

This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-
NoDerivs 3.0 Licence.

To view a copy of the licence please see:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

(832)

INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT STUDIES
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, NAIROBI

IDS LIBRARY
RESERVE COLLECTION

Discussion Paper No. 91

ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS OF DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING AND PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

B Y
Walter Ouma Oyugi

February, 1970

This paper was originally prepared at the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) New York, during the summer of 1969. A grant from the Graduate Committee on Summer Internships, the Graduate Division, University of California at Berkeley made the research possible.

Any views expressed in this paper are those of the author. They should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of the UNITAR, University of California, the Institute for Development Studies or the University College, Nairobi.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS OF DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING AND PLAN IMPLEMENTATION*

Planned development has assumed such an important role in the economic behaviour of the developing countries that one wonders whether as a system it has no problems.

In this essay, the author attempts to answer this question, paying special attention to the administrative aspects of the matter.

* The author is grateful for the assistance and criticism he received from Mr. Leonard, head of the Evaluations section at the UNITAR and also from Professor C. Leys of the Department of Government, University College, Nairobi. Of course they bear no responsibility for the opinions expressed here.

I - THE CONCEPT OF PLANNING

As a concept and a process, planning has been defined by different people in different ways.¹ In the final analysis, however, one would agree with Professor Bertram Gross that:

" A plan or a program is a sequence of future actions to which a person, unit or organization is committed."

And he continues:

" In the simplest form, planning is the process of making, changing, or coordinating such plans."²

Summarizing the opinions of many planners and theoreticians, Waterston writes:

" Planning has been defined in many ways, but most authorities agree that it is in essence, an organized, conscious and continual attempt to select the best available alternatives to achieve specific goals."³

Conceived in the Grossian terms, a development plan is, therefore, a sequence of future developmental actions to which a government (organization) is committed. Further modified, a development plan is a shopping list (in as much as many would not want to admit it) of future developmental actions to which a government aspires. They are aspirations because of their dependence on resource availability. Still, in the manner of Waterston we would emphasize that development planning is an organized, conscious and continual attempt on the part of the modernizing national elites to select the best available alternatives to achieve specific development oriented goals. This is what poor nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America have been attempting to do for the last twenty years. We shall now examine this historical background.

1. At least most books on development planning attempt to either define or explain the concept, e.g. Lewis, Meier, Hanson, Hagen, Waterston, Gross, etc.
2. Gross, Bertram M., Organization and Their Managing. The Free Press of Glencoe, 1968. Chapter 23, "Planning: Developing Purposefulness", P. 573.
3. Waterston, A., Development Planning, Lessons of Experience. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1965, P. 26.

The Emergence of Planning:

The practice of planned development as we know it today began only in the late 1920's in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). The poor nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America have practiced it in a meaningful fashion for only a decade. But the attempt at development through planning goes back much earlier than that.

In Africa and Asia (in the case of former British colonies) there was an attempt as early as 1929, through the Colonial Development and Welfare Act to develop selectively certain schemes, but the effort died during the Great Depression of the early 1930's. A similar act of 1940 attempted to enlarge the scope of assistance both in terms of schemes and financing but like its predecessor, the efforts were frustrated in the heat of World War II.

According to Professor Stolper, deliberate development really got under way with the Third Colonial Development and Welfare Act of April 1945, which made £120 million available to the colonies collectively for the ten fiscal years ending March 31, 1956. As a result of this, he writes, each colony was asked to produce a ten-year development plan.⁴

The "planlessness" of the effort during this time was dramatized as early as 1948 in a report by a Select Committee of the House of Commons. The report stated:

"the allocation of expenditure on the Ten-Year Plan ...does not give anything like a complete picture of the future development of the territory. The plan does not propound a complete strategy of development; it is merely an aggregate of proposal for spending money."⁵

This was in reference to the Nigerian plan, but it could have been said of any other British colony at the time. And even the successor plans that carried these colonies to independence were merely "aggregates of proposals for spending money."

Similar attempts at "planning" were made in Latin America in the 1930's and 1940's. Only from the 1950's, however, has there been a general desire in Latin America to regulate

4. Stolper, W.F., Planning Without Facts. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966. P. 56.

5. Ibid., P. 37.

development policy by means of overall plans establishing priorities and interrelations between the different sectors and policies on the basis of an overall view of the economy.⁶ The full realization by the Latin American countries that only through planning could they (1) mobilize national resources, (2) bring about necessary structural changes in their economies, (3) enhance efficiency and productivity, and (4) secure more international financial co-operation, came about in 1961 at the Punta del Este Conference in Uruguay (and the birth of the Alliance for Progress).⁷ Since then, according to the observation of the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA), virtually all the Latin American countries have prepared plans of different kind and scope.⁸

Today there is no developing nation that does not have a development plan in one form or another. The motivation to plan has come from within and from without. The United Nations has been very instrumental in encouraging the developing nation to adopt planning as a means to ensuring orderly progress towards the developmental goals. There has also been a realization on the part of the metropolitan powers that only through planning could there be a systematic development of their former colonies. Hence, they have encouraged planning, and have provided technical assistance where needed. What do these planners hope to achieve?

Advantages and Objectives of Planning:

Planning, as we have seen, has become an accepted practice in many countries since the end of World War II. Widespread adaptation of planning for development springs primarily from the urgency with which the task of overcoming economic backwardness is viewed. The planners hope, in the process, "to promote the structural change in the economy through a conscious direction of investment flows according to a predetermined scheme of priorities."⁹

6. Salgado, Germanico. "First Attempts of Planning in Latin America: Notes on an Experiment", Planning and Plan Implementation. UN Dept. of Economic and Social Affairs Doc. ST/ECA/102, UN, New York, 1967.

7. For a further discussion of this, see article by Secretariat of Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) "Planning in Latin America" in Planning and Plan Implementation, op. cit. P. 20 - 42.

8. Ibid., P. 20.

9. United Nations ECOSOC Committee for Development Planning, Report on the 4th and 5th Sessions: March/May 1969. UN, New York, 1969, p. 24.

This deliberate restructuring of the institutional system has succeeded in bringing to surface a number of significant considerations:

- (1) Planning has enabled the national elites to some extent to make rational economic policy decisions that are consistent with the national capabilities.
- (2) Planning helps the national planners to identify resources and relate them to plan objectives. Where they have not been exploited, their potentials are examined, and investments, both foreign and domestic, are directed or redirected accordingly.
- (3) Planning mechanism has helped to coordinate and harmonize conflicting national aspirations. /
- (4) Through the institution of planning, some governments have been able systematically to ~~plan~~ enforce requisite societal changes that are prerequisites for economic development.
- (5) In the process, the significance of the role of administrative machinery for development implementation (a point we shall return to in Chapter III) has gained due recognition.

The five advantages we have listed by no means exhaust the list. Whether they can be realized depends largely on the planning machinery and mechanism, with the accent on realism, thoroughness and efficiency. The need for efficiency arises because of lack of resources. Planning sets priorities for their allocation and use. The speed with which the benefits are realized may be disappointingly slow. Harmonizing contradictions in aspirations is an important factor to observe. Alluding to some of these attendant problems with reference to Nigeria, Professor Hagen wrote:

"In a society where change in the past has been little and slow, where resources are scarce or have not been developed, and where an effort is now being made to obtain rapid change, the need for seeing that the various governmental measures fit together sensibly and have the desired impact on development is much more urgent than in a country whose institutions have long been adjusted to continuing change."¹⁰

This planned development necessarily leads to an increase in the role played by the state in economic and social affairs, and this in turn places special burden on development administrators.

10. Hagen, E.E., "Nigeria" in Planning Economic Development. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin Inc., P. 17-18.

Characteristics of a Development Plan:

A good national development plan should, inter alia, be a unique reflection of the "peculiarities" of the nation in question. Yet we must say that there are certain fundamental attributes of a development plan that are near the universal plane.

A development plan in its proper perspective is not merely a collection of projects; projects should be viewed as some kind of system components, to be coordinated and harmonized. Germanico Salgado¹¹ has identified three functions which a development plan has to perform if it is intended to guide and promote a development policy:

- (1) To lay down a strategy - in other words to indicate the pattern of evolution which the economy should follow if it is to achieve the objectives of the action, bearing in mind the possibilities of expansion and the structural and functional relationships between its constituent parts.
- (2) To specify, in terms suitable for decision-making, the means needed to achieve the desired evolution of the economy.
- (3) To inform those responsible for the Execution of the Plan concerning the part they must play and the context in which they must play it, and to inform public opinion concerning the implications of the national commitment represented by the plan.

Plans cannot implement themselves, however good they may be. How well the national aspirations as reflected in the plan are fulfilled is dependent, among other things, on the national administrative capacity.

11. Salgado, Germanico, "First Attempts at Planning in Latin America" op. cit., P. 55.

II - PERSPECTIVES OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION UNDER PLANNED DEVELOPMENT

Development planning imposes new demands on administration. The significance of administration in the process of plan formulation is illustrated by the fact that planning requires restructuring of administrative machinery in the developing nations. A new planning agency or department must be created and properly staffed. This would require the recruitment of new staff. Where this cannot be done without drawing on the existing bureaucracy, the few professionals available to other departments, e.g. Departments of Finance and Agriculture, will be transferred to the new agency, thereby leaving an "unfulfillable" vacuum elsewhere.

Planning also brings with it the need to change the decision-making mechanism in the government. Planners can no longer do without the field administrators and vice versa. The notion of administrators being implementors as opposed to policy-makers is unrealistic.

In some cases, administrators have been overworked. Because development programmes need proper coordination and periodic analyses, it means that more work than is usual is done by administrators in the process of plan fulfillment. Some of them are imposed from outside. One notes that during the course of planning, the insistence upon the making of feasibility studies by donor nations creates additional burden on administration. In his study of Nigeria, E.R. Dean¹² found out that this was one of the major administrative burdens that the senior civil servants experienced. Senior administrative officials during the 1962-66 plan period spent a lot of time preparing feasibility studies for foreign lenders as well as preparing contract documents. This was, indeed, an added burden on a developing bureaucracy with limited manpower, both quantitative and qualitative.

This administrative "unpreparedness" is said to be the cause of the slow pace of economic growth and development in most of the developing countries.¹³ In response to this, the

-
12. Dean, E.R., "Factors Impeding the Implementation of Nigeria's Six Year Plan" in The Nigerian Journal of Economic and Social Studies. Vol. VIII, No. 1, March, 1966. P. 113 - 128.
 13. Waterston, A., Development Planning, Lessons of Experience covers most of these findings. See also UN documents on development planning and public administration; e.g. A Handbook of Public Administration, ST/TAO/M/16, UN, New York, 1961.

United Nations set up a special division in the Secretariat - Public Administration Division. Through it, men of knowledge, ability and experience in the field of administration are sent out to "needy" nations. Results have so far not been very impressive in a decisive manner. Sometimes these people are used only in advisory capacities, with the bulk of administration still in the hands of the local bureaucrats. In some areas they have worked hard enough to push the local administration, only to see it bounce back on their departure.

The complex nature of administration in a planning polity may be examined by looking at the special link between planning and administration. Perhaps this may help explain why even the United Nations efforts have not been all that successful.

Interdependence between planning and administration:

The successful implementation of a development plan depends to a great extent on how well national planning elites can coordinate their efforts with those of line administrators.

Thus conceived, planning is an integral part of administrative processes. In almost all countries, administration is regarded as the process through which administrators (or managers, executives, administrative assistants, etc.) help achieve certain purposes through the activities of people in an organization.¹⁴ A planning agency (or department) is an organization. In this respect it is involved in administration. The administration of a development programme begins not at the implementation stage but at the planning stage. It is the administrative aspect of planning, i.e. its efficiency, upon which the ultimate success of a development plan depends. This has made an experienced teacher of development planning remark that in fact "the most effective government planners are those involved in certain day-to-day activities of government".¹⁵

Planning identifies national priorities. It is essential to effective development in that it directs the proper use of resources. Left to itself, however, planning would be

14. Gross, Bertram M., The Administration of Economic Development Planning: Principles and Fallacies. Washington University, St. Louis. Studies in Comparative International Development. Vol. 3, No. 5, 1967-68, p. 90.

15. Gross, Bertram M., ibid. P. 91.

a worthless effort. There can be development without planning, but there cannot be development without administration. In this respect, administration is the "king-maker". Yet in a "development action system",¹⁶ administration must depend equally on planning for its own effectiveness. This interdependence is further demonstrated by the fact that

"the developing countries cannot easily secure aid nowadays unless they can show the aid-giving organizations that their development is being properly planned and that they have the capacity, local or borrowed, to help with the administration of the plan".¹⁷

On this same theme, William Kapp writes:

"A quantitatively inadequate or a qualitatively defective system of public administration will not merely retard the development process, but may defeat the entire development effort in an even more decisive manner than any temporary shortage of capital.....".¹⁸

Besides the technical and economic aspects, planning requires proper emphasis on administrative and organizational aspects involving political and social implications. Development planning (economic aspects aside) is "an activity that involves intricate political processes, requires far-reaching changes in social organization, beliefs, attitudes, and revitalizing administrative tools for implementation".¹⁹ Here, then, we see that even administration depends on planning for its own development. And planning depends on administration here by the very fact that planners themselves function with an administrative organization, i.e. the planning agency, department, etc.

Once a plan has been formulated, its successful execution depends on how much commitment it can earn from the administrators. They must continue to re-evaluate critically plan

16. The phrase borrowed from Saul Katz, "Systems Approach to Development Administration". Comparative Administrative Group. American Society for Public Administration.
17. Cohen, Sir Andrew: "Development in Africa: The Problem of Today", Journal of Administration Overseas. Vol. VII, No. 3, July 1968, p. 340.
18. Kapp, William K: "Economic Development, National Planning and Public Administration", Kyklos. Vol. XIII, Fasc. 2, 1960, P. 172. Quoted by Sharma, K.C.: "Development Planning and Development Administration", International Review of Administrative Sciences. Vol. XXXIII, No. 2, 1962, p. 121.
19. Sharma, K.C. op. cit. P. 121.

performance and pass over their impressions to the planners for consideration. When it comes to the actual operation of the programme, it is the administrators who have contacts with the day-to-day decision-making in the governmental machinery that affects various aspects of the plan. It is also common knowledge that the restructuring and the improvement in the level of plan performance depends largely on how well the obstacles to development can be identified. For this and many other reasons, the national planners depend on administrators for the kind of information which the making and remaking of a sound development plan so much requires.

One mistaken assumption that has been attributed to bad planning is to see economic planning purely in "economic" terms. As Bertram Gross and several United Nations missions abroad have observed, the fallacy of regarding economic planning as merely economics has resulted in an underestimation of the critical roles administrators and political leaders play in both the formulation and the implementation of economic goals.²⁰

The preoccupation with "pure economics" has made planners in many countries live in a lonely world of their own, with administrators as adversaries instead of collaborators.

More often than not, changes aimed at economic development also induce administrative and organizational changes. That is to say,

"any real life economic problem is usually also administrative and organizational change, in the political balancing of divergent interests, in changing cultural values, and in the technologies, dealing with physical, biological or ecological process."²¹

This calls for a systemic approach to the problem of economic development. His model incorporates the major concepts traditionally used in national economic accounting, but broadens them from a set of economic indicators alone to a set of social indicators. According to this model, the state of any nation at any period of time can be analyzed in terms of two interrelated multi-dimensional elements: system structure and system performance. The element of system structure deals with the internal relations among the system's parts, the element of system performance with the acquiring

²⁰. See for example Bertram Gross, "The Administration of Economic Planning: Principles and Fallacies". op.cit. P. 91.

²¹. Ibid., P. 91.

of inputs and their transformation into outputs. Both involve relations with the external environment.²² The implication of this kind of analysis is simply that a development plan functions within a social system, and so does the administration. In this sense, both planning and administration as processes are system components -- to be coordinated and harmonized. They depend on each other for the sound functioning of the governmental system.

We have thus far stressed the need for, if not the interdependence between, planning and administration. One fact remains true however. It is that the bringing together of line administrators and planners depends on the quality and awareness on both sides of the men involved. This raises the whole question of administrative development and outlook.

In many countries, administrators²³ have been regarded as generalists - men who can do this today and that tomorrow. This is still typical of a number of former British colonies. The practice has produced men with a narrow, parochial attitude toward specialized expertise in economics and other technical fields. On the other hand, the fondness for specialization in certain other countries has led to an over emphasis on narrow techniques. This has been particularly apparent in the field of public administration, where such specialized techniques in personnel matters and budgeting have often been regarded as the essence of administration rather than simply aids to administration.²⁴ It seems that the days of the "generalist" tradition (in the British character) are over. Development plans have imposed new demands, hence new requirements for administrators. Increasingly administrators will be expected to be men who can comprehend the complexity that is involved in societal changes. They will be men willing and prepared to subordinate administrative thumb-rule to the higher goals of social and economic progress. They will be men who are capable of communicating and of integrating conflicting demands. These new integrating generalists, as I choose to call them, must view the organization - in this case the government, as a total system with sub-systems. Their success will be determined by how well they harmonize the emerging conflicting interests. They must be men of knowledge, able to coordinate the activities

22. For detailed discussion see ibid., p. 91.

23. By administrators here, I am referring primarily to the non-technical personnel.

24. Observation of Gross, Bertram M., "The Administration of Economic Development Planning", op. cit. P. 92.

of many technical specialists and professionals. At the same time, they must appreciate the unique contribution of these experts. This he (the administrator) does by relating them to the societal demands. This systemic approach would require that the "new administrators" be men who know enough about economics and other specialized fields to be able to understand what this "new administration" implies. The "new administration" does not stop here. It extends to the countryside. It is here that the new "generalist" must mobilize the population in the interest of economic development. His duties include programme publicity (another sign of dependency of planners on administrators) and evaluations. And as a group of experts once put it, his role has become "one of mobilization rather than supervision - with development based on activity impetus and cooperation and not on hierarchy and authority".²⁵ This means that he must be a "participant" rather than an "observer".

We see the interdependence of planning and administration in still another perspective. A planning activity needs original data out of which to fashion plans and needs. It also needs continuous feed-back data on their effects. To detect and transmit data is only part of the problem. It is the appropriate response that the planning agencies (or planners) give to the data communicated to them by "the new generalist administrators" that is of vital importance to the proper communication process. A sense of "equalness" should be generated. Planners should not look at themselves as any more important than the administrators - thereby creating an atmosphere of superior-inferior relationship - hence the inevitable rift. As Victor Thompson has correctly pointed out, insecurity generates a need to control which greatly restricts responses (innovation or creativity is by definition uncontrolled behavior). Thus, in a bureaucratic hierarchy-emphasized atmosphere, one of the basic ingredients of development administration - innovative responsiveness - is either absent or very weak.²⁶

To repeat: a sense of "equalness" between planners and administrators is essential to developmental efforts. The reduction in resistance to plans can be achieved only by

25. Administration of National Development Planning. Report of a meeting of experts held at Paris 8-19 June 1964. UN Doc ST/TAO/M 26. p. 5.

26. Thompson, Victor A., "Administrative Objectives for Development Administration", Administrative Science Quarterly. Vol. 9, June 9 1964, P. 91-108 at 104.

getting the administrators involved in the formulation process. Often times plans have come from up the hierarchy only to be either resisted by the administrators or by the citizenry. Sometimes they have only been given half-hearted support. Nothing could be more detrimental to planned change than this. Bringing both sides together, i.e. planners and administrators, provides an opportunity for both sides to register their misgivings about the plan during its preparation. The information to be secured in the process is vital. Current conditions and practices regarding the state of the economy, viewed in its widest sense, must be known in time if the plan under preparation is to be of any value. In the process of this dialogue, possible future reactions to certain parts or aspects of the plan by certain interested parties may be identified in time and either eliminated or improved upon. An atmosphere of "we-all-participated", if generated, acts in the interest of the development efforts.

Of course, we are nor unmindful of the political inhibition on all this. In many developing countries development plans reflect the aspirations of the ruling political elites. In many cases they have deliberately overruled the recommendations of the planners and administrators for no reason other than selfish interest. Many of them are also insecure. On the elements of insecurity and authoritarianism Victor Thompson writes:

"An insecure, authoritarian planning administration is more likely to engage in ritualistic consultative process, if any, and to try to use consultative devices to increase control rather than to share it".²⁷

The powers that the planning organization and the line administration have are delegated to them by the government (i.e. a group of men in control of the nation). Any realistic discussion of what the planners and administrators ought or ought not to do must take cognizance of this political reality of life.

27. Ibid.

III - IMPLEMENTATION: ISSUES AND ANSWERS

Without implementation, planning tends to become a theoretical exercise. Directly involved in the process of implementation is the line administration. Its role is defined, in the first place by the functions and responsibilities the state assumes in controlling economic, social and cultural life. In the developing countries, the omnipresent role of the government in economic affairs is an established phenomenon. There are several reasons for this. For lack of other institutions the state finds herself assuming the role of organizing the economy even where the official government policy is non-interference. Because developmental efforts involve negotiations for, and dependence on foreign aid, the state, out of necessity finds herself directly involved in the economic affairs of the nation.

The control of the economy is reflected first in economic planning. These plans do not execute themselves. Whereas planning can be done with the aid of foreign experts, the implementation process must be carried out by the local personnel, for the very reason that in the execution process, the indigenous personnel is better equipped psychologically and politically to do the job. Secondly, the process extends for over a long period of time, thereby making it unrealistic to talk of foreign personnel in the process of implementation.

Planning, it has been observed, brings with it new and difficult task for the administrators and the planners alike. This comes about as the administrators attempt to search for the most effective way to implement the plan. Failure on the part of administrators, however, attractive the plan may look, signals the failure of the entire-developmental effort. For this reason, one observer has suggested that:

"the implementation process is more important than the planning process, for progress can be achieved without planning, whereas planning alone will not achieve progress."²⁸

28. Walinsky, Louis J., The Planning and Execution of Economic Development. McGraw Hill Book Co., 1963, p. 63.

Problems of Implementation:

Today, few people would deny that planning has helped to promote economic growth in the less developed countries, especially since the turn of the Development Decade. But this is not to state that development planning has been a success all over the developing world. Far from it. As a matter of fact, Albert Waterston made a survey of several national development plans and concluded that "there have been many more failures than successes in the implementation of development plans."²⁹ The causes of these failures are many and varied, as one moves from one country to another. Many of them tend to be administrative in nature. It has also been observed that the nature and success of a development plan depends, among other things, on :

- (1) the very procedure by which the plan has been drawn up;
- (2) the level of development of the country for which the plan is drawn.³⁰

The Nature of the plan and of planning organization:

It has been realized by now, at least in theory, that besides its technical and economic aspects on which attention has hitherto been concentrated, planning requires proper emphasis on administrative and organizational aspects. For the efficient formulation, the plan needs an efficient organizational arrangement.

Most of the developing countries have recognized the need for establishing planning organs that enjoy sufficient independence and authority to carry out their functions.

The functions of these planning organs are:

- (1) formulating, and when necessary, revising the plan;
- (2) coordinating the works of various agencies or departments that are concerned with the execution of the programme;
- (3) policy recommendations;
- (4) recommending measures and machinery for implementation;
- (5) overseeing and reporting on the progress of the plan.

29. Waterston, op. cit., P. 293.

30. United Nations Dept. of Finance and Social Affairs: Planning for Economic Development. Report of the Secretary General transmitting the study of a group of experts, United Nations, New York, 1963, p. 46.

The location of the planning agency in a government organization differs from one country to another. In some countries, the planning agency is a part of the Ministry of Finance. In others there is a separate ministry of planning; still in others there is a separate planning agency with only advisory role and usually chaired by the head of state. The first and last arrangements seem to be the most common. Thus in Africa, for example, Kenya has a separate ministry of planning and a number of planning committees at the various levels of government. In Tunisia, Uganda and the United Arab Republic, the planning committee is headed by the President. The same is true of India.

There has been a great deal of debate as to where the planning agency should be located in a government machinery and what powers to be delegated to it.³¹ Whatever the consensus, the location of the planning agency alone, say in the office of the President (or Prime Minister), does not solve the administrative problems relevant to plan implementation. A good planning arrangement in and of itself does not solve the problem unless high quality planners and administrators are available. The position taken here is simply that whereas good organization in a government department is essential to good performance, it is not a sufficient condition of good performance. It is what the individuals in an organization can do that matters, not how they are organized to perform their functions.

The problem that faces modernizers in the developing countries is therefore one of finding the right calibre of administrators, both on the planning level and at the implementation level (assuming the government is behind the developmental effort). This is imperative, taking into consideration the fact that failures to implement development programmes have always been attributed to bad plans and inefficient administration.

What is a bad plan? Any plan that does not reflect the characteristics we outlined in Part I (under characteristics of a development plan) is a bad plan. Often times

31 For further discussion see Waterston: Development Planning Lessons of Experience; Walinsky, Louis J., Planning and Execution of Economic Development. Lewis, A.W., Development Planning.

plans are never understood by the implementors. Gerald Meier blames this on "the high degree of sophistication and economic models in the formulation of plans". He considers much of the effort devolved to the use of econometric models and linear programming in framing a development programme premature. He feels that "the overreaching of the highest level of theory in preparing a development plan, the under-supplying of the plan with adequate data, the underemphasizing of sequential decision-taking, and the overtaxing of administrative competence and managerial capacity have all combined to thwart the practical implementation of the plan".³²

In his "National Planning", Bertram Gross considers "document orientation" instead of action orientation as a serious obstacle to implementation and says "the preparation of the plan rather than effecting desirable changes becomes the overriding objective of the planning technicians".³³

This is elaborated by him elsewhere:

"The tendency of planning technicians to hold that the script's the thing and not the play concentrating their attention exclusively on memoranda and reports rather than the real-life behavior toward which the documents are supposed to contribute, is one of the methodological errors that enter what might be called the administrative pathology of national development planning."³⁴

That many development plans have been overburdened with technical terminologies was also the observation of a group of experts working under the auspices of the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America. They wrote:

"Many plans use technical terminology which makes the language unintelligible for purposes of simple direct communications."³⁵

-
32. Meier, Gerald M., The Development Decade in Perspective. Paper presented at the Cambridge Conference on "Obstacles to Development", 1965, mimeographed P. 20.
 33. Gross, Bertram M., "National Planning Findings and Fallacies". Public Administrative Review, Dec. 1965, Vol. XXV, No. P. 268.
 34. Gross, Bertram M., The Administration of Economic Development Planning: Principles and Fallacies. op. cit. P. 97.
 35. "Plan Implementation": Chapter in the Report of the Committee for Development Planning at its second session held in Santiago (Chile) 10-20 April, 1967, Economic and Social Council. Official Records: 43rd session supplement No. 7. UN New York 1967. Paragraph 41.

It has also been pointed out in a special United Nations study ³⁶ that many development plans do not contain a satisfactory development strategy, i.e. an orderly array of ends and means which takes account of broad economic and social aims and of capacities for reaching them. The same study also points out that many plans lack operational components and machinery to transform elements of the plans into specific activities falling within particular sectors and tied to the periodic national budgets.

Another problem arises from the inflexible attitudes on the part of the planners to adapt planning and the plan to the particular characteristics and conditions of each country. Theories of development planning tend to be used as though they were universally applicable - a mistake that is only slowly being corrected.

Sometimes development efforts have failed simply because the plan did not, from the start, focus on the specific projects to be implemented. This was at least the opinion of a group of experts on the planning experience in Africa. They wrote:

"It has been widely felt that one of the most common reasons for inadequate performance in the implementation of development plans in Africa has been that from the beginning the plans themselves were not based on an adequate number of fully prepared projects and that during the course of their implementation the ability to prepare projects has also not increased in time with the requirements of the plan."³⁷

Resource Availability - Animates and Inanimates:

The consequences of drawing a plan without an adequate backing of projects has meant that:

- (1) The planners have always underestimated the cost of fulfilling the programme. Sometimes their estimations have been unnecessarily optimistic;
- (2) The time projects take before their success is realized has also been underestimated;

³⁶ United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR): Criteria and Methods of Evaluations: Problems and Approaches. UNITAR Series No. 1, 1969, P. 71.

³⁷ UN Economic and Social Council, Committee for Development Planning. Report on the Third Session held at the headquarters of the ECA Addis Ababa (Ethiopia) 29 April - 10 May 1968. Economics and Social Council Official Record 45th Session, Supplement No. 7. UN New York 1968.

- (3) Administration has been left without proper guidance as to what order of priority to follow (especially when there are needed changes that require financial initiative).

Many plans are known to be (or to have been) unrealistic with regard to their sources of finance. Projects have been worked out as though the planning agency was assured of ready funding. Even in those cases where financial aid has been secured, it has not arrived in time. Sometimes money has been spent contrary to the strategy set down in the plan - thereby making the whole developmental effort a mere theoretical exercise. Misappropriation of funds has in part been the reason why some countries have found it difficult to obtain funds from outside. The matter is even more serious if the plan funding was based on outside financial sources and when these fail to materialize.

Sometimes it is the need to attract foreign investments that has led to the preparation of the plan. The significance of planning for attracting foreign investment is well illustrated in the introduction to the 1959-64 Ghanaian Development Plan. The Prime Minister expressed the hope that:

"international institutions and governments which may be interested in our country will study this plan carefully and consider whether there are any individual projects with which they can help."³⁸

Waterston points out that more recently Latin American countries have been preparing plans as a means of qualifying for aid under the Alliance for Progress.³⁹ His view is supported by Daland's study, which disclosed that Brazil's Plans Triennial, for example, was produced under forced draft in two-and-a-half months with the sole purpose of getting foreign aid.⁴⁰

More recent studies have also revealed that this propensity to plan without "facts" is still a dominant trend in many developing countries. In a study of the Tanzanian experience, Professor Cranford Pratt wrote:

38. Ghana Government. Second Development Plan 1959-1964, pp iii-iv in Waterston: Development Planning op. cit. P. 103.

39. Waterston, Development Planning, op. cit., P. 103

40. Daland, Robert T., "The Future of Brazilian Planning" in Brazilian Planning: Politics and Administration. University of North Carolina (manuscript) cited by Waterston in Development Planning, p. 103.

"The planners were unjustifiably optimistic, about the amount of foreign aid Tanzania would be able to attract. The plan assumed that no less than 80 percent of the capital development expenditures of government would be financed by foreign aid."41

Another important point to note in Professor Pratt's findings is that the planners recognized that many more highly trained men and women would be needed in the civil service if the plans objectives were to be achieved. These needed men and women, the planners suggested, had to be recruited from abroad. Nothing could be more self-defeating! The number of the expatriates targeted was not reached. This imposed heavy burdens on the few competent administrators that were available. Project after project was held up because of this shortage of high level manpower even though in some cases money was available. The plan target of 6.7%, says Pratt, was never reached at any time. In 1964 - 1965 the national income at constant prices rose by 4.5% and in 1965-66 by under 2%.⁴²

"This shortage of skilled personnel, more than the lack of either foreign aid or foreign exchange has been the most important single reason why the rate of growth has been slower than envisaged in the plan."⁴³

Even in the Directorate of Planning it is said that all the senior economists were expatriots including the director himself. They soon left after producing the plan thereby leaving a leadership vacuum which no doubt affected the needed revision in the plan! It is only against this background that one should appreciate what the Tanzania African National Union (TANU) did when they (the leaders) launched the Programme for Self Reliance (better known as the Arusha Declaration). The Arusha Declaration was in a way an attempt by a young nation to live within its own means - some kind of an answer to some of these questions we have discussed.

41. Pratt, R.C., "The Administration of Economic Planning in a Newly Independent State: The Tanzanian Experience 1963-1966" in The Journal of Commonwealth Political Studies. Vol. V, No. 1, March, 1967, P. 40.

42. Figures from ibid., p. 59 at footnote 13.

43. Ibid., p. 42.

IV - ADMINISTRATIVE ECOLOGY AND PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

The importance of educated and skilled manpower capable of applying modern science and technology to the problems of development has been emphasized. Generally what is lacking is the middle group. More often than not, one finds a small group of able, well-trained leaders and an excess of unskilled manpower, but very little in between. This is a very serious defect as this is the level at which the plan is supposed to be reduced to its operational level (i.e. sectoral implementation). Yet it is not uncommon to find that the lack of skilled manpower notwithstanding, those that are available, often are not properly used or used at all. Why?

Politicization of the Administration:

The social and political configuration in which the administrators in the developing countries find themselves have imposed some limitations on what they can objectively and rationally do. In most of the developing countries, as already alluded to, the first priority of the ruling elites is self-preservation. Self interest takes priority over the national interest. The administrator is politicized i.e. he is expected to do what the leadership wants and not what is administratively wise. He is deliberately used to suppress open politics that is not in the interest of the group. Because he has no other institution to which to retreat, he cannot resist this pressure. He must submit. A relationship is then established in which the administrators' moves are calculated to register his loyalty to the ruling group at the expense of efficiency. This is the dilemma in which the development administrator has found himself in the process of modernization. The question then asked is: is such a kind of relationship conducive to sound planned development?

This writer believes that there is nothing wrong with politicizing the bureaucracy provided that the intentions are good ones. It is bad if the intentions are "protective". A "protective" politicization is bad because what results from it is that greater weight is given to the political acceptability of recruits than to their professional competence. The predominance of political criteria can result in gross loss to public enterprises. And even in the private sector, the "politicization pressure" on management

recruitment and increased vulnerability of managers to political directives and pressure, can in many cases prove highly detrimental to efficient economic operations.

There are students of development administration who feel that the state of development in public administration depends upon the state of development in "political maturity".⁴⁴ This political immaturity (or political underdevelopment) poses problems that detract the attentions of these nations from issues of economic and social development. Implementation suffers in the process. The matter becomes even worse in a government led by incompetent but authoritarian men. Lack of political guidance and "innovativeness" becomes an obstacle on its own. Politicians in such a situation "are not competent to guide, rather demoralize the administration by raising uninformed criticisms or using the civil service as a scapegoat for their own failures."⁴⁵ Another administrative obstacle with a political implication is the rotation of senior civil servants. The rationale here is that rotation helps to eliminate nepotism and "personalisation" of a department. On balance, this is not healthy for development. One can understand the need to rotate the ministers. The same is not true of civil servants. Again, if this rotation is confined to certain related ministries one would understand. This rotation that goes on in many countries is inimical both to administrative development and to the efficiency of the public enterprises and agencies. A change of government may also result in either purges or ill-advised transfers - with similar impacts on the administration.

We raise these points only to dramatize how administrative smoothness is dependent on political support. History demonstrates that where a country's government is reasonably stable, and its political leaders give a high priority to development, the country generally develops even when there are no formal plans.⁴⁶

44. See for example Emmerich, Herbert, "Some Administrative Obstacles to Development", *Eropa Review*, Vol. II, No. 1, P. 43, in Sharma, *op.cit.* P. 124.

45. Sharma, *op. cit.*, P. 124.

46. Waterston, *Development Planning, op. cit.*, p. 340.

General Underdevelopment:

The very nature of underdevelopment also becomes an administrative problem in the process of implementation. Because the country is still underdeveloped, the majority of the people still live in the rural areas without any satisfactory sources of income. They have not tasted the fruits of independence in any meaningful fashion and are therefore very indifferent to anything the government tries to do. In Africa it is not uncommon to hear a local administrator being referred to as just another colonial oppressor. This is simply because in some areas the old colonial bureaucratic mentality still survives. The administrator usually looks down upon everybody below him, including the local politicians.⁴⁷ This attitude has only perpetuated anti-government sentiments at the local levels. Field administrators - and they are the most important group in rural transformation, therefore operate in a very uncertain - and sometimes hostile political environment.

Sometimes this hostility is the result of political power structure in the country. It could be a reaction to what the government (i.e. the ruling group) stands for. It could be directed to specific issues. In a tribally divided nation such as Nigeria an Ibo found it almost impossible to be effective in the West or in the North, as did the Hausa-Fulani in the South (although they were somewhat inward-looking and were not as mobile as the southern tribes).⁴⁸ In rural areas, the task of development is seen by the population as providing social and physical infrastructure in the sense of improved health and education facilities.⁴⁹

47. There are exceptions of course.

48. Based on the research for my MA Essay, "The role of Bureaucracy in a Modernizing Polity: The Case of Nigeria" submitted to the Graduate School of Public Affairs, University of California at Berkeley, May 12, 1969.

49. Dumont, Rene: False Start in Africa (1966) quoted by Heseline Nigel. "Administrative Structure and the Implementation of Development Plans" in Journal of Administration Overseas, Vol. VI, No. 2 1967, p. 79.

This means that any development effort on the part of the Government that does not take into account some of these necessities is bound to strike no enthusiasm among the people. Higgins observes correctly that the response of a population to development planning will be determined largely by what aspect of the plan is visible to them at their own level.⁵⁰

The issues we have raised impose a great deal of limitation on the implementation of development plans. The success of the development effort will depend on finding the right answers to them.

50. Higgins, Benjamin: Economic Development, 1955 in ibid., p. 79.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

We have observed that several factors combine to define a good development plan. These factors are both economic and non-economic. Neither can define the development situation without the other.

The implementation of a development plan depends on the soundness of the plan itself. The history of the Development Decade has revealed that one of the major reasons why development plans fail to achieve their targets is simply that in many cases they are bad plans anyway. There are several reasons for this. More often than not, plans are prepared without the requisite resource availability. They are usually based on premises which do not usually materialize as outlined in the plan. Sometimes it is the economists themselves who miss the point. Usually they are foreign experts without a thorough knowledge of the country - political, social, cultural and psychological - that is so vital to successful planning and plan implementation. Sometimes plans fail to indicate precisely what the line administrators must do. This is largely so because there are still planners who think that planning and administration are two different things. Thus, they emphasize the economic aspects of the plan at the expense of administration and other non-economic factors that enter the implementation phase. A good plan must therefore take into account the following factors:

- (1) The economic capacity and potential of the country;
- (2) Administrative capacity -- and where it is wanting; the methods to develop it;
- (3) A devotion on the part of the politicians to develop the country;
- (4) Public inertia - i.e. finding ways and means of moving the public towards the developmental goals.

Administrative aspects of planning and plan implementation have been emphasized. A successful plan, in terms of administration, is likely to be that in which both the

planners and line administrators participate in its formulation. This is important for several reasons: first, the planners cannot dispense with that kind of first hand information on the likely impact of the plan that only the administrators are in a better position to assess. Second, they need continuous feedback about the performance of the economy throughout the plan period. Third, it is only human to expect that administrators would execute the plan more enthusiastically and more effectively if they had been involved in the planning process; for they would consider the plans failure their own failure if that were to be the case. This is the psychology of planning-implementation syndrome.

Another administrative obstacle is the poor quality of administrators. This poor quality is reflected in the fact that the country is characterized by underdevelopment. The higher the level of national development the higher the level of administrative performance. We cannot therefore expect high quality administrative inputs without a significant amount of national development. Because the quality of administration is low, there are always administrative and procedural delays. Initiative is lacking. This often results in delays to execute the projects. Sometimes projects may fail simply because the administration is overworked. This is what happens when investment increases and the level of administration remains constant.

Plan failures may also be attributed to structural orientation of administration. Especially in the former British Colonies, the colonial government was a government by bureaucrats, primarily concerned with the maintenance of law and order and the collection of taxes. They were not concerned, generally speaking, with problems of development and nation - building. Their "professional" preparation did not equip them with the needed knowhow to deal with problems of economic, social and political development. Even today the only qualification needed to join the administrative branch in many former British Colonies is the mere possession of a college degree irrespective of the field of concentration. Worse still, top bureaucrats - especially administrative heads of

departments - are moved about from time to time with the result that some of them hardly begin to understand the operations of their new departments before being moved again. If the "generalist" administrator in the old English character is to be maintained, this rotation must stop. It is the only way they can get to know a department well enough to be of any use to themselves, the department, the Minister and finally the collective government.

We have attempted to summarize the major developments of this essay without pretending to offer solutions, and thereby add to the stock of "speculation." The literature on development administration and development planning is already immense. As we know, many of these writers have tended to be structural reformers. It is not uncommon to hear them talk of the location of the planning agency, the machinery of planning, organization for implementation e.t.c. e.t.c. The result is that there is no structure in this writers observation, that can be proposed that has not in some degree been tried somewhere else and failed. Thus, structural reform in development planning and plan implementation is a trial and error game. There is nothing one would expect to be a lasting solution.

To repeat, it is my contention that structural changes in themselves without administrative development (in the Riggsian sense)⁵¹ does not solve the administrative problems of development planning and plan implementation. The emphasis must therefore be on the training of development administrators; the aim being to produce men who understand not only the working of their own departments but also of the other departments. But above all they must understand that development as a process has many faces to it - social, cultural, economic, political etc. They would be generalists, yes, but of a special type - what I have already referred to as "the new integrating generalists".

The administrative problems of planning and plan implementation will not be solved over a night. What is important is identifying them and beginning to do something about them. This, I recognize, is a challenge to the underdeveloped world, but one that must be grappled with if we have to "catch up".

51. See F.W. Rigg's article in I. Swerdlow: Development Administration concepts and problems Syracuse University Press, 1963.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Books:

- Gross, Bertram M., ed., Action Under Planning, the Guidance to Economic Development. McGraw Hill Book Co., 1967.
- Gross, Bertram M., Organizations and their Managing. New York: Free Press, 1968. (esp. ch. 23).
- Hagen, E.E., Planning Economic Development. Homewood, Ill: Richard D. Irwin, 1963. (esp. ch. 1 and 9).
- Hirschman, Albert O., Development Projects Observed. Brookings Institution.
- Karmarck, M., The Economics of African Development. esp. ch X: "Economic Plans and Planning in Africa", New York: Fredrick A. Praeger, 1967.
- King, John A., Economic Development Projects and Their Appraisals. Cases and Principles from the Experience of the World Bank. Johns Hopkins Press.
- LeeBreton, P.P., General Administration: Planning and Plan Implementation. New York: Holt Rinchart and Winston, 1965.
- Lewis, A.W., Development Planning, the Essentials of Economic Policy. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- Leys, C. (ed.), Politics and Change in Developing Countries: Cambridge University Press, 1969 especially Leys article: "The analysis of Planning", and B.B. Schaffers article: "The Deadlock in Development Administration".
- Montgomery, J.D. and Siffins, W.J., ed., Approaches to Development, Politics, Administration and Change. McGraw Hill Book Co., 1966.
- Riggs, F.W., Administration in Developing Countries. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1964. (esp. ch. III).
- Stolper, W.F., Planning Without Facts. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Swerdlow, I., ed., Development Administration, Concepts and Problems. Syracuse University Press, 1963.
- Walinsky, L.J., The Planning and Execution of Economic Development. McGraw Hill Book Co., 1963.
- Waterston, A., Development Planning: Lessons of Experience. The Johns Hopkins Press, 1965.
- Witt, H., ed., Managing Economic Development in Africa. MIT Press, 1963.

United Nations Documents:

- Dept. of Economic and Social Council: Planning and Plan Implementation papers submitted to the Committee for Development Planning at its Second Session, held in Santiago, Chile, from 10 to 20 April 1967, United Nations, New York, 1967.

United Nations Documents: contd..

- ECOSOC Committee for Development Planning, Report of the 4th and 5th Sessions. E/4682, United Nations, New York, 1969.
- ECOSOC Committee for Development Planning, Report on the Third Session. E/4515, United Nations, New York, 1968.
- ECOSOC Committee for Development Planning, Report on the Second Session. E/4362, United Nations, New York, 1967.
- ECOSOC, Committee for Development Planning, Report of the First Session, E/4207/Rev.1, United Nations, N.Y., 1966.
- ECOSOC: A handbook of Public Administration: Current Concepts and Practice With Special Reference to Developing Countries. United Nations, New York, 1961.
- ECOSOC: Management of Industrial Enterprises in Underdeveloped Countries. New York, 1958.
- ECOSOC: Planning for Economic Development. Vol. II. Studies of National Planning Experience, Part I, Private Enterprise and Mixed Economies. A/5533/Rev.1/ Add 1 Sales No. 65: II.BB, United Nations, New York, 1963.
- ECOSOC: Planning for Economic Development. Vol.1, A/5533/Rev.1, Sales No. 64: II.B3.
- ECOSOC: Economic Commission for Africa (ECA): Economic Conditions in Africa. 1960-1964.
- ECOSOC, ECA: Report on the Seminar on Urgent Administrative Problems of African Governments. E/CN. 14/180.
- ECOSOC, ECA: Report of the Meeting of Expert Group on Comprehensive Development Planning. E/CN. 14/182.
- United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR): Criteria and Methods of Evaluations: Problems and Approaches. UNITAR Series No. 4, UNITAR, 1969.
- OECD, Development Plans and Programme. Studies in Development No. 1, 1964 "Some Experiences of Planning in Africa" by Jackson, Edward F.

Articles:

- Gross, B.M., "The Administration of Economic Development Planning: Principles and Fallacies." Studies in Comparative International Development. Vol.III, No. 5, 1967-68. Original Series O31. Social Sciences Institute, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Gross, B.M., "National Planning, Findings and Fallacies" in Public Administration Review, Dec. 1965, Vol. XXV, No.4.
- Heseltine, N. "Administrative Structure and the Implementation of Development Plans" in Journal of Administration Overseas. Vol. VI, No. 2, April, 1967.
- Hanson, A.H., "The Administration of Planning" in The Indian Journal of Public Administration. Vol.IX, No.2, April - June, 1963.

Articles; contd...

Pratt, R.C., "The Administration of Economic Planning in a Newly Independent State: The Tanzanian Experience 1963-1966" in Journal of Commonwealth Political Studies. Vol. 5, No. 1, March 1967.

Sharma, K.C., "Development Planning and Development Administration" in International Review of Administrative Sciences. Vol. XXXIII, No. 2, 1967.

Thompson, Victor A., "Administrative objectives for Development Administration" in Administrative Science Quarterly. Vol. 9, June 1964.

Weiss, M., "Suggestions for Improving Development Administration" in International Review of Administrative Sciences. Vol. XXXII, No. 3, 1966.

Seminar Papers:

Ghai, Dharam P., Machinery of Planning in Kenya paper presented at the Conference on "Crisis in Planning" held at The University of Sussex 29th June - 10th July, 1969. Also available as Discussion Paper No. 84 Institute for Development Studies, University College, Nairobi.

Leys, C., "A new conception of planning", Institute for Development Studies, University College, Nairobi. Staff Paper No. 33, May 1969.

Meguid Abdel, A.R.: "The Methodology of comprehensive Planning" paper presented at the conference on "Crisis in Planning" held at The University of Sussex 29th June - 10th July 1969.

Waterston Albert: "An operational approach to Development Planning" paper presented at The University of Sussex Conference on "Crisis in Planning" 29th June - 10th July 1969.

Meier, Gerald M., The Development Decade in Perspective paper presented at The Cambridge Conference on "Obstacles to Development" 1965 (mimeographed).