

2

ADMINISTRATION FOR DEVELOPMENT AND THE EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATOR

DONALD C. STONE

IN approaching this subject, the administration of Development, it is necessary to examine the accumulated experience. We are in the early stages in many countries to bring about rapid social and economic advance through comprehensive planning and fostering of use of all physical and human resources through government action and private initiative under democratic processes. On this particular trip which includes four continents I am examining the different approaches to economic and social development, identifying the difficulties or obstacles to be overcome, and, hopefully gaining more insight into the instrumentalities and processes which must be carried on if a whole society is to advance.

Four major undertakings or movements in which I have participated have provided certain insights, and no doubt prejudices, with which I approach the subject of development. First, is the reform and improvement efforts of municipal government to which I devoted my early years. Now American cities and many cities everywhere, are endeavouring through comprehensive planning, redevelopment, renewal, and other measures, to become livable and economically viable. The 1930's in the United States was

Two lectures delivered on 21 and 22 January, 1963

essentially a period of great economic and social development. It produced profound changes in the philosophy and approach of our government to the social and economic problems that beset the country. Through the initiation of the federal government, far-reaching programmes of a development character were launched – the social security system, the TVA and other multipurpose projects, vast public works programmes, rural electrification, public housing and inducements for private housing, aids to industrial development, farm assistance programmes, regulation of banking, insurance of securities and other financial practices, and public welfare and health advances.

Most of the ingredients of today's economic and social development plans were present, although there has always been a suspicion on the part of some elements of our population that there is something sinister in planning. The National Planning Resources Board (and its predecessors) contributed to these innovations of the 1930's, but it was not a counterpart of the Planning Commission of India, or what is viewed today as a comprehensive planning agency. The Congress finally abolished the Resources Board but new programmes and institutions to bring about economic recovery and social advance have been continued and expanded. The lessons of this era has more relevance to the development efforts of other countries than is usually assumed; at least in respect to problems of policy formulation, plan preparation, programme and project development and execution, and the organizational tasks these administrative processes entail.

The advent of World War II produced a radically different kind of mobilization and development – first for defence, and then for war. This was a period in which a whole nation concentrated all of its effort on the use of its resources for a single purpose. It provided many significant experiences in planning, programming, scheduling, and in how to marshal and utilize resources. The manner in which the new organization was planned and implemented, old agencies energized, and improved management and practices fostered, might well be studied by today's developing countries.

In the post-war period, the Marshall Plan was launched to bring about the recovery and development of the countries of Europe. This vast collaborative effort, founded on the principles of

self-help and mutual help, provided many insights into and understandings of the processes by which economic and social change can be accelerated through cooperative efforts involving whole populations. The Marshall Plan produced the concept of the comprehensive country programme, one of the most significant contributions to the field of economic and social development.

Simultaneously broad reconstruction and development efforts started in a few countries of low income. Stimulated by experience in Europe, the idea of comprehensive programmes for development spread to these countries and then throughout the world. Today virtually no country is without a major plan to bring about rapid economic advancement and improvement of conditions of life for its people.

These national efforts have been greatly aided by bilateral assistance and by international cooperative efforts fostered by the U.N., and by the International Bank and other agencies. International private agencies such as the Ford and the Rockefeller Foundations have also contributed. The aggregate experience is impressive, and research and education in development administration are enabling us to study this field in a systematic and constructive manner. I am here to learn. I would like to review what I see in the situation in some of the countries elsewhere, situations upon which the example of India can have a great effect.

Plans and Strategies

What are some of the lessons we can learn from this experience? What differences do we find in approaches? What are the main obstacles to development?

In examining the practices of different countries I find that development efforts vary greatly. Development is often approached in narrow terms. Sometimes the plans and programmes are comprehensive but vague; often development plans will be little more than a shopping list of projects that the country would like to carry on, hopeful that in some international body or country will be willing to help finance them.

In some countries, development plans are primarily analyses of economic and fiscal trends, with projections or economic models of desired increases in national income, agricultural and industrial

production, trade, tax revenues, investment, and similar matters. Sector programmes, and projects for achieving these goals may be entirely absent.

A few countries, following in the footsteps of India, are beginning to formulate comprehensive plans, supported by well-defined policies, programmes, projects, and activities which are essential for their implementation and for which budgetary funds are made available.

In this context development can be viewed as embracing the total task of building a nation. For this reason we now tend to think more in terms of nation-building than in terms of the limited context of economic development. This broader view has led to comprehensive plans which deal not only with the major economic and social objectives, the policies and procedures to utilize resources, and other basic elements, but they also include the programmes, projects, and activities for each of the sectors involved. Some examples are: education; infrastructure, projects and facilitating services essential for industrialization; the agricultural component, village or community programmes, and the rest of the things that are necessary in modern society.

Countries are much more resourceful in formulating plans than in implementing them. Perhaps this is due to the failure to appreciate that development is a continuing process of fundamental change, and that it involves a complex of mutually related political, economic, social, and administrative actions. Looking at development as a total process of this kind, it is clear that each country must have a strategy for development embodied in its legislation as well as in its plans.

There are several kinds of judgments, it seems to me, that determine this strategy. The available resources are a basic element. Other considerations are: the magnitude of planned goals feasible of achievement; the methods chosen to fulfil these goals; the role of government in economic and social activities; the balance between the innovation of government, on one hand, and the stimulation and activity of private initiative and enterprise, on the other; the levels of domestic capital formation that appear achievable under voluntary methods or methods of constraint; the time and value of preferences which characterize the doctrine built

into the plans; and the administrative capabilities available for carrying out the plans. In this way development is a continuous process of formulating, reformulating, and implementing a set of interrelated decisions which are directed at realizing stated development ends in a prescribed time sequence and by optimum means.

Political Leadership

It is in this context that I propose to explore briefly some of the administrative aspects of development. But since political leadership and a sustaining political environment are essential for effective development administration, I shall make a few references to this aspect.

In regard to this matter of political leadership and action, those of us in the academic field and even those of us within the executive branches of governments, often overlook the fact that development must be the direct result of political action and must take place within a solid political framework. Stagnant and traditional societies obviously reflect the lack of dynamic political systems.

Has development been viewed sufficiently in terms of social action and change? Certainly development cannot be successful without a sustaining philosophy or doctrine, without a strong, aggressive and dramatic political leadership, and without the organization necessary for the mobilization of wide popular support. Do we not need more research and education within our universities and institutes on how these essentials can be brought about? We urgently need a greater understanding of ways to foster political leadership which supports development, and at the same time maximizes democratic processes.

If more resourceful and imaginative approaches were utilized by civil servants in securing identification and support by politicians in development plans, programmes, and projects, far more genuine development would occur. Moreover, it would be evident that the goals of development can be secured through democratic processes and would thus provide an answer to those who advocate communism with its coercive methods as the only means of producing rapid social and economic change. If adequately interpreted, this alternative can be made especially appealing in

view of its humanistic commitments which enhances personal dignity, freedom, and opportunity; and because it offers wide popular participation in the processes of decision-making.

Should we not also avoid judging and patterning political systems in countries in need of rapid development according to the familiar models of the British parliamentary or United States presidential systems? Some countries may choose to adapt, or in some respects incorporate, elements of such systems in their own organizations, but we need to caution them on the dangers of transplanting systems designed for a radically different set of circumstances.

Political action, capable of achieving development in most countries of low income entails a number of different components. *First*, in new and emerging countries, there is no alternative to the exercise of considerable coercion to concert diffused loyalties and powers, and to eliminate external interests which, in some respects, tend to obstruct social progress. The dangers of such an exercise of exceptional power are obvious, and the proliferation of the autocratic one-party systems we find in so many areas is ominous. Nevertheless, the political strength necessary for rapid and constructive social change in most societies require the exercise of power different from that normally provided under traditional constitutional systems with low pressure politics.

Second, we must also recognize that emerging leadership will inevitably reflect primarily a minority of the population. It will predominantly reflect the intellectuals, those who have the knowledge and capabilities to deal with this complex process of development, and to present to the people the social and economic goals which are so important. In societies which have large aggregations of illiterate and depressed people, rule by the majority becomes especially difficult, if not impossible. Countries whose base of citizen participation is small have very difficult tasks ahead of them. It seems to me that here we need to find better methods of reconciling what might be called pragmatic leadership with the mass movements which suppress special privileges and parasitical groups and enhance political freedom, personal safety, and other human values.

Third, there is a need to develop a doctrine which has mass appeal for its goals but is rational in its methods.

Fourth, is the necessity of creating organizations, political and administrative, which are capable of enlisting mass identification and participation in the processes of development. This is an acute problem everywhere. Lack of citizen involvement is proving a great obstacle to the Alliance for Progress in Latin America.

Fifth, is the question of the capacity of a political system and the political leadership which it sustains to accommodate to the necessity of change. Political parties often assume specific roles which become inflexible and serve as deterrents in accommodating to new conditions and needs.

In the absence of effective political leadership and political systems, the military often of necessity exercises excessive, if not predominant, power. Insufficient study has been made of the role of the military in relation to development. Would it not be possible to develop more guidelines – more information that would have some influence on the behaviour of military groups – if we gave sufficient attention to this subject? Should there not be a solid effort to formulate and disseminate doctrines about the potential role of the military in development, to foster the administrative capacities necessary to sustain a national development effort? Could not more information be fed into military systems on the requisites for the formulation and execution of economic and social development? Might not some good come from feeding military authorities with methods and cases on how to exercise self-restraints and avoid becoming exploitive and wasteful? Some officers are interested in such matters and in knowing how to support a civil administration, and how to transfer authority from a military junta to a civilian system.

These factors of the scope of the planning process, the need for strategy and doctrine, and the essentiality of political leadership, all affect the organizational posture and relationships of the planning agency. The need for plans to enfold all of the sectors and all the measures, processes, and forces which must be put to work to execute the plans likewise have a bearing on the location of the planning agency. In many governments, the planning agency is not put into harness the various ministries and departments in a comprehensive, cooperative effort to produce and implement an effective plan. Sometimes the planning function is discharged to a

particular ministry, such as the Ministry of Finance or the Ministry of Economic Affairs. This location does not provide it with a sufficiently central position to serve as an instrument of the Prime Minister, the Cabinet, the President, or whatever form the Head of State may take. Unless the planning function is in some effective way related to the central channel of political and administrative authority, the planning process itself will suffer.

Another vital feature is the necessity of incorporating into the planning process and plans the decisions necessary for implementation; and of defining the instrumentalities to be created or which must operate to implement the plan. These elements are not found in the development plans of most countries and, as a result, the plan often becomes a piece of paper rather than a dynamic instrument.

The Director of the new Plan Implementation Agency in the Philippines vividly described this aspect of a plan in a recent conversation by saying: "We have yet to develop within the Philippines an awareness that a plan should not be primarily a piece of paper or a document, but as an essential habit; it must become a process, a part of the way the country functions."

The Plan Implementation Agency provides the President of the Philippines with an essential instrument to foster action within the ministries. In 1953 when the central planning body, called the National Economic Council, was created there was no recognition that a central organ must be charged with expediting and coordinating the execution of plans. Because of this oversight, this important link was not forged until recently. For the first time it looks as though significant development results may be achieved. With the National Economic Council, the Budget Commission, and the Plan Implementation Agency, all functioning as a team under the President, the Philippines has finally achieved a good organic solution to its planning problem.

Relation of Budgeting to Planning

This brings us to the need for basing plans on financial realities, and of translating plans into budgeted programmes, projects and activities.

If plans are to be executed, they must be formulated in terms

of both capital and current budgets. As a matter of fact, it is necessary for budgets to cover all of the resources available for application to development purposes. This is the practice in India, but in most countries, budgeting is a very imperfect instrument in the fulfillment of plan objectives. Important financial resources are not covered by budgets.

Six types of resources can be identified which need to be budgeted in relation to the development plan: (1) Revenues of the country which are available for and are allocated for ordinary governmental purposes. (2) General revenues which are determined to be used for development purposes. (3) Funds derived from internal borrowing which are assigned for development goals. (4) Funds available through the financial institutions of the country for investment for development purposes of one kind or another. (5) Earnings of public enterprise which, because of the autonomy given to such endeavours, are often not really readily available for priority objectives of a development character. (6) External loans and grants that are available, or can be negotiated, for development purposes.

All of these financial resources need to be budgeted and authorized by appropriate authority if effective programme and project implementation is to take place.

While they are not strictly a part of budgeting, the forecasts and administrative efforts which are necessary to induce private savings and investments in purposes essential to the fulfillment of development goals, have a bearing on budgeting. The budget itself must provide the resources and instrumentalities to carry out this essential part of development administration. Beyond this is the need for estimating the temporary loss of income through special inducements provided to new industry and the ultimate increase in revenues which higher levels of national product will permit.

This question of the relation of budgeting to planning has always been of great interest to me. In the United States during the 1930's, we learned that the budget could be a significant instrument of planning and programming. Americans are more ready, sometimes eager, to suggest to other people ways in which they might engage in planning, without providing them with a reasonably good demonstration of planning. That is always more fun. But through

various devices we have been able to find ways to engage in a great deal of planning, which may not be readily apparent on the surface. The Bureau of the Budget has always served as a major instrument for integrating the major policies, objectives, programmes, and operations of the Government.

In the United States budgeting is a policy formulation and programming process. Five year projections, as well as annual programmes, are now made by the Bureau of the Budget. The Council of Economic Advisers is consulted in this process. Thus there is achieved in some considerable degree the principle of a marriage of planning and budgeting. The UK develops this interplay through an additional Under Secretary of the Treasury who is concerned with economic development. The parallel between the UK Treasury and the US Bureau of the Budget is striking. The Treasury has a crucial relationship to the Prime Minister and the Cabinet through the historic designation of the Prime Minister as the First Lord of the Treasury. In the United States, this relationship is achieved through the establishment of the Bureau of the Budget as the major component of the Executive Office of the President. The Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget are both broad administrative arms of their respective governments and have about two-thirds of their functions in common.

The United Arab Republic provides an interesting case of placing the budgetary agency and the planning agency in a single ministry which reports to the President through a chairman of a council of ministers. This plan was recommended by Drs. Luther Gulick and James K. Pollack in a recent report covering a comprehensive restructuring of the UAR government.

There are many advantages to this arrangement, for both plan formulation and as a general rule where budgeting is a part of a traditional ministry of finance, it tends to become a fiscal and accounting process rather than a policy formulation and programme decision-making process. In India an exceptionally high degree of cooperation and coordination appears to be achieved between planning and budgeting with a minimum of transaction control psychology injected into the budget process. Much needs to be done to develop an awareness in other countries of the need for budgeting to be made an instrument of value to the Head of State,

to each minister, and to their permanent administrators in fostering effective programme development and in administering and coordinating programmes within the agencies.

Administrative Obstacles to be Overcome

On this particular trip, during which I shall visit some twelve different countries, I am asking officials these questions: What are your major administrative problems? What are the major obstacles to development in your country? What are the things that are not taking place that must take place if real development is to be achieved? These are some common responses I have found so far:

First, a number of central planning officials point out that the Ministries and Departments do not understand how the development plan can really help them. They reject it. They have not been involved in it sufficiently or do not have the capability or understanding to realize that they are an integral part of the planning process, and that by participating effectively in it, they can help further their own interests.

Second, a point made a number of times is that the ministries are unable to develop solid sector plans and projects and to execute them within the original schedule and cost-estimates. This lack of administrative capabilities within ministries has been evident ever since countries began to engage in comprehensive development efforts. Programmes to improve departmental administration are imperative.

The *third* problem is that projects designed by the various ministries are vague; they are poorly described; they are not tested as to their feasibility, their economic viability, or their engineering potentiality; and the administrative requirements necessary to carry them out have not been determined in advance. A major effort is needed to train departmental personnel in planning, programming, scheduling, and in project preparation and management.

Fourth is the lack of coordination among the ministries and institutions which must play a role in the execution of a particular project. For example, the necessary funds do not get allocated to carry out the project. The personnel essential to the execution of the project are not authorized. The proceedings of loan funds are

not available when required. Foreign exchange may be denied for the purchase of equipment or materials essential to carry out the project. Materials may be delayed in customs. The paralyzing effect of a breakdown at some point in the machinery is evident everywhere. In addition to the initiation of management improvement programmes, provision is needed in the central planning or implementation agency and within the ministries for expeditors to clear up these bottlenecks.

Fifth, there is a lack of coordination among departments in relation to development work which has an impact on particular geographical areas, i.e., the question of major highways versus feeder highways; industrial development or agricultural projects; the interrelationship of agricultural development and industrial development as it takes place in particular regions. Each department tends to go its own way. For example, education is carried on in traditional terms with the assumption that every young person must have an elementary school education. This system does not respect the priorities that are needed in order to develop persons capable of carrying out specific development activities.

Sixth is the difficulty or failure to fit regional and local governments effectively into plan formulation or implementation. I have seldom seen a development plan of a country which recognizes either the role that the state, provincial, and local governments should play or the essential interrelationship of urban development and industrial development. With the tremendous increase in urban population, and with its dependence upon industrialization and urban infrastructure and services, we must develop much more understanding of the need for and methods whereby local, regional, and national governments will work together on a partnership basis.

Seventh, the point is frequently made that a profusion of governmental agencies makes the machinery excessively complicated to administer. All one has to do is to look at a chart of the agencies of Thailand to have a good case-illustration of the co-existence of an intolerable number of evidently duplicating agencies. This is a common ailment of many countries.

Concluding Notes

In conclusion may I suggest several steps to create the essential

administrative capabilities. *First* of all, the identification of the existence of a problem is a big step towards the solution of that problem. It is abundantly clear that administrative deficiencies are the major cause of the disappointing progress in most countries in achieving development. More obstacles would be removed if there were greater recognition that the formulation and implementation of a development plan is primarily an administrative problem rather than an economic one. When this is recognized the administrative actions to carry out the plan will be built into the plan itself, and the creation of the essential administrative instrumentalities and competences will become a primary step in plan implementation.

The *second* suggestion is a corollary of the first, namely, the necessity of vesting the plan agency with the function, on behalf of the chief of state, of exercising central coordination and direction to plan administration. Other staff agencies such as the budget and O & M office also have a crucial role to play in this responsibility and team work is vital. In the planning agency a separate staff should be charged with the execution.

Third is the necessity of assigning the ministries and other operating agencies a greater role in plan formulation. This requires the closest kind of relationships both in plan formulation and in execution. If the ministries were forced to participate more fully in plan preparation they would gain more capacity to execute their part of the plans.

The *fourth* step, which grows out of the third, is to develop, through central leadership, a sustained programme for building into the ministries the capabilities to formulate and manage projects and programmes. The permanent or chief secretary, or whatever he is called, must with the support of the minister, put the highest priority on creating effective planning and programming, budgeting, personnel administration, and supervision throughout the ministry. A sustained programme of administrative improvement headed by his O & M chief provides a mechanism for this purpose.

A *fifth* step is to involve the regional and local governments in plan preparation and execution. An important part of a national effort of this kind is to search for the administrative and political means for achieving this integration. Village or community development, urban development and industrialization, and regional

efforts through provinces or states must be fostered, supported, and coordinated.

Sixth is the need for continuous and effective evaluation of the validity of plans and their constituent programmes and projects. The instruments of evaluation must be built into the system both in the departments and in the central planning organ. This includes informative progress reports and a formalized system for determining the rate of progress and the adherence to time schedules. Without these there will be no mechanism to indicate promptly the need to take corrective measures. Most countries do not possess evaluating systems which can bring about these important corrective measures.

Finally, a word on education and research. If measures along these lines are to be taken, new kinds of personnel are needed. An examination in any country of the administrative obstacles to plan formulation and implementation will reveal serious shortages of personnel with essential blends of administrative and technical competences. If these shortages are matched against educational and training programmes, it will be found that the latter are not geared to producing the knowledge and skills required. New curricula and improved teaching methods are required for pre-service and in-service preparation of development administrators and technicians, project developers, managers, expeditors, and many other personnel. In my next lecture, I shall discuss some of the ways in which the necessary development administrators can be accomplished.

Likewise a more solid underpinning of research is required, especially to examine the kinds of administrative problems I have touched on in these remarks. Such research would contribute to the solving of particular problems and it could result in most useful materials both for teaching purposes and for operational guidance.

The work of the Indian Institute of Public Administration in this connection is most heartening. The close cooperation between the Institute, the Planning Commission, the O & M office of the Cabinet Secretariat, and other organizations, including foundations, U.N. agencies, and the Agency for International Development is most heartening. India is providing a guide for others to follow. Your experiences need fuller dissemination.

II

THE EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATOR

One of the best definitions I ever heard of an effective administrator was a person who managed to be present at the lifting of trouble. The situation of a person who follows an individual who is a very effective administrator and has created a great reputation is radically different from that of one who succeeds a man who has made a mess of things. We have all seen cases where a pleasant person with an impressive bearing and resonant voice, but with no leadership or managerial talent, has been viewed for a long time as being a great success merely because his predecessor, who may have been a far superior person, had to cope with a difficult political, financial, or internal problem for which he was not responsible. A person who may function and survive under one environment or set of circumstances may not prove to be effective under another.

Traditional vs. Developmental Administration

In my country the reputation of an administrator is also affected by the popularity of the programme he is administering. Any agreeable official in a newly created education agency will have more public prestige than the director of petrol rationing during a period of short supply – unless the latter was very effective, as was the case of Chester Bowles when he served as administrator of the Office of Price Administration during the war. In that case, his situation was enhanced by succeeding a very poor administrator.

Then there is the question of who does the evaluating. The minister has his criteria, the director of establishments uses other factors, the budget officer views the administrator with a quite different perspective, and his subordinates have many bases for judgment, often influenced by how they are doing or what life is like at home.

Thus my observations must be interpreted as being only one person's view of a subject which lacks reliable objective standards. My only qualification is that I have been an official of or served as a consultant to a large number of agencies at all levels of

government in several countries. I have learned enough to know the unreliability of almost anything anyone says on this subject, including myself. I could cite several instances of very bad assessment of the qualifications of administrators on my part.

In my discussion of "Administration for Development" I mentioned some of the major administrative tasks which I have found to be essential in bringing about rapid economic and social development, and advance in the modernization of a society. In considering the effective administrator for development, one must be aware of the kind of administration required to carry out the distinctive tasks in this complex field. In one of the questions on my previous discussion, the point was raised as to the adjustments necessary in the transition from an administration set up under a colonial regime to one under a state of independence – in a country which has become the architect of its own destiny. I think the administrative tasks are radically different and, therefore, the tasks and qualities of the administrator need to be different. The enforcement of law and order and the conduct of traditional services such as posts and telegraphs, require certain qualities on the part of the administrator. The knowledge and skills required of individuals endeavouring to bring about a radical change in the behaviour and values of people in order to carry forward economic and social advance is obviously greater and in many ways different.

Development is concerned with changing from a relatively static or traditional state of affairs to a dynamic, revolutionary one. The process of change obviously calls for planners, programmers, organizers, operators, and administrators who have an understanding and knowledge of how to bring about social, economic, administrative, and political change. We call this process – "the administration of change". If we approach the task of the administrator in this light and the kind of education most relevant to his needs, we can more readily see both the differences in the function of administration and the education required to perform that function.

Required Knowledge and Skills

What are some of the knowledges and skills that this kind of administrator should possess? First is the necessity for a more penetrating understanding of the environment in which change must take place. If one is to come to grips with the process of change

within an environment or culture, with its particular set of attitudes, relationships and behaviour, the approaches and methods to produce change must be compatible and effective within this environment. Indeed, the factors in the environment often become primary elements with which one must deal, and therefore, the ability to work effectively, to understand, and to become skilful in dealing with the complexities of the environment is a very basic requirement.

Second, an administrator concerned with development must have some genuine understanding of the processes of inducing change, because development as a process is concerned with how you foster, induce, or set in motion the forces that will bring about change. This means planning, organizing, implementing, and evaluating. This area of understanding and skill might be summed up under the term institution-building. We use this term to identify the process involved in moving from an objective to be accomplished to the actual creation of the organization, service, system, new practices, or relationships which evidence that change has actually taken place. This may be a school, a panchayat, a water distribution system, or any kind of organized effort that requires acceptance and response. We know all too little about the processes of institution-building.

Would not many benefits be derived if a number of institutions in different parts of the world would cooperate in case-studies of the means by which effective institutions are brought into being? From this we should learn something of the knowledge and skills that the administrator must have, and in turn, we will be able to develop materials for teaching and operational guidance that can be used in the preparation of this type of administrators. Recently we staged a conference of representatives of several United States universities that are interested in economic and social development. The Conference explored the potential interest in cooperative research in institution-building. The response was most gratifying. This group is now collaborating in a sustained research effort, and it is hoped that several institutions in other parts of the world will initiate similar studies so that this type of research and analysis can be conducted on an international basis. Perhaps this is something in which the Indian Institute of Public Administration might have an interest.

The third type of knowledge and skills is the development of proficiency in dealing with the substantive knowledge or technology of the functional field in which the administrator is operating. In saying this I realize I can start a vigorous debate as to whether it is preferable to develop administrators through suitable assignments and training from persons who have a specialized or professional education in a field such as engineering, agriculture, public health, or law, or whether administrators should be generalists whose education is of a broad character, with or without professional training in public administration. I am not seeking to raise that argument, although I am prepared to support all three positions.

In any event, one of the significant facts of life in the modern world is that administration in such functional fields as public works, education, agriculture, health, communication, and commerce and industry has become a vast and complex domain. Has it not become clear that administrators in these fields, i.e., the persons who are concerned with creating the institutions that make significant contributions to development, must have some significant grasp of the technology of their fields? I am not saying that the person must be a professional in that technology, but if he has no previous exposure to the field, surely he must devote himself passionately to mastering a sufficient understanding of the substance or technology of his agency to function in a sophisticated manner and to know when he must have the advice of specialists. Moreover, any good administrator must have commitment to and emotional involvement in the programme to which he is assigned. Too rapid rotation of civil servants or a spirit of detachment will not contribute to the fulfillment of this requirement.

The fourth type of skill, art, or capability that seems vital to me in the administration of development relates to the method of changing values and behaviour of people. This entails creating a desire for change, a will to achieve and an appetite for the benefits of development. The goals and methods of development must conversely be sustained by wide popular participation by those affected.

The fifth need of the administrator is a keen understanding of political processes and of the role of political leadership and support. He must have sensitivity and adaptability to work in a political

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
BAPRASTHA ESTATE NEW DELHI-2

6R-17817
dt. 2.2.11.06

environment. As I used to advise my staff in the Bureau of the Budget, "you must be politically sophisticated but not politically motivated."

The reality of life to anyone working in development is that development objectives lie at the centre of the political purposes of an enlightened nation. Therefore, any administrator in this field must support and facilitate legitimate political processes, as well as relate institution-building efforts to a changing value system.

The sixth, and in many ways the primary, competence is a broad grasp of the problems, processes, and practices encountered in the formulation of plans, programmes, and projects; in the design and operation of organization for their implementation, and in management and supervision. National development requires the invention of new kinds of administrative doctrine, instrumentalities, and systems. Administrators ignorant of these requisites and untutored in how to bring about administrative improvement will not make much contribution to a country's development goals.

An Innovative Spirit

The development administrator certainly must possess sufficient knowledge and skills of the type I have mentioned if he is to engage with assurance in whatever sector of responsibility is his lot. The technologies with which he deals and the organic settings in which he operates may vary greatly. For this reason his knowledge and skills should be designedly cultivated for these various roles, through either formal education or training on the job. It seems to me preferable to have some effective combination of both.

Any effective administrator is undergoing training on the job every day. We often overlook the potency as a training force of the experience gained in dealing with the practical problems and situations which confront one from day to day. The extent to which experience may develop a person depends upon the type of experience. In one kind of a role a person may have five or six days of experience each week, or he may have the same experience five or six times each week; he may have 52 weeks of experience in the course of a year, or he may have the same experience 52 times.

So it makes a tremendous difference what kind of experience it is — whether the person has been moved and has faced new

situation or whether his job has become one of merely turning the crank to keep some operation going. This development field is one in which there is very little crank turning. Almost everything one does must be of an innovative character.

Planning and Operating Roles

The role of the planning officer is quite different from that of a programme administrator, although both share some of the same kinds of technological knowledge, especially if they are working in the same general field or function. Too often, planners, formulating long term objectives, projections, and policies, have no background or orientation in the processes of social and administrative action. If the persons preparing a plan of action, over either a short or a long term, do not understand the above processes, the plan will falter.

To be effective, a plan must contain the administrative measures and instrumentalities essential to its execution. This is the common crippling deficiency in development plans. For this purpose, administrative experts who can contribute these inputs essential for plan realization are required in planning agencies. Without such provisions, the plans will likely end up gathering dust in some government archive.

Thus the plan itself must be a dynamic document. It becomes an instrument for action. The fact that it is a document is not important but rather that it represents a way of behaviour, a line of action, a sequence of decisions to be taken, and a means for implementing officials to bring about whatever type of change is embodied in the plan itself.

Likewise, the administrator must be sensitive to and able to deal with the multiple factors and forces involved in development. This means that anyone in a significant role must come to grips with all of the elements which are interrelated in the most varied and complex ways (the economic aspects, the social factors, the political forces, the legal requirements or framework in which a programme must function, the ethical issues involved, the physical or engineering requirements, etc.).

The roles within the sectors of development differ greatly, and the understanding and the insights and skills which one must develop

vary according to those roles. This is true whether one is an officer related to the chief of state, a member of the budget office of a ministry of finance, an administrator in a bureau of the budget, that is directly related to the prime minister or president, a public service commission officer, a departmental secretary in the health or agricultural field, a public works officer in a state, or an urban administrator.

Tasks Common to All Administrators

Nevertheless, I have found many similarities in the administrative process and the tasks of management, regardless of the character of the programme or the organizational setting. A knowledge of these similarities and of the elements contained in the process provides an important framework and a tool for the development administrator. This framework is being designed in many contexts by many persons, but no matter at what level of government a person is functioning – whether as in the role of a specialist or in a more generalized role – to the extent that he is working through an organization and is part of a team of persons carrying out a specific objective, he is always engaged in a continuous process.

First is the setting of objectives and formulating and reformulating the policies to sustain the goals; this entails securing support from higher authority of decisions in regard to such policies.

Translation of the objectives and policies into definitive programmes, such programmes to consist of activities, projects, and operations expressed in definable terms and scheduled according to the time periods of execution.

Incorporation of work programmes into budgets which allocate all appropriate financial resources to capital and current development purposes.

The development of organization structure suitable to the achievement of institutional goals and programmes.

Recruitment and development of personnel with the capabilities necessary to provide an effective development instrument.

Provision of the procedures, methods, and technical processes essential for the programmed endeavours.

Establishment of systems for the communication of knowledge,

ideas, and intelligence, upwards and downwards throughout the organization, so that each person can play a responsive role.

Motivation and stimulation of leadership and initiative throughout the organization by the interaction of the administrator's personality with others at all levels.

Evaluation of accomplishments – how affairs are going, and the initiation of corrective measures.

A Static vs. Dynamic Organization

May I illustrate the characteristics of an effective administrative organization and the importance of administrative leadership at all levels by describing an interesting fictitious case. This description has been very helpful to me in identifying the difference between a static organization and a dynamic one.

Let us assume that a decision had been made to create a new organization, a development bank for instance. A general manager has been selected as the chief administrator. He has been informed of the objectives and programme and has been allocated ample funds. He is given a period of time in which to develop the plan of organization, identify all of the posts which need to be filled, prepare a description of the functions of each post, and recruit persons who are ideal for each post. When all of the arrangements are worked out and all employees have been recruited, they are advised that on a certain Monday morning at 8-30 they are to report for duty. Quarters have been set up; desks, paper, typewriters, and all the other equipment and facilities provided; and all are told that when the whistle blows they should go to work.

I have posed this question to our students at Pittsburgh and asked them what would happen. At first there are diverse views, but after much argument it is usually agreed that nothing would happen. There would be chaos.

An essential factor of a dynamic organization is knowledge of supervisors and subordinates of what is expected and what to expect, of what and how others work in relationship to them, of how others think and react, and of what produces the best responses. If all actions must be based on thinking through all of the courses of action to make a determination of what is to be done – how, when, where, and by whom – as would be required in the

case illustration – so much time would be expended in securing facts and in making logical decisions, that little could be accomplished. Only when most decisions or actions are “non-logical” from a psychological standpoint, will supervisors and workers have time for innovations, new solutions, and new ideas.

Thus, an effective organization is one that has been developed to the point where most of the activity is done on the basis of habit, of assumption of what others will do, rather than having to start from the beginning to initiate each action as in the illustration. The major task of the administrator is to build effective patterns of behaviour and working relationships throughout the entire organization.

The Administrator as a Problem Solver

The administrator must obviously be a person who is especially skilful in identifying problems and working out their solutions. A person who can build a first class institution is a person who has the capacity to identify what needs to be done and has the ability to build his whole institution as an instrument for producing an “institutional product”.

Many persons tend to operate as isolated individuals. When working in an organization, it is the institutional product that becomes important. Does this not have profound implications in terms of how the administrator functions? On the need for capability of analysis and of carrying through the issue to decision? On the involvement of all persons within an organization who should be consulted to ensure that the decision is one that reflects the fullest wisdom available in the institution and has their support?

A great deal of attention is being given to decision making processes, and some of the research on this is very illuminating and helpful. On the other hand, I find that some of the writings on decision making are such that I fear that if an administrator really tried to reflect their implications through his own behaviour, he might be rendered impotent for making decisions himself. The process of making a decision involves what I call “visceral elements”. It also includes the interest in, and the capacity to come to grips with both fundamental policy and the technology that lies behind a problem. Is not this an area in which our decision

making literature is deficient? Do not administrators adhere slavishly to the rituals and processes for reaching decisions, without enough regard for pragmatic and empirical factors? Is not an important function of the competent administrator to contribute out of his total experience and sensitivities, almost at times, in a way that may not seem rational? To the extent that he has subjected himself to a life-long learning experience, the end contribution should be a highly rational one.

I have come to feel that skill in analyzing and solving problems – policy, programme, organization, procedure, public relations, and especially those of human behaviour and response – is, next to a sense of humour, the most important quality required of an administrator. The analytical process has universal application: (1) recognition that a problem exists, (2) identification of its general character and scope in order that it can be examined, (3) determination of how and by whom it will be analysed, (4) gathering of relevant facts, (5) analysis and synthesis of the facts and the formulation of conclusions as to causes and results, (6) design of alternate solutions, (7) test of the probable outcome under each alternative according to value criteria for the desired end results, (8) communication and negotiation to produce an “institutional” decision, (9) installation or effectuation of the solution, and (10) subsequent evaluation of how it has worked out and the introduction of whatever modifications may be indicated.

The full-time policy analyst and O & M officer, or a team of such persons, may spend weeks or months on a single problem. The top administrator, however, may have only ten minutes to make up his mind on an issue described in a file of papers or presented orally by his subordinates. But he must go through the same analytical process – highly telescoped to be sure – in those ten minutes. If his decision is overly influenced by precedent, prejudice, political, or personal considerations, the end result is what one sees all too frequently in most public and private services.

Since analytical or problem solving competence is required in all parts of an organization and at all levels, should not a far greater emphasis be placed on the development of such knowledge and skills both prior to and after recruitment? Educational programmes in public administration in most countries are largely doctrinaire,

descriptive, and based on the ability of the student to memorize what he has heard or read and "play it back" to his professor on examinations. A new volume of papers on teaching methods and materials discussed at the 1962 Vienna meeting of directors of institutes and schools of public administration under the auspices of the International Institute of Administrative Sciences provides illustrations of the problem solving approach to education. Professor Menon prepared one of the papers.

The especial merit of supervisor-oriented work simplification programmes is their emphasis on this problem solving process and on instruction in the use of simple analytical tools in examining and solving problems of work distribution, flow, and volume, and in casting up major problems requiring attention of higher authority. When administrators and employees at all levels in an organization are imbued with the conviction that there is always a better way of doing everything, and that each person has a responsibility for initiating improvements within his area of concern, a dynamic and effective institution results.

Functioning in an Adverse Environment

Administrators require the resilience to function in an adverse environment. No environment in which an administrator operates is the ideal one and the different adverse effects may vary greatly. He may be working under an unstable political situation; he may be charged with administering a function which for some technical reason, is incapable of being administered; or he may be denied the tools, funds, or resources to carry out the function. The programme may be strongly resisted by some groups in the population. In any event, any administrator who functions in a political environment will be faced with having to make many compromises on what he feels is the best solution or the most effective course of action.

The problem is how to make compromises without compromising one's self. The British civil service tradition has contributed significantly to the manner in which such accommodation is achieved. You have evolved your own accommodated approaches in India which other countries might well examine.

In the United States the civil servant is easy prey for criticism or ridicule by newspapers, legislators, pressure groups, or disaffected

citizens. He needs frequent reminders of Lord Holland's words:

"Who seeks to please all men each way
and not himself offend,
He may begin his work today
But God knows when he'll end."

Education for Development

This takes me to the last observation which returns to the question of education – the type of education that is most relevant to producing persons for this field of economic and social development. During the last five to ten years, educational programmes related to the public service have been created all over the world. Very few have focused upon development administration. Most public service education has not been geared to the knowledge and skills required to analyze, plan, organize, and implement development programmes and projects.

Universities everywhere have been preoccupied with other fields. They are in many respects the most traditional and inflexible of all of our institutions. As one of my colleagues commented, "the problem of changing a curriculum is a more difficult task than that of moving a cemetery." Where you have autonomous bodies or faculties in universities and faculty appointments are under life tenure, it may be impossible to make a change unless a professor has committed some abhorrent deed which discredits him publicly.

Where the final decision making is allocated to collegial groups, you have a setting conducive to minority control. You have the nullification of the principle of leadership under consent and exercised consultatively. The result is a static rather than a dynamic institution. Universities are today the ideal refuge of resisters to administrative modernization – the final hold-out to the utilization of administrative science in the solution of their problems.

Even in the most resourceful universities, there is insufficient recognition of the difference between professional education and education in the humanities and social science disciplines. Administration is obviously based upon the social sciences and the humanistic disciplines. On the other hand, professional education is concerned not only with the insights and understandings of the social sciences, but also with application. Development, as an aspect

of administration, is concerned especially with planning and effectuating change. The problems, processes, strategies, and methodologies for achieving development become the substance of professional education in development administration.

If an adequate cadre of persons capable of dealing with these complex processes is to be created in each country, do we not need to work together to introduce – even to force – new approaches to education into our universities and institutes? Is it not necessary to relate administration to the policies and the substance of what is being administered, to the technologies involved, and to the interplay between policy, substantive technology, and administration?

Most public administration education today came out of either one of two streams. One was the European continental stream of law or jurisprudence. Faculties of law have dominated education for public administration.

The other came primarily out of the stream in the United States that began with the governmental research movement, and was influenced in part by evolving thought in scientific management. As interest in the public service gained in the universities, the tendency was to build on political science courses by adding a few additional courses in administration – personnel, budgeting, administrative law, accounting and so on. The assumption has been that this makeshift arrangement produces a curriculum in the field of administration.

In my experience, the major problems were not of this segmented character. They arose in connection with: how do you develop an organization that is capable, for instance, of controlling prices or rationing foodstuffs? Or, how do you develop a programme which will bring about the renewal and redevelopment of an “urban community?” In the administration of development programmes, one has to deal with legal, financial, personnel, economic, social, political and many other factors as one complex in relation to the substance or technology of the particular issue or function. It seems to me, therefore, that education for the kind of administrator I have described must expose him to the whole range of subjects, processes, and problems encountered in this complex area.

Are not these, then, some of the things which we might think about as we approach the question: what are the requirements of the effective administrator and what kind of education should he have?

An argument took place between a landscape architect, an engineer, and a public administrator as to which belonged to the oldest profession. The landscape architect said: “I surely belong to the oldest profession because when you read of the Garden of Eden and how Adam and Eve came into being, you must realize that it was the landscape architect who designed that lovely place.”

The engineer said: “I am not so sure. If you read earlier in the Good Book, you will find that the earth was created out of chaos and who could create the earth but the engineer? It’s the oldest profession.”

After a thoughtful pause, the public administrator said: “Who do you suppose created chaos!”