which administrative reforms are imposed on administrators. A revolutionary change like colonialism giving place to constitutional democracy or a sudden coup signifies radical transformation of power. Sweeping administrative reforms are likely to follow such radical political change. When an organization becomes too rigid, and stresses and strains appear, internal demands for administrative reform increase. Flexibility is reintroduced. The changes can take place in the form of restructuring, reinvention, rethinking, and reengineering. The law is also becoming an increasingly important method for implementing administrative reforms. Human beings are an important part of any organization. Change in their attitude will help in bringing reforms. No legal, structural, or political change can lead to desired reform unless and until they are appreciated and accepted by the people working in the organization. As far as the acceptability of reform is concerned, according to Caiden, they are more likely to be accepted (*a*) if they are tailored to local circumstances, implemented through existing institutions, and invite local participation, (*b*) if existing institutions and practices are not condemned out of hand, that is, if attention is given to extolling the virtues of reform rather than the defects of the unreformed; and (*c*) if they are based on critical rather than uncritical non-operationalism (Caiden 1969: 142).

The reformer has to enlarge his areas of support. The most appropriate strategy would, therefore, be 'to win over vested interests, opponents and neutrals if possible while strengthening support'.

Reforms may preferably be on the basis of a long-term plan and in several stages. There can be a build-in experimentation within the reform plan so that if things go wrong at any stage, the plan should be flexible enough to permit necessary adjustments in the light of the experience. The role of leadership in pushing through reform hardly needs any emphasis. Those who propose reforms must have a large following and should be holding important positions in the organizations concerned. Their personalities in terms of leadership qualities and general acceptability help in popularizing the reform proposals. This suggests that there can hardly be a universal package for administrative reform. No situation is identical to the other. Each reform situation is peculiar in itself. Just an administrative culture differs from one country to another even from one region within a country to another, so organization cultures differ among and even within organizations. Reforms aim 'to change the culture in some way and the more dramatic or drastic the change sought, the more problematical the chances of success' (Caiden quoted in Chakrabarty 2007: 115). The bigger the canvas, the more that can go wrong and the more time needed to assimilate changes. Given the peculiarities of public administration, there is, therefore, no textbook solution and reforms are contingent on the circumstances in which they are articulated and implemented.

Administrative reform is a constant process, the aim of which is to adapt the administrative system, as far as possible, to the changing requirement of the society in question. Given its peculiar dynamics, reforms need strong political backing, mass support, and competent inside facilitation. The success of these efforts also depends on a mechanism to successfully execute the reforms that aim not merely at restructuring bureaucracy but also the broader environment in which the system functions. Hence, implementation and evaluation of reforms are important in the entire exercise.

To sum up, administrative reform is an important issue in public administration. Its need is widely felt and its modalities are currently receiving considerable attention. Reforms serve a number of purposes and are of various types. There are distinct phases through which reform proposals pass. Reforms depend for

their success on able leadership, correct diagnosis and grasp of the situation, proper sense of timing, wider support base, careful planning and phasing of proposals, command over resources, and above all, a sound understanding of 'politics'. The implementation of reforms has to be planned properly and monitoring should be a part of the implementation process. It has to be clearly proved that reform produce expected results. Hence, evaluation should be an integral part of reform.

ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS IN INDIA SINCE INDEPENDENCE

Turning to the 'reforms' scenario in India, one has to run through a long period of bureaucratic ups and downs since the advent of colonial rule. During imperial rule, the core purpose of administration was to bolster colonialism where people's interests were absolutely peripheral if not entirely absent. Hence, administrative reforms had to single priority of perpetuating British Rule. With Independence, the nature and the spirit of administration were bound to be radically different since its moral foundation had undergone dramatic changes. The Indian historical experience, both during the British period and its immediate aftermath, led to the emergence of a public administration that was ill-suited to the needs and aspirations of the people. The reasons are not difficult to seek as studies have shown that the bureaucrats who have been brought up and trained in the colonial administrative culture are welded to the Weberian characteristics of hierarchy, status, and rigidity of rules and regulations, and are concerned mainly with the enforcement of, law and order and collection of revenues. While this structure was most appropriate for the colonial regime, it is completely unfit to discharge the functions in the changed environment of an administration, geared to the task of development. As the government becomes the main institution for development in the democratic set-up that India adopted following Independence, the role of the officials has undergone changes. Their role objective is to 'emphasize results, rather than hierarchy and status, flexibility and decentralization rather than control and authority'

(Bhatt quoted in Chakrabarty 2007: 228). Seen as 'the development administrator, the bureaucrat should therefore be characterized by "tact, pragmatism, dynamism, flexibility, adaptability to any situation and willingness to take rapid, ad-hoc decisions without worrying too much about procedures and protocol'" (Bhatt quoted in Chakrabarty 2007: 282).

However, given the new challenges of economic development and social change, the prevalent administrative structure was both structurally inadequate and functionally unprepared in India's changed sociopolitical circumstances. So, there was a need for administrative reforms whereby the structure would respond to systematic changes in the Indian polity following British withdrawal. The need also arose as people's awareness and aspirations increased. There was also a sudden shortage of top-notch British officials and some Muslims opted to go to Pakistan (Ramachandran 1996: 215). All these developments necessitated appropriate administrative readjustments.

In order to respond to the new challenges, several steps were undertaken in the post-1947 transfer of power. The first step was undoubtedly the formation of the secretariat reorganization committee, appointed by the imperial government even before the actual transfer of power. In its report, submitted in August 1947, the committee commented extensively on the 'unresponsive' nature of the administration that was simply incapable of handling 'the new challenges' in the aftermath of British withdrawal (Government of India 1949: 225). These years also witnessed the IAS to replace the Indian Civil Service, such as the Indian Police Service, Indian Foreign Service, the Central Services, as well as the setting up of a training school for the IAS probationers.

A comprehensive review of working of the machinery of the central government was undertaken towards the end of 1949 by Gopoalaswami Ayyanger committee which dealt with organization changes, improvement in methods of transaction of governmental business. He recommended a distinction between a 'ministry' and a 'department'. He recommended a new grouping of ministries responsible for economic and social services under the name of bureaus like bureau for agriculture and natural resources, industry

and commerce, transport and communication, and labour and social services (Singh and Ansari 2007: 478).

In 1951, the Planning Commission set up the Gorwala Committee to consider whether the existing administrative machinery and methods were adequate to the requirements of planned development. The main finding of the committee was that the public was experiencing delay in execution, and there was lack of integrity and undue interference and corruption and lack of involvement of officials. It recommended a reorganization of the government for greater speed, efficiency, effectiveness, and responsiveness. The committee even suggested that a minister and a secretary be appointed solely for pursuing administrative reforms and its promotion.

An important landmark in the area of administrative reforms goes back to Paul H. Appleby's two reports on Indian Administration. In its first report, *Public Administration in India: Report of a Survey* (1953), it recommended for the establishment of an O and M (Organization and Methods) organization in the central government and the setting up of an institute of public administration, which was adopted immediately (Appleby 1953). Appleby's second report *Reorganization of India's Administrative System (With special reference to Administration of Government's Industrial and commercial Enterprises)* was submitted in 1956. As a consequence of the Appleby Report, O and M divisions were established in each government department to take care of everyday issues of procedural efficiency. The Indian Institute of Public Administration was set up in March 1954 to serve as a 'Think Tank' to the Government of India. It was entrusted with the task of conducting research studies, undertake consultancy assignments, and organize training programmes for senior civil servants.

In his reports, Paul Appleby suggested radical reforms of the administrative structure that was 'archaic', feudalistic', and 'inadequate' to fulfil the primary goal of the nation with 'a long history of colonialism'. What was most surprising to him was the acceptance of 'an administrative machine' simply because of its 'instrumental' significance. As a result, the later structural changes were

believed to be crucial in radically altering the inherent ideological foundation of Indian public administration. The report of the Second Pay Commission (1957–59) is illustrative here. Appointed in 1957, the primary task of the commission was to examine 'the principles' that should govern 'the structure of emoluments and conditions of service' of central government employees. In order to ascertain efficiency, the commission suggested the classification of government offices into 'attached' and 'subordinate' offices on a functional basis and bringing the relevant secretariat and the attached offices under 'a single headquarter organization'. The other remarkable recommendation was about the creation of machinery for negotiation and settlement of disputes between employers and employees (Government of India 1959: 228).

The growing corruption in administration led to the appointment of the Shanthanam Committee in 1964 that looked into the problem of administrative corruption. The committee examined the organization and working of the vigilance units in central ministries and departments, suggested changes in conduct rules applicable to government's servants, and recommended for the creation of the central vigilance commission as a permanent administrative wing to keep a sustained watch on civil servants. As a result of its recommendations, the central vigilance commission was set up by the Government of India.

The most comprehensive enquiry, ever undertaken in the aftermath of decolonization was the Administrative Reforms Commission (ARC) that came into being in 1966 under the stewardship of Morarji Desai. It was patterned after the Hoover Commission of the US set up in the post Second World War period having a political and civil servant membership with experts coming into write reports after study and research. Two important ideas seemed to have governed the constitution of the commission. First, the changing nature of administration, from a mere law and order maintenance agency to an apparatus responsible for development, radically altered the traditional concept of administration. Second, the ideological goal of a socialist pattern of society called for a drastic overhauling of the machinery of government that so far discharged the responsibility in a very stereotypical manner. So,

the commission was given a very wide mandate and was entrusted with the task of 'giving consideration to the need for ensuring the highest standard of efficiency and integrity in the public-service and for making public administration a fit instrument for carrying out the social and economic goals of development as also one which is responsive to the public' (Government of India 1966–70). The commission worked over a period of four years making a total of 581 recommendations. Some of the important recommendations of the ARC include the following:

- The appointment of Lokpal (at the centre) and Lokayuktas (in the states) to deal with complaints of corruption and public grievances.
- Introduction of performance budgeting in all development departments.
- Establishment of a central personnel agency at the centre (Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms) under the cabinet secretariat and independent personnel departments in each ministry.
- Vesting of development responsibilities at the district level with the Zilla Parishad (district set-up with elected representatives) and appointment of a district development officer as the chief executive officer of Zilla Parishad.
- Constitution of inter-state councils under Article 263 of the Constitution for dealing with centre–state relations.
- Greater opportunities should be provided to government servants of lower ranks to rise rapidly as high as their competence and performance warrant.
- Constitution of administrative tribunals for redressal of grievances of the public servants.
- Developing a positive organizational culture and a motivational climate in government organizations.
- Depoliticization of service in minister–civil servants' relationships.

The ARC report is probably the most exhaustive check-list of steps to streamline the administration in the changed sociopolitical

environment. The most significant recommendations happen to be the appointment of the Lokpal and the Lokayukta apart from the introduction of the concept and technique of performance budgeting. As a consequence of the ARC report, the Lokpal and Lokayuktas Bill, 1968, was introduced in the Lok Sabha in the year 1968. Unfortunately, it could not be passed in the Rajya Sabah. Though introduced in the Parliament three times, the Lokpal Bill has not been passed, but so far nine states have adopted some variation of the ombudsmen proposal. Recent mass mobilization by social activist Anna Hazare has pressurized the government to pass the Lokpal Bill in the Parliament as soon as possible. If it happens it will be a major step in preventing public corruption in India. Another achievement of ARC report is that the performance budgets were prepared and presented to Parliament for the first time in April 1968, in respect of four ministries of the central government, and from 1975–76, most of the ministries and departments at the centre are following the same. Despite these small successes, the ARC report was not so illuminating and hardly effective in substantially transforming Indian administration which had colonial roots. To Kuldeep Mathur, failure was due to a number of factors like sudden death of Lal Bahadur Shastri, who had appointed the commission; the next prime minister was herself fighting for her political survival and did not find time to reflect on administrative change. Finally, when the commission finished its tasks, the country was facing a war for the liberation of Bangladesh and subsequently was caught in the turmoil of national emergency. Thus, the Administrative Reforms Commission just faded away leaving behind a pile of reports and frustration at the national inability to reform a colonial administrative system.

POST-ARC REFORMS INITIATIVES

During the period between the appointment of the ARC in 1966 and the inauguration of the Fifth Pay Commission in 1997, there have been no major committees or commissions on administrative reforms except three isolated attempts to: (*a*) improve the pattern of the combined civil services competitive examination

by introducing a preliminary set of examination to eliminate a large number of candidates having less potential for success as a sequel to the 1976 Kothari Committee Report, (*b*) revitalize the Panchayati Raj system of governance at the grass roots by converting the three-tier structure into a two-tier structure (Ashok Mehta Committee Report, 1979), and (*c*) change the system of economic administration (the 1986 Jha Committee).

However, another development in the history of administrative reforms has been the appointment of the Satish Chandra Committee to review the civil services examinations system. The task of the committee was 'to review and evaluate the system of selection to the higher civil services introduced from 1979 in pursuance of the Kothari committee on recruitment policy and selection methods [1974] and to make recommendations for further improvement of the system'. The committee reported in 1989, and some of its major recommendations have been put in operation effective with 1993 competitive examinations for all India and Central Services (Government of India 1998: i–vii). Two important recommendations which were accepted and implemented are the introduction of an 'essay paper' carrying 200 marks in the civil services (main) examination and the maximum marks for the personality test increased from 250 to 300. It also recommended for giving more publicity to the civil services examination through the print and electronic media.

In these series of reform schemes, the recommendations of the 1981 National Police Commission (NPC) are different, not only in their thrust but also in raising the most crucial question in a context when those possessing the legitimate instrument of coercive power tended to distort the public nature of their authority at the slightest pretext. Appointed at the aftermath of the 1975–77 Emergency, the NPC made several recommendations on police reform in its eight-volume report, submitted in 1981. Two areas that appeared to have bothered the commission most were (*a*) the misuse of the police and (*b*) accountability and police performance. To contain the misuse of police force, it recommended that there should be a tenured office of the Chief of Police, selected by a panel and there should be a six-member permanent state

security commission with a fixed term of three years to annually review the performance of the police. To ensure accountability, it was suggested that the duties are to be discharged to the satisfaction of the party for whose benefit the duties are being performed. The commission also noted that accountability also depends upon the awareness of the people of their rights and their willingness to exercise the same in a responsible manner (Government of India 1981).

REFORMS IN THE POST-LIBERALIZATION ERA

With the adoption of the new economic policy in the early 1990s, there have been attempts at dismantling the centrally directed framework of economic development. This was also the beginning of the period when the international donor agencies exercised immense influence on the domestic economy by attaching 'conditional ties' while giving aid. These conditionalties were, at the outset, mere prescriptions for administration of aid but later became modalities for reform in the overall framework of governance itself. Given the rising tide of 'neoliberalism', no country is free from this. The changed empirical context has contributed to a new conceptualism in the form of 'reinventing government' that actually seeks to articulate the transformed role of public administration. Reforms in administration in India in the 1990s have been basically driven by the measures of economic liberalization.

Seeking to articulate the typical Indian response to liberalization, the 1991 Industrial Policy Resolution suggested several steps to 'unshackle the Indian industrial economy from the cobwebs of unnecessary bureaucratic control', though from within the overall control of the state. Four specific steps were recommended. First, the government decided to abolish 'industrial licensing policy', except for a short list of industries related to security and strategic concerns, social concerns, hazardous chemicals, and overriding environmental considerations. Second, the government also endorsed 'direct foreign investment up to 51 per cent foreign equity in high priority industries'. To avoid bottlenecks, an amendment to the 1973 Foreign Exchange Regulation Act was suggested.

Third, it was also decided to withdraw protection of the 'sick public sector units' and there would be 'a greater thrust on performance improvement' to ensure accountability of those involved in these state-sponsored enterprises. Finally, the 1991 policy sought to remove 'the threshold limits of assets in respect of those companies functioning under the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act (MRTP)'. By seeking to amend this act, the 1991 policy suggested elimination of the requirement of prior approval of the union government for establishment of new undertakings, expansion of undertakings, merger, amalgamation and takeover, and appointments of directors under certain circumstances. Quite clearly, the focus of the policy was on increasing privatization, de-licensing, and decentralization.

The role of the command and control structure of the government received a new meaning in the regime of economic reforms. Major initiatives towards restructuring of public sector units (PSUs) were initiated, in view of their low productivity, over staffing, lack of technological upgradation, and low rate of return. In order to raise resources and ensure wider public participation in PSUs, it was decided to offer its shareholding stake to mutual funds, financial institutions, general public and workers. Similarly, in order to revive and rehabilitate chronically sick PSUs, it was decided to refer them to the Board for Industrial and Financial Reconstruction (BIFR). The policy also provided for greater managerial autonomy to the Board of PSUs. In order to promote the role of the private players, the National Mineral Policy (1993) de-reserved thirteen minerals for exploitation by the private sector, while the National Telecom Policy, 1994, allowed private participation in basic telecom services. The Air Corporation Act, 1994, enabled private air taxi companies to operate regular domestic services. The National Highways Act was amended to enable levy of toll on users of national highways (Government of India 1997b: 92). The new economic policy of 1991, thus, envisaged a roll-back of the state and placed a greater reliance on market-friendly policies.

In the post-1990s, there were sporadic attempts at disinvestment in public sector enterprises, but these got embroiled in controversies, culminating finally in the setting up of the Disinvestment

Commission in 1996.The Fifth Pay Commission Report (1994) stated that it is increasingly felt that in capital intensive infrastructural sectors like energy, telecommunications, roads, ports, and others, the shortfalls in investment are so large that a massive infusion of private investment is a must. Many states initiated special measures to attract FDI for greater industrialization in their region. Several states introduced single-window systems for faster processing of applications for setting up industrial enterprises and liberal incentives were offered to industrialists for setting up industries in backward areas. The impact of these reforms may be gauged from the fact that total foreign investment in India grew from a minuscule US\$132 million in 1991–92 to US\$5.3 billion in 1995–96. As a part of economic reforms, creation of statutory independent regulatory mechanism is gaining wider support. The government in the sport policy draft is contemplating setting up of a Sports Regulatory Authority. Similarly, the union government has drafted a Real Estate Bill suggesting a regulatory authority for providing a safety net to buyers and investors. The Knowledge Commission has also suggested for creating independent regulatory authority in addition and even replacing the existing University Grants Commission (UGC). For the telecom sector in 2000, the government reconstituted the erstwhile regulatory body in two, namely, the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India as a regulator and the Telecom Dispute Settlement and Appellate Tribunal for settling disputes (Minocha 2007: 404–05).

Another significant development in the post-1990s is the decentralization and empowerment of localities for local resources and knowledge-based authentic grass roots governance. The 73rd and 74th Constitutional Amendments signalled momentous changes in terms of grass roots people's empowerment by providing for (*a*) regular elections, (*b*) minimal suppression of Panchayati Raj bodies through an administrative fiat, (*c*) regular finances through statutory distribution by finance commissions (Chakrabarty and Pandey 2008: 262), and (*d*) reservation of seats for the weaker sections of society including women. The aim, argues Kuldeep Mathur, 'is to reduce the margin of political and administrative discretion and to allow the decentralized institutions

to gather strength on the basis of people's involvement' (Mathur 1999: 22). Given the clear legal sanction for decentralization, there is no doubt that decentralization through Panchayats could bring about an enormous change in the way our democracy functions. This is not only a change in local governance but could provide a way for deepening political democracy by making it more direct, though it will have all the limitations of 'agency-induced instrumental decentralization' so long as the ideological format in which Panchayati Raj Institutions are articulated remains unaltered.

The Indian response to the new circumstances was clearly articulated in the 1996 conference of chief secretaries. The focus of the conference was on having an accountable, open, and citizen-friendly government, and on improving the performance and integrity. It recognized that the public image of the bureaucracy was one of inaccessibility, indifference, procedure orientation, poor quality and sluggishness, corruption, and non-accountability for result (Government of India 1997c: 1). The follow-up action of the conference included:

- Developing grievances redressal machinery;
- formulation of citizen's charters by all ministries with public interface;
- setting up of an inter-ministerial working group on right to information and transparency by H.D. Shourie;
- constituting an expert group to look into the computerization in personnel system and public services headed by N. Vithal; and
- initiating civil service reforms, especially transfer and promotion in centre and states.

Thus, the conference initiated a national debate on effective and responsive administration which culminated in an Action Plan discussed and adopted in the conference of chief ministers on 24 May 1997. The Action Plan has three components:

- Accountable and citizen-friendly government,
- transparency and right to information, and

- improving the performance and integrity of the public services.

In order to have an accountable and citizen-friendly government, the Action Plan specifies that all the central and state governments would formulate a citizen's charter for departments and offices, starting with those which have a large public interface to be operational over the next three months. All central and state departments would facilitate at various levels for the prompt and effective redressal of public grievances from the secretariat downwards to the village to be operational over the next three months. The Action Plan also recognized the need for greater decentralization and devolution of administrative powers at all levels. It emphasized to strengthen people's participation in consistent with the spirit of the 73rd and 74th Amendments of the Constitution, involvement of the people and voluntary agencies in the delivery of services and devolution of administrative powers. The conference recognized that secrecy and lack of openness in transactions was largely responsible for corruption in official dealings. Thus, a step would be taken to ensure easy access of the people to all information relating to government activities and decisions. In this regard, the government would take immediate necessary steps for examining the report of the working group on Right to Information and for introducing in the parliament, a legislation for the freedom of information. The Action Plan also aimed at imposing the performance and integrity of the civil services. It was agreed that elimination of corruption in public services would require prevention, surveillance, and deterrent prosecution. For this, investigation agencies and vigilance machinery would be strengthened. It was agreed that institutional arrangements should be evolved for enabling objective and transparent decisions as postings, promotions, and transfers of officials, particularly those working in key areas to ensure stability to tenure and depoliticized postings at all levels to sustain their morale.

In view of the above well-directed designs for civil service reform, the recommendations of the Fifth Pay Commission are another milestone in this direction. True to the spirit, expressed in the

1996 Chief Secretaries conference, the Fifth Pay Commission has recommended (*a*) downsizing the government through the corporatization of activities which involves 'malfunctioning of goods or the provision of commercial services'; (*b*) transparency, openness, and economy in government operation through the 'privatization of activities where government does not need to play a direct role' and also the 'contracting out services which can be conveniently outsourced to the private sector' (Government of India 1997a: 122–23); and (*c*) the contractual appointment in selected areas of operations 'for the purpose of maintaining a certain flexibility in staffing both the lateral entry of experts, moderating the numbers deployed depending on the exigencies of work and ensuring availability of component and committed personnel for certain sensitive/specialized jobs' (Government of India 1997a: 175).

The central government has been advised to go for a 30 per cent reduction in the strength of the civil services, as the Pay Commission felt that it would be unwise to let the government sector continue as 'an island of inefficiency' and 'inertia'. The normal procedure of voluntary retirement after completing twenty years would be continued. Alongside this, the commission recommended a special scheme of voluntary retirement in the departments where surplus manpower was identified. In such cases, there would be a provision for the selective retirement of persons, the initiative always resting with the government for a golden handshake. The Pay Commission also stated that the role of the government will be more in evolving the policy of governance and less in the actual governance itself. Most government departments will have to function as facilitators rather than inhibitors of growth. New regulators will have to be evolved and enforced so as to provide a level playing field as between the public and private sector enterprises, as also between domestic and foreign companies. The administered price mechanisms will have to be replaced by mechanisms based on market-determined prices (Government of India 1997a: 93).

The other significant recommendations of the commission concerns 'openness' in administration. Defending the repeal of 'the Official Secrets Act of the old colonial days', the commission insists on openness which 'means giving everyone the right to access to

information about the various decisions taken by the Government and [knowing] the reasoning behind them' (Government of India 1997a: 150). As an integral part of civil service reform, the commission insisted on the formation of 'efficient grievance redressal machinery that has to be effective, speedy, objective, readily accessible, and easy to operate' (Government of India 1997a: 157). Drawing upon the examples of Canada, UK, and Malaysia where effective grievance redressal cells have been functioning efficiently, the idea of a Citizen's Charter defining the rights of the customers of government schemes and services was mooted by the commission. The recognition and the procedures suggested in this connection are of crucial importance from the point of debureaucratizing government and making it citizen-friendly. The issues, raised by the Pay Commission figured prominently in the 1997 Conference of Chief Ministers where an action plan was adopted to (*a*) make the administration accountable and citizen-friendly, (*b*) ensure transparency and right to information, and (*c*) adopt measures to cleanse and motivate the civil services.

The Union Public Service Commission (UPSC) in 2001 appointed a committee of experts under the chairmanship of Yogendra Kumar Alagh to review the existing scheme of civil services examinations. The main complaint about the prelims pattern of exams was that, it was a test of memory more than knowledge. The committee after its study concluded that a mismatch exists between the suitability or aptitude and the service allocated to a candidate. The Alagh Committee recommended an aptitude test with emphasis on comprehension, logical reasoning, and problem solving and data analysis. Based on these recommendations, the UPSC has finally decided to change the patter of the preliminary examination. This entrance test would be rechristened 'civil service aptitude test' (CSAT) and will be in practice from year 2011–12. In the new scheme, there will be two objective papers in the prelims (*a*) general studies (already in practice) and (*b*) aptitude test; each will carry 200 marks and will be of two-hour duration. However, there will be no optional subject-based paper and the new scheme will test the candidates on their aptitude, decision-making skills, and analytical abilities rather than their memorizing ability.

The Hota Committee (2004) on civil services reforms, 2004, is another initiative by the government to examine the whole gamut of a civil service reform. The committee made the following important recommendations:

- Age for entrants to civil services should be 21–24 years for general candidates with five years age concession to members of SCs/STs and three years for OBCs;
- annual performance plans for the officers;
- after fifteen years of rigorous review, if an officer is not found honest and performance-oriented, he shall be weeded out of service;
- The duties, functions, and responsibilities of all senior posts to be laid down and publicized;
- Article 311 of the Constitution be amended to enable president/governor to dismiss/remove public servants in case of corrupt practice/having assets disproportionate to known source of income;
- antiquated rules and procedures in government must be discarded and new simplified ones be put in place;
- e-governance to be encouraged to augment efficiency and ensure transparency in government;
- civil servants should be encouraged to move laterally to NGOs; and
- to increase the representation of women in the civil services; it is proposed that within fifteen years, at least 25 per cent members of the higher civil service should be women as against 13 per cent women at present.

It is widely recognized that the civil services have played an important role in preserving unity, providing stability, and maintaining order in a vast country like India prone to various conflicts—ethnic, communal, and regional. Nonetheless, there are concerns about the performance of civil service in the context of realizing a result-oriented government. It has been pointed out that the civil service in India is more concerned with its internal processes than with results. The systematic rigidities, needless

complexities, and over centralization in the policy and management structures make the civil service functions too complex and often too constraining. Rapid and fundamental changes are taking place in the country in terms of rapid economic growth, urbanization, environmental degradations, technological change, and increased local awareness and identity. The response time to adapt to these changes is much shorter than it used to be. As instruments of public service, civil servants have to be ready to manage such change.

Based on the need to reform the civil services as highlighted in the foregoing paragraphs, the second ARC set up by the Government on 31 August 2005, under the chairmanship of Veerappa Moily, to prepare a detailed blueprint for revamping the public administration system. The commission was asked to suggest measures to achieve a 'proactive, responsive, accountable, sustainable and efficient administration for the country at all levels of the government'. The commission has presented fifteen reports to the government for consideration. Some of the important recommendations of the commission include:

1. A National Institute of Public Administration to be established to offer Bachelor's Degree courses in public administration, governance, and management;
2. the permissible age for appearing in the civil services examinations to be 21–25 years for general candidate; 21–28 years for candidates for OBC candidates, and 21–29 years for candidates from SC/ST as well as physically challenged candidates;
3. the number of permissible attempts should be three, five, and six, for the general, OBC, SC/ST/physically handicapped candidates, respectively;
4. as a capacity-building measure, it suggests that every government servant should undergo a mandatory training at the induction stage and also periodically during his/her career;
5. a central civil services authority to be set up which, among other things, would formulate guidelines for appointments at the 'senior management level' in the Government of India;

6. citizen–centricity, with the aim of ensuring citizen's welfare and citizens' satisfaction, is critical for any government which aims to provide good governance. The commission suggests a number of strategies and tools which can be employed to make the administration citizen-centric. Some of these are the adoption of appropriate modern technology, right to information, citizens' charter, grievance redressal mechanism, and active citizens' participation (Second ARC 2009);

7. in order to ensure ethics in governance, the commission recommends for the establishment of a national ombudsman to be called as 'Rashtriya Lokayukta';

8. it suggests that the state vigilance commission/Lokayukta may be empowered to supervise the prosecution of corruption-related cases;

9. the commission recommends for greater devolution of powers and responsibilities in order to empower the local institutions of governance. It is of the opinion that a comprehensive exercise needs to be taken up regarding broadening and deepening of the revenue base of local governments;

10. the commission also recommends that all offices with a larger public interface should have an online complaint tracking system; and

11. the commission in its first report titled *Right to Information: Master Key to Good Governance* has recommended that the Official Secrets Act, 1923, be replaced and substituted by a chapter in the National Security Act. The manual of office procedure be revised in the light of the provisions of the Right to Information (RTI) Act, 2005, with regard to 'communications of official Information'. The ARC also suggested that MPs and members of State Legislative Assembly should be declared as 'public authorities' under the RTI Act, except when they are discharging legislative functions (Second ARC 2006).

Thus, the second ARC has presented a comprehensive document dealing with the administrative reforms in India.

The Government of India constituted the Sixth Central Pay Commission on 5 October 2006 which submitted its report on 24 March 2008. It is the First Central Pay Commission to be constituted in this century of rapid technological advances and after coming into force of the RTI and Fiscal Responsibility and Budget Management (FRBM) Acts. The government machinery, therefore, has to gear up for better performance under stricter fiscal discipline and delivery mechanisms. These imperatives are reflected in the 'terms of reference' of the Sixth Central Pay Commission which made it incumbent on the commission to recommend systematic changes for (*a*) transforming the central government organizations into modern, professional, and citizen-friendly entities that are dedicated to the service of the people and (*b*) harmonizing functioning of the central government organizations with the demands of the emerging global economic scenario.

The Sixth Central Pay Commission, therefore, had not only to evolve a proper pay package for the government employees but also to make recommendations rationalizing the governmental structure with a view to improving the delivery mechanisms for providing better services to the common man. The main recommendations of the commission which have a bearing on good governance are as follows:

- *Reduction of layers*: The commission has recommended reducing the layers within the government structure so that decisions making and delivery is expedited. From thirty-five standard pay scales, the grades have been reduced to twenty, spread across four distinct running pay bands, one apex scale and another grade for the post of Cabinet Secretary and equivalent.
- *Restoring pride in public services*: Government employees have to be motivated to take pride in public services. Thus, the commission has recommended various measures for job enhancement and job enrichment. The functions presently being discharged by assistants and private secretaries will now be carried out by executive assistants. Upgradation of all posts in Group D in the government to Group C, along

with their retraining and multitasking will provide enlargement and enrichment of functions and responsibilities to a large section of government employees.

- *Delegation with accountability:* Restoring delegation with accountability at each level in the decision-making process is one of the main thrust areas proposed by the commission. Upgradation of the critical cutting edge jobs like teachers, staff nurses, constables, and so on, has been recommended. Strengthening the decentralized levels with parity between fielder offices and the secretariat has also been recommended as the motivation and performance of the field and programme officers is critical to improve service delivery to the common man.

- *Ensuring the availability of the best possible talent for government:* The commission has recommended for lateral entry at higher level in the government to ensure availability of the best possible talent from within and outside government with performance contracts. It suggests a shift from career-based to post-based selection in the higher echelons of government in order to get the best domain-based expertise. A higher start and better incentives have been recommended at the initial entry level so as to attract a younger talented profile. No increase in retirement age is recommended as an active younger employee profile is best suited for the tasks ahead. Additionally, it argues for a market-driven compensation package for young scientist and posts requiring special expertise and professional skills.

- *Performance-related incentive scheme (PRIS)*: The introduction of a PRIS is designed to reward performance, innovation, creativity, and responsive delegated administration of stakeholder interface for inclusive outcomes and service delivery. This will be a budget neutral tool for results-based management with performance targets, standards, and indicators and greater accountability.

The Sixth Pay Commission is a watershed in the evolution of India's civil services for a variety of reasons. This is not a pay

commission in the ordinary sense of the term since it has also sought to reshape the bureaucracy in the light of emerging global trends. By suggesting significant changes in the administrative hierarchy, the commission translates into reality the drive towards 'debureaucratization'.

Information technology (IT) is emerging as a major instrument for ushering in administrative reforms. The objective is to empower the citizens as well as the administrators. A major initiative taken by the government for ushering in e-governance on a national scale, called the National E-Governance Plan (NEGP) was approved on 16 May 2006. The NEGP consists of twenty-seven Mission Mode Projects (MMPs) encompassing central MMPs, eleven state MMPs, and seven integrated MMPs that span multiple backend ministries/departments. It is being implemented at the central, state, and local government levels. The Indian Portal project is an MMP under the NEGP which aims at providing a single-window access to the information and services of the Indian government at all levels from central government to state government to district administration and Panchayats for the citizens, business, and overseas Indians. An assessment report released in November 2008 of the three state-level e-government projects—vehicle registration, property registration, and land records (data selected from twelve states across India)—has the following key findings:

1. The number of trips to government offices has reduced from eight trips to 1–2 trips;
2. waiting time at the offices has reduced in the range 20–40 per cent;
3. people show strong preference for computerized systems;
4. there has been direct cost saving to citizens in the range of ₹50–100; and
5. in land records project, there has been a significant improvement in the perception of citizens (Singh 2009: 28–30).

The e-governance initiatives introduced by various government agencies include the setting up of single-window system in government offices, public grievances redressal system, creation of

online reservation in domestic rail and air travel, and so on. This has benefited the general public by improving the quality in delivery of services of these agencies. A few states like Andhra Pradesh and Maharashtra have taken the lead in making e-governance an integral part of the efforts at good governance. Gireesh Pradhan assumes that in a country like India, if access to IT were not restricted because of poor infrastructure, high costs, and lack of opportunity, the benefits in terms of savings would be phenomenal (Pradhan 2005: 344). The only area of concern is that in a country that already has so many divisions and differences, another division in the form of a digital divide cannot be encouraged. Therefore, one of the challenges in e-governance would be to allow access to the maximum number of deprived and weaker sections of society through such common facilities as can be created whether by government, or better still by private initiative.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Reform efforts in India have been based on the assumption that Indian administration has to be freed from its colonial baggage to be able to respond to a dynamic development environment (Mathur 2005: 292). The purpose of 'reform' has been to reorient the civil services into a dynamic, efficient, and accountable apparatus for public service delivery. The initial phase of administrative reform which began in 1947 and continued until 1990 was characterized by several internal shifts as shown by numerous administrative reforms committees and commissions. Recommendations for reform were numerous but implementation of them was poor, tardy, uneven, and on the whole unimpressive. As a result, public administration of independent India, rooted as it was in the colonial culture, remained blithely unchanged in its basic structure of administration, procedures of work, and attitudes and orientations of public bureaucracy.

Since the 1990s, India has identified four principal thrust areas for administrative reform. The first basic concern has been to make the public administration of the country accountable and citizen-friendly. Second, it must ensure transparency and endow

the citizens with the right to information. Third, corruption in administration being presently widespread; it must promote integrity in the public services and motivate the civil service. Fourth, public administration must be result-oriented and improve its performance (Maheshwari 2002: 251). In its efforts to make administration responsive to citizen and accountable, citizen charters are being issued and RTI has been institutionalized. As far as corruption is concerned, there is huge public pressure to set up Lokpal at the centre.

Administrative reforms in India in the 1990s have been basically driven by the measures of economic liberalization, based on the philosophy of NPM. The best application of this could be seen in the Report of the Fifth Pay Commission. New Public Management attempts to create a new entrepreneurial and user oriented culture in public organization, with emphasis on performance measurement and autonomy given to organizations and individuals. Though the focus appears to be on the improvement of government functioning, the process also aims at privatizing, downsizing, marketisation, contracting out, and so on. Doubts arise regarding the divergence between a market economy's interests and pursuance of social concerns (Medury 2010: 133).

It is significant to note that in a vast country, like India, consisting of states with varied administrative practices and local conditions, it is difficult to be prescriptive about the extent of reform. However, it is remarkable that there is considerable agreement on the thrust areas in reform and the immediate priorities, especially the need to make administration more people-centred, open, decentralized, and flexible and free from corruption. Recent initiatives for decentralization of power to the local self-governing bodies, people's RTI, introduction of citizens' charters by government institutions, e-governance initiatives, and the recent public pressure to appoint a Lokpal at the centre to check corruption, make it clear that the nation is heading towards a responsive, people-centric, and accountable administrative system. However, a well-informed public and political will is a sine qua non to actualize the same.

REFERENCES

Appleby, Paul H. 1953. *Public Administration in India: Report of a Survey*. Cabinet Secretariat, Government of India.

Bhatt, Anil quoted in Chakrabarty, Bidyut. 2007. *Reinventing Public Administration: The Indian Experience*. New Delhi: Orient Longman.

Caiden, Gerald E. 1969. *Administrative Reform*. Penguin Press: Chicago.

Caiden, Gerald E. quoted in Chakrabarty, Bidyut. 2007. *Reinventing Public Administration: The Indian Experience*. New Delhi: Orient Longman.

Chakrabarty, Bidyut and Rajendra Kumar Pandey. 2008. *Indian Government and Politics*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.

Downs, A. 1967. *Inside Bureaucracy*. USA: Boston Little Brown.

Fiana, W.F. and A.L. Dean quoted in Caiden, Gerard E. 1969. *Administrative Reforms*. Chicago: Penguin Press.

Governance in Transition. 1995. *Public Management in Reforms in OECD Countries*. Paris: OECD.

Government of India. 1949. *Report of the Secretariat Reorganization Committee*. New Delhi: Government of India Press.

———. 1959. *Report of the Commission of Enquiry as Emoluments and Conditions of Services of Central Government Employees*. New Delhi: Government of India Press.

———. 1966–70. *Administrative Reforms Commission's Report*. New Delhi: Ministry of Home Affairs.

———. 1981. *Report of the National Police Commission*. New Delhi: Government of India.

———. 1997a. *Action Plan for Effective and Responsive Administration*. Statement Adopted at the Conference of Chief Ministers, New Delhi.

———. 1997b. *Report of the Fifth Central Pay Commission*, Vol. 1. Ministry of Finance, Government of India.

———. 1997c. *The Report of the Fifth Pay Commission*, Vol. 1. New Delhi: Government of India Press.

———. 1998. *Annual Report, 1997–98*. Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, New Delhi.

Hota Committee. 2004. *Report of Union Public Service Commission, 2003–04*. P.C. Hota Committee as Civil Service Reforms, July.

Lee, Hann-Been. 1976. 'Bureaucratic Models and Administrative Reform', in Arne F. Leemans (ed.), *The Management of Change in Government*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Leemans, Arne F. 1976. 'A Conceptual Framework for the Study of Reform of Central Government', in A.F. Leemans (ed.), *The Management of Change in Government*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Maheshwari, S.R. 2002. *Administrative Reforms in India*. New Delhi: Macmillan.

Mathur, Kuldeep. 1999. 'Strengthening Bureaucracy: State and Development in India', *Indian Social Science Review*, 1, January–June.

Mathur, Kuldeep. 2005. 'Administrative Reforms in India', in Bidyut Chakrabarty and Mohit Bhattacharya (eds), *Administrative Change and Innovation: A Reader*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Medury, Uma. 2010. *Public Administration in the Globalization Era: The New Public Management Perspective*. New Delhi: Orient Black Swan.

Minocha, O.P. 2007. 'Revamping the Role of Government as a Regulator', *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, liii (3, July–September).

Mosher, F.C. quoted in Caiden, Gerard E. 1969. *Administrative Reforms*. Chicago: Penguin Press.

Pradhan, Gireesh. 2005. 'Civil Service Reforms in Independent India', in Bidyut Chakrabarty and Mohit Bhattacharya (eds), *Administrative Change and Innovation: A Reader*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Ramachandran, Padma. 1996. *Public Administration in India*. New Delhi: National Book Trust.

Second ARC. 2006. *Right to Information: Master Key to Good Governance*. Second ARC, Government of India.

———. 2009. *Citizen Centric Administration: The Heart of Governance*. Second ARC, Government of India, February.

Singh, Deepali and Nafees Ansari. 2007. 'Administrative Reforms in India: An Overview', *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, liii (3, July–September).

Singh, Sujata. 2009. *Reforms in Governance: Six Decades of Administrative Reforms*. New Delhi: Indian Institute of Public Administration.

Chapter 12

Globalization and
Public Administration

Learning Objectives
- To make sense of the concept of globalization
- To assess the impact of globalization on public administration
- To evaluate how globalization affect the developing countries
- To situate the idea of global justice in the context of globalization

There is no denying that globalization has brought about a paradigm shift in the nature and scope of public administration. It has virtually unshackled the discipline from the classical bondage of structure and paved the way for a more flexible, less-hierarchical, and accommodative kind of discipline informed by networks and collaboration. It shook the very foundation of the discipline and encouraged a few sceptics and self-styled analysts to proclaim an imminent death of public administration. However, more than two decades down the line, ever since globalization was first thrust upon nation states, public administration has not shown absolutely any signs of receding. On the contrary, rendering those dooms-day predictions wrong, public administration has reincarnated in a readjusted form to cope with the new set of challenges. In fact, globalization had increased the urgency of

having a more proactive public administration. However, the traditional notion of public administration with a sheltered bureaucracy, rigid hierarchy, and organizational principle no longer exists today. Both structurally and functionally, public administration has experienced a metamorphosis of sorts. Structurally speaking, thanks to the sweeping social–economic–political transformation under globalization, the rigid, hierarchical, and bureaucratic form of governance has given way to a more flexible, de-hierarchical, and post-bureaucratic form of governance based on networks and partnership. Similarly, at the functional level, public administration has witnessed a profound transformation in the form of delivery of public goods and services. Until recently, the delivery of goods and services was considered as one of the important functions of public administration. But, the onset of globalization and the eventual rolling back the welfare state ushered in a new collaborative form of public administration, where state administration has had to readjust itself to deliver public goods and services in collaboration with the innumerable other players and NGOs functioning at the societal level. Hence, public administration in the era of globalization has been donning a new robe of the 'enabler' or 'facilitator' by privatizing the substantial part of welfare delivery functions. Several methods have been used to facilitate the privatization of welfare delivery, namely, contracting out, encouraging private provision, introducing quasi-markets, mobilizing voluntary sectors, and the like.

However, the shift from the role of a direct provider to a facilitator of welfare delivery did not make public administration redundant. In fact, it continued to enjoy its key position. The centrality of public administration is neither denied by the state nor by market. Though, the rationale of having a public administration differs widely, for states, a vibrant public administration is fundamental for its sustenance. It provides the state with adequate support mechanisms to govern. In a market economy, public administration has great instrumental value, which not only facilitates the smooth functioning of the market, but also legitimizes its operations within a society. Market economy is also anxious to add a human face by provisioning the key social services. Hence, public administration is here to

stay despite globalization, as Farazmand has reassured us about its continuity as a self-conscious enterprise and as a professional field, in the broader sense of the term. However, he has opined that the traditional 'administrative welfare state' will give way to a 'corporate welfare state' with the corresponding changes in the nature of public administration in the wake of globalization.[1] In traditional public administration, an elaborate administrative mechanism was put in place to facilitate the smooth delivery of public services, which was popularly known as 'public administration model of welfare delivery'. The model envisaged an impartial and efficient administration, informed with five distinctive features like a bureaucratic structure, professional domination, accountability to the public, equity of treatment, and self-sufficiency.[2] However, such providential nature of services had come under a severe challenge with the emergence of the market alternative advocated by the New Right movement in the West from late 1970s to early 1980s. The bold step like the privatization of welfare delivery was prescribed on the pretext of efficiency and economy. The introduction of the globalization package under the grab of structural adjustment programme (SAP) in the early 1990s had further accentuated demand mooted by the advocates of the New Right movement.

Hence, globalization had unpacked a mixed bag of possibilities and problems for public administration. Before we go into that discussion at length, a quick overview of the impact of globalization on public administration is made here.

The first and most explicit impact of globalization on public administration is associated with the centrality of state within the discourse on public administration. Public administration, by nature, is co-terminus with state administration. However, the very contour of state, which forms the basis of public administration, has undergone a sea change with the onset of globalization. Globalization has prescribed the neoliberal recipe of market intervention by rolling back of the state. Initially, it was apprehended that globalization would have spelled doom for public administration per se. However, as it turned out in reality, the prescription of rolling back the state was blown out of proportion and so was the apprehension centring round it, as the absolute rolling back was

neither possible nor feasible. In fact, globalization has led to 're-configuration of political power'[3] with an underlying objective of re-positioning the state vis-à-vis non-governmental sectors including market, NGOs, civil society organization, people's initiatives, and so on. Few scholars like Farazmand, have shown that the impact of globalization on public administration was not as harmful as it was initially feared. Rather, they have argued that globalization has resulted in at least five major changes in the character of the modern state. First, the emergence of supra-territorial governance organizations like, the IMF, World Bank, WTO, and so on, in the wake of globalization, have serious implications for administrative systems. This is because these institutions have imposed a uniform code of conduct, which in effect has substantially downsized the publicness of public administration. Second, the growing degree of interdependence among modern states owing to globalization has facilitated modern states to cope with issues of territorial or supra-territorial nature with an inevitable repercussion on the state and its public administration. For example, the alliance forged to counter the global vulnerability on environmental degradation may be mentioned. Third, free flow of information has differential impact among nation states. Though most of the states have reaped the benefit of free access to information in their governance and administration, developed nations have capitalized more than their less developed counterparts. Fourth, more emphasis was given on the facilitating or partnering role of the government, where the private sector would take the lead in delivering public goods and services. Fifth, the most important change for public administration is the shift of administrative welfare state to corporate welfare state.[4]

First, the traditional bureaucratic notion of organization has undergone a sea change in terms of magnitude, boundary, and mode of operation, and so on, with the onset of globalization, leading thereby to a consequent rise of post-bureaucratic organization. The idea was that the traditional structure of bureaucracy fails to cope with the new organizational reality opened up by the multinational and transnational organizations in a new world order undeterred by national boundaries. Warren Bennis (1968)

had visualized the emergence of a post-bureaucratic organiza-tion of 'temporary work system', much before the formal birth of globalization. Second, it has also brought a paradigm shift in the process of governing by introducing a new governance discourse. It has replaced the administration discourse, hitherto under the tutelage of a sheltered bureaucracy. The governance discourse in public administration has problematized the ambit of public ad-ministration by going beyond the formal structural sense of state or government and by partnering with innumerable non-govern-mental and civil society organizations. Third, it has liberalized the delivery of public services, so long deemed as the basic respon-sibility of public administration. Globalization has changed the contour of public administration by privatizing a substantial part of the delivery of public services. Emphasis was, therefore, given on the management of welfare functions, instead of sticking to mere administration of welfare. Consequently, public administra-tion in the era of globalization had partnered with other players operational in the society in delivering public goods and services. Fourth, the logic of globalization has engendered a public sec-tor reform movement worldwide by reinventing the government movement and NPM movement. Fifth, as a part of that public sector reform movement, demand has been raised for civil ser-vice reform. With the onset of globalization, there has been the birth of a global consciousness for global justice, transparency, and accountability in administrative functioning. Sixth, another important impact of globalization on public administration is the empowerment of citizens. Theoretically, citizens and administra-tions have had a long and cosy association. The formal birth of the discipline of public administration had institutionalized such associations. Catering citizenry was considered as the principal objective of administration. However, it was largely a one-way traffic. Driven by a paternalistic attitude, states and governments have delivered public goods and services to the citizens. Since the dawn of public administration, the state has been engaged in provisioning a host of key social services to its citizens. But, no serious attempt was made to encourage the citizens to have their choice and voice. The increasing reliance on a bureaucratic form

of management with the beginning of industrialization and the birth of the so-called administrative state had led to an eventual dissociation between citizenry and public administration. Bureaucracy, on the pretext of providing rational and impartial form of governance, had become the de facto master of the people. Consequently, the citizenry, whom they were supposed to cater, had been relegated to the margins of development. As a part of welfare compulsion, though bureaucrats had to engage themselves willy-nilly in people-oriented development programmes, those attempts were largely unidirectional, assuming citizens as the mere beneficiary of development. Citizens had no other alternative but to accept whatever was provided to them by the bureaucracy. They had been treated as the passive recipients of goods and services to be provided by the state. Even the birth of the welfare state, with an avowed pro-people stand in the post-war reconstruction phase in Europe, had brought no change in the status of citizen either. The status of citizens vis-à-vis administration began to change for better from the late 1980s with the upsurge of public choice theory in economics. The advent of the NPM perspective in public administration in 1990s and the eventual reinvention of government in the form of entrepreneurial government (EG) had given further boost to the citizen-orientedness in administration. The emergence of EG was instrumental in renewing the association between citizenry and administration by putting extra pressures on bureaucracy to become more responsive to citizens as clients. The NPM has brought an increasing perceptual change among the administrators vis-à-vis citizens. Citizens, especially those at the post-colonial countries, have so long been treated as the passive recipient of goods and services. With the onset of globalization, citizens have been couched as the centre of the development discourse. The traditional conception of the 'citizen' was redefined as active 'customers' to be always kept in good humour. Drawing primarily on the experiences of private sector management, customer-orientedness in public administration was ranging from 'closer to the customer' to stronger version of 'customer sovereignty'.[5] Hence, serving the people has become the central

focus of administration. Consequently, the gap between the public and private has become increasingly blurred, paving thereby the way for greater public–private NGO interface. Eighth, globalization has also superseded the traditional distinction between private and public administration and has given more space to non-governmental and civil society organizations and the private sector. In sum, the 'publicness' of public administration has come under challenge. Consequently, the discipline had to deal with a series of structural, procedural, and attitudinal adjustments to cope with the enormous challenges and possibilities opened up in the process of globalization. Putting into theoretical framework, the said transformation in the realm of public administration can be aptly encapsulated as a shift from the Weberian model of administration to a new-Taylorism. Despite the exponential rise of literature on globalization, very little attention is being paid to the correlations between public administration and globalization. A handful of works that have been devoted to this area is not comprehensive either. This chapter offers a reader-friendly account of this phenomenal event of human history.

Before we spell out the specific impact of globalization on public administration, a comprehensive account of globalization deserves some space here. In the following section, we shall try to make sense of globalization.

CONCEPT OF GLOBALIZATION

As a complex interplay of economic, political, and social, or cultural factors, globalization has almost engulfed the world with its sweeping forces. However, the term is 'notorious' for its imprecision. There is hardly any consensus among scholars and practitioners alike on the meaning of the term. Even after a couple of decades, the discourse remains as fuzzy and amorphous as ever. However, there is no dearth of literature on the subject as a veritable army of scholars, drawn from almost all the branches of human knowledge, forayed into this field of study. Like the proverbial elephant and the three blind men, the concept of globalization

became subject to all kinds of interpretations. Both, the proponents and opponents equally poised in the literature of globalization, have ended up making the discourse even more intricate and fuzzy. While the proponents eulogized it as phenomenal event in the history of mankind that facilitated better governance, the opponents were apprehensive of its explicit agenda, especially the way it was projected as inevitable. The *Handbook of Globalization, Governance, and Public Administration* has aptly captured the conceptual dilemma in the following words:

> Globalization has meant many things to many people. The ideas are diverse, interchangeable, and broad, so much so that it is easy to fall into a definitional trap. For example, economists consider globalization as an advance step toward a fully integrated world market. Political Scientists view it as a march away from the conventionally defined concept of state with territorial sovereignty and the emergence of supranational and global governing bodies under a new world order. Business school scholars and consultants see globalization as unlimited opportunities in a 'borderless world'. Others view globalization as a phenomenon driven only by private sector corporations, not governments. These viewpoints reflect different lenses of seeing the world, and they promote the interests they are supposed to serve. (Farazmand 2007: 13)

The pervasiveness of globalization is evident in the words of Petras and Veltmeyer (2001: 8). They note:

> [A]s both a description of widespread, epoch-defining developments and a prescription for action, it has achieved a virtual hegemony and so is presented with an air of inevitability that disarms the imagination and prevents thought of and action towards a systematic alternative, towards another, more just social and economic order.

The above statement exhibited the indictment of the authors regarding globalization. They viewed it as the ideological smokescreen, which garbed the real interests of capitalism or the 'economic interests of an emerging class of transnational capitalists' in mystification. Hence, the authors have identified the class interest

behind the proliferation of this neologism as the New World Order and portrayed as the 'inevitable, necessary and the harbinger of future prosperity'.[6] Almost in a similar vein, Farazmand (2007) emphasized the complementarities between capitalism and globalization as both capitalism and state supplement each other. In fact, the global consolidation of capitalism coupled with the collapse of state socialism has further accentuated the public discussion on globalization.

Essentially economic in nature, the word globalization is interpreted in multiple ways which include political, social, and cultural dimensions. Putting it simply, the term globalization can be conceptualized by a 'tripartite cluster of forces viz. increasing global economic interconnectedness, repositioning of political space and national sovereignty, and last but not least the growing and deepening enmeshment of global and local cultures' (Held and McGrew 2003). Hence, three distinctive dimensions of globalization can be identified, namely, economic, political, and social/cultural. Here, we shall try to untie the concept in a more reader-friendly mode. Theoretical debate around globalization is centring around three positions as Waters (2001: 6–7) has shown:

(*a*) that globalization has been in process since the dawn of history, that it has increased in its effects since that time, but that there has been a sudden and recent accelerations;

(*b*) that globalization is contemporal with modernization and the development of capitalism, and that there has been a recent acceleration; or

(*c*) that globalization is a recent phenomenon associated with other social processes called postindustrialization, post-modernization or the disorganization of capitalism.

Primarily *economic* in nature, globalization has been identified with three different phases of its development, which is often satirically abbreviated as LPG, that is, liberalization, privatization, and globalization. Though they are often put in a sequential manner, the process of globalization does not necessarily occur in sequence. Bhagwati (2004: 3) defines economic globalization as the 'integration of national economies into the international

economy trough trade, direct foreign investment (by corporations and multinationals), short-term capital flows, international flows of workers and humanity generally, and flows of technology.'

Putting it simply, *liberalization* can be defined as the opening up of the economy. In normal practice, as a part of protectionism, national economies try to guard the national economy from being exposed to external competition by putting up tariff barriers. Generally, there are three kinds of barriers between and among the nations, namely geographical barriers like mountain ranges, seas, and others, which can hardly be surmounted; political barriers, that are man-made borders that can be drawn or redrawn as the situation demands; and finally, the tariff barrier, which are put up by nations to save their own business. Liberalization is mainly sought to bring down the tariff barriers. Jiblerto and Mommen have identified the following components of liberalization: (*a*) privatization of state and parastatal enterprises in order to reduce inefficiencies and government protection monopolies; (*b*) high interest rates and credit squeeze in order to reduce inflationary tendencies; (*c*) trade liberalization in order to open up the internal market and expose local industry to world market competition and boost foreign trade exchange; (*d*) domestic demand management, leading to a lowering of state budgets, and decreasing expenditure in the social sector; (*e*) currency adjustments in order to improve the balance of payment by raising import prices and making exports more competitive; and (*f*) free market prices in order to remove distortions resulting from import taxes on luxury items. The above features of liberalization were encoded as SAP or essential preconditions for availing foreign loans.

Privatization, on the other hand can be defined as the 'act of reducing the role of government, or increasing the role of the private sector, in an activity or in the ownership of assets' (Savas 1987). Savas has identified at least four major forces or pressures behind the emergence of privatization as a potential remedy for the ailing private sector. They are pragmatic pressure, ideological pressure, commercial pressure, and populist pressure. Pragmatic pressure refers to the demand for privatization raised because of pragmatic reasons. It is claimed to have provided the much

needed succour to cash-trapped governments. Ideological pressure is the demand for privatization that comes from the liberals or New Right. With their inherent antipathy towards representative democracy and bureaucratic forms of management, the New Right thinkers have proposed privatization as the potential antidote of oversupply and splurge. Commercial pressure is another important impetus for privatization emanating from the business groups. As the gospel of efficiency, economy and business groups have criticized governments for siphoning off a huge amount of money from the state coffer in non-productive expenditures like salaries for its employees, routine work, and so on. Finally, populist pressure is perhaps the most common factor to foot any kind of change. The popular demand is not only instrumental in footing a bill, but its sustenance is also largely contingent upon the popular support. Once the decision of privatization is reached, it is necessary to put it in practice. Savas has mentioned four 'interrelated and mutually reinforcing strategies' to put privatization in practice, namely, load-shedding, devolution, user charges, and competition.

1. *Load-shedding* is one of the most effective strategies of privatization, whereby huge loads from the government are gradually reduced by 'divestiture, default, accommodation, and by the gradual replacement of government activity with market and voluntary activity'.
2. *Devolution* is another strategy of privatization, applicable to those areas where government involvement is unavoidable. In other words, privatization can be made possible through devolution, using vouchers, franchises, and contracts, and others, as strategy.
3. *User-charges* 'wherever practicable' is another important strategy of privatization. The main objective for levying user charges is not to mobilize resources, but to notify the true cost of service.
4. *Competition* is another important strategy of privatization. Despite the advocacy of privatization for its efficiency and effectiveness, it has been equally subject to severe criticism

for its prescription of cutting government spending and the consequent pauperization (Savas 1987).

Globalization, on the other hand calls for the integration of global markets with free flow of labour and capital from virtually all directions. It consists of, to quote Andrew Sobel (2009: 1), 'multiple processes by which people in one society become culturally, economically, politically, socially, informationally, strategically, epidemiologically, and ecologically closer to peoples in geographically distant societies'. At least three different kinds of infrastructures can be identified, which have been instrumental in implementing globalization, namely, physical (through transport and banking systems), normative (through trade laws), and symbolic (through English as lingua franca) (Held and McGrew 2003). Systematizing mushrooming literature on globalization, the *Handbook of Globalization, Governance, and Public Administration* (2007) has identified six meanings of globalization:

- Globalization as internationalization
- Globalization as border openness
- Globalization as a process
- Globalization as ideology
- Globalization as a phenomenon
- Globalization, as both a transcending phenomenon and a continuing process of capital accumulation (Farazmand 2007).

Political Aspect of Globalization

Politically speaking, globalization calls for a reconfiguration of the political order. It is said that globalization has ushered in an era of 'geo-centric global politics' instead of 'state-centric geopolitics', born at the Treaty of Westphalia. Westphalian 'constitution of world-order' emerged out of the Treaty of Westphalia at the end of Thirty Years War in 1648 and marked the beginning of the sovereign nation state system. The authority of this system was based on the principles of territoriality, sovereignty, and autonomy.[7] Commentaries have been ranging from total eclipse of a nation state to the substantial curtailment of it. There has been

a deeply-lodged apprehension among the sovereign nation states that globalization will unseat them from their so-called pedestals their its quest for a post-Westphalian global order. For example, Bauman laments to be 'orphaned' by the post-national state,[8] whereas Sassen has hinted at the birth of the 'denationalized state' (Sassen, quoted in Dillon 2010: 473–74). However, globalization does not augur an all-pervasive doom for the nation state as it was initially feared. In fact, quite to the contrary, globalization has increased the urgency of 're-configuring political power' with an underlying objective of re-positioning of the state vis-à-vis non-governmental sectors including market, NGOs, civil society organization, people's initiatives, ad so on. Farazmand (2007: 12) have succinctly summed up the fact in the following words:

> The core of the state and administration persists in the broader sense of continuity. But major changes have been occurring as a consequence of globalization, that alter the nature and character of the state and public administration from the traditional welfare administrative state to that of the corporate welfare state.

The urgency of bringing back the state in its Westphalian sense of exclusivity, territoriality, autonomy, and sovereignty came into sharp focus after 9/11. The gruesome terror strike at the city of New York on 11 September 2001 has exposed the dreaded under-belly of globalization. The free flow of labour and capital could also facilitate free flow of narcotics, arms, and even terror/terrorists. Consequently, a huge demand was raised in the Europe and the US to retrieve the original notion of the nation state by repudiating multiculturalism as an official policy of citizenship and physically sealing off their borders. Hence, the position of state in the overall discourse of development has been in a flux. A rather extensive excerpt from a sociological text would capture the precarious position state in the era of globalization:

> In sum, it is evident that sociologists vary in their appraisal of the role and power of the state in and amidst globalization. The extent to which the state becomes relatively impotent, or instead acquires new institutional significance as a denationalized actor, is

an empirical question that remains to be answered over the new few decades. In the meantime, the unprecedented intervention of national governments in the US and in European countries, in rescuing corporations and financial markets from further collapse during the recession of 2008–2009, suggests that the power of the nation-state and its various bureaucracies is not likely to soon diminish. (Dillon 2010: 474)

Social/Cultural Aspect of Globalization

Cultural elements also play significant roles in sustaining the process of globalization. Cultural elements are, both, a component and variant of globalization. Cultural or social elements of globalization primarily consist of two contradictory processes, namely cultural homogenization versus cultural specificities in terms of localization. It is generally argued that the economic integration of global markets and the necessary repositioning of political space can only be possible if the said processes are adequately backed by cultural homogenization. The homogenizations of global cultural space can reinforce the onward march of global capital. Hence, there has been a significant convergence in global cultural practices.

Hence, conceptually speaking, globalization involves all three elements mentioned above. Though the word globalization was popularized in 1990s, the term was coined for the first time in 1959 in *The Economist*. Even the word 'global' has a 400-year-old history (Waters 2001: 6–7). Robertson[9] has identified five distinctive phases of development of globalization, namely, the germinal phase (Europe: 1400–1750), the incipient phase (Europe: 1750–1825), the take-off phase (1875–1925), the struggle for hegemony (1925–69), and the uncertainty phase (1969–92).

Definition(s)

Like many other concepts in social sciences, the word globalization also eludes precision. This is more so as the word is often confused with similar words like globalism, global village, internationalization, and so on. Here, before we offer any definition, we shall conceptually attempt to untangle the concept by comparing it with

related terms. Generally speaking, globalism stands for an ideological conviction, which vows to integrate global markets. In addition, the word globalization also signifies a process, which specifies at least four interrelated stages in the ideology of integrating global markets can be brought into being. These can be identified as a 'stretching of social, political and economic activities across political frontiers'; the 'intensification or the growing magnitude of interconnectedness in every sphere of social existence'; the 'accelerating pace of global interactions and processes'; and the 'deepening enmeshment of the local and global' (McGrew in Baylis and Smith 2005: 22). Farazmand (2007: 13) have made a clear distinction between the two terms globalization and globalism. The former is 'an ideological system… a process and a means to achieve the goals of globalism [the latter] and serve its interest'. The global village is another expression, which we often come across in the globalization discourse. It is a MacLuhan's utopia, which views that the astounding development of information and communication technology, the virtual distance among the nation state has been dwindled substantially so much so that it seems the entire globe has been compressed like a tiny village. Another expression is often equated with globalization is internationalization of economies. No doubt, globalization invariably leads to internationalization of economies, but it cannot be treated as the replacement of the word of globalization. Ramesh Mishra (1999: 4) has cast some light on this semantic puzzle. In case of internationalization, the principle economic units remain national, whereas in globalization the possibility of distinct national identity does not arise. From the above discussion, let us settle down for a less contentious definition of globalization. Anthony Giddens (quoted in Waters 2001: 6–7) has defined globalization as:

> … as the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa. This is a dialectic process because such local happenings may move in an observe direction from the very distanciated relations that shape them. Local transformation is as much a part of globalization as the lateral extension of social connections across time and space.

Malcolm Waters (2001: 6–7) defines globalization as 'a social process in which the constraints of geography on economic, political, social and cultural arrangements recede, in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding and in which people act accordingly'.

GLOBALIZATION: A NEW GARB OF IMPERIALISM?

Is globalization a new garb of imperialism? This question occurs in the mind of every concerned citizen, especially the way globalization has been projected these days as the compulsive and inevitable mode of governance. There has been an evolving literature to support this thesis. Culling out the essence of the literature, it can be argued that globalization with its huge paraphernalia appears to be a new garb or a ploy of the imperialists to reclaim their lost grounds in the colonies. It is argued that the neoliberal design of global market and imperialist ambition of colonizing the world has been converged in the project of globalization. Argument goes, as the direct politico-military control over the colonies no longer exists today, colonialists are now taking a round-about route of reinforcing their control in the erstwhile colonies via economic globalization. The birth of the neoliberal package of globalization with its economic, political, and social dimensions has provided the much awaited opportunity to neo-colonizers to get back their earlier positions. Immanuel Wallerstein,[10] a famous American sociologist, equates capitalism with globalization. However he rarely mentions globalization. Rather, he prefers to call it a 'world capitalist system', instead of globalization. It is argued that the capitalist system, which has encountered severe crises since 1960s, gets a new lease of life with the birth of globalization.

IMPACT OF GLOBALIZATION ON PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

For the sake of analytical convenience, we can broadly categorize the impact of globalization under two heads—possibilities and problems.

Possibilities

Globalization did not bring an all-pervasive doom for public administration as a few commentators seem to have suggested. On the contrary, it induced public administration to readjust itself with the new developments and thereby suggested a much-coveted booster dose of efficiency and economy. It sought to introduce post-Weberian and post-bureaucratic paradigm of public administration based on flexibility, specialization, and networking. The impact of globalization on public administration can be discussed under three heads—structural, procedural, and attitudinal.

Structural

Structurally, the entire paradigm of public administration had undergone a sea change, that is, from a state-controlled and bureaucratically managed paradigm of administration to a more flexible, market-based administration. Unlike what Weber seemed to have suggested, public administration as heuristic type, based on strict adherence of hierarchy, rule-boundedness, neutrality, and impersonality, the globalization-induced administration had reposed maximum faith on decentralization of authority, flattening of hierarchies, slimming of bureaucracy, and so on (Bhattacharya 2001) Hence, structurally:

1. administration became much more transparent; and
2. top–down administrative decision-making had given way to a bottom–up model with increasing participation of local people.

Procedural

Similarly, at the procedural level, there were certain changes as well. Listing a few will illustrate the point.

Leasing/contracting out services

Contracting out governmental programmes and services to private entrepreneurs or service providers through competitive biddings in a cost-effective way of implementing public policies, has been gaining huge currency these days. Until recently, public administration was responsible for providing basic amenities to the

citizens. But of late, increasing pressure on public exchequer, the credo of efficiency, economy, and effectiveness in the wake of globalization had compelled public administration to lease out some of the services to private service providers. It infused the spirit of competitiveness among the service providers and thereby improved the standard and quality of the services to be delivered. Examples were multiplied where contracting out brought huge success. The experiment of contracting out of services for the quest of efficiency was no longer confined to the Western cities alone, the wind of change was also sweeping the Eastern shores as well. Like many Asian Tigers, India's metros were also moving to that direction. In 1992, New Delhi became the first city in India to adopt large-scale privatization of bus services. Slowly other metros across the country followed suit. For example, the city of Ahmedabad in the late 1990s, handed over many civic responsibilities to the private companies in order to ensure efficiency and economy. The most significant of all was obviously the privatization of electricity in 1996, followed by contracting out of development of city's major commercial street, CG Road, to Arvind Mills.

Quality service delivery

If globalization had any positive impact on public administration, it was obviously its renewed interest in the delivery of quality services to its citizens. With the onset of globalization a host of Service Quality Initiatives (SQIs) like TQM, counter services, Citizen's Charter, and others, had been adopted by public administration to ensure standard services. Among the said initiatives, TQM warrants special mention here as this managerial technique of maintaining quality of services was increasingly used by the city administration across the globe. Stripping of all jargons, TQM can be defined as the measures that are intended to provide customers with fast, accurate, and courteous services on a regular basis. Moreover, the Citizen's Charter is another initiative of quality assurance in public services.

> The concept of Citizen's Charter espouses, quintessentially, the idea of citizen's entitlements vis-à-vis the government: entitlement to easy,

unhassled access to public services, to services of stipulated quality and specification, to efficient and courteous delivery of services, to a transparent conduct on the part of the service providers and so forth. (Sharma 2003: 322)

R.B. Jain mentions six elements, which were instrumental in setting of a Citizen's Charter:

1. *Standards*: Setting, monitoring, and publication of explicit standards for the services that individual users can reasonably expect. Publication of actual performance against these standards.
2. *Information and openness*: Full, accurate information, readily available in plain language, about how they perform and who is in charge.
3. *Choice and consultation*: The public sector should provide choice wherever practicable. There should be regular and systematic consultation with those, who use services. User's views about services and their priorities are to be taken into account for final decisions on standards.
4. *Courtesy and helpfulness*: Courtesy and helpful service from public servants who should normally wear name badges. Equality in service should be ensured and services should run to as per the convenience of those entitled.
5. *Putting things right*: If things go wrong, an apology, full explanation, and swift and effective remedy must be offered. Well-published and easy-to-use complaint procedures with independent reviews, wherever possible to be introduced and maintained.
6. *Value for money*: Efficient and economic delivery of public services within the resources the nation can afford. Finally, independent validation of performance against standards.

Hence, a Citizen's Charter would:

- incorporate a statement of the services, which a bureau might offer;

- indicate the services standards and the remedies available to users in the event that there might be a non-compliance of the stipulated standards;
- insist on the display of requisite procedures involved in obtaining user feedback;
- institute an easy-to-follow procedure for making complaints and provide for a grievance redressal mechanism;
- indicate the response-time for various public transactions;
- set up machinery for system-audit, performance monitoring, and evaluation; and
- make provision for an independent scrutiny of the agency's performance (Sharma 2003: 322–29).

Performance measurement

Another important procedural change that was brought into being on the heels of globalization was a rigorous performance-measurement technique. Since, it is not always possible to quantify the services offered by any kind of administration, performance measurement can hardly be considered as a feasible idea all the time. The root of performance measurement as a technique of quality assurance had it first forceful advocacy in the scientific management theory of Fredrick Taylor and in its latest incarnation of Neo-Taylorism or NPM.

Attitudinal

The most far-reaching impact of globalization on public administration was obviously at the psychological or mental level. There had been an increasing perceptual change among the administrators via-à-vis citizens. Citizen, especially those at the post-colonial countries, had so long been treated as the passive recipient of goods and services. With the onset of globalization, citizens have been couched as the centre of development discourse. Traditional conception of citizen was redefined as active 'customers' to be always kept in good humour. Hence, serving the people had become the central focus of the new generation of public administration. Consequently, the gap between the public and private got increasingly blurred, and thereby paving the way for greater public–private NGO interface.

Hence, globalization had brought about a new genre of smart, slim, and transparent public administration infused with 3Es—efficiency, economy, and effectiveness.

Problems

That said, however, does not mean globalization brings an unadulterated blessing for public administration. In fact, the conditionality embedded in the process of globalization cast an ominous spectrum of uncertainty for public administration. In the era of globalization seems to have been beset with innumerable challenges. Farazmand had enumerated the following negative consequences of globalization: 'they include the diminished or lost sovereignty of states, constraints on democracy, loss of community, concentration of the global power structure, increased centralization of corporate and government organizational elites, and increased dependency among less-developed nations on globalizing powers' (Farazmand 1999: 515). In this sub-section, we will spell out a few such challenges.

1. *Diminution of state*: The first major casualty public administration had to suffer in the era of globalization was the increasing diminution of state. Drawing on the New Right philosophy, the advocates of globalization had forcefully argued in favour of the rolling back of the state from the social sector, leading thereby to depoliticization.
2. *Increasing pauperization*: This is more of a corollary to the previous point. The increasing shrinkage of state, especially from the social sector led to pauperization. Examples were aplenty which demonstrated that the pernicious impact of globalization on the common men led to increasing pauperization.
3. *Breakdown of the Social Safety Net*: This is perhaps the most debilitating impact of globalization for post-colonial countries like ours. As a part of SAP, globalization had advocated the steady roll back of the state from the social sector which in effect exposed the core areas of social sector like health,

education, infrastructure, and so on, to the vagaries of the market force. The resultant escalation of the cost of public services put the marginal section of society in a fix.

IMPACT OF GLOBALIZATION ON DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Most of the developing countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, have had a common legacy of colonial subjugation and the resultant problems of low agricultural and industrial productivity, poor social index, political underdevelopment, and so on. The peculiarities of these countries have justified the state-led development offensive and consequent elaborate welfare arrangements. Globalization as a neoliberal design of hollowing out of the welfare state has a debilitating impact on developing countries. In this section, we will spell out the apparent vulnerability of developing nations in the wake of the neoliberal recipe of more market and less state.

Born at the decolonization phase, the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America had launched a huge offensive in order to catapult these nascent countries in the development trajectory. State and bureaucracy have been roped in this task of nation building. Consequently, a welfare state system with an elaborate social sector had come into being. The arrangement of welfare state system had been working in perfect synergy with the newly formulated constitutional framework in these countries until it was rocked by a powerful jolt called globalization. Globalization has posed a serious challenge to these developing countries. As a part of aid conditionality, the developing countries had to accept a SAP, which among others had a compulsion to open up their national frontiers for international trade and commerce. Though the proponents of globalization have opined that the globalization process, if allowed to function freely, would open up floodgate of opportunities, the adverse impact of it cannot be entirely ruled out. Thanks to inherent inequality and uneven growth of capitalism, globalization had also registered an uneven and stunted growth.

While, some industrially developed capitalist countries reaped a rich harvest out of globalization, most of the underdeveloped countries had to bear the burnt in terms of increasing unemployment, pauperization, malnutrition, and marginalization.

The first casualty of globalization in the context of the developing countries is the shrinkage of social sector. The social sector has so long been jealously guarded by the state. Health, education, and infrastructure have so long been provided by the state. But, with the onset of globalization, especially as a part of aid conditionality state had to move out of social sector, leaving it to the vagaries of market forces.

Second, the exposure of the social sector to the market forces as part of SAP had a far-reaching and pernicious impact for the developing countries as it led to exclusion, marginalization of resources and pauperization.

Third, globalization has also led the developing countries to an extractive mode of economic development. Unlike their developed counterparts, most of the developing countries have found it difficult to sustain in this globalized order. Consequently, they have been compelled to indulge in an extractive mode of development in order to remain in the fray. Examples are aplenty where the developing and the underdeveloped countries are forced to extract their marine resources, mineral resources, or agricultural produces and tailor them for the export market.

Fourth, as a corollary of the previous point, the above compulsion of globalization had a serious ramification for the environment per se. The said compulsion of the developing and the underdeveloped countries had further exemplified the position taken by the South in the protracted debate between the North and the South over environmental degradation

Public administration also includes the administration of justice. It is mostly concerned with issue of justice within the territorial jurisdiction of the nation state. The onset of globalization with increasing enmeshment and interconnectedness has brought the issue of global justice in the forefront, which has so long been considered as cosmopolitan utopia at best. In fact, the success of globalization calls for an order of global justice in the first place.

Hence, the recent concern for global justice can be attributed to the political economy of market. In the following section, we shall discuss the concept of global justice and show how globalization has engendered it.

CONCERN FOR GLOBAL JUSTICE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

In the era of mutual interdependence, there has been a growing global concern for humanity in distress. Issues of justice like human rights or environment have transnational implications and can hardly be confined within the peripheries of the nation state. Thanks to instant communication, no part of this world can afford to remain impervious to global consciousness. Any incident of injustice to humanity is bound to have global repercussions. From the procedural point of view, the idea of global justice seems unlikely as it requires all the states of the world, irrespective of their specificities, to be enveloped by a common regime.

The concept of global justice is often confused with international justice. Chris Brown has come out with an apt distinction that is worth a mention. International justice, according to Brown (2008: 621):

> … implies that what we are interested in is the relations of states or nations, the kind of entities that make up the membership of the United Nations; justice in this case points us towards the normative principles that underlie such relations, as encapsulated in, or summarized by, the practices of international society, more particularly the discourse of international law. Global justice, on the other hand, does not privilege the nation-state in this way; here, the referent object of justice is humanity taken as a whole, all the people who share our planet, and it is by no means to be taken for granted that their interests are best served by the normative principles that underlie interstate relations.

Is it possible to bind this world of innumerable diversity under a single framework of justice? There is hardly any agreed stand on the scope of global justice. In fact, the issue of feasibility of global

justice is equally poised between the *proponents* and *opponents*. The proponents, like cosmopolitans, advocates of the society of state tradition have reposed their faith on the eventual birth of a global justice regime. From the ethical point of view, especially moral universalists, it is argued that the objective ethical standard should not be confined to a few nation states, but to be applied to humanity per se. The philosophical justification of this rather utopian goal of global justice, especially the recent outpouring of studies on it can be traced back to John Rawls and to be more specific his book entitled *The Law of Peoples* (1999) as well as the position taken by the Cosmopolitans (McKinnon 2008).

John Rawls, the Harvard philosopher, is known for his seminal contributions to the revival of normative political theory through his erudite intervention of social justice. Broadly speaking, the Rawlsian perspective on justice can be divided into three positions. The *initial position* he took can be found in the publication of an article on the theory of justice in 1968, which later culminated into a full-fledged book, *A Theory of Justice* (1971). Drawing on a distributive mode of justice, Rawls had forcefully reasoned in favour of active state intervention in providing social justice. The *revised position* appeared in the wake of severe criticisms for his alleged dilution of liberal values. Rawls had come out with a revised version of his theory of justice in 1993, reclaiming his liberal position in a book entitled *Political Liberalism*. In his *later position*, Rawls took his theorization of social justice to the global scale. In a publication titled *The Law of Peoples* in 1999, Rawls had come out with the notion of global justice. Unlike his first publication, *A Theory of Justice*, which was mainly concerned with the principle of justice that govern the close communities, especially nation states, *The Law of Peoples* was rather cosmopolitan in its outlook. Like his earlier celebrated work, here also Rawls had resorted to an elaborate philosophical foundation to situate the idea of global justice. He believed that an idea of global justice was possible had there been a liberal order informed with descent people. Like his earlier work, in *The Law of Peoples* also, he falls back on his trusted hypothetical construct of ideal choosing situation, that is, the original position. Extending his earlier formulations,

Rawls presupposes two 'original positions' to ascertain the laws of the peoples. While, the first original position helps decide the 'fair terms of cooperation' that regulates the basic structure of society, the second original position would determine the foreign policy that liberal people choose (McKinnon 2008). In other words, the Ralwsian scheme of global justice presupposes a liberal society informed with social justice, based on an elaborate philosophical framework. He believed that domestic social justice can be converted into the global context.

Cosmopolitanism

Another important philosophical source of the concept of global justice is cosmopolitanism. The *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* has defined cosmopolitanism in the following words:

> The nebulous core shared by all cosmopolitan views is the idea that all human beings, regardless of their political affiliation, do (or at least can) belong to a single community, and that this community should be cultivated. Different versions of cosmopolitanism envision this community in different ways, some focusing on political institutions, others on moral norms or relationships, and still others focusing on shared markets or forms of cultural expression.

Broadly speaking, there are two variants of cosmopolitanism, namely, consequentialist cosmopolitanism and human rights cosmopolitanism. In fact, unlike the nationalists who have unadulterated obligation to members of the nation, cosmopolitans believe that national borders has nothing to do with our moral obligations to others as all human beings have equal moral value (McKinnon 2008). Hence, the idea of global justice received a forceful advocacy from the cosmopolitan theorists. They value moral universalism as the most important quality of a modern society, and refuse to discriminate among fellow-citizens and outsiders in delivering justice.

The concept of global justice is also subject to criticisms. The opponents are ranging from realists, particularists to nationalists. Despite the distinctiveness of the above positions, they share a

common sentiment that expecting social justice at the global level is no less a utopia and chasing that utopia would invariably sacrifice national interest. The *realists* have questioned the very logic of following a global ethical standard, unless that is conducive for furthering strategic national interest. This school is sceptical about universal moralism or international moral obligation to reach out to the poor and destitute. Major advocates of this rather radical stand were Hans Morgenthau, Kenneth Waltz, amongst others. The *particularists* believe that in complying with universal objective, ethical standard often gloss over the particular attributes of a given society. Hence, the advocates of this school have criticized moral universalism as false and concentrate on particular culture of that society. Major exponents of this school are Michael Walzer, James Tully, and others. The *nationalists* almost in a similar vein have criticized the notion of global justice as their main preoccupation is to serve the citizens within their boundary.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

Drafting any concluding observation on the assumed correlation between globalization and public administration is by no means a daunting task, as the phenomenon of globalization is yet to reach a conclusive phase. As an all encompassing phenomenon, globalization has unlocked a virtual floodgate of possibilities and problems for public administration, ever since it came into being in the 1990s. On the basis of the foregoing analysis, some observations can be made.

First, it is true that globalization has had a definite impact on public administration and virtually redefined it. The indelible mark of globalization can be discerned in its structural, functional, and attitudinal aspects, if we compare the globalized version of public administration with that of the traditional one. Unlike the traditional variant of public administration based on Weberian formulation of strict adherence of rules, regulation, hierarchy, its contemporary incarnation seems to be upholding the Taylor-driven principles of administration drawing largely on pro-market arguments.

Second, globalization did not mean the end of public administration. Rather, public administration has reincarnated to cope with new challenges. The administrative welfare state has given way to a corporate welfare state with a substantial repercussion for the nature and scope of public administration.

Third, globalization has increased the urgency of having a more proactive public administration. This is more so if we take developing countries into considerations. Locked in a common legacy of colonial subjugation and the resultant underdevelopment, developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America began their journey as independent nation states with elaborate public administration. Globalization with its agenda of minimizing the role of public administration with a corresponding increase of market space had posed serious challenges for these countries, still caught in the vicious circle of poverty, illiteracy, underdevelopment, and malnourishment. Hence, these countries had to fall back on the good old institutions of public administration for bringing about rapid socioeconomic and cultural development instead of relying on market mechanisms like their developed counterparts in the West.

Fourth, the disintegration of Soviet Union and the resultant collapse of socialist alternative had heralded a new unipolar world order with the US at the helm of affairs. With no ideological alternative in sight, globalization as a neoliberal recipe of free-market economy had gathered huge steam throughout the world. This sweeping flow of labour, capital, and investment in the form of globalization led to a nervous apprehension for the post-colonial countries, where public administration was still in a commanding position. Being the late-starter, these countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, had to develop an elaborate public administration in order to overcome several shortcomings.

Hence, globalization for these countries appeared to be an ordeal as most of them had been caught in a typical dilemma of sorts. Given the historical context, they were neither in position to thwart the onward march of globalization, nor whole heartedly accept it, as that implied a severe downsizing of public administration. Nevertheless, the post-colonial countries had to accept willy nilly the neoliberal design of globalization.

Now that we have been through this phenomenon of globalization for more than three decades, it is possible to have a relatively objective assessment of the impact of globalization on public administration. Initial apprehensions notwithstanding, the experiences corroborated that globalization could not downsize public administration altogether. Rather, specificities of these countries have compelled to reinvent public administration to withstand the impending challenges.

Hence, to conclude we can argue public administration is yet to have a settled identity. Rather, there has been a continuous movement of configuration–reconfiguration–deconfiguration of its core values.

NOTES

1. For details, see Farazmand (2007: chapter 1).
2. See Butcher (1995); though the book is generally meant for the students of British social policy and public administration, as has been stated in the preface, it also provides an excellent account of the evolving nature of the governance of social service per se.
3. For details, see Held and McGrew (2003: Part II, 105–90).
4. Ali Farazmand in his article, 'Globalization and Public Administration' has nicely accessed the pernicious impact of globalization on public administration. For details, see Farazmand (1999: 509–22).
5. For further details, see Butcher (1995: chapter 9, pp. 137–38).
6. Petras and Veltmeyer have unmasked the ideological veil of globalization, which sought to further the interest of capitalism in a new garb. For details, see Petras and Veltmeyer (2001).
7. Several authors have opined that globalization has ushered in a new post-Westphalian world order. The Westphalian model, based on territory and autonomy, has become redundant in the interconnected world of globalization. For details, see Krasner (2003). Almost in a similar vein, Anthony Mc Grew in an article titled 'Globalization and Global Politics' has discussed this dimension of globalization. For more, see McGrew in Baylis and Smith (2005).
8. Zygmunt Bauman, a noted sociologist, is very much sceptical about the nature of the post-national (post-Westphalian) order, opened up by the forces of globalization. He is very apprehensive of this upcoming order, marked by extreme fluidity and flux. For more details, see Michele Dillon's excellent chapter on globalization in Dillon (2010).
9. R. Robertson (1992) is known as the key thinker of globalization. He refused to accept globalization as a new phenomenon. Rather, identified the concept

in pre-modern period and scaled the process of globalization in the five successive phases. For details see Robertson (1992). Also consult Waters (2001).

10. For a precise account of Immanuel Wallerstein's analysis of evolution of world systems, see Dillon (2010: 474).

REFERENCES

Arora, Ramesh. 2007. 'Organization Theories: Concerns and Orientations', in Ramesh Hooja and Ramesh Arora (eds), *Administrative Theories: Apporaches, Concepts, and Thinkers in Public Administration*. Jaipur, New Delhi: Rawat Publications.

Baylis, John and Steve Smith. 2005. *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations* (3rd edition). New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Bennis, Warren B. 1968. 'Beyond Bureaucracy', in Warren B. Bennis and Philip Slater (eds), *The Temporary Society*. Harper and Row Publishers. Reprinted in an abridged version in Nigro, F. and G. Nigro. 1983. *Readings in Public Administration*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Bhagwati, Jagdish. 2004. *In Defense of Globalization*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Butcher, Tony. 1995. *Delivering Welfare: The Governance of the Social Services in the 1990s*. Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Dhameja, Alaka (ed.). 2003. *Contemporary Debates in Public Administration*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.

Dillon, Michele. 2010. *Introduction to Sociological Theory: Theorists, Concepts, and Their Applicability to the 21st Century*. Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Dryzek, John S., Bonnie Honig, and Anne Phillips (eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Political Theory* (paperback edition). Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

Farazmand, Ali. 1999. 'Globalization and Public Administration', *Public Administration Review*, 59 (6, November–December): 509–22.

———. 2007. 'Globalization: A Theoretical Analysis with Implications for Governance and Public Administration', in Ali Farazmand and Jack Pinkowski (eds), *Handbook of Globalization, Governance, and Public Administration*. London, New York: Taylor & Francis.

Held, David and Anthony McGrew. 2003. *The Global Transformations Reader*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Krasner, Stephen D. 2003. 'Compromising Westphalia', in David Held and Anthony McGrew (eds), *The Global Transformations Reader*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

McKinnon, Catriona. 2008. *Issues in Political Theory*. London: Oxford University Press.

Mishra, Ramesh. 1999. *Globalization and the Welfare State*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Petras, James and Henry Veltmeyer. 2001. *Globalization Unmasked: Imperialism in the 21st Century*. London: Zed Books, in association with Madhyam Books, Delhi, 2001.

Rabin, Jack, W. Bartley Hildreth, and Gerald J. Miller (eds). 2007. *Handbook of Public Administration* (3rd edition). London, New York: Taylor and Francis.

Robertson, R. 1992. *Globalization*. London: SAGE Publications.

Savas, E.S. 1987. *Privatization: The Key to Better Government*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.

Sharma, Arvind K. 2003. 'The Citizen's Charter Initiative: Pronouncement of a Paradigm Shift in Bureaucracy–Client Interface', in Alka Dhameja (ed.), *Contemporary Debates in Public Administration*. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India.

Sobel, Andrew (ed.). 2009. *Challenges of Globalization: Immigration, Social Welfare, Global Governance*. London, New York: Routledge.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Available at http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmopolitanism/ (accessed on 29 December 2011).

Wignanya, P. and S. Sirivandana (eds). *Pro-Poor Growth and Governance in South Asia*. Colombo: SAGE Publications.

Waters, Malcolm. 2001. *Globalization* (2nd edition). London, New York: Routledge.

Conclusion

I

Public administration is being constantly reinvented simply because of the processes in which it is embedded. It is state-centric and as the scope and complexities of the state activities increase, public administration can hardly afford to remain static. The wider social, economic, and political processes thus provide critical inputs to public administration. Hence, for a meaningful study of governance, one has to take into account the wider social, economic, and political milieu; otherwise, the effort will largely be academic. In addition to this, there is another dimension to it as well. Public administration is government in action. A government is always enmeshed in a web of complex relations involving society, economy, and polity. Unless these complexities are understood, governmental activities appear to be mere structural responses to stimuli of various kinds. A surface reading of a government in action shall invariably end up with a simplistic conceptualization because it is based on a clear demarcation of the domains of public administration and other political institutions of the state. This is far from the truth because public administration responses are perhaps the most complex outcomes drawn on inputs from political institutions which are critical in deciding the ideological contour of a state. Public administration is, thus, very complex simply because of its contextual nature, though there is always continuity in terms of the structure in

which it is articulated. Behaviourally, public administration is always different presumably because of the changing sociopolitical reality shaping its ideology and values that hardly remain static for obvious reasons. As the scope of and complexity of government activities grow, it would be misleading to understand the structure, behaviour, and process of public bureaucracy in terms of the traditional Weberian mould. The obvious question is how to conceptualize and grasp public administration that evolves historically and transforms in response to the specific nature of social transformation in a country. What is critical here is the relationship between public and administration in which the former sets the goal for the latter. Public administration, thus, provides a system that draws its legitimacy, if not sustenance, from 'public' which is usually defined contextually. Hence, it would be intellectually sterile to argue for a universal model of public administration. Public is, thus, critical in any conceptualization of public administration which is broadly defined as 'government in action'. As praxis, public administration can never be universal, but historical. Because public administration is always articulated in accordance with the historical specificities in which it is located, there is no way one can evolve a universal explanatory model. Hence, it has been accepted that public administration is required to be conceptualized through 'a variety or perspectives, taken together and synthesized [which] can stimulate fresh idea [and] also illuminate underlying and constitutive features of public administration' (Farmer 2010: xi).

II

Reflective of changing governmental practices, public administration as a discipline is constantly reinventing its character. What bothered the scholars at the outset was the concern for creating adequate administrative capacity of the state within a democratic sociopolitical framework. Woodrow Wilson, in his pioneering paper entitled 'The Study of Public Administration', heralded a new era in public administration. While defining and understanding public administration, Wilson seemed to have demarcated the arena of administration from politics. He appeared

to have assigned primary, but not exclusive, responsibility for establishing collective purposes (politics) and for carrying out these purposes (administration) to separate spheres—the legislature and the administrative state. What Wilson, thus, suggested is that 'politics' and 'administration' constituted separate spheres of governance (in order perhaps to preclude undue political and judicial intervention in the performance of the administrative tasks). Furthermore, by defining public administration as 'business like', Wilson seemed to have focused more on 'the art of doing' on the basis of certain acquired professional training. It would be however wrong to argue that Wilson sought to erect a strong wall between politics and administration. His concern for administrative efficiency led him to avoid unwarranted political interference in administration. However, his emphasis on business like professionalism in public administration was articulated by Frederick Taylor's theorization of 'scientific management' that divided formal responsibility for administration into two groups—a managerial group and the performers. While the former refers to those who manage what to do and how to do, the latter is concerned with 'actual doing' of the work.

While Taylor demarcated the two domains of public administration, W.F. Willoughby in his *Principles of Public Administration* (1927), was concerned with the actual organization of public administration. He sought to provide what is known as 'the institutional' approach to governance. In his opinion, since public administration is the action part of the government, the emphasis should be shifted from legal rules and cases to formal framework and procedures of the administrative machine. According to Willoughby, 'the highly technical tasks of government be held to no lower standards of efficiency and honesty than are operative in the business world'. In other words, bureaucratic efficiency is critical to 'flawless' governance and public administration continues to be defined in the traditional bureaucratic mould. What is missing is the ambience in which public administration is articulated. Is public administration independent of the popular control? Or, can public administration avoid value-preferences of a political regime which sets its ideological tone. Seeking to articulate the

new trend, especially in the post Second World War period, Wallace Sayre underlines the growing importance of 'a new logic of democratic control' in public administration. Characterizing this as 'a paradigmatic shift', Sayre argues that 'a new logic of democratic control superseding the premises of the spoils system [is] a way to ensure transparent governance that is obedient and accountable to the expressed will and duly elected officials' (Sayre 1958: 103). Governance cannot be conceptualized, as Willoughby underlines, in a vacuum; instead, the sociopolitical context is critical to its character. In fact, this is the argument that has been pursued consistently by scholars seeking to redefine public administration in terms of 'the values' that remain significant in its articulation.

With the articulation of NPA, the view that gained pre-eminence was that public administration was not merely technical, but value-based. The hiatus between value and public administration was largely explained in terms of the discipline's alienation from political science. It was argued that unless there is 'a critical inter-penetration' between political science and public administration, understanding of public administration would be lopsided. Because the study of public administration is the study of politics as well, the separation between these two disciplines can be intellectually 'suicidal'. The search for a new paradigm resulted in what is known as 'New Public Administration'. At the backdrop of the Vietnam War and urban riots in Europe and America, the scholars gathered in Minnowbrook in 1968 to redefine the contours of public administration. Under the patronage of Dwight Waldo, the scholars challenged the bureaucratic model of public administration for having seriously undermined the importance of 'the political' in shaping government. Two volumes (Marini 1971; Waldo 1971) were published to herald a new trend in public administration underling the dialectical interaction with political science. The primary concern of NPA was to make public administrative sensitive to the political values that remained critical in governmental behaviour. As George Frederickson (1971: 69–70) succinctly put, the new public administrator is less 'generic' and more 'public' than his past counterparts, less 'descriptive' and more

'prescriptive', less 'institution-oriented' and more 'client-oriented', and less 'neutral' and more 'normative'.

Change was evident in public administration in the 1980s and early 1990s. The context of public administration was changed in favour of less directly performing government and governance, more privatization and contracting out, more voluntarism and social-capacity building. The values of public purpose came to be steadily replaced by the emerging values of private interests. A new paradigm known as NPM emerged seeking to redefine public administration in the radically altered global social–economic and political circumstances in the aftermath of the demise of the former Soviet Union. An essentially market-driven rhetoric, the NPM is based on the premise that by narrowing down of the scope of government activities, an efficient, tranparent, effective and accountable governance would appear. The rationale appears to be that with fewer bureaucratic structures there would be only a fewer problems. The NPM can be distinguished from NPA by (*a*) its clear emphasis on business-managemrent practices and (*b*) its reliance on individual rationalities and market mecahnism in the restructuring and operation of public administration. The anti-public service stand has created a strong challenge for managing diversity in the public sector. Administration is something more than rational operative acton. It is full of meaning and mired in conflict and controversy, at the root of which lie various values which shape the cultural characteristics of any orgnaizations (Dwivedi 2002: 22–27).

The NPM is a design which is guided by global capitalism. For capitalism to prosper, it needs a strong state and a stable environment. It demands order and social control without which the market cannot be as efficient as is desirable for global capital. Capitalism needs strong state and bureaucracy to flourish and powerful business elites to dominate the policy process and its outcomes. To protect the system from periodic collapse and to provide safety nets for promoting capitalist development, market failures demand government intervention in the economy. Thus, the modern state, through public expenditures, plays a significant role in the accelerated development of capitalism and globalization. In fairness to

these system, it is appropriate to argue that they also spend significant portions of their budgets to support a relatively trouble-free and a stable political system that is also necessary for the growth and sustenance of a sociopolitical order without which globalization cannot prosper.

The rise of NPM to preeminence coincides with societal changes, which is theorized as a shift from government to governance: from coordinated, hierarchical structures and processes of societal steering to a network-based process of exchange and negotiation. The NPM is, thus, a paradigmatic change in public administration for a number of reasons.

First, the traditional output-oriented administration is replaced by the process-oriented administration with emphasis on performance indicators, evaluations, and performance-related pay, and quality improvement; second, the focus is on the flexible provision of individualized products instead of 'collective provision'. Hence, customer replaces the citizen, and the 'production line' of public administration is broken down into individual pieces for 'contracting out' or 'privatization'; third, structurally, 'clusters' rather than 'pyramids' as the preferred design for administration in which the autonomous agencies or institutions outside the formal government are inducted in governance as 'complementary structures' of public administration; finally, there is a clear shift of general emphasis from policy to management with full cost consciousness before making any decision.

There is no doubt that NPM is a refreshing input in our search for 'an appropriate' model for public administration in two ways: (*a*) it has brought back the old debate between government administration and business administration and (*b*) by seeking to review the bureaucracy-centred public administration in the name of 'state-minimalism', it has raised issues which are pertinent in redefining the contour of public administration in its contemporary manifestation. The fundamental question is whether public administration can be conceptualized as NPM. The market-driven NPM is qualitatively different from public administration which is guided by a distinct purpose of supporting and developing collective life by choosing goods and services

essential to the community as a whole, establishing collective efficiency and devising social and political rules in support of a particular system of order. Public administration is also a space in which citizens and government interact dialectically. Public policy is, thus, not merely government-driven, but an outcome of such an interaction which is conceptually understood as 'the politics of participation'.

III

The governance paradigm has challenged state-centric public administration. In the context of 'de-administered development', the top-down-bureaucracy-led development appears to have lost its viability since it was ill-equipped to bring about development in the real sense of the term. Poverty showed no signs of abatement and the benefits of development were appropriated by the elite. The inadequate state-directed development paradigm has given rise to an approach involving local people and local resources in a decentralized, people-centric self-development mode. Development is not the brainchild of the experts, but is the outcome drawn upon the inputs from the grass roots. What is critical in this conceptualization of development is civil society that has emerged as the third sector along with state and market. This is a new venture of societal-problem solving in which public administration is far from bureaucratic. A significant departure from the conventional conceptualization of public administration, civil society-centred governance creates spaces for voluntary action in areas where state has already retreated.

The growing importance of civil society in governances can be traced back to three sources: first, civil society is critical in reducing the 'governmental overload', especially in the developed countries where governments were downsized to achieve the goal; second, the role of civil society is justified as pertinent in governance in the World Bank 'good governance' policy of aid-conditionality focusing on transparency, human rights, and accountability; third, civil society gains salience in the developing countries presumably because the state-directed development

paradigm fails to a large extent to eradicate poverty and also to contain the emergence of 'an insensitive' and also mechanical bureaucracy. Civil society contributes to the consolidation of decentralized bottom–up people-centric grassroots governance. There seems to be a growing realization that wider social space is available outside the governmental institutions for autonomous social action; as a result, the dependency syndrome (or dependence on government) seems to have evaporated and people are drawn in the processes of development no longer as 'mere target groups', but as active participants shaping the course of development. In the changed environment, civil society organizations, commonly defined as non-governmental or voluntary organizations, are crucial aids to governance especially in areas like environment, human rights, gender, and transparency in public administration, to name a few.

Public administration, in its new avatar of governance, articulates a trilogy of state, market, and civil society. This is a new perspective in public administration that received enormous attention in the 2008 Minnowbrook Conference III. Governance does not, therefore, merely refer to a process (in which public administration articulates a specific response), but is also a design which is both market-driven and civil society-induced. Market redefines citizens as clients or consumers while civil society expands public sphere by including a whole range of civic actions that hardly figured in the bureaucratic model of public administration. Civil society is also the arena in which social movements become organized. Representing diverse and even contradictory social interests, civil society is an arena that generally articulates responses that invariably reflect the social base, constituencies, and thematic orientations of the concerned group.[1] Civil society can, thus, be most effective in governance by mediating between citizen and state, by articulating citizen's interests to government, by inculcating participatory norms, and by restricting the government by citizen's involvement in its day-to-day functioning. Drawn on shared accountability of stakeholders, the new governance paradigm secures accountability by reducing discretion or delegation in public bureaucracy through collaborative governance. This also

makes participation meaningful and effective in the sense that the involvement of the stakeholders in the decision-making brings about changes in the organizational structure from a hierarchical, centralized form to a more decentralized and flexible form for enhancing self management.

Two important points emerge out of the above discussion: first, while the market seems to provide an effective alternative to the inefficiencies and waste of state planning, civil society is an arena where governance is both contested and defended. Second, the failure of the West-induced Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) confirms the inherent weaknesses of a programme that lacks indigenous roots. The SAP had not only failed miserably to stimulate economic growth in developing countries but also had aggravated inequalities and diminished access for the poor to the basic needs, such as education and health. So, the attention was drawn to the indigenous governments. Rather than redesigning the SAP, the international donors now stress the importance of *good governance*, underlining the need for democratization, accountability, and participation. Here lies the theoretical justification for civil society which is being projected as a 'critical stalwart' against the governmental excesses and also as a site for people's participation in the development process. Civil society, thus, makes participation in governance people-centric and also development-oriented.

There is no doubt that civil society is now integral to governance. That it is a contested terrain, adds a new twist to its relationship with governance. Civil society, just like the state, is a site of power relations. So, the tendency to treat civil society as benign is theoretically misleading and empirically wrong. Civil society cannot be depoliticized simply because one cannot wish away the contradictory relations along class, caste, or gender axis, for instance, in which it is articulated. Furthermore, civil society can never be a universal category since it is specific to historical circumstances. Hence, the assumed shared meaning seems to be futile for two reasons: first, since civil society is specific to the cultural context of the country in question it cannot be translated so comfortably into other languages and

social milieu; second, in many state-directed economies, where state played key roles in development and governance, civil society may not be an accepted partner simply because it has no antecedent in the sense that organizations outside the state were always suspect. In a nutshell, what it suggests is the difficulty in conceptualizing civil society as a universal category presumably because the history of state–society relations differs profoundly from one society to another.

IV

It has now been established beyond doubt that public administration cannot be conceptualized in traditional bureaucratic mode. It is also very clear that there cannot be a universal model simply because public administration is contextual. Moreover, one cannot wish away the importance of 'the purpose' in articulating public governance that cannot simply endorse 'the market logic' just like the private operators. The guarded Indian response to economic reforms seems to be a balanced one because at one level the process of debureaucratizing public administration has already begun (as the recommendations of the Fifth Pay Commission suggest, by adopting a calibrated approach to privatization, the Indian state has articulated a response), while at another level, that is appreciative of her socioeconomic peculiarities. So far from turning the clock backwards towards the failed statist public administration of the past, governance in India is being articulated on the basis of new and imaginative solutions, tailored to country-specific needs, rather than the 'one-size-fits-all' approach that was intellectually persuasive nor empirically appropriate. Being normative, public administration can never be reinvented merely as 'a technical exercise'; similarly, being context-specific, there can hardly be 'a universal mode' of public administration that will always be 'a historical' response to governance.

NOTE

1. For details of this argument, see Cohen and Arato (1992).

REFERENCES

Cohen, J.L. and A. Arato. 1992. *Civil Society and Political Theory.* Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Dwivedi, O.P. 2002. 'The Challenge of Cultural Diversity for Good Governance', *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, xlviii (1, January–March): 22–27.

Farmer, David John. 2010. *Public Administration in Perspective: Theory and Practice through Multiple Lenses.* New York and London: ME Sharpe.

Frederickson, George. 1971. 'Toward a New Public Administration', in Frank Marini (ed.), *Toward a New Public Administration.* Chandler.

Marini, Frank (ed.). 1971. *Toward a New Public Administration.* Scranton: Chandler.

Sayre, Wallace S. 1958. 'Premises of Public Administration: Past and Emerging', *Public Administration Review,* Vol. 18.

Waldo, Dwight (ed.). 1971. *Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence.* Chandler.

Model Questions

CHAPTER 1

1.1 Define public administration. Discuss the nature and scope of public administration.

1.2 What is public administration? Describe the managerial and integral views of public administration.

1.3 Explain how public administration differs from private administration.

1.4 Discuss the evolution of public administration as a discipline.

1.5 Examine the various stages in the evolution and growth of public administration as an academic discipline.

1.6 What is new public administration? Discuss its implications for public administration.

1.7 Critically examine new public management.

1.8 Discuss the impact of globalization on public administration.

1.9 Write an essay on the Minnowbrook Conference III.

1.10 What are the new trends in the discipline of public administration? Elaborate.

CHAPTER 2

2.1 Do you think that the theory building exercise in public administration is in a shamble? Explain the statement in the light of the evolution of public administration.

2.2 Examine the basic principles of classical organization theory.

2.3 What are the distinguishing features of the scientific management theory as propounded by Fredrick Taylor? How far Scientific Management Theory is considered to be scientific? What are the areas where there is democratic and participatory emphasis?

2.4 Give a critical estimate of the Human Relations Approach in organization theory.

2.5 Critically examine the impact of Hawthorn Studies in the organization theory.

2.6 Discuss Herbert Simon's Rational Decision-making model with special reference to his concept of 'bounded rationality'.

2.7 Examine, after Weber, the structural and functional features of bureaucracy. Are these features relevant in development administration?

2.8 Write an essay on the post-Weberian development of bureaucracy.

2.9 What do you mean by post-bureaucratic theory? Elucidate after Warren Bennis, the shifting paradigm of post-bureaucratic organization.

2.10 What is pathological theory of organization? Identify the major variants of pathological theory of organization.

CHAPTER 3

3.1 What do you mean by governance? What is 'good' in good governance? Identify the major features of governance.

3.2 What role does state play in the process of governance?

3.3 What is corporate governance? Why do we need a regime of corporate governance?

3.4 Trace the evolution of corporate governance. Identify its major components.

3.5 Give an account of the Indian version of corporate governance.

3.6 What is digital governance? What are the different components of corporate governance?

3.7 How could we bridge the digital divide? Identify a few possible steps in this regard.

3.8 Write a brief account on the gender images in public administration.

3.9 What are the different approaches of feminist discourse in public administration?

3.10 'Public administration has become less catholic as a discipline of study.' Do you agree with the statement? Elaborate your response.

CHAPTER 4

4.1 Discuss the various models and approaches to the study of public policy.

4.2 'Public policy is the essence of public administration.' In the light of this statement, discuss the relevance of public policy-making.

4.3 What do you understand by public policy? How are public policies formulated? Discuss.

4.4 Define public policy. Examine the challenges in its implementation.

4.5 Discuss the process of policy formulation and evaluation. How can we improve the evaluation process?

4.6 'An ounce of implementation of policy is more important than the tonnes of written policies.' In the light of this statement, discuss various factors which obstruct the implementation of public policy.

4.7 Critically examine the formulation and implementation of public policy in India.

4.8 Discuss the various factors which influence the formulation of public policies.

4.9 Critically examine the role of bureaucracy in policy implementation.

4.10 Explain, with illustration, the conditions required for successful policy implementation.

CHAPTER 5

5.1 What is development administration? Discuss the various elements of development administration.

5.2 Define development administration. Discuss its role and relevance in the developing countries.

5.3 Describe the main features of development administration. How far is it relevant in understanding the problems of developing countries?

5.4 Discuss the major characteristics of development administration. What are the hindrances before administration to achieve its objectives?

5.5 Write an essay on the changing patterns of development administration.

5.6 What is development administration? Differentiate between traditional and development administration.

5.7 What is development administration? Has this technique really accelerated the speed of development in the developing countries?

5.8 Distinguish between administrative development and administration of development.

5.9 Development administration is 'an action-oriented, goal oriented administrative system'. Discuss

5.10 'Development administration calls for some revolutionary changes in the attitudes, behaviour, orientation, and outlook of public services at all levels of administration.' Discuss.

CHAPTER 6

6.1 What is decentralization? Discuss the significance and approaches to decentralization.

6.2 Decentralization leads to greater democratization of administration. Discuss.

6.3 Distinguish between delegation and decentralization. Discuss the merits and demerits of decentralization.

6.4 What is democratic decentralization? Examine democratic decentralization in the context of the 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act for Panchayats.

6.5 Analyse the functional and fiscal decentralization of administration in the context of rural India.

6.6 Discuss the problems in the process of decentralization in rural administration.

6.7 What are the main features of the 74th Amendment Act?

6.8 Discuss the implications of the 73rd and 74th Amendment Acts.

6.9 Critically examine the functioning of Panchayati Raj Institutions in India.

6.10 Briefly examine the major rural–urban development programmes and their management in India.

CHAPTER 7

7.1 What is social welfare administration? Discuss its main characteristics.

7.2 Write an essay on the evolution of social welfare administration.

7.3 Examine the role of social welfare administration in India, with particular reference to weaker sections of the society.

7.4 How far social welfare administration benefited the weaker sections in India? Discuss.

7.5 What measures have been taken by the Government of India for the uplift of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes? Discuss.

7.6 Discuss the organizational structure and functions of social welfare administration in India.

7.7 Examine the effectiveness of welfare programmes for women in India.

7.8 'Social welfare administration has to go a long way to get the recognition as an independent discipline.' Comment.

7.9 What are the main challenges before social welfare administration in India? Discuss.

7.10 How do you make social welfare administration efficient? Explain.

CHAPTER 8

8.1 Examine the relationship between citizens and administration.

8.2 What is the citizen's perception about administration in India? Discuss.

8.3 Discuss the necessary pre-conditions for citizen-centric administration.

8.4 Write an essay on people's participation in administration.

8.5 What is accountability? Discuss the administrative accountability in India.

8.6 What are the main factors responsible for the growing discontent of citizens with administration?

8.7 What are the important grievance redressal mechanisms in India? Examine their effectiveness.

8.8 Discuss the impact of e-governance on administration.

8.9 What is a citizen's charter? Examine its role in ensuring administrative accountability.

8.10 Write an essay on 'Right to Information' in India.

CHAPTER 9

9.1 Trace the evolution of public administration in India.

9.2 Evaluate the importance of Council Acts in colonial publication administration in India.

9.3 Evaluate the significance of the 1858 Queen's Proclamation in changing India's public administration.

9.4 What are the distinctive features of Indian administration under parliamentary control following the adoption of the 1858 Government of India Act? Elaborate.

9.5 'Colonial interests were paramount in administration during the British rule in India.' Do you agree? Elaborate your response.

9.6 Critically evaluate the 1935 Government of India Act.

9.7 'The Government of India Act of 1935 was a significant step towards transferring power in 1947.' How do you account for this assessment? Elaborate your response.

9.8 'All India Civil Services are nothing but a continuity of the erstwhile British administration in India.' Do you agree? Elaborate your response.

9.9 Do you agree with the view that the prevalence of the Indian Administrative Services challenges India's federalism? Elaborate your response.

9.10 Is it fair to argue that the nature of administration is contingent on the existing socioeconomic milieu and political calculations? Elaborate your response.

CHAPTER 10

10.1 What is a budget. Discuss its significance.

10.2 What are the different types of budget? Discuss

10.3 'Budget is an instrument of socioeconomic change.' Discuss this statement.

10.4 Performance budgeting is an improved form of budgeting. Discuss.

10.5 What is gender budgeting? Discuss its role in improving the status of women.

10.6 Discuss the process of budget formulation in India.

10.7 Examine the role of different actors in the process of budgeting in India.

10.8 Write an essay on budgetary innovations.

10.9 Write an essay on financial administration in India.

10.10 Suggest reforms in the financial administration in India.

CHAPTER 11

11.1 Discuss the concept of 'administrative reform'.

11.2 Explain the Gerald Caiden's notion of administrative reform.

11.3 Write an essay on administrative reforms in post-Independence India.

11.4 Discuss the main recommendations of the first administrative reform commission.

11.5 Examine the changing pattern of administrative reform in the post-liberalization era in India.

11.6 Highlight the main recommendations of the Fifth and Sixth Pay Commissions on administrative reforms in India.

11.7 Discuss the recent initiatives undertaken for civil service reforms in India.

11.8 Highlight the significant recommendations of the second administrative reform commission.

11.9 Discuss the impact of information technology on administrative reforms in India.

11.10 Write an essay on 'Lokpal and administrative reforms'.

CHAPTER 12

12.1 What do you mean by globalization? What are the different facets of globalization?

12.2 What do you mean by LPG or Liberalization Privatization Globalization? Elucidate the three stages of economic globalization.

12.3 'The Westphalian model of nation state system is given way to a post-Westphalian order of global interconnectedness.' Explain the statement in the light of globalization.

12.4 'Globalization is a new form of imperialism.' Elucidate the statement in the light of its pernicious impact on the newly independent states.

12.5 Assess the impact of globalization on public administration.

12.6 What do you mean by global justice? Distinguish between global justice and international justice.

12.7 What are the major philosophical justifications behind the concept of global justice?

12.8 Does the concept of global justice at all feasible?

12.9 Write a brief note on Rawls' contribution in developing the concept of global justice.

12.10 What do you mean by cosmopolitanism? Identify the different variants of cosmopolitanism.

Index

About the Authors

Bidyut Chakrabarty is currently a faculty at the Department of Political Science at University of Delhi, India. He was also Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences and Head of the Department of Political Science, University of Delhi. He has taught in some of the most prestigious educational institutions such as London School of Economics, UK; Indian Institute of Management (IIM) Calcutta, India; Monash University, Australia; National University of Singapore, Singapore; and Hamburg University, Germany.

Dr Chakrabarty has authored two textbooks for SAGE India: *Indian Government and Politics* (with Rajendra Kumar Pandey, 2008) and *Modern Indian Political Thought* (with Rajendra Kumar Pandey, 2009).

Prakash Chand is currently a faculty of Political Science in Dyal Singh (E) College, University of Delhi, India. His research papers have appeared in various journals including *Indian Social Science Review*, *Gandhi Marg*, *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, *Urban India* and *Social Change*. His areas of interests are public administration and environmental governance in India.

Arindam Roy is currently Assistant Professor in Political Science in the University of Burdwan, West Bengal, India. He has worked on several government projects, which include, among others, 'Women at Panchayats' and 'Development-Induced Displacement'. He has several publications to his credit, the most notable

being 'Impact of Globalization on City Government', 'Terrorism: The State is No Saint Either', and 'Medical Pluralism and Myopic Public Health: A Study of Memeri-I Block (Burdwan, West Bengal)'. Presently he is working on a project entitled 'Impact of Socio-cultural Diversity on Delivery of Health Services in India: A Case Study in the District of Burdwan (West Bengal): 1991–2009'. His areas of interest are public administration and political theory.