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DISCUSSION

The study followed a standard and rigorous procedure as well as statistical analysis that organized the data and gave descriptive and inferential meaning to it. It could be stated that statistics give meaning to the observation. The discussion in contrast explains and justifies the same. Therefore the discussion for the present research is on similar lines of the result analysis and thus, follows the same pattern.

Research Question 1 concerned about identifying the roles of an RAS officer. The findings of the present study specified 163 roles in all that were further classified into 17 meta-roles. These 17 meta-roles were categorized into three major sets/categories - strategic roles, operations-related roles and leadership/people-oriented roles on the basis of resemblance of duties that existed amongst them.

The strategic roles were the roles that were played by teams of administrative officers across hierarchy. These are the roles that lead to the formulation of policies for the state, schemes for the welfare of the people, revenue generation policies for better administration as well as various other issues related to good governance. These certainly included the state administrative officers that were working on higher supertime and supertime scales as these were the scales that got the highest level designations in the state administrative services. Along with higher supertime and supertime, an administrative officer working on senior scale could also be a part of the committee that decides and formulates various policies and schemes for the welfare of the state. The state administrative officers involved with the strategic roles were found assisting the preparation of bylaws and acting as technical advisors to the city
administration. They also built the code for administration, planned for future development of urban and rural areas to provide for growth expansions and other services that were required by the citizens. Duties like proposing change of policies, ordinances and other regulatory constraints that facilitated or improved the operation or management of the state; scrutinize federal, state or local governmental programs; and providing recommendations to the elected officials regarding the state’s responsibility and/ or the desirability of participation in these programs were also included. The officers also conducted research and reports on state programs and problems as well as acted as competent authority for survey and settlement matters in the state. The state administrative officers in strategic roles were responsible for planning and development- setting the goals for long range planning, determining strategies, setting priorities, preparing agenda and presiding over meetings. Works like reporting to administration on matters involving city administration were their routine tasks. Initiatives like proposing policies, amending planning documents as necessity, setting of short term tasks and targets for the areas of work, providing direct guidance and assistance to the state conservationists on all administration activities were also required by a state administrative officer. Other tasks involved- setting deadlines for reports, annual development plan as well as five year plans, implementation of the policies formulated along with the implementation of changes and innovation in the area of work. Implementation of policies also required travelling to places where the policies were being implemented.

The operations-related roles were the roles that were performed by almost all the state administrative officers (supertime, senior, junior or selection scale) as per the job rotation policy of the state. The role which an RAS officer performed often was to acts as a link between political leaders and administration. It was observed that the political leaders played an
important role in passing the law or any policy. In such situations the administrative officers brief them with the real life conditions and give their suggestions before passing the laws or policies. The state administrative officers also coordinated with the program managers on all the administration activities. The administrative officers were required to deal with the protocols, elections and the residuary work. It was quoted by almost all the administrative officers that managing the politicians is a challenging job! Many a time situations also arose where the administrative officers of the state had to represent their state in other states. The issues, conflicts and treatises needed to be taken proper care of. In such a situation the administrative officers played a crucial role. Other than this an administrative officer working for operations-related roles also performed roles such as administering and enforcing contracts that assisted the activities of the state government in a beneficial manner.

*Leadership/ people-oriented roles* were the roles that were performed by the officers that were working on senior, junior and selection (middle and lower level) scales of the state administrative services. A senior administrative officer played the role of head of the family most of the times therefore, was required to look after the staff in a similar manner. A state administrative officer could not win the cooperation and appreciation of the team if he/she was stringent but at same time could not be lenient with the staff. Tasks for “personnel and general administration role” that belonged to leadership/ people-oriented roles were more or less similar to those of the human resources of the corporate world. It set the limits for getting the staff excited by taking on challenging goals and innovations related to the area at operations and placing competent personnel in the required places. It also involves maintaining the leave management system, evaluating the results that are accomplished by the personnel along with managing the filing storage and security of the documents. Processing the salaries, professional
and business-like management of the administrative affairs, creating departments, authorizing positions and fixing compensations are also included in leadership/ people-oriented roles.

In search of the answer to **Research Question 2** the investigator used Behavior Event Interviews (BEIs) as primary source of data collection and pointed out that a state administrative officer requires a set of 28 competencies for his/her daily functioning in the services. These are clubbed into six meta-competencies that were mentioned elsewhere. Meta-competency is a term used to define a single trait that carries a number of characteristics attributes or behavioural traits. The clustering technique was also used in a number of other studies (Velayudhan and Maran, 2009; OECD countries competency management system, 2010; Civil Service Competency Framework, 2012). As examined by the researcher the state administrative officers had a number of tasks in hand in their daily schedule. The officers require competencies that assist them in taking decisions at fractions of seconds. For these the state administrative officers require **contextual-sensitivity competencies** that help them in understanding the organisational dynamics, analyzing the patterns of the preceding events as well as the events that follow. These also give them the expertise to plan and articulate their forethoughts and objectives to their subordinates. The “information seeking” and “proactive” behavior help them to manage a number of conflicts and stressful situations. The ability to feel quite at home in new settings and with new people, get new projects going easily, take calculated risks, flexibility, coming up with original solutions and mostly seeking novel or offbeat solutions in tough problem situations bestowed them with **resilient problem-solving competencies**. To complete the tasks that are assigned to them the state administrative officers need **task-execution competencies**. Without these it was nearly impossible for the state
administrative officers to do the right thing at the right hour. The team spirit and bonding between the state administrative officers existed even in the crucial times like riots, famines and mob mentality because of the *interpersonal and leadership-related competencies*. In all, the presence of all these 28 competencies assists the state administrative officers to perform well and up to the mark. It is noteworthy to state that similar results were found in the GoI-UNDP report (2012). This study was conducted on civil servants of India. There is an interdependence and independence between the centre and state. Neither it is a replica of the study done at centre nor is it entirely different from it. Nevertheless, the inclusion criterion is stated elsewhere. The present study is confined to competency mapping of the state. No such studies have been conducted in the state till date. Still there were some similarities of the competencies between the two. This gives great relevance to the present study.

Competencies are elements that could be present in one person in some proportion and might remain absent in the other completely. A right team needs to have people with complementary competencies. A team worked well when some of the members had competencies that a superior performer had. Once the competencies were identified, it became crucial to see whether the superior performing state administrative officers possess a different set of competencies as compared to the average performing state administrative officers. *Research Question 3* set out to identify the competencies that differentiated the superior performers from the average ones. In order to find out the differences in competencies of the superior performers and the average performers chi-squares ($\chi^2$) were calculated. Table 5.1 shows the chi-squares ($\chi^2$) between the competencies of superior performers and the average performers. The level of significance was kept $p < .01$. 
In the present study it was observed that a significant difference existed between the competencies of both the categories i.e. the superior performers and the average performers. This justified Spencer’s work (1993) that pointed to the fact that the competencies of the superior performers are different from the average performers. Table 5.1 gave evidence for six competencies that could be considered most important for the superior performers. Competencies like “diagnostic focus”, “conceptual thinking”, “information seeking”, “responsibility”, “administrative abilities” and “communication skills” were exclusively present in all star performers and therefore the chi-square ($\chi^2$) calculations for these competencies was “not applicable”. This clarified that all the superior performers had the above quoted competencies. Similar findings were reported by Orr (1995). It is thus suggested that the entrants for the state administrative services must be scrutinized and trained for these competencies specifically along with the other competencies that make an administrative officer a star performer! The results also signified that the superior performers possessed almost all the identified competencies. An insignificant difference was however found in one competency—“conflict management”. This indicated that both superior and average performers do not differ in this particular competency. This could be credited to the fact that conflict management is a routine task and a joint venture in state administration.

As it is often talked about, “A psychologist not only reads and listens to the person but also understands the hidden intentions and observes the person carefully.” The researcher observed and perceived certain characteristics of the state administrative officers during the behavior event interviews (BEIs). As also suggested by Spencer (1993) in his book “Competence at Work: Models for Superior Performance” the general observations of differentiating characteristics while interviewing the star and average performers could also be
considered as supporting evidence. The observations suggest the following characteristics differentiate the star performers and the average ones:
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Figure 6.1 Differentiating characteristics of star and average performers observed while BEI

a) **Philosophy:** The superior performers preferred Gandhian philosophy over Chanakaya's teachings. This was because they believe, “The truth has short term hiccups but lays strong foundation of the state for the people's welfare. In long run it always comes to lime
light.” Another superior performer quoted, "We are responsible to the higher power up above who watches us and help us grow.”

b) Aspirations: The superior performers thought about the higher perspectives whereas; the average ones just executed the tasks allotted to them. The superior performers aspired serving the nation, making the country a better place to live in and thus promoting a positive approach in their lives. The average performers on the other hand had the charm of the services, power, authority, money or public recognition.

c) Service Mind: A major line of difference between the superior and average performers was drawn by the strong feeling of sacrificing their familial share of time and responsibilities for the sake of their official duties. As a reward of exemplary deeds they either got greater responsibilities and challenges or got frequent transfers to tough and sensitive locations as an appreciation of performing well. They nevertheless accepted such challenges only to perform better whereas, the average performers tried to avoid such situations or cried over it.

d) Outlook: The superior performers manifested enthusiasm. They could manage almost everything more effectively as compared to the average performers who cribbed about things not done, the subordinates who gave them trouble or the superiors that acted nasty.

e) Behavior: The superior performers were polite, flexible, humble and kind in their approach unlike the average performers who seemed busy but rigid. Power, synergy, cohesiveness, expertise were the traits of superior performers which they used frequently
to resolve issues at hand as well as for future perspectives. The average performers were found talking about the small technical issues which hindered their progress.

f) *Reading Habits*- The superior performing state administrative officers kept themselves updated by reading widely. Many superior performers took part in literary activities, presented papers in seminars and conferences thus, sharing their knowledge openly. It is praiseworthy to state that one of the superior performers even translated Sigmund Freud’s “Interpretation of Dreams” in Hindi so that it could be used by Hindi readers. The said state administrative officer cum author was also translating two literature books; one of which was in the process of publishing. The average performers on the other hand remained contented with just the local newspapers and bothered by works at hand.

g) *Media Confrontation*: The superior performers though were not afraid of media; refrained releasing any premature information to it before the work took the right shape, neither did they believe in false publicity. It could be stated that the star performers used media to disseminate the right information, whereas, the average performers seemed to use it for false publicity.

h) *Office Management*: Cleanliness, organization, artistic taste were witnessed in the offices of the superior performers that was grossly missing in case of the average performers.

i) *Post-Retirement Days*: The superior performers never retired as they picked up various other jobs that required their expertise in the services. Many of them rendered extended services using their rich experiences (e.g. joined the OTS for training the new recruits,
shared their success stories, acted as advisors, consultants etc.) While in work they indulged in training their subordinates and supported them in their assignments. The world is their home and as a virtuous family member they sustained to make it better with every single day of their life. At the end of their days they were satisfied for doing something constructive with their lives even at the cost of their personal lives. The fire to do something worthwhile continued thriving in them (expressed by the comments like: “The best is yet to come!”). They felt happy, energetic, optimistic and busy, whereas the average performers sounded dissatisfied, ran down on energy, sat idle, remained pessimistic and regretful (expressed in the comments like: “I wish something better could have been done by me…”). They blamed the system in general for their average performance. Needless to state that the superior performers felt exuberant even at the age of 68 while the average ones were left with the feeling of discontentment and lifelong regrets of could’ve been or should have been.

The above discussions on the chi-square ($\chi^2$) results of the Behavior Event Interviews (BEIs) as well as the observations justify that there lies a significant difference between the superior performers and the average performers in the state administrative services.

**Research Question 4** examines the relation between the identified roles and competencies for the state administrative services. The survey results (table 5.2) illustrated that the average ranking for leadership/ people-oriented roles is 2.75 as compared to 10.6 and 11.13 for strategic roles and operations-related roles. This gave evidence that the state administrative
services required the officers to be more proficient at discharging leadership/ people-oriented roles followed by strategic and operations-related roles.

While ranking the first three ranks (I, II and III ranks) were given to leadership/ people-oriented roles. These were: “maintaining law and order”, “district administration” and “public relations”. “Personnel and general administration” role also appeared in top five ranks. It should be noted that the role- “district administration” was considered to be on top priority. A state administrative officer needs to be in constant touch with the public. This included-establishments to be seen during natural calamities, taking charge of fire and controlling the same, looking after planning and development of the city, maintaining data related to rainfall, crops and population. Simultaneously they require solving problems of the city, dealing with emergencies, looking after the water facilities, organizing and preparing annual censuses. This also requires submitting the required reports to state agencies, anticipating and mitigating crises, handling complaints about city government, assuring rules and regulations were followed, imposing fines and penalties for violations of city ordinances etc. A UN report on management competencies for senior public service managers emphasized that managers in the US, Canada, the UK, Australia and France gave evidence that effective leadership leads to effective public governance (Charih et al., 2007). Same is suggested by various reforms in Ireland. An administrative officer is the face of the government in a district. Whatever he/she says is the line of law for the common people. Decisions at crucial points might bring riots and disputes at times.

The BEIs gave an insight that most of the times the SDM city was assisted by the ACEM and thus, plays the lead role further assisted by the police and other important personnel. Many a times it was found that the mob went out of control in such situations the administrative
officers had to take tough decisions like firing in order to control the mob. There was a system that the administrative officers followed in order to deal effectively with such crucial situations. In such a situation an administrative officer needed to be competent and quick enough to make the right decision at the right time or else worse consequences could have taken place. In such situations a person with proper competencies serves the purpose well.

As observed in table 5.9 leadership/ people-oriented roles required a number of ‘core’ competencies like “administrative abilities”, “communication skills”, “information seeking”, “leadership”, “responsibility”, “team building”, “trustworthiness”, “achievement orientation”, “influential”, “motivation”, “visionary” and “concern for quality”. Taking a simple incident of maintaining law and order as elaborated by many star state administrative officers- in situations where mob got violent, the state administrative officers required to do the right things at the right hour, had to be logical in their communication, constantly scanned the environment around them as well as demonstrated optimism, values, confidence and strength. They took charge of the situation and coordinated well with the authorities. Nevertheless, they built teams that balanced their tasks in favor of the government and the public both. In such situations, only those people who could be counted upon were selected and such officers were expected to achieve some concrete results within a stipulated time period. This can only happen when a civil servant possess the skill of seeking confidence and keeping in touch with the local residents of his/her area. A skill of developing good rapport especially with the local leaders solved the issues at hand quickly and efficiently. A superior performer not only encouraged his/her team to perform productively but also maintained the quality of work by providing a strong vision for future, recognizing an earnest worker and appropriately rewarding.
Table 5.10 depicts ‘role-set specific’ competencies for leadership/ people-oriented roles. These are very much similar to the ‘core’ competencies required for leadership roles. As observed (table 5.9 and 5.10) almost all the ‘core’ competencies and the ‘specific’ competencies to leadership- related roles belonged to task-execution competencies and interpersonal and leadership-related competencies justifying the functions of a leader and the capacities to lead others. The data pointed out that “information seeking” competency was very much necessary to the leadership/ people-oriented roles. This could be credited to the initiatives that superior performing administrative officers took for better functioning of the system. The information seeking attitude helped them scan for potential opportunities or for miscellaneous information that may be of future use. The competency framework of UK government (GoI-UNDP, 2012) also identified a similar set of competencies under people cluster.

Although all the competencies were essential, “responsibility” ranked first in the complete set of competencies (table 5.3). Thus, it can be observed that an administrative officer required being highly responsible in order to take charge of the services. This was the first and foremost competency that the experts looked for even in the interview panel. During the informal discussions as well as the BEIs it was found that the administrative officers gave chief significance to “responsibility”. The competency framework for civil servants by GoI-UNDP (2012) stated “people first” as the top most competency. The competency definitions for “people first” and “taking accountability” (GoI-UNDP, 2013) are similar to “responsibility” competency of the present study.

The second most important competency in line was “leadership” as most of the times the administrative officers were found interacting with people whether in workplace or in the field of work. Citizens and their subordinates looked up to them in times of hardships and
various other issues. In such situations and otherwise as well, the state administrative officers ought to be optimistic, courteous, caring and virtuous thus, proving themselves to be real role-models.

According to the survey, the third crucial competency that a state administrative officer ought to possess is “trustworthiness”. The administrative services hold the responsibility of the state and in such a scenario the state of affairs must be in trustworthy hands rather than the ones who would dampen the economy of the state and make it a mess. The decisions that needed to be made and the circumstances which went wrong many a times demanded someone who was independent, committed and dependable.

Another set of abilities crucial to the administrative officers was to know what to do when and in what manner, how to get the jobs done by the subordinates and significant others, a tact to deal with associates in addition to maintaining the confidentially of critical matters. This competency was labeled as “administrative abilities”. The significance of these administrative abilities put them on the fourth important position in the list. An efficient administrative officer was expected to be visionary and being passionate about the same. “Administrative abilities” was the competency that did not fall under any of the pillars of competency framework for the Indian civil servants (GoI-UNDP, 2012). It becomes essential to note here that “responsibility”, “administrative abilities” and “trustworthiness” formed the ‘versatile’ group of competencies for the state administrative services (table 5.11). It was mandatory for an RAS officer to possess these three competencies in order to be a superior performer as these applied to all three categories of roles.

Another significant competency for the state administrative services for superior performance was “communication skills”. The investigator observed that the administrative
officers were found interacting with other people most of the times. If the individual was exceptional in communication skills half of the problems were solved! People working on profiles like SDM, ADM, and ACEM use these skills to a greater extent. As Peter Drucker (Gupta, 2013) puts it, “The most important thing in communication is hearing what is not said.” In a similar manner communication skills were crucial to the administrative officers as they could figure out any mishap that was about to happen. The investigator recalls a superior performer who shared his success story and claimed to sense the troubles before it took place. One probable reason was that the administrative officer was exceptional at communication skills. He not only listened to the person but could also understand his/her body language. This was how he could anticipate the tribulations and prepared his guards against them very much in advance. Studies by Rankin (2004), Learning and development survey (2007), The United Nations (99-93325—November—18M), Republic of Kenya, (2011) and GoI-UNDP (2012) also support that communication skills were an imperative competency.

The empirical evidence in table 5.3 estimated that “information seeking” is another competency for superior performance which was followed by “concern for quality” and “team building”. Good communication skills facilitated the state administrative officers in seeking right information. They filtered the information of use in some future context and kept the same as their central point of action, if any. “Concern for quality” and building effective teams were equally important as without these the administrative officers couldn’t be trusted for. An administrative officer had to work in teams in all aspects of work. For this, the teams required being coordinated properly as the quality of work was ought to be maintained. The administrative officers were accountable for every task they took up. Thus quality presided over
quantity. Sadly, “concern for quality” was not identified separately by GoI-UNDP (2012) in the competencies required for civil servants.

When put into tasks that required analyzing, the administrative officers were spotted using their intellects. They were true detectives while solving issues at hand. Observing the pattern between what had happened and what might occur in future plus, what was taking place and so on… the administrative officers were excellent conceptual thinkers! The miscreants otherwise could create many issues and the administrative officers would be clueless. Thus, “conceptual thinking” was the next important competency for the state administrative officers.

Innovation is the need of the hour! How flexibly the state administrative officers kept the new tasks going smoothly was the accurate measure of their “innovative” competency. The report by AIMA- KPMG (2014) demonstrated a significant scope for improvement in innovations in products and services. The leaders from public sector services treated innovation as a daunting challenge as compared to the fast paced global world (AIMA- KPMG, 2014). “Motivation” was a competency which was essential for the superior performers in state administrative services. If the administrative officer himself would not have been enthusiastic about the tasks he had in his hands then, the excitement and commitment of the whole team would have been at stake. An ideal administrative officer thus needed to inspire others and influence them in such a manner that the enthusiasm continued no matter what! The leader of the team ought to always encourage the team members rather than blaming them for their mistakes.

Being in administrative services it was vital to follow the boundaries set for one’s job role or else the confusion might occur specially in the administrative set-up. This might lead to
overlapping of roles giving rise to disputes and discordances. A mission-oriented approach with proper time management skills assist in better performance. “Concern for Order” is another competency which the administrative officers need to master. Competencies that follow “concern for order” are “achievement orientation”, “creative”, “diagnostic focus”, “coaching” and “impressive”. The above findings were supported by GoI-India (2012).

Developing others was also a remarkable competency of an Indian civil servant (GoI-India, 2012) similarly “coaching” competency was identified in present study. “Consultation and consensus building” lied in the pillar of “equity” for the Indian civil servants (GoI-India, 2012) just like “impressive” competency- cluster F (interpersonal and leadership-related competencies) of the present study. “Proactive” and “influential” are two more competencies that are required in the state administrative services.

It was observed that “critical thinking”, “stress management”, “balanced” and “political skills” were the competencies that were of moderate order (table 5.3). The least important competencies were “conflict management” and “change agent”. “Conflict management” as it was also observed in Table 5.1 served the least differentiating competency. It was observed that almost all the administrative officers were equally good at these competencies or maybe they were used less often individually. “Change agent” was least required as the system doesn’t promote change agents. It is disheartening to recollect the tough times of one of the superior performers who was not only forced- not to formulate new schemes for the welfare of the people but was also threatened by the local political leaders in the 1980’s. Nonetheless, till date as the administrative officers put it, “The reward for bringing in change in the system is transfers.” The harsh reality of the administrative services is that most of the administrative officers were transferred time to time when they tried introducing new concepts
or ways to solve the problems. In such a scenario the initiative by the researcher for mapping competencies for state administrative services might bring a ray of hope for the superior performers as though not required presently these competencies could be of future scope in the services.

The ‘core’ competencies identified for the strategic roles in the present study (table 5.7) were: “administrative abilities”, “responsibility”, “trustworthiness” and “conceptual thinking”. It is observed that three out of four competencies that are ‘core’ to strategic role of the state administrative services belonged to the task-execution competencies (E). The ‘role-set specific’ competencies for the strategic roles (table 5.10) on the other hand completely belonged to cluster E (task-execution competencies) - “administrative abilities”, “responsibility” and “trustworthiness”. This could be attributed to the importance of strategic roles in the state administrative services that demanded personnel who were responsible and trustworthy. The ability to understand the patterns of events gave them an eye that was quick to assume the consequences of the schemes and policies that the state administrative officers were formulating. As discussed elsewhere, the “administrative abilities” were the fourth most important competencies that a state administrative officers needed to posses. No doubt they were required in top-level administrative officers who performed the most important tasks of the state like formulating policies for the welfare of the state, planning changes and innovations in their area of jurisdiction and securing critically needed information. They possessed intelligence for formulating goals, set long term objectives for the area of work; secure an understanding of the nature of the department’s vendors and competitors etc. if any.

The operations-related roles were of least importance to the state administrative services (table 5.2). The only crucial role under this cluster was “general elections” that
occupied the fourth rank among all the roles. Managing the general elections remains a herculean task in the country where all the politicians remain busy propagating their parties and many a times it happen that they even disturb the system for election. At such a crucial time the administrative officers are required to be active and attentive. One erroneous decision taken at such time may leave a bad name to the officer and mark gross discrepancies in the complete system! Based on these grounds the ‘core’ competencies for the operations-related roles were aptly identified (table 5.8) as “responsibility” (E), “administrative abilities” (E) and “trustworthiness” (E). There were no ‘specific’ competencies for operations-related role in context to state administrative services. The investigator during the BEIs got the insight that the superior performers remained alert, active and formulated their own strategies and cohesive teams that maintained the proper functioning of the system. The required competencies during the general elections were very much similar to the ‘projects’ cluster of Competency Based Approach to Training Needs Assessments- Competency Framework of Office of Fair Trading, Progression Grade 6 for Grade 7 as presented by Vere in the National Conference on Human Resource Management- 2011 (GoI-UNDP, 2012).

Three competencies were found to be ‘versatile’ for state administrative services (table 5.11): “administrative abilities” (E), “responsibility” (E) and “trustworthiness” (E). The superior performing state administrative officers had the ability to take charge when things went wrong and managed to provide required guidance to others. These officers were found to be service-oriented and public focused. The critical incidents of the lives of the superior performing state administrative officers proved that they took personal responsibility for anything that went wrong and tried their best to correct the same. They easily partnered with the public and took charge. In short, they were good commanders and coordinators. It was also
observed that almost all the superior performers had a knack for doing the right things at the right time in getting jobs done by their subordinates, superiors, ministers or anyone else for that matter. They were smart enough to deliberately give or withhold the information to gain specific results. They readily changed their behaviours or approach to suit the situation. They were excellent in analyzing the problem, followed a chain of command basically the upward communication, demonstrated diplomacy and also understood the need for cooperation to achieve larger state objectives. The trustworthy behaviours made the state administrative officers dependable, accessible, integrated and committed. The superior performers observed and supported ethical practices. They possessed a kind of conscientiousness which made them independent. The state administrative officers could be counted upon to play their parts well in getting the jobs done. It is noteworthy to state that the star performers were known for following up on tasks in order to get them executed effectively.

As mentioned elsewhere, an attempt was made by the researcher to estimate the validity of the research. While comparing and contrasting the competencies of the studies- the present research and GoI-UNDP (2012), it was established that- “desire to knowledge” is akin to “information seeking” competency. “Team working” belongs to the pillar of efficiency (GoI-UNDP, 2012) and was found similar to “team building” competency of the present study. The competency “trustworthiness” was found identical to “integrity” of the cluster- “ethics” of the competency framework for the civil servants (GoI-India, 2012). The competencies from GoI-UNDP (2012) reported: leading others, self-confidence, self awareness and self-control as similar competencies to “leadership” competency of the present study. A resemblance was also instituted between the competencies of both the studies (the present study and GoI-India, 2012) when “conceptual thinking” was compared. The report (GoI-UNDP, 2012) had made use of the
aspects of “conceptual thinking” a number of times in their individual competencies like “attention to detail”, “conceptual thinking” as a whole, “planning and coordination” as well as in “problem solving” competencies. “Innovative thinking” as a competency was also supported by GoI-UNDP (2012). “Proactive” competency of the present study was endorsed as well by “initiation and drive” competency under efficiency pillar (GoI-India, 2012). “Political skills” of the present study on the other hand was endorsed by the competency “organizational awareness” (GoI-India, 2012). Same was the case with “decision making” and “critical thinking”.

Part II of the present research led to the formulation of Research Question 5 that was concerned with the comparison of the findings of the present study with those of the study on corporate senior managers (Khandwalla, 2004). In search for the answer to this question the researcher tired to compare the roles and competencies for the state administrative services with those of the corporate senior managers as identified by Khandwalla (2004).

When the major findings of the present study were compared with those of Khandwalla’s study (2004) on corporate senior managers it was estimated that there were some similarities and some differences in both the services. Table 5.12 compared the roles of both the services and concluded that the state administrative officers paid maximum heed to the leadership/ people-oriented roles (Figure 6.2) whereas the senior managers focused on strategic roles (Figure 6.3). As mentioned elsewhere the leadership/ people-oriented roles of state administrative services occupied top ranks in the state administrative services. Vital responsibilities like “maintaining law and order”, “public” and “district administration”, “personnel and general administration” along with “public relations” fall under this category of roles.
The state administrative officers were often found collecting information and conducting inquiries, attending committee and board meetings, seeking suggestions and help from experts (superiors as well as the public) in order to improve the services provided by their departments. They also work with other agencies of private concerns in order to accomplish the goals and objectives of their departments. Maintaining law and order is the most tedious task for a state administrative officer in a country like India where the people were divided on the basis of caste and sects. These roles are usually accomplished by teams of three to four departments altogether. As pointed out elsewhere, the SDM city was assisted by the ACEM. They were further assisted by the police and other important personnel of the civil services.

The corporate senior managers were least proficient in leadership/people-oriented roles (Khandwalla, 2004). But on the contrary, for good public governance, effective leadership was a critical component (OECD project report, 2004). In case of corporate managers developing effective working relationships with colleagues, getting the cooperation of the colleagues was strenuous, collaboration, teamwork and guidance and counseling of the staff were at the last priority. The results of both the studies- Khandwalla (2004) and the present study were justified by AIMA-KPMG’s (2014) MCI report. The report put forward that the Indian multinationals had a scope of improvement in people leadership.
whereas; government establishments excelled in this dimension. Certainly, the categorization of roles in both the profiles is different however looking at the individual roles it can be deduced that the corporate senior managers underplayed the roles that demanded cooperation whereas, the state administrative officers worked in teams. A kind of competition was found in the roles of corporate managers while the state administrative officers were collaborative in their approach.

As reported by Khandwalla (2004) the corporate senior managers are mostly found formulating policies, planning of changes and innovations, setting long-term goals, building up the image of the unit, procuring scarce financial, human, technical resources for the unit etc. for further developments. Strategic roles are most important roles in corporate services (Khandwalla, 2004) but ranked second in the state administrative services because of the slower and centralized decision making processes of the administration (AIMA- KPMG, 2014). The AIMA- KPMG (2014) report also supported that the foreign and Indian multinationals were high on visionary and strategic leadership dimensions.

Operations-related roles were least important for the state administrative services (Figure 6.3) while occupied the second most important categories of roles for the senior managers of corporate services as identified by Khandwalla (2004). Probable reason could be that almost all
the state administrative officers were required to perform these roles. In corporate services short-term goals, implementation of policies and managing crisis were routine tasks as compared to the state administrative services.

While comparing the competencies of state administrative officers and senior managers (Table 5.13) it was observed that task-execution competencies (E) were the ones that were highly sought after competencies for both state administrative services as well as the corporate sector. Figures 6.4 and 6.5 illustrate the preference for competencies in both the services- state administrative services and corporate sector. Both (state administrative officers and senior managers) could be counted upon in times of need, showed concern for quality and were trustworthy and responsible in their approaches. The present study and the study by Khandwalla (2004) established that such competencies were most required for effective administration as well as management.

This was followed by initiative-related competencies (B) for state administrative officers while contextual sensitivity competencies (A) for the corporate managers in the study of Khandwalla (2004). Working in open fields with thousands of people around, naturally required the administrative officers to be proficient information seekers and volunteers in various other responsibilities. The managers in contrast were found retrieving information regarding the
power structure of the organization and simultaneously sensing the trouble that might occur in near or far future.

The third important set of competencies for the administrative officers was *interpersonal and leadership-related competencies* (F) (table 5.13). The state administrative officers ought to be real leaders motivating others to perform up to the mark, sharing their visions with the team while coaching and mentoring the subordinates with the intentions to improve their career graphs. The managers on the contrary practiced *resilient-problem solving competencies* (D) (Khandwalla, 2004). They faced real tough times in the corporate world and thus, knew how to return to their normal selves when faced with organizational hardships. They also knew how to bring order in the messiest situations. As justified by Khandwalla (2004) *interpersonal/ leadership-related competencies* (F) for the senior managers on the other hand occupied number five that meant there was still scope of improvement for the same. Similar results were found in AIMA- KPMG (2014) MCI reports. The reports stated that people leadership was yet to be improved upon as far as Indian corporate managers were concerned.

The fourth important set of competencies for the state administrative services was *contextual sensitivity competencies* (A) as compared to *initiative-related competencies* (B) for
the corporate senior managers (table 5.13). This is followed by *innovations-related competencies* (C) for the state administrative officers and *interpersonal and leadership-related competencies* (F) for the corporate managers (Khandwalla, 2004).

Table 5.13 also explained competencies that were of minimum magnitude in state administrative services. These were *resilient problem-solving competencies* (E) whilst those of corporate sector were *innovations-related competencies* (C) (Khandwalla, 2004).

Coming to ‘*core*, ‘*specific*’ and ‘*versatile*’ competencies’ table 5.14 illustrated ‘*core*’ competencies specific to *strategic roles* in both the services. The table concluded that the state administrative officers were supposed to be strong on *cluster E competencies* i.e. *task-execution competencies* as compared to the corporate senior managers who excelled in competencies belonging to three competency clusters- *B (initiative-related competencies)*, *E (task-execution competencies)* and *F (interpersonal and leadership-related competencies)* indentified by Khandwalla (2004). Therefore, it could be pointed out that there was a significant difference in ‘core’ competencies specific to strategic roles of both the state administrative officers and the corporate senior managers (Figure 6.6). Looking at table 5.14 it is comprehensible that only *cluster E (task-execution competencies)* is shared mutually.
Table 5.15 presented a comparison between the ‘core’ competencies specific to operations-related roles and it was scrutinized that there were no specific competencies for operations-related roles as far as state administrative officers were concerned. The corporate senior managers working for operations-related roles had the ability to follow up on tasks and getting them executed effectively (E) (Khandwalla, 2004). The competency again belonged to cluster E i.e. task-execution competencies.

A quick glance at Table 5.16 suggested that state administrative officers were required to be more competent at discharging the interpersonal and leadership-related competencies (F) as compared to the corporate senior managers. This could be attributed to the top-most importance of leadership/people-oriented roles in the state administrative services. The competencies that were required most for leadership/people-oriented roles in state administrative services belonged to competency clusters- B (initiative-related competencies), E (task-execution competencies) and F (interpersonal and leadership-related competencies). As pointed out by Khandwalla (2004) the corporate senior managers who worked for such roles possessed only two competencies that belonged to interpersonal and leadership-related competencies (F). This suggested that the
competencies of *leadership/people-oriented roles* showed some kind of similarity between the state administrative officers and the corporate senior managers (Figure 6.7).

Coming to *versatile competencies* (the ‘core’ competencies specific to all three sets of roles; table 5.17), it was observed that the state administrative officers needed only three competencies namely “*responsibility*” (E), “*administrative abilities*” (E) and “*trustworthiness*” (E) for all the three sets of roles. It is noteworthy that all the three competencies belonged to *cluster E* i.e. *task-execution competencies*. On the contrary, the findings of the study by Khandwalla (2004) indicate that the corporate senior managers showed traits of four clusters of competencies viz. *initiative management competencies* (B), *innovations-related competencies* (C), *resilient problem solving competencies* (D) and *task execution competencies* (E) (Figure 6.8).

![Figure 6.8 'Versatile' competencies for all three sets of roles](image)

The kind of challenges, requirements and expectations from the state administrative officer are entirely different than those from a senior manager working in the world of corporate. The corporate means ‘the world’ to a senior manager while a state administrative officer needs to manage his/her area of jurisdiction. The corporate senior managers are
expected to maximize profit and minimize cost while the state administrative officers are required to maintain peace and prosperity in the state. The corporate world involves planning strategies for the growth and profit of the organisation whereas; an administrative officer is expected to plan strategies that bring welfare to the people and generate revenues to the state. Using a similar classification of role and competencies for RAS and senior managers some differences were observed in roles, as well as ‘core’, ‘specific’ and ‘versatile’ competencies whereas, some competencies tried bridging the gap between both the services. For instance, the strategic roles were of utmost importance in corporate services as compared to the leadership/people-oriented roles required for state administrative services. Nevertheless, the tables- 5.13, 5.14, 5.15, 5.16 and 5.17 gave evidence that task-execution competencies were the highest order competencies for both the services- the state administrative services and the corporate services as these were the competencies that were similar in both the services. Cluster F competencies (interpersonal and leadership-related competencies) on the other hand were akin in leadership/people-oriented roles.

The following overview outlines the recommended competencies for the identified roles of a state administrative officer that can further be compared with the roles and competencies of senior managers reported by Khandwalla (2004). The behavioural indicators of the identified competencies are also given at the end (Appendix II).
Versatile competencies ('core' competencies for all three sets of roles):
- Responsibility
- Administrative Abilities
- Trustworthiness

Roles of state administrative services:
- Leadership/People-oriented Roles
- Strategic Roles
- Operations-related Roles

Core competencies specific for Leadership/People-oriented Roles:
- Administrative Abilities
- Communication Skills
- Information Seeking
- Leadership
- Responsibility
- Team Building
- Trustworthiness
- Achievement Orientation
- Influential
- Motivation
- Visionary
- Concern for Quality

Core competencies specific for Operations-related Roles:
- Responsibility
- Administrative Abilities
- Trustworthiness

Core competencies specific for Strategic Roles:
- Administrative Abilities
- Responsibility
- Trustworthiness
- Conceptual Thinking

Figure: 6.9 Roles and ‘core’ competencies for state administrative services
Conclusion

The present research was carried out to identify the roles and competencies of the state administrative services, to find out if there are different sets of competencies for superior performers and average performers and to compare the findings of the present study with those of Khandwalla (2004) to see the variability between the state administrative services and the corporate services. Although the new approach shall fetch resistance but as Taylor (1992) had pointed, reform is often hindered by those who perceive the status quo as an opportunity to dispense patronage and wield power. Thus, the competency based management in state administrative services as mentioned by the investigator shall require a change in attitudes, culture and also in political circles where decision-making lies. The results and discussion of the present study however can be concluded on following lines:

- There are 17 categories of roles that are required in state administrative services. These are classified into 3 broad categories of roles viz. strategic roles, operations-related roles and leadership/people-oriented roles.

- The 28 competencies that are required for state administrative officers were further classified into 6 meta-competencies: contextual sensitivity competencies (A), innovations-related competencies (B), initiative-related competencies (C), resilient problem-solving competencies (D), task execution competencies (E), interpersonal and leadership-related competencies (F).

- While comparing the competencies of superior and average performer all the values except one (conflict management) of chi-squares ($\chi^2$) were found to be significant at $p>.01$ level. It can thus be proved that the competencies of superior performers are invariably different as compared to the average performers (table 5.1).
Six competencies are *indisputable differentiating* amongst superior performers and average performers—**diagnostic focus, conceptual thinking, information seeking, responsibility, administrative abilities and communication skills** (table 5.1).

Nevertheless, a difference in pattern of thinking and behaving (*characteristics: figure 6.1*) is observed in the superior performing state administrative officers and average performers when measured on points like- service mind, philosophy, outlook, office management, media confrontation, reading habits, behavior and aspirations.

Top five roles of a state administrative officer are: “**district administration**, “**public relations**, “**maintaining law and order**, “**general elections**” and “**personnel and general administration**” (table 5.2).

Top five competencies for state administrative services are comprised of **“responsibility”, “leadership”, “trustworthiness”, “administrative abilities” and “visionary”** (table 5.3).

Competencies indentified for *strategic roles* for state administrative officers:

- ‘Core’ competencies- “administrative abilities”, “responsibility”, “trustworthiness” and “conceptual thinking” (table 5.7)
- ‘Specific’ competencies- “administrative abilities”, “responsibility” and “trustworthiness” (table 5.10).

For *operations-related roles* ‘core’ competencies were found to be “responsibility”, “administrative abilities” and “trustworthiness” for state administrative officers. Whereas, there are *no specific competencies* that are required to play such roles (table 5.8).
• Competencies identified for leadership/ people-oriented roles for state administrative officers:
  - ‘Core’ competencies- “administrative abilities”, “communication skills”, “information seeking”, “leadership”, “responsibility”, “team building”, “trustworthiness”, “achievement orientation”, “influential”, “motivation”, “visionary” and “concern for quality” (table 5.9).
  - ‘Specific’ competencies- “achievement orientation”, “communication skills”, “concern for quality”, “influential”, “information seeking”, “leadership”, “motivation”, “team building” and “visionary” (table 5.10).

• ‘Versatile’ competencies for all three sets of roles for state administrative officers are: “responsibility”, “administrative abilities” and “trustworthiness” (table 5.11).

• The roles and competencies of corporate senior managers as well as the state administrative services are somewhat similar, nevertheless, the ranking of the roles and competencies are however altogether different (table 5.12, 5.13).

• Leadership/ people-oriented roles in administrative services stand out from all other roles. The corporate services on the other hand rely on the strategic and operational roles more as compared to leadership/ people-oriented roles (table 5.12; figure 6.2, 6.3).

• Task-execution competencies (E) play an important role in both state administrative services and corporate services (table 5.13; figure 6.4, 6.5).

• It was also found that different sets of competencies are required for different sets of roles in both the services (state administrative services and corporate sector). Cluster E
competencies (task-execution competencies) are ‘core’ competencies that are specific to strategic roles of state administrative services whereas, cluster B (initiative-related competencies), E (task-execution competencies) and F (interpersonal and leadership-related competencies) were ‘core’ competencies specific to strategic roles of senior managers in the corporate sector (table 5.14, figure 6.6).

- The state administrative officers showed no preference for ‘core’ competencies specific to operations-related roles. The corporate senior managers had one ‘core’ competency to specific operations-related roles belonging to cluster E (task-execution competencies) (table 5.15).

- The ‘core’ competencies specific to leadership/ people-oriented roles of state administrative officers belonged to clusters B (initiative-related competencies), E (task-execution competencies) and F (interpersonal and leadership-related competencies). The leadership/ people-oriented roles of corporate senior managers on the other hand relied on competencies that belonged to cluster F (interpersonal and leadership-related competencies) (table 5.16; figure 6.7).

- The state administrative officers require competencies belonging to cluster E (task-execution competencies) that are ‘core’ competencies specific to all three sets of roles while the senior managers showed traits of competencies belonging to cluster B (initiative-related competencies), C (innovations-related competencies), D (resilient problem-solving competencies) and E (task-execution competencies). Figure 7.1 elaborates the roles and ‘core’ competencies specific to all three categories of roles that are required for the state administrative services (table 5.17; figure 6.8).
Summary

Present study mapped the roles and competencies of the state administrative services. A state administrative officer performed a number of responsibilities keeping the norms of the state and public welfare in mind. Hiring on such a profile of the state needed to be done carefully as the future of the state lied its officers’ hands. It was thus, crucial to identify the required set of competencies for the highest cadre services of the state. Competencies in the present world prove to be a part of almost all the organisations- private and public enterprises. A flourishing organisation is one that identified the competencies required for the organization, measured the present level of competencies in its employees and sought to develop the required competencies in the workforce. The review of literature shows that many organisations have accepted and adapted to competency mapping for a better performance. The GoI and UNDP took an initiative like other republics to build a competency pathway for Indian civil servants (GoI-India, 2012). No such study is carried forward for the state cadre of the Indian civil service to the best of the author’s knowledge. The present study thus, examined the competencies that superior performers had and the set of competencies that are required for different sets of roles. The study also compared the competencies and roles of the state administrative services with those of the corporate services as identified by Khandwalla (2012).

The present study was an investigative cum descriptive study which made use of ex-post-facto research design. Hence, this study was designed to address certain research questions. A sample of 150 experts and job incumbents of the state administrative services were selected for the present study using non-probability purposive sampling. The job incumbents were from various cities of Rajasthan covering almost all the districts. The superior and average performers were interviewed using Behavior Event Interview (BEI) technique. Using BEI technique, three
critical incidents describing their success stories and three critical incidents whereby each state administrative officer could have done better were listened to. The data was then transcribed onto the behavior event reporting sheets. Two trained psychologists then identified the pattern of roles and competencies from the recordings as well as the transcripts. The reliability scoring was then checked by inter-rater reliability using inter-scorer percentage agreement. The results were found reliable. Chi-square ($\chi^2$) was calculated for perceived competencies of superior performers and average performers as identified by BEIs. A significant result was obtained between the competencies of both superior and average performers suggesting a clear differentiation between the competencies of both.

A rating scale in the form of matrix was created whereby the respondents (expert panel) were supposed to rate the identified competencies for each identified role. This survey was done in order to find out the relationship between perceived roles and perceived competencies. Statistical tools like averages, standard deviations, ranking, average ranking and percentages were applied on rating scale data in order to attain concrete results.

The results thus obtained were then compared with the results of Khandwalla’s study (2004) for corporate senior managers in order to see if any difference lies between roles and competencies of the state administrative services and the corporate services. The roles that were identified were almost similar but a difference was found in their levels of priority. The state administrative officers needed to be more proficient in dispatching leadership/ people-oriented roles while the corporate senior managers were found to be more proficient in dispatching strategic and operational roles. Both the services were given similar nomenclature for the competencies for procedural similarity. It was however, observed that both the services had different cluster priorities for different categories of roles. Task-execution competencies were
common in both the services. The discussion above gave an elaborate justification of the same. While the conclusion summed up the findings. On comparing the results of the present study with those of GoI-UNDP (2012) it was determined that similar set of competencies were identified by the investigator along with few more competencies that are required for efficient functioning in the state administrative services. The study concluded with the model of competencies that are required according to the job roles.
### Table 6.1

**Study in Nutshell**

**Aim:** To identify the roles of state administrative officer and map the competencies for state administrative services and then compare the same with the roles and competencies of the senior corporate managers as identified by Khandwalla (2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Statistical Technique</th>
<th>Results*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>What are the roles of the state administrative services?</td>
<td>75 job incumbents (37 superior performers and 38 average performers)</td>
<td>Behavior Event</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>CAVE, inter-rater reliability</td>
<td>17 roles categorized into three roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews (BEIs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>What are the competencies of the state administrative services?</td>
<td>75 job incumbents (37 superior performers and 38 average performers)</td>
<td>Behavior Event</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>CAVE, inter-rater reliability</td>
<td>28 competencies clustered into six meta-competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews (BEIs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>What are the competencies that differentiate the superior performers from average performing state administrative officers?</td>
<td>75 job incumbents (37 superior performers and 38 average performers)</td>
<td>Behavior Event</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Chi-squares ($\chi^2$) (.01 level)</td>
<td>Six indisputable competencies, 21 differentiating competencies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviews (BEIs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Is there any relevance of the perceived role effectiveness and the perceived competencies?</td>
<td>75 panel of experts (25 senior IAS officers, 35 senior RAS officers, 12 psychologists and 3 members of the board)</td>
<td>Rating scale survey</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Mean, SD, Ranking, Average Ranking, Percentage</td>
<td>Core, specific and versatile competencies, Top five roles and top five competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>How are the roles and competencies of the state administrative services different from the roles and competencies of the corporate senior managers?</td>
<td>75 panel of experts (25 senior IAS officers, 35 senior RAS officers, 12 psychologists and 3 members of the board) and 73 senior managers (Khandwalla, 2004)</td>
<td>Primary data: Rating scale survey Secondary data: findings of Khandwalla (2004)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>State administrative officers- execute leadership/ people-oriented roles, Senior Managers-strategic roles and operations-related roles, Parity- Task-execution competencies- Disparity-between other competencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Elaborated further in table 6.8*
### Table 6.2

**Results in Nutshell**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>17 roles categorized into three roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td><strong>Strategic roles</strong>- formulation and implementation of policies, revenue administration, budgeting, accounting and auditing, imposition of taxes if not prohibited by state law, leasing and agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td><strong>Operations-related roles</strong>- maintenance and supervision of land records, general elections, inter-governmental relations, act as a link between the government and administration, administer and enforce contracts, procure and supervise budget allocations, issue permits and licenses, maintain insurance coverages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td><strong>Leadership/ people-oriented roles</strong>- maintaining law and order, district and public administration, public relations, personnel and general administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>28 competencies clustered into six meta-competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td><strong>Contextual sensitive competencies</strong>- political skills, diagnostic focus, conceptual thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td><strong>Innovation-related competencies</strong>- creative, innovative, change agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td><strong>Initiative-related competencies</strong>- information seeking, proactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td><strong>Resilient problem-solving</strong>- critical thinking, conflict management, stress management, resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td><strong>Task execution competencies</strong>- motivation, achievement orientation, concern for order, concern for quality, trustworthiness, responsibility, administrative abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td><strong>Interpersonal and leadership-related competencies</strong>- visionary, coaching, balanced, impressive, leadership, team building, empathy, communication skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>Competencies that differentiates superior performers from average performers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Six indisputable competencies</strong>- diagnostic focus, conceptual thinking, information seeking, responsibility, administrative abilities and communication skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>21 differentiating competencies</strong>- political skills, creative, innovative, change agent, proactive, critical thinking, stress management, resilience, motivation, achievement orientation, concern for order, concern for quality, trustworthiness, visionary, coaching, balanced, impressive, leadership, team building, empathy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>no difference competency</em>- conflict management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>Core competencies, Specific competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Strategic roles</strong>- ‘Core’ competencies- administrative abilities, responsibility, trustworthiness and conceptual thinking. ‘Specific’ competencies- administrative abilities, responsibility and trustworthiness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Operations-related roles</strong>- ‘Core’ competencies- responsibility, administrative abilities and trustworthiness. No specific competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Leadership/ people-oriented roles</strong>- ‘Core’ competencies- administrative abilities, communication skills, information seeking, leadership,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Versatile competencies
- Responsibility, team building, trustworthiness, achievement orientation, influential, motivation, visionary, concern for quality

### ’Specific’ competencies
- Achievement orientation, communication skills, concern for quality, influential, information seeking, leadership, motivation, team building and visionary.

### ‘Versatile’ competencies
- Responsibility, administrative abilities, trustworthiness

### Top-five roles
- District administration, public relations, maintaining law and order, general elections, personnel and general administration

### Top-five competencies
- Responsibility, leadership, trustworthiness, administrative abilities, visionary

---

**Comparison of state administrative officers and senior managers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State administrative officers</th>
<th>Senior Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Execute leadership/ people-oriented roles</td>
<td>Strategic roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior managers- strategic roles and operations-related roles</td>
<td>1st rank- strategic roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity- Task-execution competencies</td>
<td>2nd rank- strategic roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd rank- operations-related roles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Parity (state administrative officers + Senior Managers) task-execution competencies (E) |
| Disparity-Between other competencies |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disparity</th>
<th>RAS Officers</th>
<th>Senior Managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Roles</td>
<td>Cluster E</td>
<td>Cluster B, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations-related Roles</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cluster E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/ people-oriented Roles</td>
<td>Cluster B, E, F</td>
<td>Cluster F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versatile Competencies</td>
<td>Cluster E</td>
<td>Cluster B, C, D, E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applications and Recommendations

In an era of emerging markets, technologies and social structure the state administrative services need to be more vigilant towards various growth aspects and align their activities for better performance to face such crucial challenges. The administrative officers need to disentangle themselves from the present state of mind reared by decades of years in service that had led to some kind of rust formation in the system. The present study enables the state administrative services to address these problems-

- The transformation of the world into a globalised village is a high alert for the administrative services to be on their guards to break through the set patterns of practices and devise some new healthy work practices. This would require that the state administrative officers play their roles- leadership, strategic and operational more efficiently than in a segregated economy. The state administrative services need to be brought into system that led to transparency and yielded some beneficial and concrete results.

- The study by Health and Safety Executive (2007) reported that competencies were related to stress management in an organisation. The present study suggests that the recruitment, selection and placement of the RAS officers for specified roles need to take place accordingly. It remains needless to state that the proper competency identification and development in the state administrative services shall enhance their performance leading to a healthy atmosphere in the state administrative services that shall promote improved working relationships in the departments, mental peace to the officers, growth and prosperity in the state!
• The findings of this study can assist the Rajasthan Public Service Commission in choosing the appropriate candidate for the state administrative services in an objective and systematic manner by focusing on the competencies that are required for superior performers. The researcher hereby suggests that the six competencies ("diagnostic focus", "conceptual thinking", "information seeking", "responsibility", "administrative abilities" and "communication skills") that were indisputably present in the superior performing state administrative officers need to be the most sought after competencies during recruitments for the new candidates.

• The reform in civil services serves as an eye-opener for the state administrative services as well. Besides cultivating state administrative officers with technical knowledge they need to be trained and hired for some soft skills especially "responsibility", "leadership", "trustworthiness" and "administrative abilities". The state administrative services need to nurture people with the competencies that the superior performers possess. This calls for more versatility and competency in the state administrative services.

• Present research proposes a robust ready-to-use framework of the 'core', 'specific' and 'versatile' competencies required to play the three sets of roles (leadership/people-oriented roles, strategic roles and operational-related roles) effectively. The identified 17 roles and 28 competencies can assist the state administrative services in enhanced and specialized delivery of their services. A concentrated effort to build up these 28 competencies in the state administrative officers may set in motion a proficient work-
force for the state administrative services. A focused approach towards inculcating the identified competencies shall not only bolster the performance of the state administrative officers of the state of Rajasthan but can also prove to be a benchmark for other states. This being a pioneer study can act as a frame of reference for the other state administrative service boards to identify the competency criteria. This would create parity between various state administrative services selection boards in India.

- The study gave a picture of broad competencies that are required in the state administrative services for superior performance but once practiced, could lead to certain micro-competencies as well. The identified competencies can also be developed and chiseled further in newly appointed officers during induction training.

- The complete system needs a makeover and this shall take a step by step approach. A road-map just the way it is created for the civil servants (GoI-UNDP, 2012) needs to be formulated for the state administrative services as well. Further an implementation guide for the identified competencies shall help in powerful renovation of the system.

- Once the competency criteria of the state administrative services are established special training course structures for the aspirants could be designed for the educational institutions, preparatory and training institutes to prepare the young aspirants for these services in the right direction and equip them with desirable competencies. The educational institutions being the feeders for the state administrative services need to inculcate the identified competencies in the aspirants. This shall bridge the gap between
the supplying agencies (educational and training institutes, who train the aspirants), recruitment agencies (RPSC), and the absorbing agencies (government, who employs them). The recruitment board would have a wider choice of competent candidates to choose most suitable candidate from a vast pool. Simultaneously, to the confused and disoriented youth, it shall give the right direction to aspire and prepare for the career of their choice and capacities. This shall lead to the synergetic gains to the welfare of the state as well as to the officers in terms of success and satisfaction.

- The administrative officers need to screen the aspirants on the basis of the required competencies and train them at regular intervals for the competencies which are required for different profiles. Simply informing the state administrative officers for developing the required competencies would not be of sufficient help rather, training modules need to be developed for each competency with a set time-limit for it. This in turn needs to be followed by periodical follow ups to check the progress towards the proficiency levels. There’s a paradox when training the person for the specified roles is concerned as the person might also learn the required competencies being in the actual job roles. But, that may cost the state heavily. Hiring the right people with right competencies and then training them for better performances is thus wiser than recruiting arbitrarily and leaving them to learn through trial and error during their tenure.

- The work profile of a state administrative officer is not static/fixed. He/she is posted in various positions and locations. Thus, it becomes obligatory to prepare the state administrative officers for the kind of roles expected as well as the detailed set of competencies required for the same. This makes the state administrative officer more
effective and efficient. This could happen only by proper *mentoring* and *trainings*. Training programmes could also be designed for the state administrative officers to face the new challenges of promotion, rotation and transfer during their services. The regular refresher courses could also be designed to enhance and update these competencies of already employed officers from time to time.

- The competency model suggested by the present study can also be used for job design, performance appraisals, personal enhancements and career growth just like the Western Balkans civil service systems (GoI-India, 2012).

- Once the competency mapping is established in state administrative services, the concept of competency- based pay system can also be introduced. This shall lead to better services and transparency in the system.

The author strongly recommends-

- The findings of the study to be shared with the Chief Secretary, Secretariat, Jaipur who further establishes the competencies for the state administrative officers simultaneously, directing the RPSC to select new recruits on the basis of established competencies.

- The results of the established competencies to be shared with the educational institutions and coaching centres so that the aspirants are trained for required set of competencies thus, assisting the RPSC with a vast pool of candidates with desired competencies.
• The competencies once established needs to be shared with Harish Chandra Mathur
  Rajasthan State Institute of Public Administration (HCM-RIPA) for further developments
  of the modules for induction, refresher trainings as well as promotion trainings.

Future plan of action

The present study suggests the following step-by-step approach to competency-based
management for state administrative services (Figure 6.10). It should be noted here that each step
involves construction and standardization of competency mapping scales as well as training
modules according to three different proficiency levels namely- for self, for subordinates and for
others (as suggested by Spencer, 1993).
Figure 6.10 Road-map to Competency-Based Management for State Administrative Services
Limitations

No research is a perfect piece of scientific base. Although the researcher was cautious enough to make the present study a scientific one nevertheless, there are always some chances of limitations. The following limitations should be noted before generalizing the results-

- The study is limited to state administrative officers of Rajasthan only.
- The Department of Personnel and Training did not permit to get an access to the performance appraisals of the state administrative officers for identifying the star performers and average performers due to their government policy, the referrals (opinion of colleagues and retired officers) were used by the researcher for this purpose.
- Greater cooperation from RPSC was expected that caused administrative hurdles and some compromises in the study.