



**Development Administration in Developing Country with
Reference to Nepal: Dead or Alive?
TEJASWI SHARMA, KATHMANDU, NEPAL**

Abstract:

Literally, development is teleological, that is, goal-focused with a gradual process into more improved conditions than present. The concept of development can be categorically conceptualized into three aspects as: (i) definition (writer's perspective) (ii) theoretical perspective (iii) dimensions of development. Different philosophers have varied views on this and among them, Fred Riggs has considered "diffraction" as the necessary and perhaps the sufficient condition for development, that is, for increased discretion. The "Development Administration" is concerned with the development of a country's economics and society or, more rightly, with socioeconomic changes in a society. The concept of 'development' has been used in natural sciences, social sciences and physical sciences differently.

Development is the center of politics of the so called Third World countries and governments play a key role in national development. Regarding the development shift, situating the concept of sustainable development within the broader context of development discussions, there has been a constant concern regarding the state of poverty especially in developing countries. Whereas, in case of developed countries, some of the key factors like high level of differentiation, professionalization, integration, motivated work force, participatory governance etc has been taken into account of.

In case of Nepal, factors like diversity in political regime, bureaucratic polity, varying levels of economic and human development play a pivotal role. But, development administration has failed to achieve the benchmark in context of Nepal because of-

(a) Shortages of skills and tools; (b) Difficulties of organization and structure; (c) Political difficulties and (d) Cultural and attitude barriers. *Afno Manchhe* (one's own people), *Chakari* (Sycophancy), political influence, and bribery are deeply rooted in Nepalese bureaucracy to some extent.

As an alternative solution of development administration in Nepal, both qualitative and quantitative changes are required in many aspects like man-power planning and management, decentralization, ameliorated bureaucracy, administrative reform etc. Nepal belongs to one of the least developed countries around the world with two third of the population depending on subsistence agriculture. Nepal, as a resourceful country, has the enormous capacity to develop itself, if it continues to initiate economic growth. Developed nations are decades and, in a few cases, centuries ahead of developing nations. Yet both of them have to evolve goal-oriented administrative systems. All administrative systems need to be change-oriented, goal-oriented, progressive, efficient, decentralized, responsive and motivated.

Keywords: Development, Development Administration, Developed and Developing countries, Nepal.

Concept of Development:

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

The concept of development can be categorically conceptualized into three aspects as: (i) definition (writer’s perspective) (ii) theoretical perspective (iii) dimensions of development Fred Riggs has defined development as “a process of increasing autonomy (discretion) of social systems, made possible by rising level of diffraction”. “Discretion,” Riggs has observed, “is the ability to choose among alternatives, while ‘diffraction’ refers to the degree of differentiation and integration in the social system”. Riggs has considered diffraction as “the necessary and perhaps the sufficient condition for development, that is, for increased discretion”.

In ancient time, find of valuable metal was what was considered the criteria for development but in modern time, the aspects considered are: increase in- per capita income criteria; national income criteria; physical quality of life (PQLI) (composition of life expectancy, infant mortality and literacy); basic need criteria (health, education, nutrition, healthy drinking water, cleanliness and settlement) and Human Development Indices (HDI) (composite index of life expectancy, literacy and income). Economic, political, socio-cultural, administrative and technological are some of the important dimensions of development.

Concept of Development Administration:

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

1967). Thus, the development of theory and theory of development administration has moved together. This is understandable, since the field of comparative public administration is primarily concerned with the comparison of administrative systems of different nations at varying stages of development. It has been recognized that because of its central concern, the study of development administration could be the meeting ground for almost all the approaches in comparative public administration (Heaphey, 1968). This could be so, especially when the concept of development administration is considered broadly and not just restricted to the focus on what are popularly called “developing” nations. Interestingly, development administration can also be a meeting ground for portions of comparative public administration and the so-called “New” (American) Public Administration (Marini, 1971) that includes considerable elements of action and goal orientation.

As Riggs has argued:

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

Development Administration – An Overview:

The “Development Administration” is concerned with the development of a country’s economics and society or, more rightly, with socioeconomic changes in a society. The main objective, however, remains to build a nation. Since it’s a continuous process of formulation, reformulation and implementing a set of goals in a certain time frame, therefore, it carries characteristics like socioeconomic changes, being result-oriented and client-oriented, and Commitment or Motivation.

Being result-oriented, its focus is on purposes, loyalties and attitudes. Purpose is socioeconomic progress, change and innovation. Loyalty is to constitution, country and people. Attitude is always positive, persuasive, participatory, flexible and adaptive. Here it would be equally important to mention that administration of development and development administration are two different concepts; the former emphasizes that development can be achieved through administration while the latter stresses upon the need to enhance the capacity for development. Both converge as far as end results are concerned.

Mere economic growth doesn’t mean that development has taken place in areas like investment, capital-formation and industries, and has increased national income nor does it mean that overall development and growth have been achieved; since it must be viewed in totality by including social, political, cultural and economic dimensions. The objective of development shall remain the social justice as it provides foundation for development.

Similarly, development has to be a participatory process; it no more can remain the privilege of only the elite who wield power and have say. This has been one of the obstacles to the

development of Third World countries. Bringing and implementing any good idea nurtured in the West means adopting an inclusive development approach to get the desired results. Relying on one's own resources is an important and inseparable aspect of development. It asserts that the developing countries while formulating and adopting policies be at equal footing and any agreement should not be based on the exploitation of the other. Scarcity of resources is another issue of development, therefore, it must be kept in mind that overexploitation of resources blindly for the sake of development will bring potential challenges to development. It calls for maintaining balance in development approach.

Overall evaluation and implementation of development administration programs are carried out by the bureaucracy playing leading role in developing nations. Bureaucracy and development are two components of development philosophy; however, both possess opposing values. Bureaucracy is viewed by Weberian model and other theorists as doing same routine, unchanged and repeated procedures day in and day out without getting influenced by external factors. While development as a concept, on the other hand, is seen as a phenomenon influenced by change and is responsive to external factors, adoptive in attitude. To realize the concept of development, both are complementary. Now what is required to transform the bureaucracy into an administration of development is to provide them training in the real sense that brings attitudinal changes, and understanding the ecology of the system. It also includes the building of special knowledge houses in order to play the role of a development administrator. A lot more is still required to be done to tread on the path of development for bringing socioeconomic change.

Meaning of Development Shift:

The concept of 'development' dates back to the 19th century and has been used in several fields including natural sciences, social sciences and physical sciences (Abercrombie, Hill & Turner, 1994; Cliché, 2005). For instance, in the natural sciences, it was used by Aristotle to explain the nature of all things that develop, and Charles Darwin in his theory of evolution of species (Cliche, 2005). However, in the field of social sciences, the concept of development emerged during the 1950s and 1960s following the end of the World War II (Harris, 2000; Hettne, 2002). Accordingly, the concept has been associated with many disciplines such as economic development (Todaro, 2000), social development (Seers, 1969), human development (UNDP, 1990), sustainable development (Adams, 2006), and development as freedom (Sen, 1999)

Brandt Commission report stated that Development could never be defined to universal satisfaction. (Brandt Willy, 1980) In the same note, Uphoff and Ilchman 1972 pointed that Development was in all probability one of the most depreciated terms in social science, literature and has been used more it has been understood. (Uphoff Norman and Ilchman (eds), 1972).

Many have defined it in terms of increase in national economy other defined it to include social improvement and still others in terms of increase in the capacity of the political system, and

while there are others who make no distinction between development and modernization., development is a complex phenomenon comprising many dimensions—social, political, economic, administrative and so on. Now there is trend to call as 'economic development', 'political development', 'social development', and soon. In the context of public administration, development is development administration and 'administrative development'. Then economic, political, social and administrative may be viewed as emerging from development without being development. So, while defining the concept of development, it is necessary to take an integrated approach. The overall goal of development is therefore to increase the economic, political, and civil rights of all people across gender, ethnic groups, religions, races, regions and countries. (Pye Lucian, 1966)

Unquestionably, the concept development is a multidimensional phenomenon which has been hotly debated globally (Thomas, 2004; Todaro, 2000). Recent literature cites over 500 publications on the various aspects, focus and application of the concept of development. Many scholars have described the concept as an 'unstable concept' being both an urgent global challenge and a vibrant theoretical field for achieving an ideal future or a destructive myth (Edelman & Haugerud, 2005), a 'contextual concept' focusing on western and other cultures (Rist, 1997), a 'binary concept' in terms of developed and developing countries (Hettne, 2002), a 'European Enlightenment' a period during which the foundations of modern science and technology, together with rational and liberal ideologies of progress and development, were laid down (Osborne, 2001) and 'modernity' emphasising constant pursuit of progress in human wellbeing (Giddens, 2003; Jones, 1993). Several theories have also been developed over the past 50 years to explain development patterns and process. Theories of development such as modernisation theory, dependency theory, social justice theory and human capital theory (Blomstrom & Hettne, 1984; Preston, 1996; Rapley, 1996) have evolved over the past six decades to give explanations to the wellbeing of people, nations and regions. Additionally, discussions on the concept of development have been debated within the sustainable development context focusing on environmental, social and economic factors (Adams, 2006; Fergus & Rowney, 2005; Lele, 1991; UNESCO, 2005)

Situating the concept of sustainable development within the broader context of development discussions, there has been a constant concern regarding the state of poverty especially in developing countries. Understanding the poverty situation and ways of improving the living conditions of the poor in developing countries are critical factors in achieving sustainable development. Supporting Pearce and Atkinson (1998), sustainable development cannot be achieved when the current generation is in abject poverty. A conscious effort to improve the living conditions of the poor is important in ensuring environmental protection, improving economic development and achieving social equity. (Patrick Brandful Cobbinah, 2011)

Facets of Development Administration:

Development is the center of politics of the so called Third World countries and governments play a key role in national development. (Handler Ralph and Plano Jack C, 1982). Public administrations are considered an important mechanism in this development process. Government uses its administrative authority to achieve national development task by formulating, organizing and implementing large-scale action programs. To handle these complex activities of the government, instrument of development administration is employed. (Sapru R, 1980)

Development Administration is an instrumental means for defining, consolidating, and implementing national goals in developing countries. (Minocha.O.P. (ed),, 1983) The concept of development administration emerged shortly after the Second World War. The field of development administration can be talked about in various contexts but its applicability depends upon mainly the systems which affect it and in turn is affected by the systems.

Concept of Development Administration in Developed Countries:

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

- High Level of Differentiation
- High Degree of Professionalization
- Great Stress on Training
- A Motivated Work Force
- State-of-the-Art Technology
- Effective Integration
- Sound Regulatory Mechanisms

- Public-Private Partnership
- Participatory Governance
- Indicative Planning
- Higher Level of Integrity
- Responsiveness
- The Innovative Spirit
- Balanced Polity

Concept of Development Administration in Developing Countries like Nepal:

A critical difficulty in discussing the status of development administration in developing countries is the phenomenal heterogeneity in the environmental context, structures, behavioral patterns and outputs of the administrative system of these countries. There are prominent variations in the levels of political, economic, social, cultural and technological development in the so-called “developing nations” that cover geographically, a major part of the globe. Most nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America will fall in this category. Exceptions are, however, too obvious to be ignored. While Japan has joined the big league of developed nations, South Korea is not too behind. But most notably, the People’s Republic of China is leaping towards the status of a Super-power and the Asian Tigers are not comfortable in the company of Nepal, Sri Lanka or Bangladesh. Thus, the variations in their level of socio-economic development create categories within the broader category of developing nations. And then there are countries such as North Korea, Cuba and Vietnam, which still value certain attributes of Communism, while there are nations like India and Philippines that have honored the tenets of parliamentary democracy.(www.google.com, Development Administration in Developed and Developing Countries)

The following factors play a pivotal role in Development Administration for developing nations:

Diversity in Political Regimes

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

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

Bureaucratic Polity

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

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

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

Varying Levels of Economic Development

Heterogeneity is the key characteristic of the level of economic development in developing countries. The World Bank reports point out massive variation in the levels of national income,

per capita income, industrial development, agricultural growth, etc., in these nations. To a great extent, the level of an economic development and the level of equity in the distribution of economic resources influence the nature of development administration in developing countries. Nations which decided to move with the times in matters of globalization and liberalization of their economies, with the help of foreign assistance and investment, moved a lot faster on the road to economic development than did the others, which took initiative in this regard belatedly and haltingly.

Differing Levels of Human Development

Many reports show that there is a striking dissimilarity among developing nations in matter of human development. While India, Nepal, Pakistan and Bangladesh are low in Human Development Index (HDI), there are many other nations of the Third World that enjoy a higher place in this realm, for example, Sri Lanka.

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

Causes of Failure of Development Administration in Developing Countries like Nepal:

Students of public administration tend to view administration in developing countries as an output. They ask, for example, how can the Western nations help produce and equip competent personnel for the administrative tasks of development? This objective obviously coincides with one of the aspects of educational planning. But the educational planner - indeed any planner - is confronted by the problems of administration in another respect as well - as an input. The indigenous administration, whatever its failings, is the instrument that must execute the plans. It is not only a patient to be cured, it is also the only doctor in town. Technical assistance can, indeed, only assist. Thus, while schools and institutes of public administration have before them the long-run positive task of training and improving public administrations, the planner working with administration as an input meets the difficulties in the short run. The study of development administration will have for him at least the negative usefulness of illuminating the obstacles he must take into account if his plan is to have a chance of being implemented. Indeed, economists and educational planners must recognize that, if the best-laid plan comes to naught because of administrative inadequacies - and if these difficulties could have been foreseen - it is the fault of the plan and of the planner.

The experiences and observations of those who have gone before present an awesome picture. The obstacles are many and varied and interconnected, but we might usefully discuss them under four somewhat arbitrary headings:

- (1) shortages of skills and tools; (2) difficulties of organization and structure; (3) political difficulties and (4) cultural and attitude barriers.**

Shortages of skills and tools:

First, there is a shortage of trained personnel, which is the most obvious and widely noted difficulty» The shortage generally afflicts all levels of administration, but is particularly acute with regard to 'support administration', i.e. middle- and lower-echelon personnel, and local administrators. One expert has stated that ten people are needed for 'support administration for every one person at the top. (1) A n additional problem is that the emerging nations' interest in foreign affairs absorbs m a n y of their skilled people, and this further reduces the number available for development tasks.

Secondly, there is a great waste of the limited talent that is available for administration. There are often large numbers of skilled people in administration, but with the wrong skills., e., g , people who studied liberal arts or law (The tradition of the amateur 'generalist' dies hard,) These subjects have prestige but little usefulness., and thus m a n y new administrators are in effect untrained.

Much of the right kind of training is wasted because trainees seek other work or get no chance to use their skill. New schools and institutes for the teaching of public administration are often provided, for both students and teachers, for those people who can be spared from their work, i, e. the least useful. (Shriram B Bapat, 1965)

Another aspect or consequence of the shortage of personnel is the rapid turnover in individual positions, as skilled m e n are shifted around from one position to another. Some of it is voluntary, and due to the lack of uniform systems of pay, classification, and advancement. But most of it is a relic of bygone days of the generalist administrator, when one administrative job was not basically different from any other, and when frequent rotation could broaden the generalist's outlook.

The skill lacking is not merely advanced economic or administrative expertise, but simple office skills: filing systems, internal communications, trained stenographers, clerks, accountants, etc. Without the ability to preserve and organize internal records, an administration is m o r e or less amnesiac. Yet training institutions often teach advanced concepts and techniques borrowed from advanced countries - philosophical bases of administration, human relations, computer technology etc., and neglect the 'nuts and bolts'. (Sam Richardson,1965)

Elementary statistical data are often unreliable, fragmentary, or non-existent. Governments m a y be incapable of collecting the tax revenue that is due them. Because of the unreliability of local administration, the point at which the marginal revenue falls short of the marginal cost of tax collection is reached very early. Professor Fred Riggs has estimated that in Colombia, for

example, better administration and enforcement could raise the total national tax yield by one-third or more. (Riggs, 1956)

Difficulties of organization and structure:

There are problems involved in the location of the central planning agency in the over-all governmental structure. Each of the several possible arrangements has its own hazards, all planning responsibilities can be concentrated in a cabinet-level ministry of planning, or in a super ministry like the Ministry of Co-ordination in Greece« Planning units can be established in the Ministry of Finance or in the Ministry of Economic Affairs« An independent planning commission can be established, perhaps, as in Pakistan, located in and responsible to the Office of the President» Or the Commission may constitute a cabinet committee composed of the interested ministers (finance, economic affairs, labour, education, agriculture, etc.).

The essential problem is co-ordination. Co-ordination has at least two major aspects: co-ordination of the several departmental objectives in one over-all, balanced plan, and co-ordination of planning, financing, and execution» One source of problems is that these two requirements are to some extent incompatible.

On the one hand, coordination of departmental objectives seems to require a planning unit independent of any particular ministry, for example, depositing planning powers in a Ministry of Finance facilitates co-ordination of project and budgetary planning, but risks subordinating departmental objectives to narrow fiscal considerations. In general, locating over-all planning units in a ministry which is on a par with other ministries greatly complicates the task of co-ordination between them. On the other hand, the more 'over-all' the planning unit's scope and position, the more divorced it may be from the units responsible for detailed execution, a free-floating planning agency, independent of particular ministries, may be more capable of an over-all view, but may have no mandate except to draw up the development plan. The resulting plan is likely to be 'nonfunctional', i.e. it will not incorporate measures, provisions and procedures (administrative and financial) necessary for implementation.

With weak liaison with the interested ministries and operating agencies, the planning organ can neither direct the administrative machinery nor benefit from its co-operation. As a result, plans may not be backed up by operationally designed programs; projects may be described only in vague terms, the required manpower and equipment may not be scheduled, sites may not be selected, finance may not be fully arranged, projects may be inadequately tested for administrative or practical feasibility or for economic viability etc. (Donald C. Stone, 1965)

The super ministry seems subject to the same considerations as any independent planning unit: the question is one of co-ordination of effective power. This is more obvious in regard to a Cabinet Committee: what guarantee is there that committee decisions will be binding on the members? In fact, the problem of organizational structure is a residual one: the essential problem of central planning is the mobilization of political power in the society, which is a matter of

leadership and co-operative action on the part of the people who count. This can succeed (or fail) no matter what the location of the planning unit in the formal organizational chart. Unfortunately, one observer states, most central planning commissions in the developing world have little more than an advisory capacity, i. e. influence but no power. (William K. Kapp, 1960)

The budget process can be a source of problems. Lack of co-ordination between planning and financing has its own particular aspects: the budgetary credits allotted to the plan may be insufficient, essential loan funds may be unavailable, foreign exchange needed for equipment importation may be denied, foreign aid programs may be un-coordinated with each other or with the budget etc. (Peter W. Rodman, 1968,)

Political difficulties

The most frequent complaint in this regard is that of political interference with administrative tasks. Political prestige motivates some projects. Political pressure rather than merit, influences appointments and promotions. Africanization (and its counterparts) may proceed too rapidly, and lower the over-all level of competence. Officials abuse their positions because of political influence - to accept bribes, to intimidate the public, to flout regulations, or to ignore instructions.

Political instability is another aspect of this problem. Frequent government changes imply not only changes in policy, but also changes in administrative personnel. Ministers of education may come and go rapidly. Disruption of policy results either because the new Minister must learn from the beginning what is going on, or because he insists on starting all over again from scratch (the 'pseudo-creative response').

The vulnerability of developing administrations to political vicissitudes is due to the fact that these bureaucracies are politically engaged themselves, to a far greater degree than are their counterparts in advanced countries. That is, the bureaucracy may be not merely a realm of the executive, but the executive - in-fact. It may be the only body in the society capable of formulating clear social and political goals. If the legislature is feeble (as is often the case), the bureaucracy may be the arena of political struggle among interest groups, or may become an interest group itself, allying itself with the ruling oligarchy. In fact, (to look at this from another point of view), it is usually desired that the bureaucracy go beyond its specialized mechanical functions and become an active promoter of the political goal of change. The reasons for this phenomenon of political engagement will emerge in the later discussion of development administration theory, but it should be evident already that its roots go deeper than the venality of isolated individuals.

Cultural and attitude barriers:

Because of the bureaucracy's significant political role in developing societies, the bureaucracy's adjustment to the tasks of development is crucial. The ingrained conservatism of most of these bureaucracies thus becomes a major obstacle. Development requires an administration mobilized for transformation not for mere 'administering'. But bureaucracies, like any established institutions, tend to prefer stability and continuity; staff colleges tend to imbue a code of behavior that emphasizes rules and routines. Universities, though more autonomous than staff colleges may be even more stubbornly resistant to change in their approaches to training. (Donald C. Stone, 1965)

Whatever the validity of generalizations about inherent conservatism, bureaucracies in formerly colonial countries are likely to inherit a conservative paternalistic orientation from their pre-independence days. Colonial administration concerned itself with the status-quo-maintaining functions of collecting revenue and preserving law and order.

The social status of the civil service, usually another part of the colonial legacy, can be an important aspect of the bureaucracy's unsuitability for change. Many countries, especially in Asia and Africa, have inherited the European idea of the civil service as a privileged elite. For political and other reasons, salaries and leave provisions geared to the living standards of personnel from the metropolitan country are unlikely to be altered suddenly when native personnel take over.

Less striking cultural influences affect the human relations of management. A more authoritarian tradition than the U.S. is accustomed to undermines the application of administrative principles that seem essential to Americans. The 'participative' approach to management is likely to produce disappointing results with workers who accept, and are accustomed to, closer supervision and stricter pressure. But the authoritarian pattern suffers from the poor feedback of information and criticism to supervisors. (William Foote Whyte and Lawrence K. Williams, 1963).

In general, personnel administration is supposed to ensure that the personal motivation of employees is channeled in socially beneficial directions. But the absence of uniform systems of examination, qualification, pay and classification, the lack of opportunity for advancement, the lack of job security, and continuity, and the absence of satisfactory retirement provisions, are all likely pre-conditions for corruption.

Lethargy and inept service are common, making the bureaucracy ineffective and incompetent. Public servants lack commitment and are overwhelmingly influenced by political parties and their ideologies. The traditional administrative process is still bogged down in longer procedures than necessary, and creating quicker services seems to always be latched to some form of corruption. ***Afno Manchhe (one's own people), Chakari (Sycophancy), political influence,***

and bribery are deeply rooted in Nepalese bureaucracy. (Bishwambhar Ghimire and Muhammad Ashraf, 2016)

Alternative Solution of Development Administration in Developing Countries like Nepal:

The challenges faced by development administration make it difficult for the discipline to achieve development goals, socio-economic progress, and nation-building. Therefore, efforts should be made to improve the techniques and methodologies of development administration in the developing countries to serve as the instrument to implement development programmes. The efforts to improve administration relates to both **qualitative and quantitative changes in bureaucratic policies, programmes, procedures, methods of work, organisational structures, staffing patterns, number and quality of development personnel of different types, and patterns of relation with clients of administration.** (Bishwambhar Ghimire and Muhammad Ashraf, 2016)

Man-power planning and management:

There must be proper man-power planning and management in order to ensure the supply of sufficient qualified and competent personnel to execute development programmes. Through proper training, the essentially status-based bureaucratic structure and behaviour can be changed into a change-oriented, client-oriented, and service-motivated bureaucracy.

Bureaucracy should be made to be more flexible and adaptable to meet quickly the exigencies of development. Organizational rules and procedures should not be allowed to get precedence over target achievement

De-centralization:

Authority should be decentralized to enable field units to take decisions on the spot as far as possible. This is necessary because most of the development activities take place at the field level far away from the administration headquarters. Also, the supremacy of the politician must be accepted and bureaucracy must work with the political class as a co-partner in development enterprises. Change in participation from elite to mass must as well be adopted as a way of doing things.

Ameliorated Bureaucracy:

Bureaucracy should secure the co-operation and participation of the people in development activities. It must be understood that bureaucracy, however, capable it may be cannot take the entire responsibility and load of development. The people have to look after themselves and be primary actors in the development drama. It is in their interest not to be dependent on the administration but to be largely self-reliant. Popular participation in development activities is a resource hence bureaucracy must work very closely with the people under a general rubric of service ethic. If development is to have a meaningful content, defence expenditure has to be scaled down, population explosion curbed, employment opportunities created and expanded, and literacy level has to be improved substantially. (Adam Adem Anyebe , 2017)

Administrative Reform:

The term “Administrative Reform” represents the elimination of endemic problems in the present system and establishes a new improved system.

It includes interaction between politics and administration for the betterment of public services. It is not only an initiative to strengthen services but also to foster better understanding between public servants and stakeholders (Brunsson and Olsen, 1993). One study in 1988 indicated: “Administrative reform is a universal claim of contemporary societies, but strategies of general applicability for achieving such reform are far from being universally defined” (Jreisat, 1988, p. 85).

Public administration is the fundamental organization of the state that implements public policies and accomplishes the activities of national development. However, it is only possible to achieve the goal of reform if bureaucracy is accountable, result-driven, people-oriented, effective, efficient, competent, and transparent (Brunsson and Olsen, 1993).

According to Caiden (1968), “Administrative reform is the artificial inducement of administrative transformation against resistance. It is artificial because it is manmade, deliberate, and planned; it is not natural, accidental or automatic” (p.349). He characterized reform into three features “moral purpose, artificial transformation and administrative resistance—gives administrative reform its distinctiveness” (p. 350). Reforms are not applied by reformers and then measured by their advocates; rather reform focuses on results rather than observation (Caiden, 1968). Thereby administrative reform seeks “to improve administrative capacity for efficient and effective performance” (Jreisat, 1988, p. 86). In addition, it is fundamental to make administration viable when the function of administration is inadequate (Caiden, 1968).

Overall Scenario of Nepal:

Nepal belongs to one of the least developed countries around the world with HDI 157 out of 187 countries (UNDP 2013). Two third of the population still depends on the subsistence agriculture. Similarly, due to lack of job opportunities, youth migration is escalating and Nepal is facing one of the most critical phases of development in its history (Snellinger 2009). Inadequate

infrastructure and poor road connectivity are other constraints for the development (World Bank 2011). It follows that, poor access to electricity is another challenge despite the country's enormous potential for hydroelectricity. Similarly, Nepal has huge prospective for tourism due to its unique natural resources (Bhandari 2004). Nonetheless, Nepal has not benefited optimally from the tourism sector for its self-sustained development. Recently Government of Nepal (2011) has announced diverse policies for accelerating development through proper utilization of local resources. This paper critically evaluates the crucial policies such as Agriculture Development Strategy, National Cooperatives Policy, National Youth Policy, and Micro-hydro for Rural Development, and Tourism for Development. The paper discusses each of these policies' background; critically analyze the likelihood as well as challenges for fast-tracking development; and finally offers some recommendations based discussion and analysis. (Sudarshan Neupane, 2014).

Nepal is a least developed country (LDC) characterized by slow economic growth, socioeconomic underdevelopment and a low level of human development, it is emerging from a politically and socially fragile post-conflict situation, structurally generated poverty and inequality, and deeply entrenched forms of social exclusion.

The economic growth of the country has averaged 4 percent over the last decade. Absolute poverty decreased from 42 percent in 1995 to 25 percent in 2010 and decreased further to 23.8 percent in 2015. However, there are large disparities in the rates of poverty by gender, social group and geographical area. Nepal remains one of the few countries to have accomplished impressive human development gains over the last two decades. But having started from a very low base, Nepal still has a low human development status. Nepal aspires to emerge as an inclusive, equitable, and prosperous middle-income country by 2030 with the spirit of a welfare state. The country aims for sustainable poverty reduction and human development with low vulnerability and higher human security. (NPC, 2015)

Nepal, as a resourceful country, has the enormous capacity to develop itself, if it continues to initiate economic growth, while concurrently implementing the above-discussed policies, to carefully address the issues of rural community development. As discussed in the paper, a policy such the Agriculture Development Strategy has potential for tremendous growth by significant contribution to GDP, resource mobilization and poverty reduction particularly in rural areas. Nonetheless, the government's budget allocation and overall administration should be improved (ADB 2013). Otherwise the agriculture policy will become a 'policy tiger' and remain ineffective. To generate plentiful youth employment opportunities, government and its partners, particularly private sector, should be active and enthusiastic. In addition, the cooperatives mobilization is likely to bring remarkable changes in rural livelihoods and for this, the government needs to develop effective and strategic partnerships with the private sector. Similarly, micro-hydro is substantiated to be remarkably successful in improving living standards in focused rural communities, and it requires further scaling up for its lasting contribution for energy sufficiency and economic development. Last but not the least, tourism

provides a strong foundation for the country's economic development and still requires a dedicated effort to increase connectivity, domestic and international airport, as well as generating capable human resources. In order to achieve accelerating development in Nepal, coordination among stakeholders, enhanced public-private partnership, local participation and ownership, political commitment and the actual enactment of these policies are essential. (Sudarshan Neupane, 2014)

Conclusion:

The above analysis underlines the growing impact of development administration on the broader governance systems. Although there are objections to this concept emanating from several intellectual quarters, the fact remains that the whole literature of public administration in the last four decades bears the imprint of development administration. As the World Economic Order continues to unfold itself, the nature and scope of development administration is bound to change further. This adaptability is an intrinsic vitality of development administration that would lend it sustainability.

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

Developed nations are decades and, in a few cases, centuries ahead of developing nations. Yet both of them have to evolve goal-oriented administrative systems. Depending on the political stability and the level of socio-economic development of a particular category of nations, the progressiveness of these goals, will vary. And within the same category of nations, the goals to be achieved by their respective administrative systems will differ in nature and intensity. In all cases, the success of a society in achieving its goals of development will depend upon the competence, performance and attitude of its administrative system. All administrative systems need to be change-oriented, goal-oriented, progressive, efficient, decentralized, responsive and motivated. These features create a confluence between the development administrative systems of the rich and the poor nations.

Bibliography:

1. Abercrombie, N., Hill, S. and Turner, B. S. (1994). *The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology* (3rd Ed.). Penguin Group:
2. Adam Adem Anyebe , 2017, A n Assessment of the Relevance of Development Administration as a System of Action in Developing Nations
3. Adams, W. M. (2006). *The Future of Sustainability: Re-Thinking Environment and Development in the Twenty-First*
4. Administration & Development (1986-1998), 8(1), 85.
5. *Administration and Change*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1966.
6. Bishwambhar Ghimire and Muhammad Ashraf, 2016, BELEAGUERED ADMINISTRATION: A STUDY OF ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS IN NEPAL
7. Blomstrom, M. and Hettne, B. (1984). *Development Theory in Transition: The Dependency Debate and Beyond-Third*
8. Brandt Willy : North –South: A Programme for survival (London,Pan Books,1980) p 48 .
9. Brunsson, Nills and Johan P. Olsen. 1993. The Reforming Organization, Routledge, London and New work.
10. Caiden, G. E. 1968. A dministrative reform. International Review of Administrative Sciences, 34(4), 347-354. doi:10.1177/002085236803400404
11. Camiller). London & New York: Zed Books.
12. *Century*. The World Conservation Union. www.iucn.org (Accessed on 4th Jan. 2012)
13. Chandler Ralph and Plano Jack C:-The Public Administration Dictionary (New York, John Wiley and Sons,1982)p 13
14. Cliche, P. (2005). *A Reflection on the Concepts of “Poverty” and “Development”*. Canada: Canadian Catholic
15. *Companion to Development Studies*. London: Arnold & New York: Oxford University Press.
16. Donald C . Stone, speaking at Xlllth International Congress . . . , 22 July 1965.
17. Donald C. Stone, 'Tasks, Precedents, and Programs for Education in Development Administration', paper submitted
18. Edelman, M. and Haugerud, A. (Eds.). (2005). *The Anthropology of Development and Globalisation: from Classical*
19. Esman, Milton J., “CAG and the Study of Public Administration”, in Fred W. Riggs, ed., *The Frontiers of Development Administration*, Duke University Press, Durham, 1970.
20. Esman, Milton, “The Politics of Development Administration” in John Montgomery and William Siffin, eds., *Approaches to Development: Politics*,
21. Esman, Milton, “The Politics of Development Administration” in John Montgomery and William Siffin, eds., *Approaches to Development: Politics, Administration and Change*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1966.

22. Fred W . Riggs, 'Public Administration: A neglected Factor in Economic Development', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, vol, 305 (May 1956).
23. Gupta, M.C. and R.K. Tiwari, eds., *Restructuring Government*, IIPA, New Delhi, 1998
24. Gupta, M.C. and R.K. Tiwari, eds., *Restructuring Government*, IIPA, New Delhi, 1998.
25. Harris, J. M. (2000). *Basic Principles of Sustainable Development*. Metford: Global Development and Environment
26. Heady, Ferrel, *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, Marcel Decker, New York, 1996.
27. Heady, Ferrel, *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, Marcel Decker, New York, 1996.
28. Heady, *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, op. cit
29. Heady, *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, op. cit
30. Heaphey, James, "Comparative Public Administration: Comments on Current Characteristics," *Public Administration Review*, XXVIII, 1968.
31. Hettne, B. (2002). Current Trends and Future Options in Development. In V. Desai & R.B. Potter (Eds.), *The*
32. House, London
33. in Comité International de l'Organisation Scientifique (CIOS), XIIIth International Management Congress, Proceedings: Human Progress through Better Management, 1963.
34. Institute, Working Paper No. 00-04, Tufts University.
35. Jreisat, J. E. 1988. Administrative reform in developing countries: A comparative perspective: SUMMARY. Public
36. Minocha.O.P. (ed): Advanced Development Administration for the Executives of Government of Gujrat, January 24 to February 5, 1983 P.6.
37. Montgomery, John, "A Royal Invitation: Variations on Three Classical Themes", in John Montgomery and William J. Siffins, eds., *Approaches to Development Politics, Administration and Change*, McGraw Hill, New York, 1966.
38. National Planning Commission, 2015
39. Organisation for Development and Peace.
40. Osborne, R. (2001). *Megawords: 200 Terms You Need to Know*. Crows Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin.
41. Patrick Brandful Cobbinah, 2011, Reflections on six decades of the concept of development: Evaluation and future research
42. Penguin Books
43. Peter W . Rodman, 1968, DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION: OBSTACLES, THEORIES AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING
44. *Political Economy to Contemporary Neoliberalism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers
45. Pye Lucian : Apects of political Development :An Anayalitical Study, Boston Little, Brown and Company, 1966, pp 45-48
46. Raphaeli, "Comparative Public Administration: An Overview", in Raphaeli, ed., *Readings in Comparative Public Administration*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, 1967

47. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2393993>
48. Riggs, Fred, W., "The Context of Development Administration", in Edward Weidner, op. cit, 1970.
49. Riggs, Fred, W., *The Ecology of Administration*, Indiana University, Bloomington, 1964.
50. Rist, G. (1997). *The History of Development: From Western Origins to Global Faith* (Translated by Patrick
51. Sam Richardson, speaking at the XHIth International Congress . . . 22 July 196 5.
52. Sapru R.:-Nature ,Needs and Strategy of Development in Developing Countries: A Review in *The Indian Journal of Economics*,Vol- LX,No.238,January 1980 pp 293-294
53. Seers, D. (1969). 'The Meaning of Development'. *International Development Review* 11(4), 2-6
54. Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press
55. Shriram B Bapat, speaking at the XIIIth International Congress . . . 22 July 196 5.
56. Thomas, A. (2004). *The Study of Development*. Paper prepared for DSA Annual Conference, 6 November, Church to the XIIIth International Congress . . . July 196 5, pp. 5ff, . . . See also Donald C. Stone, 'Government Machinery
57. Snellinger, A 2009, 'Yuba hamro pusta: youth and general politics in Nepali political culture', *Studies in Nepali History & Society*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 39-66.
58. Sudarshan Neupane, 2014, AN ANALYSIS OF IMPORTANT POLICIES FOR ACCELERATING DEVELOPMENT IN NEPAL
59. Todaro, M.P. (2000). *Economic Development* (7th Ed.). Reading, MASS: Addison-Wesley.
60. UNDP 2013, H uman development report 2013, United Nations Development Programme, New York, USA.
61. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (1990). *Human Development Report*. New York: Oxford University Press
62. Uphoff Norman and Ilchman (eds) :-The Political Economy of Development : Theoretical and Empirical Contributions (California,University of California Press,1972) p. 9 Waterston, op. cit. , p. 309.
63. William Foote Whyte and Lawrence K. Williams, 'Supervisory Leadership: A n International Comparison',
64. William K .K app, 'Economic Development, National Planning, and Public Administration' *Kyklos*, vol. XIII, fase. 2 (1960), p. 179 *World Responses*. London: Zed Book
65. www.google.com, Development Administration in Developed and Developing Countries