

CHAPTER: - II

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

INTRODUCTION

DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION: IT'S RELEVANCE

CHANGING CONCEPT OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

GOVERNANCE AS A CONCEPT AND ITS APPLICABILITY IN LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

FROM GOVERNANCE TO GOOD GOVERNANCE

E-GOVERNANCE AS CITIZEN – CENTRIC GOVERNANCE

NOTES AND REFERENCES

Chapter – II

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

A. INTRODUCTION

Development is a widely participatory process of directed social change in a society, intended to bring about both social and material advancement including greater equality, freedom, and other valued qualities for the majority of the people through their gaining greater control over their environment. The literature on development shows lack of agreement as to what precisely constitutes development. To Riggs, it is an elusive concept¹; to Heady, the term has invidious implications²; while Gunnell thinks that the problem of defining development is not merely a semantic one; the lack of agreement about the concept is the result of deeper theoretical problem in social science.

The World Development Report considers development as the improvement of the quality of life calling for higher income, better education, higher standards of health and nutrition, less poverty, a clean environment, more equality of opportunity, greater individual freedom and a richer cultural life.³ Brandt Commission has perhaps rightly stated that 'Development never will be and never can be defined to universal satisfaction'.⁴

Lerner described development as a systematic process involving complementary changes in the demographic, economic, political communicative and cultural sectors of a society. Esman opined, that development denotes a major societal transformation, a change in the system along the continuum from peasant and pastoral to industrial organization and affecting the values, behavior, social structure, economic organization and the political process. Taking a broad view, Todaro described development as a multi-dimensional process involving change in structure, attitudes and institutions as well as the acceleration of economic growth, the reduction of inequality and the eradication of absolute poverty.⁵

The non-western perspective of development has been enriched by what is called the 'dependency perspective'. Frank shows that underdevelopment in the underdeveloped countries is the consequence of the economic and political expansion of Europe since the 15th century and suggests that development in the underdeveloped countries would be possible when the people of underdeveloped countries cut their links with the capitalist developed countries. However, within the dependency perspective, there emerged a number of variants

If we look into the concept of Administration, it implies the organization and direction of human and material resources to achieve desired ends. In other words, Administration is a process, common to all group effort, public or private, civil or military, large scale or small scale. It is a process of work in a departmental store. It consists in the systematized ordering of affairs and the calculated use of resources aimed at making those things happen which we want to happen and simultaneously preventing developments that fail to square with our intention.

Generally the term development administration is used in two interrelated sense. First, it refers to administration of development programmes, to the methods used by large-scale organization, notably government, to implement policies and plan designed to meet their developmental objectives. Secondly, it by implication rather than directly involves the strengthening of administrative capabilities. Thus administration must be able to generate, accept and implement new ideas, processes, products and services. In order to ascertain this in the developing countries, the concept of development administration came into focus.

B. DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION: IT'S RELEVANCE

The term "development administration" came into use in the 1950s to represent those aspects of public administration and those changes in public administration which are needed to carry out policies, projects and programmes to improve social and economic conditions. Some scholars like Caiden, Swerdlow, Gant Tarlok Singh, J. N. Khosla and V. Jagannadham have viewed development administration as an area of the broader fields of public administration there are

other such as Montgomery, Weidner, Riggs and Pai Panandikar, to mention a few, who regard it as a distinct concept with distinctive meaning, characteristics, strategies and theory of its own.

Edward Weidner, a pioneer in this field examined development administration as an action-oriented, goal – oriented administrated system.⁶ He also stated it as the process of guiding an organization towards the achievement of development objectives – progressive, political, economic, social objectives that are authoritatively determined in one manner or the other. To Pai Panandikar, development administration principally means administration of planned changed. Essentially, development administration refers to the structure, organization and organizational behaviour necessary for implementation schemes and programmes of socio-economic and political change undertaken by the governments of developing nations.

The father of the sub-discipline of Development Administration, Fred Riggs, pointed out two aspects, namely, “the administration of development” and “development administration” and there exists a chicken and egg type of causation between the two.⁷ In the developing countries development demands effective implementation or administration of public policies oriented to the goal of socio-economic development because if the policies are not properly implemented the goal, however auspicious, will remain unachieved. This administration of development may be ascertained only if the administration is capable of administering the policies. And the capability of the administration to effectively administer the development-oriented policies depends upon whether or not the administration itself is developed.

Thus the goal of development requires effective administration of development policies which in turn, requires the development of the administration or administrative development. Development administration refers to those aspects and changes in public administration that are essential for the formulation and implementation of socio-economic development plans, policies, programmes and projects undertaken by the governments of developing countries

in order to eradicate poverty, unemployment, inequality and to attain economic development, social justice, democracy mass-participation, national integration, modernization and cultural growth.

“Development Administration” is the term used to denote the complex of agencies, management system, and processes a government establish to achieve its development goals.⁸ It is the public mechanism set up to relate the several components of development in order to articulate and accomplish national social and economic objectives. It is the adjustment of bureaucracy to the vastly increased number, variety, and complexity of governmental functions required to respond to public demands for development. Development administration is the administration of policies programs and projects to serve development purposes.

Conceived originally as the administration of policies, programmes, projects and activities to serve developmental purposes, and the complex of agencies and management system, the concept is not inherently confined to the analysis of the administrative problems of the so-called ‘developing’ countries, since countries of the world face the challenges of social changes. Never-the-less, since its inception, the term has acquired a pejorative connotation, being looked upon as a conspiratorial phenomenon which seeks to establish the extending arm of American imperialism to the so-called Third World countries.

In a nutshell it is possible to identify five major assumptions underlying the concept of development. One is that development could only be attained by modernization⁹ (Westernization); i.e., the diffusion of Western values and technology. The second is that development could be defined and measured in terms of economic growth,¹⁰ i.e., the expansion of GNP per capita over a period of time. The third is that quantitative change or economic change would produce a critical mass leading to qualitative changes. The fourth theme is that process of development historically entails the movement of societies between a traditional agrarian stage of underdevelopment and that of development after the industrial take-off stage. The fifth main developmental underpinning of development administration is the emphasis on harmony: “stable and orderly change.”¹¹

Development in this context is perceived not only as attainment of change but mainly as adaptation and systems-maintenance.

Like the term 'development' the concept of development administration' has changed drastically over the last four decades. During the 1950s, development administration was concerned primarily with transferring the techniques of public management applied in western industrialist countries to the developing countries. The aim was to create rational, politically impartial, efficient bureaucracies in the Weberian tradition. During the 'era of optimism' in the First U. N. Development Decade of the 1960s, development administration was supposed to be based on professionally oriented, technically competent, politically and ideologically neutral bureaucratic machinery.

This approach, evolved wide spread dissatisfaction because it could not fulfill the developing countries' need for institutions that could help administrators deal creatively with complex and uncertain problems and promote innovation and change. Thus, in the mid-1970s, the focus again shifted to expanding the capacity of organizations not only to manage development projects and programmes efficiently, but also to bring about more equitable distribution of the benefits of developmental activities. Greater attention was given to the ways in which governments might alleviate the high levels of poverty in the rural areas, elicit participation of the poor in development-planning and management, and deliver essential public services to those groups who had previously been marginalized.

Emphasis was on improving the capacity of public agencies to respond more effectively to the needs of the poor, to provide for basic human needs, to stimulate productivity and raise the income of the disadvantaged groups, to create condition in which the community, private and voluntary organizations, could play a stronger role in process of development planning at the grass-root level. Rural development became a matter of major concern and decentralized processes of planning and implementation were deemed to be relevant than centralized control and management. Planning for integrated rural development has assumed great significance as a means to achieve a balance rural area development.

The basic objective is to bring about social change through a decentralized system of small, locally controlled organizations rather than through large-scale governmental organizations, with increased local participation, creation of new intermediary organizations, and other major changes in socio-political conditions.

C. CHANGING CONCEPT OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION:

The impetus for the discipline can be traced to Robert Dahl's 1947 essay where public Administration was indicted for its inability to develop a comparative framework.¹² The emergence of newly independent nations, advances in the field of comparative politics, abundance of development research funding, together with problems in the American Aid programme, meant that Dahl's indictment fell on receptive ears. Consequently, scholars, who sought to discover a comparative 'Science' of Public Administration in the 1950s and 1960s, focused on the narrow area of how public sector agencies realize development goals. Since it was felt that public bureaucracy in all countries – of the First, Second and Third Worlds – formulated and implemented development goals, it was theoretically possible to justify the quest for scientific principles, albeit in such a narrow area of specialization.

Thus, an opportunity was presented to advance Public Administration, which, up to that time, had remained the soft-belly of Political Science. However, differing theoretical, methodological and ideological orientations amongst scholars resulted in a lack of consensus on the scientific principles which cause public bureaucracy to maximize development goals.¹³ Moreover, changing definitions of development naturally found their way into the field resulting in a further source of disagreement.¹⁴ Against this background two significant distinctions to emerge in early literature found their way into successive works.

The First distinction was between public administration and development administrationist, who subscribed to different definitions of development. For example, early contributors, such as Swerdlow, emphasized the economic growth

aspects of development,¹⁵ while others, such as Riggs, viewed development in comprehensive terms which included social change.¹⁶

As the definition of development shifted to social change in the 1970s and to growth in the 1980s and 1990s, works in Development Administration discovered in decentralization and bureaucratic politics the causes that explain underclass empowerment and, therefore, social change. In the 1980s and 1990s, the emphasis switched to administrative forms of efficiency to facilitate economic growth. Therefore, factors such as administrative-capacity building and managerial autonomy have risen to prominence.

The Second distinction was between scholars such as Riggs¹⁷ and Braibanti¹⁸, who explored bureaucratic performance in terms of development of political environment, and organisationalists, such as technical assistance and administrative capacity. This distinction was to permeate into works of the 1980s and 1990s.

Not surprisingly, by early 1970s, Development Administration failed to discover 'scientific' principles of how public bureaucracy realizes development goals. With the intellectual hegemony of neo-liberal economists in the 1980s¹⁹ and neo-liberal posture adopted by the World Bank, a deceptively comprehensive explanation was offered on the relationship between public bureaucracy and development goals.²⁰ By focusing on the nature of the Third World State and indeed, State failure, neo-liberalism seemed to fall within the political environment position of Development Administration. Because neo-liberals subscribed to a notion of development as economic growth, they, however, parted company with development administrationists of the 1970s, who viewed development as social change.

Administrative reform, administrative development and institution development are used interchangeably with administrative capacity building to describe the process whereby public sector institutions are themselves purposefully developed in order to undertake interventions designed to promote development.²¹ During 1970s, the importance of administrative capacity for

economic growth attracted less interest. This was largely a reaction to the failure of the previous decade's central planning effort. Thus, a new Development Administration emerged more concerned with the process interactions between public bureaucracies and beneficiaries than with the structures.

Not surprisingly, financial management, accountability and efficiency reform were exported to the developed countries in the 1980s and 1990s as part of the World Bank's Structural Adjustment Project.²² The World Bank initiative was inspired by the poor compliance record of developing countries implementing Structural Adjustment Programmes.

Of late a newer approach sanctioned by the World Bank, IMF, the US Agency for International Development, the British Overseas Development Agency and other similar agencies – appeared to provide an alternative model to administer development by way of replacing it with de-administered development.

In compare to that of the last two decades, it is revealed that administrative development would co-exist alongside private sector entrepreneurship; Private Voluntary Organizations and Non-Governmental Organizations with public officials providing an enabling environment and the necessary security, infrastructure and financial regulation. The new administrative environment emphasizes public-private partnerships and market-friendly strategies and may open up new opportunities for abuse as existing informal techniques for avoiding and expediting myriad official regulations supplemented by new rules aimed at making it easier for entrepreneurs to do business.

Development administration has been criticized as 'ideological' and Eurocentric. The ideal of modernization and development seems an export model of civilization that is incompatible with life in most Third World countries. Hence, there has been a persistent demand for a 'non-ethno-centric' theory of development and an alternative conception of Third World development.²³ For development administration, the implication is that the underdevelopment-dependency movement conceives bureaucratic behavior in class terms. By

contrast, conventional development administration looks at bureaucratic behavior as an outcome of organizational structure and hence manipulability.²⁴

Riggs has argued: “The existence of a career bureaucracy without corresponding strength in the political institutions does not necessarily lead to administrative effectiveness...Without firm political guidance; bureaucrats have weak incentives to provide good service, whatever their formal, pre-entry training and professional qualifications. They tend to use their effective control to safeguard their expedient bureaucratic interests—tenure, seniority rights fringe benefits, toleration of the achievement of program goal.²⁵ The other debate has raged between technological-managerial school and ecological school.²⁶ Another school of thought has questioned the strategy of development administration by characterizing it as the first world’s diplomatic effort to stem the tide of insurgency and communist movements in the “Third World”²⁷

The entrance of 21st Century projected that the past few decades of developments in politics and administration have demonstrated two major trends: standards of conduct and probity have been steadily declining among politicians; and such a massive regression is yet to engulf the bureaucracy. The capability of the administration to effectively administer the development-oriented policies depends upon whether or not the administration itself is developed. Thus, the goal of development requires effective administration of development policies which in turn requires the development of the administration or administrative development. Here comes the need for governance.

D. GOVERNANCE AS A CONCEPT & ITS APPLICABILITY IN LOCAL ADMINISTRATION.

Governance refers to those measures that involve setting the rules for the exercise of power and settling conflicts over such rules. A broad institutional definition would thus refer to governance as the setting of rules, the application of rules and the enforcement of rules. Hyden opinions that governance is the stewardship of formal and informal political rules of the game

However, the concept of Governance has been in use at least since 14th century. It was used in France during the period which implied seat of government. Governance, in simple terms, means the process of decision-making and the process by which decisions are implemented or not implemented; the process of exercise of authority to govern people or regulate public affairs.

Though the traditional use of 'governance' define it as synonym one with government, in the current use of governance there is a redirection in its use and implication. Thus, 'governance' signifies 'a change in the meaning of government, referring to a new process of governing; or a changed condition of ordered rule; or the new method by which society governed'²⁸ It refers to the development of governing styles in which boundaries between and within public and private sectors are thought to be blurred. The essence of governance rests on its focus on governing mechanisms that do not involve authority and sanctions of government.²⁹The concept of governance points to the creation of a structure or an order which cannot be externally imposed, but is the result of the interacting of a multiplicity of governing and each other influencing actors.³⁰

It implies that the purpose of the popularization of the concept of governance is to extend worldwide the 'market democracy' model. This becomes more manifest when it is explained as management of regime structures in such a way as to increase the legitimacy of the public sphere³¹or as a political regime based on a liberal democratic model that protects human rights and civic rights, combined with a competent, responsible administration untainted by corruption.³²However, in spite of the concept being loaded with 'Westerns', 'governance' as an explanatory perspective is preferred on the ground that it captures the action part of the governmental process – the informal, actual and behavioral in contrast to the formal, normative and institutional.

In the most common sense, government consists of a group of individuals who share a defined responsibility for exercising power. Governance is the manner in which authority controls the power of government mobilizes society's economic and social resources to address the issues of public interest. It is the art of

governing, associated with the exercise of authority within specific jurisdiction, and is embedded in the structure of authority.

It was Harland Cleveland (1972) who first used the word 'governance' as an alternative to public administration. He was of the opinion that what people want is 'less government and more governance'. According to his opinion, the organizations that get things done will no longer be hierarchical pyramids with most of the real control at the top. "Decision-making" will become an increasingly intricate process of multilateral brokerage both inside and outside the organization. Because organizations will be horizontal, the way they are governed is likely to be more collegial, consensual and consultative. The bigger the problem to be tackled, the more real power is diffused and the larger the number of persons who can exercise it – if they work at all.

Etymologically, governance can be traced back to the Greek verb *kubernan* (to pilot or steer) and was used by Plato with regard to how design to a system or rule. The Greek term gave rise to the Medieval Latin *gubernare* which has the same connotation of piloting, rule-making or steering. The term has been use as synonymous with government. During the 1980s, however, political Scientists referred to the term as distinct from government and as including civil society actors. Governance refers to self-organizing, inter-organizational networks characterized by interdependence, resource-exchange, rules of the game, and significant autonomy from the state.

However, as per the report of the World Bank, Governance is the institutional capacity of public organizations to provide the public and other goods demanded by a country's citizens or their representatives in an effective, transparent, impartial and accountable manner, subject to resource constrains'. This leads to a broader concern in all governance theory: how to steer, but also how to improve accountability. In this sense governance resurrects an old discussion about the relationship between legitimacy and efficiency.

In India, we have fortunately before us Jawaharlal Nehru's view on governance. On the historic occasion of beginning of the first Session of the first

Parliament – 16 May 1952, Prime Minister Nehru shared in scholarly detail the burden of governance and his concern for guiding the government of free India. In a letter to State Chief Ministers, soon after 16 May 1952, Nehru dealt at great length on the art and science of governance. The letter is a scholarly text on governance: “First about the vastness and the diversity of the task which called for humility and faith ... The governance of any country in the world today is no easy matter, the governance of a great and varied country like India is perhaps as hard a task as anywhere in the world today...”³³

Nehru’s concept of governance as an exceptional link with the people at large raised the concept of governance to vision – redefining the hitherto known approaches in administration. It was part of a belief in the large vision of India as a first rate nation where governance has a developmental role to play. Thus, governance is about managing rules of the game in order to enhance the legitimacy of the public realm. Legitimacy may be derived from democracy as well as from efficiency which can be established by means good governance.

In any society, one of the primary concerns of the citizens is that their government must be good. For a government to be good, it is essential that the systems and subsystems of governance must be efficient, effective economical, ethical and equitable. In addition, the governance process must also be just, reasonable, fair and citizen-caring. For these and other qualities of good governance, the machinery of governance must also be accountable and responsive.

E. FROM GOVERNANCE TO GOOD GOVERNANCE:-

In recent years, there has been perceptible shift in the academia towards problems of realizing good and responsive governance. The concept in ancient Indian polity of the rulers being bound by Dharma was precisely that of ensuring good and responsive governance to the people. Rajdharma was the code of conduct or Rule of Law that was superior to the will of the ruler and governed all his actions. The Jataka tales, “Shantiparva” or Mahabharata, Shukracharya’s

Nitisar, Panini's Ashtadhyayi Valmiki's Ramayana Kautilya's Arthshastra and many other classics are replete with descriptions of the tenets of good and responsive governance.

The watchword for Ashoka was *yogakshema* or public welfare and this could be achieved only through good and responsive governance. Similarly, in the old Western thought e. g., in Plato's Republic and Aristotle's Politics, the supreme concerns and objectives of all political activity happened to be those of providing good and responsive governance to the people and for that purpose devising the best political system and finding the best kind of rulers. Peter Drucker draws our attention to his concept that governing is not doing; it can be inducing or making it easy for others to do. Vivek Chopra defines good governance as unambiguously identifying the basic values of society and pursuing these.³⁴

Conceptually, the ideals of good governance, broadly speaking, are the same as the fundamental values of administrative law which includes openness, fairness, impartiality, rationality and participation. The hope, expectations and aspirations of citizens from the government are that the system of governance should be citizen- friendly and caring, responsive and accountable, effective and effective and efficient, just, reasonable, fair, open and impartial. According to Minocha, good governance "is an equivalent to purposive and development oriented administration which is committed to the improvement of quality of life of the people. It implies high level of organizational effectiveness. It also relates to the capacity of...political and administrative system to cope up with the emerging challenges of the society. It refers to the adoption of new values of governance with a view to establish greater efficiency, legitimacy and credibility of system. In simple terms, good governance may be considered as citizen friendly, citizen caring and responsive."³⁵

From Minocha's point of view it projects that good governance is a function of installation of positive virtues of administration and elimination of vices of dysfunctional ties. It must have the attributes of an effective, credible and legitimate administrative system – citizen friendly, value caring and people sharing.

The World Bank's Report of 1992 and emergence of new paradigm in public administration have added a new dimension to the whole issue of governance, rather to say, good governance.

Good governance is associated with efficient and effective administration in a democratic framework.³⁶ The determinants of good governance can be related to the basic goals of a society as enshrined in its Constitution and other policy and plan documents. However, the World Bank has identified a number of aspects of good governance which has assumed significance for the developed and the developing countries. These factors deal with political and administrative aspects which are as follows:

1. Political accountability, including the acceptability of political system by the people and regular elections to legitimize the exercise of political power.
2. Freedom of association and participation by various religious, social, economic, cultural and professional groups in the process of governance.
3. Cooperation between the government and civil society organizations.
4. An established legal framework based on the rule of law and independence of judiciary to protect human rights, secure social justice and guard against exploitation and abuse of power.
5. Bureaucratic accountability ensuring a system to monitor and control the performance of government officer and officials in relation to quality of service, inefficiency and abuse of discretionary power. The related determinants include openness and transparency in administration.
6. Freedom of information and expression needed for formulation of public policies, decision-making, monitoring and evaluation of government performance. It also includes independent analysis of information by professional bodies, including the universities and others needed for civil society.
7. A sound administrative system leading to efficiency and effectiveness. This, in turn, means the value for money and cost effectiveness. The

effectiveness includes the degree of global achievement as per the stated objectives and also the administrative system which is able to take secular and rational decisions and the system which is self propelling to take corrective measures.³⁷

Thus, it is clear that good governance is not simply something that government can achieve or do by itself. Good Governance depends on the co-operation and an involvement of a large number of citizens and organizations. These requirements are considered not only essential for good governance but are also important for sustainable human development³⁸

The whole idea of good and responsive governance is that of giving, of serving and or doing good to the people, or solving their problems and making their lives more livable, satisfying and enjoyable. It comes close to Gandhiji's concept of politics for service of the people and not for becoming masters of the people. The essential pre-requisites for quality governance are that the system should be good and suited to the needs, aspirations, and ethos of the people concerned and that those selected for operating the system should be endowed with competence and motivated by the spirit of public service.

In India, the only place where our Constitution uses the term 'governance' is in article 37 under the Directive Principles. Article 37 speaks of certain 'principles' of being "fundamental" in the "governance of the country" but not "enforceable by any court". Under these fundamental principles, the state is directed in order to ensure good governance to secure:

- a social order for promotion of welfare of the people with social, economic and political justice for all [article 38(1)]
- minimization of inequalities in income and elimination of inequalities in status, facilities and opportunities among individuals and groups of people [article 38(2)]
- right to adequate means of livelihood for all citizens – men and women equally [article 39(a)]

- equal pay for equal work for men and women [article 39(d)]
- opportunities and facilities for children to develop in a healthy manner and in conditions of freedom and dignity [article 39(f)]
- the right to work, to education and to public assistance in cases of unemployment, old age, sickness and disabilities (article 41)
- just and humane conditions of work and maternity relief (article 42)
- free and compulsory education for all children below 14 years (article 45)
- high level of nutrition and public health (article 47)

As governance deals with the State and bureaucracy, it is pertinent to spell out their nature very specifically. Douglas North³⁹ has explained several ways in which the state could ensure conditions for free entrepreneurship to succeed, and that was the actual nature of the state very little resembling the normative description of Max Weber's state dealing with rigid rules, impartially applied by a bureaucracy.⁴⁰

Max Weber's bureaucratic model which is also known as legal-rational bureaucracy is technically superior to all administrative systems that continue to be the dominant paradigm in public administration. The ideal paradigm of bureaucracy, as described by Weber is viewed with some structural dimensions and an achievement of purpose i. e., it is meant to increase the efficiency of an organization

If we match Max Weber's paradigm of bureaucracy based on principles of rationalization with tradition-bond Indian social system, we may find that Weber is trying to consolidate many ideas concepts and approaches in his scientific social theory, but it ultimately established being a grapple with the problematic of a modern capitalist society. His concept of 'Ideal Type' does not suit with the Indian scenario. Because Weber theorized on the basis of early 20th Century, India is a late starter in building capitalism. He considered Indian society being a traditional one which is a real obstracter before the rise of capitalism.

Thus, the focus of development administration shifted again in the mid – 70s to expand the capacity of organizations not only to manage development project and programme efficiently but also to bring about more equitable distribution of the benefits of the development activities. The focus shifted towards the development at the grass root level and greater attention was given to way in which government might elicit participation in development planning and management to provide for basic human needs, to stimulate productivity and raise the income of the disadvantaged groups. Decentralized process of planning and implementation was of greater concern than centralized control and management.

Currently, international development institutions, such as the World Bank, come to the issue of bureaucratic politics through their focus on governance. Fundamental to the discussion of governance in the developing world is a Weberian understanding of bureaucracy as stripped of bureaucratic politics and engaging primarily in policy implementation rather than the more political arena of policy formulation. Such a role is adjudged to be imperative to effect the necessary social changes in State-society relations contained in the new structural adjustment policies. To contribute to good governance, the bureaucracy⁶ is circumscribed by notions of transparency and accountability.

Therefore, the emerging challenges of development administration have been of finding ways of improving the capacity building by means of public – private partnership (PPP) in the developing countries to cope with social and economic change and to structure their administrative procedures more efficiently and effectively in order to bring about more equitable economic growth. In order to avoid further abuse of bureaucracy, public administration has to cut down public tasks. All authorities have to analyze which of their tasks are indispensable and which may be fulfilled by private institutions or individuals. That approach includes reflecting the role of private sector in the economy on principles. Contracting out the service delivery responsibility to private firms or NGOs is the first choice to minimize unnecessary overhead expenditure.

Public administration depends normally on the work of uniform governmental authorities and local-level-institutions. But in reality, there is a wide range of possibilities for differentiation in building up independent authorities in regions or at local levels by conceding them autonomy. Altogether, regional and local institution-building could strengthen the reform of public administration. So, an active institutional policy has to fight for decentralized structure of public administration and to establish a new relationship between state, society and particular pressure groups or groups of population. Thus, by enhancing the role and capability of local institutions means at the same time, to create various leagues in the local governments, namely leagues of provinces, cities or municipalities.

Thus, if we consider the cases of the developing countries like India, liberalization privatization, and globalization are still far reaching to the hands of the people at the grass root level. All these concepts have popularized in theories but not in practice, particularly in small and medium towns and even in rural areas. It necessities to bring about the idea, named, New Public Management.

However, in the developed countries, there is a need to start once again with emphasis on improving the bureaucratic model. To this, New Public Management Approach (NPMA) gives a specific direction. In the last few years, there have been different understandings in the highly industrialized countries about NPMS.⁴¹ For those who take a skeptical view of administrative reform as a series of evanescent fads and fashions, NPM's rise might be interpreted as a sudden and unpredictable product that offers a classic statement towards administrative reform.

The theoretical underpinnings of e-governance come from the New Public Management (NPM) which originated in the late 1970s in the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand, and swept across other countries since. NPM, which has been fast replacing the Old Public Administration seeks to 'reinvent' government through metamorphosis into an entrepreneurial, business-like, mission and vision-driven state, which changes its role from 'rowing' to 'steering'. According to Lynn, New Public Management is "an ephemeral theme likely to

fade,” just as enthusiasm for innovations such as the planning-programming-budgeting system, zero base budgeting, and management by objectives has passed on to newer tools and strategies.⁴² Mathiasen has called NPM a “paradigm shift” and a series of papers released by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (1995a, 1995b) suggest that innovations occurring abroad have dislodged the bureaucratic model with a new management paradigm.⁴³

The two basic principles of NPM are managerialism (a proactive, outcome-oriented, customer-centric government based on decentralization and participative management) and marketisation (charging for public services, promotion of markets through creation of incentives, introducing competition between units through fragmenting, and competition in public service delivery through contracting)

Until quite recently, governments were plagued by a typical supply-side orientation, wherein developmental priorities were set by notions of the welfare state and centralized planning, and citizens were merely treated as passive recipients or beneficiaries of public services.

E-governance has the potential to transform not only the way in which public services are delivered, but also the fundamental relationship between government and citizens. Moon (2002) has identified five stages in the development of e-government. These include information dissemination, two-way communication, service and financial transactions, vertical and horizontal integration, and political participation.⁴⁴ Through new modes of communication and interaction among government and various stakeholders, e-governance provides an all encompassing framework within which e-administration grows and includes e-citizens, e-services, and e-society.

F. E-GOVERNANCE AS CITIZEN – CENTRIC GOVERNANCE

The NPM heralds the transformation of the citizen into a customer of public services, who pays for public services, and hence has choice and the exit option (Osborne and Gaebler, 1992; Barzelay and Kaboolian, 1990),⁴⁵ and the

opportunity to give feedback on public service delivery (Bellamy and Taylor, 1998)⁴⁶. People wear fur hats in society – that of customer, client, citizen, and subject (Mintzberg, 1996)⁴⁷. As customers, they purchase private goods from markets; as clients, they consume professional services such as health care; as citizens they are entitled to certain rights; and as subjects, they receive protection.

Citizens are active participants in service-delivery and co-producers of policy. As political beings, they participate in public life, have voice, and fulfill their collective purposes through politics (Cook, 1998)⁴⁸. NPM transforms the traditional notions of democratic accountability by strengthening accountability of public managers downwards to customers. E-governance involves the following functions for citizens (Malick and Murthy, 2001)⁴⁹:

- Providing information to the citizen through a single source of information, optimizing the resources of multiple organizations, creating economies of scale for information processing and distribution, inter-government participation and establishment of public utility networks.
- Providing representation to the citizens by making elected representatives more accessible and enhancing their functions in e-government.
- Improving citizens' voice by stimulating debate, exchange of ideas and the resultant feedback for qualitative improvement in the delivery system.
- Improving citizen's participation by promoting two-way communication, participatory decision-making, improving availability of services, and developing a system for public information and feedback.
- Engaging the citizens by providing a vision for partnership, community engagement and development of skills to participate in e-government, and creating conditions for information and knowledge relevant to citizens, service users, business and voluntary organizations.

E-governance entails a partner-approach in which there is collaboration between government and citizens in all phases of the policy cycle (Snijkers, 2005)⁵⁰. As a partner of government, citizens are not subordinate to the government;

citizens and government are placed on an equal footing. E-governance promises a plethora of benefits to citizens by accelerating and automating government-citizen interface, bringing about transparency in the functioning of the government, and enabling democratisation. Government is transparent for citizens and open to citizens' scrutiny. Within this framework e-governance enables new forms of e-presentation and accountability.

E-governance develops new styles of governance through the engagement of citizens which improves citizens' trust in government. These new styles of governance represent a change from traditional bureaucratic systems to pluricentric systems (Bekkers and Korteland, 2005)⁵¹. Whereas traditional accountability is organized in a vertical, hierarchical manner, e-governance entails more public forms of accountability, in which information about the results of organizations are made accessible and transparent for citizens as consumers of public services, professionals and civil society.

E-governance is in fact a step ahead of NPM as it enables the reinventing of governance (rather than reinventing government alone) through the emergence of networks where states and citizens, governments and private sectors, organizations and citizens form a web of relations redefining accountability relationships, and placing the citizen at the centre of government efforts. Thus, e-governance carves out a new domain for citizen empowerment. However, The potential of e-governance to transform government-citizen relations is often rhetorical rather than realistic. Empirical evidence shows that e-government is often in the first (information dissemination) or at best in the second (two-way communication) stage of development.

E-governance in India

E-Governance originated in India during the 1970s with focus on in-house applications in the areas of Defence, economic monitoring, planning, and the deployment of ICT (Information and Communication Technology) to manage the data intensive functions related to elections, census, tax administration etc. Most of these initiatives were stand alone applications. During the 1980s, State Wide

Area Networks (SWANs) were created, linking all districts through ICT networks. From the late 1990s onwards, the national government as well as State governments have been enthusiastically pursuing the adoption of ICTs, particularly web-based technologies including the Internet.

Key milestones of the Government of India (GoI) include the Information Technology Act, 2000, that legalizes electronic forms of communication and regulates practices relating to electronic exchange of information. Another revolutionary institutional change is the Right to Information (RTI) Act, 2005, that makes public institutions liable to provide information to citizens who demand such information. From 1997 onwards, through the adoption of citizen's charters, each ministry/department is committed to deliver specified services to citizens in terms of explicit standards, time frames and grievance redressal mechanisms. Even at the grass-root level the same facilities have also been ensured for example by the municipal bodies to the citizens. It has compelled the urban local bodies more accountable and responsive as well for providing highest possible facilities to its inhabitants.

G. NOTES AND REFERENCES:

- 1 Fred W Riggs, (1970)“The Idea of Development Administration”, in Edward W Waldo(ed), Development Administration in Asia, (Durham N C. :Duke University Press, p. 70.
- 2 Ferrel Heady,(1984) Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, (New York: Marcel Decker, p. 10.
- 3 World Bank, World Development Report, 1991, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), p. 4.
- 4 Independent commission on International Development issues (under the Chairmanship of Willy Brandt) North-South: A Programme for Survival, (London: Pan Books, 1980), p. 48.

-
- 5 Michael Todaro,(1977) "Economic Development in the Third World" London, Longman.
 - 6 Edward Weidner,(1964) "Technical Assistance in Public Administration Overseas: The case for Development Administration" Chicago, Public Administration Service.
 - 7 Fred W Riggs,(1970) "The Idea of Development Administration", in Edward W Waldo(ed), Development Administration in Asia, (Durham N C. :Duke University Press. p 68.
 - 8 George F Gant (1979) "Development Administration: Concepts, Goals, and Methods". Madison; University of Wisconsin Press.
 - 9 Irving Swerdlow,(1975) The Public Administration of Economic Development, New York, Praeger, p 14.
 - 10 Gerald Meier (1970), Leading Issues in Economic Development, New York, Oxford University Press, p 7.
 - 11 Susanne Bodenheimer,"The Ideology of Developmentalism: American Political Science's Paradigm – Surrogate for Latin American studies" Berkeley Journal of Sociology, Vol. 15, 1970, p 112.
 - 12 Robert Dahl, "The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems" Public Administration Review Vol. – 7, No. 1, 1947, pp 1 – 11.
 - 13 Ferrel Heady, Public Administration (1979): A Comparative Perspective, New York, Marcel Dekker.
 - 14 Arvind Singhal, "Evaluation of Development Administration Theory" The Indian Journal of Public Administration, Vol. – 35, No. 4, 1989, pp. 841 – 850.
 - 15 I. Swerdlow, (1963) "Economics As Part of Development Administration" in I Swerdlow (ed), The Public Administration of Economic Development, New York, Praeger.
 - 16 Fred W Riggs, (1971)"Relearning An Old Lesson: The Political Context of Development Administration" Public Administration Review, Fred W Riggs, "Bureaucrats and Political Development" in Jason L. Finkle and Richard W. Gable (eds), Political Development and Social Change, New York, John Wiley.

-
- 17 Fred W Riggs, (1971) "Bureaucrats and Political Development" in Jason L. Finkle and Richard W. Gable (eds), *Political Development and Social Change*, New York, John Wiley.
 - 18 Ralph Braibanti, (1969) "External Inducements of Political-Administrative Development" in Ralph Baribanti (ed), *Political and Administrative Development*, Durham, N. C.,Duke University Press.
 - 19 D. Lal, (1983) 'The Poverty of 'Development Economics', London, Institute of Economic Affairs.
 - 20 C. Colclough and J. Manor (1991), 'Neoliberalism and the Development Policy Debate', Oxford, Clarendon Press.
 - 21 V. V. Moharir, "Capacity Building Initiative for Sub-Saharan Africa", *Public Enterprise*, Vol. – 11, No. 4, 1991, pp. 235 – 245.
 - 22 B. Smith: (1994)"Progress in Development Administration: From Underdevelopment to sustainable Development, New York, St. Martin's Press.
 - 23 Howard J. Wiarda, "Toward a Nonethnocentric Theory of Development: Alternative Conceptions form the Third World", *The Journal of developing Societies*, July 1983.
 - 24 David Hirschman, "Development or underdevelopment Administration: A Further Deadlock", *Development and Change*, Vol. 12, 1981.
 - 25 Fred W Riggs, (1971) "Bureaucrats and Political Development" in Jason L. Finkle and Richard W. Gable (eds), *Political Development and Social Change*, New York, John Wiley.
 - 26 A. Waterston,(1983) *Development Planning: Lessons of Experience*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University, 1965; and Dennis A. Rondinelli, *Development projects as policy Experiments: As Adaptive Approach to Development Administration*, London, Methuen.
 - 27 O. P. Dwivedi and J. Nef. (January-March, 1982) "Crises and Continuities in Development Administration" ,*Public Administration and Development*,.
 - 28 R. Rhodes, (1987) "The Governance: Governing without Government" in *Political Studies*, 44, p.-652-53.

-
- 29 Garry Stoker, "Governance as Theory: Five Propositions" in *International Social Science Journal*, 155, March 1998, p.-17.
- 30 J. Kooiman and M. Van Vliet, (1993)"Governance and Public Management" in K. Ehiassen and J. Kooiman(eds), *Managing Public Organizations* (London: Sage,)), p. 64.
- 31 G. Hyden and M. Bratton(1992), *Governance and Politics in Africa*, (Boulder : Lynner Rienner Publishers, UK p-7
- 32 A. Leftwitch, (1993)"Governance, Democracy and Development in the Third World", in *Third World Quarterly*, 14, 3, p- 605.
- 33 Jawaharlal Nehru, *Letters to Chief Minister*, Vol 2 Delhi, 1952, Nehru Memorial Fund.
- 34 Subash C. Kashyap (1997), *Crime, Corruption and Good Governance*, New Delhi, Uppal, p-113.
- 35 O. P. Minocha, "Good Governance: Concept and Operational issues". *Management in Government* October – December, 1997.
- 36 H.K.Asmerom, K.Borgam and R. Hoppe, "Good Governance, Decentralisation and Democratisation in Post Colonial State" *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 41, No 4, Oct – Dec, 1995, p 736.
- 37 Peter Blunt, "Cultural Relativism, Good Governance and Sustainable Human Development" *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 15, 1995, pp – 5-7.
- 38 *Ibid.*, P- 4.
- 39 D. C. North and R. P. Thomas,(1973) *The Rise of the Western World*, London, Cambridge University Press.
- 40 Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, New York, Free Press, 1947.
- 41 Christopher Hood, "A Public Management for All Seasons?" *Public Administration* Vol. 69, 1991,pp - 3 – 19.
- 42 Lynn, L. Jr. (1998). "The New Public Management: How to Transform a Theme into a Legacy." *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 58, No. 3: 231-237.

-
- 43 Mathiasen, D. (1996). The New Public Management and its Critics. Paper presented at the Conference on The New Public Management in International Perspective, St. Gallen, Switzerland, July 11-13.
- 44 Moon, M. J. (2002) The Evolution of E-Government Among Municipalities: Rhetoric or Reality? *Public Administration Review*. 62: 4. pp. 424-433
- 45 Osborne, D., and Gaebler, T. (1992) *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- 46 Bellamy, C., and Taylor, J. (1998) *Governing in the Information Age*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- 47 Mintzberg, H. (1996) *Managing Government, Governing Management*. *Harvard Business Review*. May-June. pp. 75-83.
- 48 Cook, B.J. (1998) Politics, Political Leadership, and Public Management. *Public Administration Review*. 58: 3. pp. 225-230.
- 49 Malick, M.H., and Murthy, A.V.K. (2001) The Challenges of E-Governance. *Indian Journal of Public Administration*. 47: 2. pp. 237-253.
- 50 Snijkers K. (2005) *E-Government, Intergovernmental Relations and the Citizen*. European Group of Public Administration. Bern. September 1-2.
- 51 Bekkers V., and Korteland E. (2005) *Governance, ICT and the Modernization Agenda of Public Administration: A Comparison of Some European Policy Initiatives*. European Group of Public Administration. Bern. September 1-2