

Ever since Woodrow Wilson published the first paper on the study of public administration, the subject evolved as an independent discipline. To lay the foundation of the subject, many scholars contributed to the process of theory building of public administration. As a result, various approaches evolved. Each approach contributed with a different perspective and methodology to answer problems encountered by modern society. The study of these approaches is an essential step towards acquiring a comfortable grip on the subject matter.

19

The approaches discussed in this unit defy the chronological arrangement. Their development and evolution are entangled in each other. Some grew parallel to others while some emerged out of formulations of others. Some grew as the antithesis of others while some appeared almost identical to each other. Nevertheless, no single approach can be sufficient and adequate to understand and explain everything in the subject of public administration. They are complementary to each other and the appropriate selection of approach to answering the given question is entirely dependent upon the student.

These approaches are the product and reaction to worldly phenomena and forces. Some broad forces that caused their emergence in the past century can be outlined as the growth of the capitalist economy, defeat of colonialism, technological innovations, and spread of democratic systems worldwide.

2.2 CLASSICAL, BUREAUCRATIC MODEL, HUMAN  
RELATIONS SCHOOL

### 2.2.1 Classical Approach to Public Administration:

The classical approach of public administration mainly dealt with the question of whether public administration is an art or a science. The major concern of the classical theory was to discover the objective laws on the lines of laws governing the natural world discovered by natural/physical sciences. These principles were presumed to be the prerequisite for improving the productivity, efficiency, and economy of organizations. The approach is developed by the likes of Luther Gulick, Lyndall Urwick, Henry Fayol, Mooney, Reiley, M.P. Follet, and Shelton. There are four defining features of classical theory-impersonality, specialization, efficiency, and hierarchy.

Luther Gulick authored several books and contributed to the field of science of administration and modern management. Urwick too wrote extensively on the science of administration. Both of them were greatly influenced by the work of Henri Fayol and Fredrick Taylor. Together they proposed the Classical Theory of Management also known as Administrative Management Theory. The theory defended public administration as a science. In the development of the classical theory of public administration, Gulick and Urwick laid stress on the importance of the study of the structure of the organization. Gulick identified 10 principles which according to him form the strong foundation of modern organizations. They are a division of labor, departmental organization, hierarchy, coordination, coordination committees, decentralization, unity of command, staff and line, delegation, and span of control. Urwick proposed 8 principles, viz. the objective of the organization, the principle

of correspondence, authority and responsibility, scalar principle, a span of 20

control, the principle of specialization coordination, and the principle of definition amongst other principles. The famous POSDCORB principles are the major contribution of Gulick that transformed the way the organizations are managed thereafter. They are illustrated as Planning, Organization, Staffing, Directing, Coordination, Reporting, and Budgeting.

Henry Fayol stated that management is the need of all human activities and organizations. He divided all activities of organizations into six groups: technical, commercial, financial, security, accounting, and administrative. He listed fourteen principles of organization which are: division of work, authority, discipline, unity of command, unity of direction, subordination of individual interest to general interest, remuneration of personal, centralization, scalar chain, order, equity, stability of tenure of personnel, initiative, and comradeships. Mooney and

Reiley emphasized the principle of scalar formation i.e. hierarchical, graded arrangement within the organization with a system of superior- subordinate relationships.

The classical approach is subjected to severe criticisms for its shortcomings. Herbert Simon dubbed the principles of public administration as “proverbs” mainly due to lack of empirical validity and universal applicability, both are the necessary conditions of the scientific status of the inquiry. The principles also lack consistency and appear to be contradictory to each other. The theory also neglects the human element in an organization. It projects organizations as a system of mechanical elements of which humans are placed as one of the parts. This mechanical

perception of human beings considers humans as an insignificant and passive element in the production process. The theory is accused of being pro-management and reduces human labor to the instrumental use in increasing productivity and efficiency in the organization.

### 2.2.2 Bureaucratic Model of Public Administration:

The bureaucratic model of public administration is the major contribution of Max Weber, a German Sociologist, to the field of Public Administration. His book *Economy and Society* published in 1922 contained his ideas of bureaucracy. His writings cover a large canvas of the study of ancient and modern states to elaborate the working of bureaucracies in different eras. He was greatly influenced by the ideas of Immanuel Kant and Heinrich Rickert. Under the influence of both, he borrowed the belief in rationalization as the core of working of economy, politics, society, culture, and religion in modern society.

According to Weber, the need to maintain armies, public finances, and the running of political affairs of the empires resulted in

bureaucratization in ancient times. Modern societies are more complex as compared to the ancient societies hence the administration too developed as a complex organism. He stressed that a bureaucratic state is

21

characterized by certain behavioral and structural features like division of labor, hierarchy, rules and rationality, impersonality, rules orientation, and neutrality.

Weber used the term 'rational-legal authority' to characterize the modern liberal states. He argued that authority can be classified into three

types namely, traditional authority, charismatic authority, and legal-rational authority. Traditional is based on the legitimacy endowed by the

virtue of heredity and customs or conventions. The charismatic authority received legitimacy from the personality traits of the individual. Both according to Weber are not suitable to the functioning of liberal democracy as they cause the irrational distribution of power and positions in the given society.

Weber was concerned with the functioning of a liberal democratic society for which he proposed rational-legal authority based on the legitimacy from the rule of law. The power in this type of authority emanates from the legal offices that the individuals hold. It is temporary and held by the official while holding the office for the term the positive law of the land permits to do so. Further, the persons to hold such authority are selected based on formal qualifications through the process established by the law. It is consistent with the political systems operating based on the Constitutions.

The bureaucratic model proposed by Weber invited criticism from various quarters. Herbert Simon and Chester Bernard argued that by following Weber's structural approach efficiency will be reduced, because informal organizations and better human relations are prerequisites for improved efficiency, and both are compromised in Weber's model.

Gouldner criticized Weber for denying the bureaucrat necessary operational freedom. By laying stress on obedience and discipline Weber kills innovations and pro-activeness among the administrators. Weber did not pay adequate attention to human behavior, relations, morale, and motivational factors. This made his model a mechanistic structure and

neglects the human side of the enterprise. Laski criticized Weber for replacing passion with routine, flexibility by rules, promptness by delay in action, and innovation by precedence in decision making.

### 2.2.3 Human Relations School of Public Administration:

Human Relations school countered the mechanical conception of scientific management theory and placed human beings at the center of administrative thinking. The theory stressed that administrative organizations are comprised of individuals with different psychological motivations and thus their behavior inside the organizations exhibits socio-psychological dynamics. Some important thinkers of this school are Robert Merton, FJ Roethlisberger, Alex Bavelas, Keith Davis, A H Maslow, D Cartwright, Leonard Sayles, and Chris Argyris.

22

Elton Mayo is the chief exponent of the human relations theory of public administration. The famous Hawthorne experiments conducted under his supervision investigated the relationship between productivity and factors like the physical conditions at the workplace (lighting, humidity, temperature, and hours of sleep), participation of workers, social relations, and networks among the workers. The experiment was conducted in several phases during the interwar period and established the new paradigm in Managerial Studies.

The approach mainly stressed that human beings are motivated by several factors like social environment, group dynamics, personal goals, value systems, beliefs, code of conduct, and ethics. It is necessary to align these factors with that of the organization's objective to get a better result

in terms of the efficiency of the workers. The theory demonstrated that the classical understanding of measuring and setting targets for employees and motivating them by providing economical incentives may not always work. The theory also rejected the efforts of the scientific management approach explaining the working of organizations based on certain objective principles of organizations.

The theory highlighted the importance of human factors like informal relationships and the group dynamics in day to day operations of an organization which is as complex as the formal structure and mechanism of modern organizations.

Human relations theory was criticized for adopting an anti-union stand. The theory underestimated the scope of worker-management conflict and labor unrest. There was fear that the theory might be misused by management for exploitation of the working-class by manipulating workers to comply with management directives instead of bringing management to an understanding of human nature and thereby bringing in the necessary changes in the organization. The theory is also criticized for overstating human needs while undermining the need for accomplishment or responsibility. It is also said that the so-called stated relationship between employee satisfaction and increased productivity has no universal validity.

## 2.3 SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT, BEHAVIORAL, STRUCTURAL-FUNCTIONAL APPROACH.

### 2.3.1 Scientific Management Approach of Public Administration:

The idea of scientific management originated in the latter part of

the 19th Century as a result of industrialization in America. Henry R. Towne (1844-1924), is the early exponent of this approach. In the paper presented in 1886, titled "The Engineer as an Economist", he argued that the time has come for the engineers to pay attention to the development of management techniques as a part of their engineering profession. The term

23

'scientific management' was coined by Louis Brandies in 1910. The approach is mainly known due to the work of F. W. Taylor who is regarded as the father of Scientific Management. Taylor argued that like any other social or personal activity management is also a science. The application of scientific principles improves the performance of these activities. His major works are A Piece-rate System (1895), Shop Management (1903), The Art of Cutting Metals (1906), and The Principles of Scientific Management (1911).

Taylor criticized the managerial style of traditional managers as authoritarian and ill-suited for running modern workplaces. According to him, they were guilty of neglecting their managerial responsibilities of determining standards, planning work, organizing, controlling, and devising incentive schemes. According to him, the foremost objective of management should be to pay high wages and have low unit production costs to achieve the increased industrial efficiency. His philosophy of scientific management is that there is no inherent conflict in the interest of the employers, workers, and consumers. The results of higher productivity should equally benefit all people i.e. workers, employers, and consumers in the shape of higher wages to the workers, greater profits to the



management, and payment of lower prices for the products by the consumers.

Taylor's philosophy of management was based on four basic principles of scientific management:

a) Development of True Science of Work:

Taylor had a tremendous belief in the capacity of scientific methodology to improve productivity and solve problems of human organizations. He suggested the application of scientific methods of research and experiments. He believed that 'science, not rule of thumb' will enable the organizations to enhance productivity, help the workers to increase earnings, and help the company to prosper.

b) Harmony, Not Discord:

As per this principle, the atmosphere in the organization should be of mutual trust and harmony. The management and the labor should follow the 'mental revolution' to end all conflicts between the two parties for the sake of the benefit of each other.

C) Cooperation, Not Individualism:

Taylor suggested that the manager and the workers should develop the spirit of cooperation. They should decide together the standards of performance and put collective effort to achieve those. This will increase the involvement and participation of the workers in decision-making and therefore will develop the feeling of responsibility.

24

d) Development of Every Person to His / Her Greatest Efficiency and Prosperity:

Taylor recognized the need for the scientific method of selection of the right employees for the appropriate jobs based on their initial qualifications and potential for further learning. He wanted the effective supervision of a worker and his working conditions after placing the worker in the right place. Taylor laid the foundation for modern personnel management by emphasizing bringing together the science of work and scientifically selected and trained Men.

F.W. Taylor followed scientific methods to answer the problems of management during his professional career as a mechanical engineer. He conducted series of experiments to know the most effective tool, the optimum cutting speed, etc. His experiments led to the discovery of high- speed steel. In the development of the shop system, Taylor conducted a controlled experiment to know how long a man or a machine would or should take to perform a given task, in a specified process, using specified material and methods. In another experiment, he analyzed how the workers handled materials, machines, and tools and attempted to determine the ability of workers in dealing with equipment and materials. To counter the practice of soldiering among workers and to improve efficiency, he conducted experiments to determine the best level of performance for jobs and the conditions necessary to achieve that level. Taylor proposed a piece-rate system to improve the wage administration in a factory.

### 2.3.2 Behavioral Approach of Public Administration:

The behavioral approach was the result of the reaction to the bureaucratic, institutional-structural, and organizational approach. It challenged the so-called scientific management approach that laid undue emphasis on the discovery of universal objective laws of organizational

structures.

The behavioral approach developed in the fourth decade of the 20th Century. It focuses on the actual behavior of individuals and groups in organizations. Herbert Simon and Robert Dahl were the major exponents of behavioralism in public administration. They argued that administrative behavior is a part of behavioral science and public administration should study individual and collective human behavior.

The behavioral approach is largely descriptive. Individuals are paid adequate attention in the analysis of organizations. In the behavioral approach factors like motivation, decision making, authority and regulation are given due emphasis.

The approach laid stress on the informal aspects of an organization. The patterns of communication are studied to understand the working style of members as well as leaders amongst themselves and with each other. The methodology of inquiry is empirical and applies field study, laboratory experiments, and application of statistical methods for systematically analyzing data. The approach is interdisciplinary and

25

borrowing theories, concepts, and formulations from other social sciences like social psychology and cultural anthropology.

The behavioral approach expanded the canvas of understanding of public administration by paying adequate attention to the effect of political, social, economic, and psychological environments on human motivation. It resolved that this broader context determines the level of contribution of an individual to the working of the administration. The

choices that leaders make, the effect of human sentiments on the working of administration, role of biases, and perceptions of leaders as well as followers in the working of an organization are studied by behaviouralists. The approach stirred the field of administrative studies by opening new frontiers of cross-structural and cross-cultural administrative behaviors that resulted in the development of a comparative approach to public administration.

The behavioral approach is criticized for its limited utility to analyze all types of administrative phenomena. The formulations of behavioral sciences have limited application to explain only administrative behavior. Other dimensions and issues of administration remain largely beyond the scope of the theory. Behavioral science per se is mainly helpful to study small social groups and individuals, whereas public administration covers a huge size of the human collective activity of larger human communities. One of the major criticism is the neglect of human values and norms in the study of human behavior. Value neutrality of behavioral sciences makes the study of public administration sterile and irrelevant to the vital issues of the modern age. Human values cannot be quantified or observed and do not qualify to be fit enough to be the subject matter of the behavioral approach. Public administration without human values will be reduced to the machine producing desired output, which is just not possible.

### 2.3.3 Structural-Functional Approach of Public Administration:

Fred Riggs is considered the chief exponent of the structuralfunctional approach of administration. The approach borrowed theoretical

formulations of the structural and functional school of Malinowski and

Redcliff Brown from the disciplines of sociology and anthropology.

According to them, society has norms, customs, traditions, and institutions that collectively form the structures and functions of that society. In the absence of those or failure of their working, the society will become dysfunctional or decay. Major proponents of this approach are Gabriel Almond, David Apter, Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton, and Fred Riggs.

Fred Riggs was interested in understanding the administrations of societies other than America, especially of the developing countries. He resorted to the structural-functional approach of Anthropology and Sociology and followed terminology and conceptual framework to

26

understand the distinct and unfamiliar societies of the developing world.

In this way, Riggs contributed an effective analytical tool to understand and comparatively study public administration. The approach analyses the administration, both as a concrete

system of departments and sections held together by shared beliefs, customs, and morals as well as abstract or analytic formed by power or authority. These structures perform certain functions like communication, administration, lawmaking, adjudication, etc. These structures display characteristics like hierarchy, specialization, rules, and roles. There can be behavioral attributes of these structures like rationality, neutrality, professionalism, and rule orientation.

The structural functionalists believed that similar kinds of structures do not necessarily perform the same functions across organizations. A single structure can very well perform multiple functions while multiple structures can perform a single function.

According to Riggs, economic, socio-communicational, symbolic, and political are four functional requisites of a society. Riggs proposed a

Prismatic Model that illustrates how the society transitioned from a traditional to a modern industrialized way of life. The traditional society according to him has a fused structure while industrial modern society is diffracted. As the light passes through a prism, the white light represents a fused structure of traditional society and the resultant rainbow represents refracted structures of an industrialized society.

## 2.4 MARXIAN, PUBLIC CHOICE, POST-MODERN.

### 2.4.1 Marxian Approach of Public Administration:

Marxian Approach is named after Karl Marx, a renowned philosopher of the 19th Century whose contribution to the field of human sciences is path-breaking in terms of volume and scope, breadth, and depth of his formulations spread across multiple disciplines. Marxian approach to public administration can better be understood from the implication of his general theory of Communism rather than his direct handling of the topic which is rare to find in his writings. Steward Clegg, David Dunkerly, Nicos Mouzelis, Braverman are the main exponent of the Marxian approach.

Marx opined that bureaucracy is the political expression of the division of labor. He suggested that bureaucracy creates conditions that subject people to gross manipulations. In Marxian analysis, the state is the agent of the bourgeoisie class and serves their interest against the interest of the masses. Masses are impoverished and controlled by the state through the apparatus of bureaucracy. In a capitalist society, bureaucracy operates hand in glove with the dominant class and projects the interests of

the haves as that of the interest of the entire society.

27

In this sense bureaucracy is mainly an oppressive system beyond the comprehension and control of the Proletariat. Although it masquerades as efficient and comprised of meritorious individuals, in reality, it is utterly incompetent and does not serve the function which it claims. In a certain way, it has certain symbols and secret ways of working and staunch traditions that make it a class in itself maintained to continue the state control over the allocation of resources.

Marx predicted that following class struggle the state will wither away. Bureaucracy as the instrument of the state will also end along with it. In the resultant Communist society, the functions of the bureaucracy would be taken over by the members of the society. In the course of events, the exploitative nature of the administration will go away and be replaced by the management of things and not of the people.

In the transition phase between the proletariat revolution and the establishment of an egalitarian communist society, the state will be controlled by the proletariat. During the domination of the proletariat, state bureaucracy will act as an agent of social transformation to get rid of bourgeoisie elements in the society. In the Marxist tradition, this is treated as a transitional phenomenon.

The critics of the Marxian school of administration argued that in socialist systems bureaucracy constituted as a "New Class", i.e. ruling in the name of the proletariat. This class exhibits dictatorial tendencies with strong vices of red-tapism, secrecy, disregard for human rights, and self-aggrandizement.

#### 2.4.2 Public Choice Approach of Public Administration:

The Public Choice Approach to public administration emerged in the 1960s. Vincent Ostrom was the chief exponent of this approach. He called to replace the traditional paradigm of bureaucratic administration with a democratic administration. The Public Choice Approach advocated institutional pluralism in the provision of public goods and services. It emphasizes institutional pluralism, diverse democratic decision-making, and management of public service distribution by applying the logic of economics, decentralization, and participation of people in Administration. It is highly critical of the traditional bureaucratic process which follows single centralized administrative power, separation of politics from administration, administrative hierarchy, and rational neutral bureaucracy.

The Public Choice Approach to public administration challenged the dichotomy of politics and administration. The first generation administrative thinkers like Wilson, Goodnow, White, and Willoughby formulated the separation of political functions and administrative functions of the government. This distinction prevailed for a near half-century and influenced the practice of public administration thereto. This

view was subjected to criticism after the Second World War. Post world

28

war period witnessed a crisis of identity in the subject of public administration. The effort to separate politics and administration was perceived to be futile while dealing with changing circumstances worldwide. Separation of administration from politics, implementation from policy-making, and private from public administration is reworked



and a new integrated approach to public administration became the new paradigm of administrative theory.

Other exponents of this approach are Buchanan, Downs, Olson, Tullock, Mitchell, Niskanen, and Oppenheimer. They formulated the theory of administrative egoism. The approach suggested that the real-life bureaucracy is usually hostile to the public interest and favors resource manipulation and self-aggrandizement. They believe that bureaucrats prefer self-interest over the public interest. Such behaviors and attitudes lead to an increase in size and costs of government and inflated departmental budgets. Bureaucracy is responsible for the declining quality of public services. There is no such thing as neutral and rational bureaucracy.

The approach suggested the new paradigm of government collaboration with market forces and remodeling of working of government to increase efficiency through competitiveness. Public Choice is the economic theory of politics as well as public administration. Choice implies competition. The competition improves the standards of services. The 'public choice' approach challenged the state monopoly in the provision of public goods and services. It believes that the multiplicity of service providers gives individual citizens the necessary choice. An individual knows his self-interest and would maximize this in his choices. The Public Choice Approach challenges the traditionally established public interest theory of democratic government that assumes that decision-making in government is motivated by unselfish benevolence by elected representatives or full-time government employees, thus public

servants are motivated by a desire to maximize society's welfare. As against it, Public Choice Approach argues that career bureaucracy is inefficient and unresponsive because it is not subject to market forces. Civil servants' attitude towards consumers of their services is different from the attitude of private sector producers to his customers. The producer's revenue comes from his customer but in government, there is no clear correlation between public revenue and expenditure: the revenue comes from the finance ministry. Secondly, a civil servant has little incentive to minimize the costs and maximum profits. In government, he does not gain financially from any such transaction.

Niskanen suggested increasing competition among the bureau for the supply of public services. He also advised changing the incentives for bureaucracy to motivate them. He further suggested increasing the competition to the bureaucracy by greater use of private sources for the supply of public services.

29

The public choice school has recommended organizational reforms like reducing the role of the state, curbing the power of government monopolies, constitutional checks to curb the power of politicians and civil servants of running budget deficits or imposing taxation beyond a certain extent. Further, the approach suggests separation of the advisory, regulatory, and delivery functions of bureaucracy, privatization of health care or education reducing the size of bureaucracies, controlling the governmental expenditures, and promoting competitiveness among public agencies.

### 2.4.3 Post-Modern Approach of Public Administration:

Postmodern Public Administration is the most recent addition to the field of public administration. The term post-modernism was coined by literary critics and French philosophers like Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Francois Lyotard, German philosophers like Nietzsche and Heidegger in the 1960s. In public administration, the roots of post-modernism can be traced to the United States of America. In American Public Administration the core of the post-modern discussion was started by a small group of scholars organized by Public Administration Theory- Network (PAT-Net, 1981) and held its first national conference in 1988, in the USA. They were inspired by Gareth Morgan's Book (1986) 'Images of Organization', which discussed the contemporary trends in organizational and cultural sociology and how our thinking about the organization may be understood as metaphors rather than as anything "real". To strengthen our creative abilities in thinking, Morgan said we should think in terms of 'imagination' rather than 'organization.'

Public administration as a study is part of social sciences. Social scientists since the last 150 years have been preoccupied with modernity and the characteristics of modern society and industrialization. Thinkers like Karl Marx, Durkheim, and Max Weber interpreted modernity in their way. The industrial revolution is the basis of modernity. The term the postmodern denotes that modern is gone and that something new which is postmodern has taken over. Public administration covers institutions, government, the process of administration, etc. Post-modernism questions the relevance to various social or public institutions and challenges the ontological presuppositions about the society and the individual.

Modernism believes in organizational rationality. Rationality is the basis because organizations are established from the Industrial Revolution. Rational thinking is modernity. Post-modernism debunks this rational process and denies that such principles can be mastered by the administrators.

The postmodern reaction against 20th-century modernism takes the form of a new type of system criticizing the hierarchy-based structure in public administration, supporting group activity, and supporting socially

30

excluded and oppressed groups in society. At the same time, the postmodernists are against categorization.

Postmodernism questions the underlying assumptions and methods in social sciences. It questions the meaningfulness of the concept of objective knowledge. Modernists use scientific methods like documentation analysis, statistical analysis, survey methods, and other rigorous procedures of inquiry but post-modernists are against these methods. Modernists call this morality in the research methods to understand something. But postmodernists prefer relativism to objectivity.

A rational idea or a thought is replaced by processes of reasoning.

Post-modernism inclines toward decentralization, individualization, and internationalization. The worldwide matrix organization, outsourcing, and the user-run public organizations are characteristic organizational features of postmodern conditions. In public administration, it advocates for a retreat from central planning and reliance on specialists. In political science, it questions the authority of

hierarchical, bureaucratic decision-making structures, that function in carefully defined spheres.

There are post-modernist writers like Fox and Miller who are often concerned with the contrast between the contemporary state of Public Administration and various ideas outlined in normative theories. They raise the question about the contemporary state of public administration. Post-modernism contains assumptions associated with imagination, deconstruction, deterritorialization, and alterity. Imagination counters the limits of rational bureaucracy based on rule observance. While the modernists relied on rationalization, the post-modernists relied on imagination. Deconstruction of texts, events, and symbols reveals how “reality” is socially constructed and thereby enabling new perspectives.

Farmer used the method of deconstruction to question what lies underneath the seemingly well-established categories such as bureaucratic phenomena. The public administrators should use the method of post-modern analysis to re-examine their fundamental assumptions based on

fixed paradigms, concepts, and categories. According to Farmer enhancing efficiency does not constitute good administration. Rather, a society in which the marginalized section of the community i.e. the poor, the oppressed, and the downtrodden including women are liberated, that society is well-administered. Thus, efficiency is not an important criterion for post-modernists. Efficiency should not be interpreted merely as a straightforward formula or a ratio but, in the words of Dwight Waldo, it should be within a framework of consciously held values in the society.

Under post-modern conditions, the alternative values such as fairness, equality, utility, and autonomy may be furthered, but they must meet the

formal requirements of the modern strategy to get recognition in the policy design phase. Deterritorialization refers to radical changes in the structure of thinking under post-modernism, opposing such rationalist concepts as

31

central planning and other authority-based structures. Alterity refers to empathy with and a new focus on socially excluded and oppressed groups. In the process, the modern assumptions underlying representation is negated. Alterity refers to the moral stance that counterweighs the standard bureaucratic-efficiency model of public administration. Farmer firmly takes an anti-administrative stance in this regard. He wants administrators to become less authoritative and more service-oriented. He said there is no one single way of understanding and diversity must be furthered.

Post-modernists created the concept of discursive democracy. It implies a pro-active role for public administrators. Public officials or administrators should be more pragmatic in their dealings with the people. They should look for an adaptive process to create a democratic environment. The post-modernists opine that there should be a reengagement of the government with its people and the participation of the civil servants in their environments, as conscious actors in a democratic system. Public administration should be more facilitative in the sense that it should make efforts to involve citizens in the administrative process through collaborative pragmatism. Pragmatism demands experimentation and learning through experience and not rigid adherence to any particular system of governance. But it should be based on a

democratic understanding of its multiple realities and conflicts. The post-modernists say that there should not be any grand theorizing or grand

narratives in public administration. The administrator should be a transformative, facilitative, public service practitioner.

Under post-modernism, there is a concept of critical theory, according to which agents/administrators work towards emancipation.

They try to transform society through dialogue, discussion, education. The role of the administrators is that of a mediator in a critical analysis or in the process of resolving the tensions and stresses which arise on account of contradictions, opposition and negation.

E-governance that is electronic governance is the use of Information and Communication Technology to carry out the functioning of the government of a country. E-governance simply means the application of ICT to transform the efficiency, effectiveness, transparency, and accountability of the exchange of information and transaction between governments, government agencies, government and citizens, government and business. The concept of E-governance aims to empower people through the mechanism of providing them access to information. The major objective of E-governance is to offer a SMART Government. The acronym SMART implies Simple, Moral, Accountable, Responsive, Responsible, and Transparent government.

Advantages of E-governance:

1.Speed: Technology enhances communication to be speedier. Internet, Cell phones have reduced the time taken in normal communication.

2. Cost Reduction: Most of the government expenditure is formulated towards the cost of stationary. Traditional paper-based communication requires a lot of stationary, printers, computers, etc. which leads to continuous heavy expenditure. However, modern technology like the Internet, Phones makes communication faster and cheaper saving valuable money for the government.

3.Transparency:The use of ICT makes governing and administrative processes transparent. All the crucial information of the government can be made available on the internet. The citizens can have a look at the information at their ease. However, it can be only made possible when every unit of the information of the government is correctly uploaded on the internet and is made available for the public to peruse.

4.Accountability: Once the governing and administrative process becomes transparent then the government is ultimately made accountable.

73

Accountability usually implies the answerability of the government to the public. It is often the answerability for the deeds of the government. An accountable government is always considered a responsible government.

Therefore, the administration worldwide has got qualitative and quantitative transformations through the implementation of ICT. The impact of E-governance in reforming and assessing public administration has become a part of the academic discourse on good governance. The concept of E-governance now has become an accepted aspect for



improving and enhancing the quality of the delivery of public services. Reforming government processes is crucial for establishing transparency, efficiency, productivity, and reducing bureaucratic controls. The pace, transparency, and accountability associated with E-governance have the valuable potential to make public administration responsive to ensure good governance. Thus, we can say that E-governance is the effective mechanism of Good Governance for developing countries like India to reduce corruption, provide efficient and effective quality services to their citizens.

#### 7.4 ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY

The concept of 'Civil Society' has come into existence to enjoy much political, administrative and intellectual currency in recent years. But it has a fairly long historical background. So traditionally the two terms 'State' and 'Civil Society' were used interchangeably and treated synonymously and this trend continued till the 18th century. G.W.F Hegel is considered the first political philosopher who separated and differentiated civil society from state. His footsteps were followed by Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels in the 19th Century. In the 20th Century, Antonio Gramsci conceptualized the concept of Civil Society. So, a Civil Society covers all forms of voluntary association and social interaction which is not controlled by the state.

Features of Civil Society:

- 1.) It is often referred to as non-state institutions, organized society and covers a large space in society.
- 2.) It considers the groups which are intermediate between the State (political society) and family (national society).

3.) Though it is considered autonomous, it is subjected to the authority of the state.

4.) It is in pursuit of a common public good.

5.) It effectively facilitates citizen's participation in politico- administrative affairs.

6.) Its crucial attribute is voluntarism, not coercion.

7.) It preaches pluralism to reduce the degree of domination of the State.

74

8.) It strongly implies the existence of freedom of association, freedom of thought, and other civil and economic rights.

Components of Civil Society:

The components included under the umbrella concept of Civil Society are:

1.) Non-governmental organizations

2.) Trade Unions

3.) Cooperatives

4.) Farmer's Organization

5.) Youth Groups

6.) Religious associations

7.) Women's groups.

In the USA, the concept of Civil Society is highly developed, while the scenario in India is that the concept is fast growing since the 1970s. In India Civil Society is observed as a fluid association of social groupings or on religious mobilization as much as on voluntary social associations.

Role of Civil Society:

Civil Society plays a crucial role in welfare and development

administration. The various dimensions of their role are:

- 1.) Civil society mobilizes the poor for socio-economic development.
- 2.) It disseminates information and helps in creating awareness among the public regarding various schemes, programs, projects enacted by the government for their betterment.
- 3.) Enhances public participation in the administrative process.
- 4.) Facilitates the administrative machinery to become more responsive to the needs and aspirations of the people.
- 5.) It helps in imposing a community system of accountability on the working of administrative machinery at lower levels. Thus, it helps in reducing the scope of corruption.
- 6.) Helps in creating political consciousness among the people by discussing various political issues.
- 7.) It acts as the watchdogs of the public interest.

Limitations of Civil Society:

Thus, there are some limitations also of the voluntary organizations which are a part of civil society.

- 1.) Lack of sufficient monetary resources
- 75
- 2.) Lack of efficient and trained workers
- 3.) Bureaucratic non-cooperation and resistance
- 4.) Insufficient information base
- 5.) Stipulated functional perspective (nonholistic approach).
- 6.) Political disturbance and influence
- 7.) Resistance from local landlords, money lenders, etc.

8.) A diverse socio-economic, political environment like casteism, communalism, poverty, etc.

Therefore, assessing the relative merit and demerit of Civil Society

and the Voluntary Sector, the World Development Report 1997 stated that,

the voluntary sector portrays its strengths to the table but also its

weakness. It rigorously enhances public awareness, raising citizens' concerns, and delivering services.

Local self-help organizations are

sometimes considered the givers of local public goods and services,

because of their closeness to local matters. However, their concern is often

for certain religious groups and not particularly to society as a whole.

Their accountability is often limited and their resources are constrained.

**OMBUDSMAN SYSTEM** Modern democratic states are often identified by welfare orientation. However, the government has come to play a crucial role in the social, economic, and political development of the nation and this has ultimately resulted in the wider expansion of bureaucracy and the multiplication of administrative process, which in turn has eventually increased the administrative power and discretion enjoyed by the civil servants at different levels of the government. Thus, the misuse or abuse of this power and discretion by civil servants opens up scope for harassment, malpractices, maladministration, and corruption and such a type of situation often gives rise to citizen's grievances against the administration. The true success of democracy and the achievement of social, economic, and political development depend on the degree to which the citizen's grievances are redressed. Therefore, the institutional device formulated for citizen's grievances is called as Ombudsman System. The earliest device of a democratic institution established in the world for speedy and fastest redressal of citizen's grievance is the Scandinavian institution of Ombudsman. The institutional device of the Ombudsman was created for the first time in Sweden in 1809. 'Ombud' is a Swedish word that means a person who acts as the representative or spokesman of another person. The Swedish institutional system of Ombudsman deals with the citizen's grievances in the following matters: 1.) Misuse of administrative power and authority 2.) Maladministration i.e. inefficiency in achieving the goal and targets. 3.) Corruption in administrative work that is demanding bribery for doing things 4.) Nepotism 5.) Discourtesy i.e. misbehavior, for instance, use of abusive language. The Swedish Ombudsman is appointed by the Parliament for a tenure of four years. He is subjected to get removed only by the

Parliament on the ground of its loss of confidence in him. He is subjected to submit his annual report to the Parliament and therefore is known as 'Parliamentary Ombudsman'. But he is independent of the Parliament (legislature) as well as the executive and judiciary. Moreover, the Ombudsman system is a Constitutional authority and completely enjoys the powers and privileges to supervise the compliance of laws and regulations, by the public administrators and see to it that they discharge their duties properly. But the Ombudsman does not have the power to reverse or quash a decision and has no direct control over administration or the Courts. The Ombudsman can act either based on a complaint lodged by the citizen against unfair administrative action or Suo Moto. He can prosecute any hearing officially including the judges. But he cannot inflict any punishment. He can only report the matter to higher authorities to take necessary corrective action. Characteristics of the Ombudsman system are: 1.) Independence of action is granted from the executive. 2.) Impartial and objective investigation of complaints 3.) Suo moto power to start investigations. 4.) Right to report to the Parliament as opposed to the executive. The institution of Ombudsman is primarily based on the concept of administrative accountability to legislature. 5.) Wide publicity is given to its working in press and others. 6.) Direct, Simple, informal, cheap, speedy method of handling the received complaints. In Sweden initially, the Ombudsman was created but then it spread to other Scandinavian countries like Finland (1919), Denmark (1955), and Norway (1962). However, New Zealand is considered to be the first Commonwealth country in the world to have adopted the institutional device of the Ombudsman system in the form of Parliamentary Commissioner for investigation in 1962. Since then more than 40 countries of the world have adopted the Ombudsman system with different nomenclature and functions. In India, the Ombudsman is called Lokpal and Lokayukta. Hence, the system of Ombudsman is a very crucial institution for the protection of democratic rights and freedoms and to free the general administration from corruption and inefficiency and in Scandinavian countries, the Ombudsman is regarded very important as it plays a crucial role in granting redressal to citizen's grievances.

## 8.2 LOK PAL

The Administrative Reforms Commission (ARC) which was initially headed by the eminent leader Morarji Desai submitted a special and important interim report on 'Problems of Redressal of Citizen's Grievances' in the year 1966. In this particular report, the ARC specially initiated for setting up of two important authorities designated as 'Lokpal' and 'Lokayukta' with the main of providing speedy redressal of citizen's grievances. These particular institutions were to be set up based on the model of the institution of Ombudsman in Scandinavian countries. The Lokpal specifically deals with complaints against ministers and secretaries at the Central and State levels. The ARC kept the judiciary outside the purview of Lokpal and Lokayukta as it is present in New Zealand. But in the case of Sweden, the judicial system is within the purview of the Ombudsman. According to the policies of ARC, the Lokpal would be appointed by the President after consultation with the Chief Justice of India, the Speaker of Lok Sabha, and the Chairman of Rajya Sabha. The government of India has accepted the policies and recommendations of ARC. The recommendations formulated by ARC are: 1.) They should be independent and impartial. 2.) Their investigations and proceedings shall be conducted in private and should be uniform. 3.) Their appointment shall as far as possible should be non-political. 4.) Their job is to tackle the issues basically in the discretionary field involving acts of injustice, corruption, and favoritism. 5.) Their proceedings should not be subjected to judicial interference and they should have the maximum latitude and powers in obtaining information relevant to their particular duties 6.) They should not look forward to any benefit from the executive government. So far, 8 official attempts have

been initiated to bring about legislation on the Lok pal subject. Bills were introduced in 1968, 1971, 1977, 1985, 1989, 1996, 1998, and in August 2001 by the NDA 79 government under A.B. Vajpayee. However, none of the bills have been passed in the Parliament due to some reasons. The salient features of the 2001 Lokpal bill are as follows: 1.) The bill effectively emphasizes the enactment of Lokpal to inquire into allegations of corruption against public officials including the Prime Minister, provided the offense committed is within 10 years from the day the complaint is lodged. 2.) The institution of Lokpal shall include a chairperson who is or has been a Chief Justice or a Judge of the Supreme Court and two members who are or have been the Judges of the Supreme Court or the Chief Justice of High Court. 3.) The chairpersons and members need to be appointed by the President of India on the recommendation of a committee which is under the control of the Vice President of India and comprising the Prime Minister, the Speaker of Lok Sabha, Home Minister, Leader of the House other than the House in which the Prime Minister is a member and leaders of the opposition in both the Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha. 4.) The bill focuses on a fixed tenure of 3 years for the chairperson and the members. 5.) The bill entrusts that the Lokpal is capable of functioning independently and discharge its functions without any kind of fear or favor. 6.) The institution of Lokpal will look into complaints alleging that a public official has committed an offense punishable under the Prevention of Corruption Act 1983. Now public officials include the Prime Minister and Member of Parliament. The judges of the Supreme Court and the institution of the Election Commission have been subsequently kept out of the jurisdiction of Lok pal. 7.) The complaints and allegations against the Prime Minister related to his functions and duties in the matters of national security and maintenance of public order have also been kept out of the purview of Lokpal. 8.) To enable the Lokpal to carry out its function efficiently and in a quasi-judicial manner, it has been entrusted with the powers of a civil court in respect of summoning and enforcing the attendance of any person or examining him on oath. 9.) The bill emphasizes for an open court or if the Lokpal wishes in-camera proceedings, it needs to be completed within 6 months, with a provision for extension of 6 months more. 10.) The institution of Lokpal is entrusted with penal powers to discourage frivolous complaints.

80 8.3 LOK AYUKTA It deals with the complaints related to other higher officials apart from ministers and secretaries at the Central and State level. In Maharashtra, the institution of Lokayukta was set up in 1971. There are 11 states in which Lokayukta is established. They are namely Orissa (1970), Maharashtra (1971), Rajasthan (1973), Bihar (1974), Uttar Pradesh (1975), Madhya Pradesh (1981), Andhra Pradesh (1983), Himachal Pradesh (1983), Karnataka (1985), Gujarat (1986) and Punjab (1995). The various aspects of Lokayukta are as follows: A) Structural Variations: The structure of Lokayukta is not similar in all states. Some states like Rajasthan, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, and Maharashtra have established the Lokayukta as well as Up Lokayukta. While some other states like Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, and Himachal Pradesh have created only Lokayukta and not Up-Lokayukta. This variation in the pattern was not suggested by ARC in the states. B) Appointment: Both the Lokayukta and Up-Lokayukta are appointed by the Government of the State. While appointing the Governor in most of the States, the institutional system of Lokayukta consults with (a) the Chief Justice of the State High Court (b) the Leader of the opposition in the state legislative assembly. C) Qualifications: Judicial qualifications have been initiated and prescribed for Lokayukta in the states of Uttar Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Orissa, Karnataka, and Assam. But there is no specific provision with regards to qualifications as prescribed in the states of Bihar, Maharashtra, and Rajasthan. D) Tenure: In most of the states, the decided tenure is 5 years for Lokayukta or 65 years of age

whichever is earlier and he is not eligible for reappointment for a second term. E) Jurisdiction: There is as such no uniformity regarding the jurisdiction of Lokayukta in all the States. The following points can be noted: - 1.) The Chief Minister is considered as a part of the jurisdiction of Lokayukta in the states of Himachal Pradesh, Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, and Gujarat but he is not included in states of Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Bihar, and Orissa. 2.) Ministers and higher civil administrators are included in the purview of Lokayukta in almost all states. Talking of Maharashtra, it included former ministers and civil ministers in the Lokayukta. 3.) Members of states legislature are included in the states of Andhra Pradesh, Himachal Pradesh, Gujarat, Uttar Pradesh, and Assam 81 4.) The officials and authorities of the local bodies, corporations, companies, and societies are included in the purview of the institutional device of Lokayukta in most of the states. 5.) Investigations: In most of the states the institution of Lokayukta investigates based on a complaint lodged by the citizen against unfair administrative action or Suomoto. 6.) Scope of Cases covered: The Lokayukta specifically tackles cases of citizen's grievances as well as allegations in the respective states namely Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, and Karnataka. F) Other Features: 1) The Lokayukta presents annually to the governor a consolidated report on his performance. The Governor then displays the report along with an explanatory note before the State Legislature and the Lokayukta is responsible to State Legislature. 2) He takes assistance from the state investigating agencies for conducting inquiries. 3) He can order relevant resources like files and documents from the State government departments. 4) The recommendation made by Lokayukta is only advisory and not binding on the State Government. Thus, it can be said that India still has a long way to go as far as containing corruption is concerned. Two main reforms that need to be made on an urgent basis are (a) the Establishment of a strong Lokpal at the Centre and (b) Uniformity in the powers and functions of Lokayuktas in the States.