Bureaucratic dysfunction is another important aspect that deserves special attention in a study of the problems of bureaucracy. Although Max Weber considered bureaucracy to be superior to all other forms of organisation because of its precision, impersonality and rationality which are conducive to efficient administration, his analysis was of the nature of ideal type bureaucratic functions. He was not concerned with the operational aspect of the ideal-typical characteristics of bureaucracy and thus ignored its dysfunctional aspects.

In his analysis of bureaucratic structure, Weber focused on official regulations and requirements and their significance for administrative efficiency. Of course, he knew that the behaviour of the members of an organisation does not precisely correspond to its blueprint. But he was not concerned with this problem and did not investigate systematically the way in which operations actually are carried out. Consequently, his analysis ignored the fact that in the course of operations, new elements arise in the structure that influence subsequent operations.

And such elements might be dysfunctional to the bureaucratic organisation.

2. Ibid., p. 2.
Although contemporary scholars like Robert Nisbet have emphasized the dysfunctional aspects of bureaucratic organization, there are very few scientific, sociological studies of bureaucratic dysfunctions in the Indian context. Referring to corruption as a dysfunctional element in the South Asian countries Gunner Rydell points out that it is almost a taboo as a research topic. It is rarely mentioned in scholarly discussion of government and planning revealing a general bias which has been characterized by Prof. Rydell as "dysfunction in research." However, bureaucratic dysfunctions in terms of corruption and inefficiency are on the increase in India, and have "become as much a part of everyone's life that people have evolved strategies and styles of operating such a system and the insecurity of dealing with an uncorrupt administration is perhaps what makes people loath to tamper with the existing arrangements." The increasing corruption and inefficiency not only cause loss of time and public money but also affect the stability of the government. If not already,


4. One such study has been made by N.K. Singh in his book Bureaucracy: Positions and Personality, op.cit.


In the near future, it can pose a threat to our democratic system because the post-war history gives ample evidence of the rise of dictators on the pretext of fighting corruption. As Prof. Myrdal observes:

The problem is ... of vital concern to the governments in the region [South Asia]. Generally speaking, the habitual practice of bribery and dishonesty tends to pave the way for an authoritarian regime, whose disclosures of corrupt practices in the preceding government and whose punitive action against offenders provide a basis for its initial acceptance by the articulate strata of the population. The elimination of corrupt practices has also been advanced as the main justification for military take-overs. Should the new regime be unsuccessful in its attempts to eradicate corruption, its failure will prepare the ground for a new push of some sort. Thus, it is obvious that the extent of corruption has a direct bearing on the stability of South Asian governments.

...Bureaucratic dysfunctions in terms of corruption and inefficiency are inter-related and affect not only the day to day life of the citizens but also raise strong obstacles and inhibitions to development. If often promotes irrationality in planning and limits the horizons of plan. The usual way to make money by corrupt practices is to threaten obstruction and delay in official functions and this causes slowing down the wheels of administration in developing countries.

8. Ibid., pp. 231-232.
With the above considerations in mind, an attempt is made in the following sections to study the bureaucratic dysfunctions in terms of corruption and inefficiency. The study will not be an abstract one. Instead, we shall try to answer the questions: what do the bureaucrats think to be the causes of corruption and inefficiency and what remedies do they suggest for removing them from public bureaucracy.

**Corruption**

Corruption is an oft-discussed subject in Rajahlaya. It pervades all spheres of society in some form or other in varying degrees. Both public discussions and newspaper accounts accord considerable importance to the growing phenomena of political and bureaucratic corruption and inefficiency. The debates in the State Legislative Assembly have quite often dealt with corruption in high places and amongst the bureaucrats and politicians. Stressing the administrative reform as an immediate necessity, the Congress M.L.A. Late Shri P.N. Chaudhary thus observed:

```
...Corruption is very rampant in our state [Rajahlaya]; this evil is deep-rooted and unless we can fight against this evil and try to eradicate it from the society we cannot give the real benefits to the people for whose development programmes are meant to be taken up.
```

---

However, corruption in public bureaucracy is not a phenomenon peculiar to Moghalaya, though its ramifications are large and pervasive in Moghalaya. Corruption in public bureaucracy is also not something new, but an age-old phenomenon. Kautilya in his Arthasastra prescribed measures to be adopted to check corruption. The Moghal period was characterised by bribery, corruption and extortion which led Akbar in 1601 to complain that the clerks and officers of the state have taken to the practice of trading and buy posts with gold and sell them for shameful considerations. During the period of the East India Company, the British officers and clerks who were virtually the rulers augmented their income through corrupt practices such as collection of graft on taxes and receipt of gifts. But, soon the Britishers realised that unless they had an honest administration, they could not be able to maintain their political power in India and consequently, they enforced a strict code of integrity. However, the Britishers could not fully eradicate corruption from the public service. There was corruption but till the World War II, corruption was mostly prevalent amongst the lower officials. The higher echelons of bureaucracy were mostly free from this evil. But the immense war

efforts during the period of 1939-1945 involved an annual expenditure of hundreds of crores of rupees and the war time controls and scarcities provided ample opportunities for corruption and bribery.\textsuperscript{12} This was probably the beginning of mass corruption in India which got its full sway after independence when economic planning and rapid expansion of government activity in new fields involved gigantic public expenditure. There has been a phenomenal increase in corruption in the public services in India since independence, writing on this subject, G.D. Khola has pointed out: \textit{"...with the realisation of our right in the kind of democracy we had chosen, came the freedom to lie, to cheat, to give and take bribes, to circumvent and to defy the law, to buy positions and power and abuse the power so acquired."}\textsuperscript{13}

In our attempt to analyse the forms and causes of bureaucratic corruption as perceived by the bureaucrats in Meghalaya, we asked them to identify the important types of corruption prevalent in public bureaucracy in Meghalaya.\textsuperscript{14} The question elicited a wide variety of responses which were classified as follows:\textsuperscript{15}

\begin{align*}
13. & \text{G.D. Khola, "Corruption Over the Ages", Corruption in India, ed. Sursh Kohli, op.cit., p.20.} \\
14. & \text{For the question, see Appendix C.} \\
15. & \text{For analysis of the responses, see Table 6.1.}
\end{align*}
1. Using official position for personal purposes.

2. Using government vehicles for personal work.


4. Showing favour to friends and relatives.

5. Using official staff, stationery, etc., for personal work.

In further efforts to enquire into the causes of corruption, irrespective of the forms of corruption, as perceived by the bureaucrats by asking them to identify the important causes of corruption, the responses received stand as follows after classification:

1. Moral factor.

2. Economic factor.

3. Political factor.

4. Structural factor.

5. Cultural factor.

Before entering into a discussion of these factors separately, it needs to be said that these factors are inter-related and cannot be studied independently of one another.

16. For the question, see Appendix.

17. For analysis of the responses, see Table 6:2.
Fiscal factor

Responses like 'no morality', 'no religious faith', 'lack of conscience', etc. are included in the category of 'fiscal factor' and it is found that 34.78 percent of the responses account for moral weakness and turpitude to be the cause of corruption in public bureaucracy. The factor of moral weakness has been considered from two viewpoints by the respondents: religious belief and social values. Some of the respondents believe that the morality of the people is becoming weak day-by-day with the advance of modern civilization, and this is because of the fact that people are losing faith in their religions. As one respondent said:

Lack of religious belief is the main cause of corruption in both our public and private life. Earlier, people had faith in religion and it was the fear of religion which made them abstain from doing immoral things. Today, religious belief is becoming less day-by-day. No longer people think about the day of judgment and they value the present more than the future.

Another cause of moral weakness is the replacement of social values, like 'service', 'sufferings' and 'sacrifice' by the new acquisitive values. New acquisitive values are in turn the result of a complex combination of factors. People's aspirations were raised during the nationalist movement by promising them a high standard of living. After independence, the programme of economic
development and modernisation promised eradication of poverty and increase of national income. Though goals were proclaimed, the means to realise the goals were lacking. This imbalance between goals and means resulted in the adoption of extra-legal means. Besides, the model of modernisation envisaged by planners is based on the affluent and advanced societies of the West. To follow this model, the norms and values of traditional society have been undermined, and the society has come to acquire a new set of norms and values. Status in the modern society is judged through economic success rather than traditional indices. People have developed increased desire for consumption of newer articles which not only provide comfort but are also considered to be a status symbol. And this desire for consumption can be met only through acquiring wealth. Wealth, however, acquired is an effective passport to honour, power and influence. 10

The bureaucrat being a part of the society cannot be expected to develop values different from those of society. They are in constant interaction with the society, and as a result of this interaction they influence and, in turn, are influenced by the society. "The standards of people influence those

---

of public officials and it is hard to develop honest officials in a corrupt society. But it is equally true that high standards of the part of officials and public leaders raise the level of the whole community. The bureaucrats, being the executors of various development programmes, have more opportunities to misuse their power and indulge in the acts of corruption more than others. In an acquisitive society, where people are judged by what they have rather than what they are, bureaucrats cannot be expected to develop personal virtues or a sense of morality. This lack of a sense of morality has led to a scramble for the acquisition of material gains and prizes irrespective of the means adopted.

**Economic factor**

Next to moral factor is the economic factor which accounts for 30-45 percent of the responses. In this category of economic factor we included responses like 'poor salary', 'family burden', 'greediness', etc. Respondents who were interviewed were found to be vocal about the gap between the cost of living and the salary they received, although, in the same breath, they pointed out that sheer poverty was not always responsible for corruption.

According to most of the respondents, poverty, along with lack of honesty and

---

integrity, causes corruption. Thus, it is neither the economic factor nor the social factor alone, but a combination of the two that causes corruption.

This aspect is well reflected in the following comment of a respondent:

"Pressure for example that I am a corrupt officer. I take bribes. I use my official position for non-official purposes. But why do I do all these things? I am an officer having a family of five members. I have a status not only in my office but also in the society. Corresponding to this status, some social roles are assigned to me. I must have a servant. I must attend parties and other such social get-togethers (both official and non-official). Then I go out for marketing or on a social courtesy visit. I should not talk, and even if I do, my wife must not talk because an officer's wife is more or less a 'soherni'. My wife must be well-dressed when she goes out. Otherwise, salesmen at the counter will address her 'Dadi' instead of 'Aunty' and her host will not see her off at the roadside. Besides, I have social obligations and the responsibility to educate my children. But therefore I will do all these things? From my salary? It is too little an amount. So, I have two alternatives open to me. Either I shall be a role-deviant (but in this case there is every possibility of disturbing family peace) or I must adopt some extra legal means. This is not something unique in my case, but common to most of the officers. In such a dilemma, either of the two alternatives is to be followed, and mostly the second, because it promises a happy life and probably a bright future."

Another aspect of this economic factor as emphasized by some respondents is the greediness for acquiring more and more money and other
material benefits. Although this is a common human desire, in some cases, it
is insatiable and leads to increasing illegal gratification of the same.

**Political factor**

Responses like 'political interference', 'favour shown under political pressure', 'illegal things done under political direction', etc., are grouped under political factor which accounts for 20.37 percent of the responses. The respondents have not pointed out cases of bribery among the politicians. Cases most frequently mentioned by them relate to illegal gratification of the demands of the relatives of politicians. Illegal gratification can be of various types and forms. Ranging from providing several fringe benefits, it may include granting of an industrial licence, export-import licence or issuing contracts to the family members, relatives, friends and favourites of the politicians in power. Once, the researcher was present when an officer was instructing the son of the ex-chief minister how to apply for a contract and that would be the charge to be shown in the tender. Such favours are shown under unwritten instructions of political bosses which influence the decisions of the bureaucracy while issuing licences, permits, and contracts. The ruling party must oblige those who give donations to their election funds which cannot be done without the help of the bureaucrat.
President of a State Chamber of Commerce once said: "Political leaders pressurised the trade and industry to make unlimited donations... which resulted in price rises... These are realised on grounds of licensing, quota and permits, not out of affection, but to protect trade and industry." If a bureaucrat acts at the behest of the politicians, he is rewarded, and if he sticks to principles, rules and procedures and refuses their requests, he is subjected to harassment. The bureaucrat who act in order to please the politicians, thus, violate the bureaucratic norms of impartiality and neutrality.

**Structural Factor**

In the category of 'structural factor', responses like 'delay', 'red-tape', 'complicated rules and regulations', etc., are included and these account for 12.01 percent of the responses. The bureaucratic system in India continued the complex set of rules established by the colonial rulers as a means of maintaining over their Indian subordinates with various levels of training, outlook and goals. The diversity and complexity of these rules have led to an 'administrative jungle'. In Nagalaya, separate set of rules for the tribal areas framed by the different District Councils have further added to this.

---

20. Quoted by Dev Dutt, "In Politics", Corruption in India, ed. Suresh Kohli, op.cit., p. 84.
complexity. This complexity of rules and regulations, sometimes, becomes a source of corruption. The bureaucrats, sometimes, deliberately make delay in their decisions so as to receive bribes and other pecuniary benefits. The clients, on the other hand, offer bribes to the bureaucrats in order to be free free of circumvent the bureaucratic web of cumbersome and complex rules and procedures. Besides, most of the people do not know much about the governmental rules and procedures and find it necessary to take recourse to the unwritten but more effective ways of getting things done by governmental agencies.

Cultural factor

Under cultural factor we included responses like "habit" and "familial tradition" which account for only 1.30 percent of the responses. Although negligible from the numerical point of view, such responses indicate that corruption can be habitual and such a habit can be influenced by the familial background of the bureaucrats. As one bureaucrat commented:

There are two types of corrupt persons not only in the bureaucracy but also in society. Some people are corrupt by nature or habit, others are made corrupt by their poor economic conditions or by the environment in which they work. Persons in the first category are not born with corrupt habits but familial traditions make them corrupt. In most of such cases, you will find either the parents or other

members of the family earning through dishonest means and this
behaviour of the elders influences the young who start considering
such a thing as a natural way of living. And, if such a person
enters the government service, he cannot give up his habit which
is formed during the early years of his life.

Measures against corruption

Having analysed the cause of corruption, we will now discuss the
measures for the removal of corruption from the bureaucracy, a problem which is
of great concern to both the public and the government. For this purpose, we
asked the bureaucrats to suggest some important remedial measures for removing
corruption from the public services. In response to this, a wide variety of
suggestions were provided which we categorised into four: Social, Economic,
Political and Structural.

Social values

Surprisingly, almost half of the responses (49.15 percent) account for
a change in societal value-structure as a remedy of corruption in public
bureaucracy. This emphasis upon social values is due to the fact that bureaucracy
being a sub-system of the social system cannot undergo basic changes without

---

22. For the question, see Appendix C.
23. For analysis of the responses, see Table 6.3.
bringing about changes in the value structure of the society. Further, the lack of morality, as highlighted to be a cause of corruption, is relative and depends upon societal values. Not only morality, but also economic, political and cultural factors are influenced by the value structure of society. Nearly 50.00 percent of respondents, therefore, lay emphasis upon a basic change in social values as a remedial measure for removing corruption from public bureaucracy. A bureaucrat commented thus:

No such measure like vigilance commission or enactment of stringent laws will be an adequate answer to the menace of corruption. Though law cannot be made fool-proof but even if it can be, its implementation depends upon man who is a social animal, and who, in due course of time, will become corrupt. Income-tax, Sales-tax, Police, Customs and Central Excise—such half-a-dozen examples can be readily given. If the evil is to be eliminated, we must go to the root of it, and that root lies in society. Today, the society has lost its values. Honesty and integrity no longer count much. A man is judged by what he has—rather than by what he is. There was a time when society looked down upon its dishonest and corrupt members. But today it is not the case, when parents arrange the marriage of their daughter, they consider

24. In this connection, it may be pointed out that though there is an anticorruption wing of the CID under the Deputy Inspector General of Police in Meghalaya, its functioning is beset with certain difficulties. In the words of the Chief Minister "... the work of the branch is too difficult because we do not have trained personnel with sufficient experience in this specialised work... Our difficulty is that specific instances are not coming forward, and we do not get witness to substantiate the allegations." See Meghalaya Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. X, No. 2, (Budget Session, 1975), p. 23.
the material possessions of the bride-groom more than his honesty and integrity. So, what can a youngster do? Instead of being rewarded, a honest person is punished by the society. Until and unless our social values are changed and society itself wages a war against its corrupt members, we cannot hope to eliminate corruption from the bureaucracy.

Social value system is undoubtedly an important factor in the establishment of a clean and efficient administrative system. Its importance has also been emphasised by the Chief Minister U.A. Sengar when he said:

...unless and until there is a change of character in our society is it possible to talk about a clean and efficient administration? I would very much like to have it and I am sure everyone would like to have it, but where lies the responsibility? The responsibility lies with you and me, with the masses of the people in the state... it is a fact that if one wants to get more than what is due to him it means corruption and exploitation. Is it possible for the government alone to rectify this? ...this problem concerns the entire society. Unless the society itself wants to have a clean and efficient administration it will not be possible to bring about that type of administration simply by trying to remove certain officer or officers from government machinery. 25

Economic measures

Economic measure accounts for 27.28 percent of the responses.

Responses like, 'more salary', 'more monetary benefits', etc., are included in this category. It is believed that if bureaucrats are well paid or paid proportionately

to the cost of living, the rate of malpractices will diminish. Earlier, while pointing out the economic strain upon the bureaucrat, a reference was made to the gross disparities of pay-scales and other monetary benefits between the State Government employees and the Central Government employees as well as between the high and low officials. During our discussion we raised the question: Is it justified to pay more to the Central Government employees than their State counterparts when they live in the same town or area and perform the same functions? Such disparities cause a feeling of deprivation in the minds of the State Government employees, and consequently, lead to the adoption of unfair means by them to compensate for their inadequate salaries. According to some of our respondents, this salary can be remedied by raising the salary of the State Government employees at par with the Central Government employees as it has already been done in the case of some states.

It is to be observed here that an increase in the salaries of the State Government employees alone will not solve the problem. There are no equal economic opportunities in India. Economic power has been concentrated in the hands of a few, and this has led to an alliance among industrialists-capitalists, politicians and bureaucrats. Further, concentration of economic power in the hands of a few gives them control over vantage positions in the government and
even on policy making. Unless a reasonable degree of economic equality is
established, a mere reduction of disparities in salary scales will not remove
corruption from the bureaucracy.

**Political factors**

Political factors include responses like stopping "political
interference" and "political pressure" and accounts for 12.50 percent of the
responses. It is said that if political interference in the day-to-day
administration ceases, there would be a decrease in corruption and malpractices.

Related to this is the wider question of the nature of political
leadership and the values and standards adopted by ministers and other political
leaders. It is of utmost importance that the leaders set an example by
refraining from indulging in acts of corruption and favouritism. The basic cause
of corruption in the bureaucracy lies in the political sphere—corruption at
the highest level in government and political parties. This, however, involves
problems which are beyond the scope of the present enquiry.

**Structural reforms**

Structural reforms include responses like "avoidance of delay"
Introduction of simple rules and regulations, etc., which account for 11.57 percent of the responses. It is suggested that instead of lengthy and cumbersome procedures, simple procedures should be introduced in order to avoid delay which is one of the basic causes of corruption in public bureaucracy.

Complex procedures and detailed and lengthy rules not only cause delay but also result in dampening individual initiative and ability. Time limits should be prescribed for dealing with receipts, files and the performance of other duties and these should be strictly enforced. Superior officers should consider it their responsibility to find out whether in any particular matter there has been avoidable delay and call to account the person responsible for delay.

On the subject of cumbersome, complex and unimaginative procedures in administration, Dr. Paul H. Appleby made the following observation which need special attention:

The rules of business, Secretariat Instructions and Office Manuals seem to me to be generally too didactic and confusing, too detailed and unimaginative. They might be expected to contribute to the extreme insistence on following formal channels too literally and invariably. They seem to assume and encourage that literal-mindedness which dampens the spirit, imagination and judgment which are important to good administration.

Inefficiency

Inefficiency is another aspect of bureaucratic dysfunction in India. They study of the perception of inefficiency is important because it affects the goal achievement of the system. It is also responsible for making the administration unpopular, and in turn, the government, because the people judge the governmental performance through the effectiveness of its administrative machinery. The complexities of a modern democratic government demand, more than before, an efficient administrative machinery and competent and capable administrators to operate that machinery. However, according to many observers and critics, growing corruption and inefficiency are the most notorious and distinguishing features of Indian administration. As Prof. Rajni Kothari has observed "... if there is any area of the Indian polity that is riddled with confusion, indeterminacy and inertia, it is the administration. Nothing is more urgent than infusing change and dynamism to this area of government. But, nothing is more neglected and more resistant to change."

One of the important questions relating to inefficiency in Indian administration is that are the causes of bureaucratic inefficiency and how can

As be removed? For studying the cause of bureaucratic inefficiency, we asked the respondents to specify some important causes of inefficiency. The question elicited different responses which were classified into the following categories:

1. Administrative.
2. Political.
3. Social.
4. Individual.
5. Economic.

Administrative Causes

24.25 percent of the respondents were found to consider bureaucratic inefficiency as resulting from administrative causes like 'complicated procedures', 'lack of co-ordination', 'red-tape', etc. Procedures, instead of serving as a means to an end, sometimes become an end in themselves. Robert Toletan has drawn attention to this tendency in the following words: "Resistance to the rules, originally conceived as a means, become transformed into an end-in-itself; there occurs the familiar process of displacement of goals whereby an instrumental..."

[For the question, see Appendix C.]
[For analysis of the responses, see Table 68.]
value becomes a terminal value. 34

Almost everyday, some or other new rules, regulations and procedures are introduced which result in the creation of a jungle of procedures. These procedures are archaic, unimaginative, anachronistic, and cumbersome and lead to red-tapism and delay in making decisions, in the movement of files and accomplishment of other work. A matter of minor importance passes through half-a-dozen hands, thus, making almost everyone busy for nothing. This aspect of cumbersome rules and regulations has been graphically illustrated by L. E.

Joe, he writes:

If someone asks me a question, the first thing I ask myself is whether it is within my competence to give him a reply. This is never easy for anyone to know. So, I start consulting everybody else who might possibly be concerned or interested. Before they give me any answer, they ask me a number of questions. I fling them back at the chap who approached me first. If he still persists and comes back with answers, I pass them back to my colleagues. If they can find no flaw in the answer, they take a decision. And usually, the decision is to put the matter up to the officers above them and so the game goes on. Do you think I like it? Then I retire, the very rules and procedures which I apply will result in my pension being held up for months and even years, and when it is sanctioned, I shall have to prove by producing certificates on the prescribed forms that I am alive and also that I was alive in each of the intervening months during which my pension was under consideration.

34. Norton, op. cit., p. 263.
yet what am I to do? People think I exercise authority. They do not know that I have no authority. Where the authority lies, no one knows. All I know is that if I do nothing, no one will blame me, but if I do something, then many people will ask me whether what I did was correct. Correct, mind you, not right. If I help someone, my motives may be questioned. If I say no, I am safe. So, I take the line of least assistance.

Not only cumbersome procedures, but also the lack of co-ordination causes inefficiency. Modern welfare administration requires co-ordination between different departments, and hierarchies and between different units or branches of the same department. But in Nagalaya, there is no rational system followed in co-ordinating the work of different ministries and departments, and consequently, there is delay and inefficiency in the administration.

Political Causes

Responses like 'political interference', 'political pressure', 'political victimization', etc., are included in political causes which account for 21.84 percent of the total responses. Politicians often interfere in administration and bring pressure upon the administrators to get things done.

according to their wishes and interests. Faced with such pressures, the
administration takes recourse to the game of 'passing the buck' or takes
shelter under the sanctuary of rules and regulations. Victimization of the
bureaucrats on political grounds deepens their initiative and morale. There
develops a tendency towards 'playing safe' and one of the most commonly-adopted
ways of 'playing safe' is to follow the precedents. Thought the observance of
precedents in making decisions is an element of bureaucratic rationality,
sometimes regard for precedents verges on morbidity. Precedents, thus, are no
longer treated as one of the ingredients in a rational decision but degenerate
into a means for avoiding fresh thinking and quick decisions. "Routine, red-
tape, and long-noting take the place of initiative, ingenuity and innovation". 34

Social Causes

Social causes like 'groupism', 'communalism', etc., are also
considered to be responsible for bureaucratic inefficiency which account for
20-50 percent of the responses in this study. As we discussed earlier, the
Mahasayan society as well as the administration is divided into two hostile

33. R.P. Khosla, "Bureaucrats: The Loss of Vision", The Indian Journal of
34. S.V. Gadgil, "Accountability of Administration", The Indian Journal of
combs of 'insiders' and 'outsiders' (the 'tribals' and 'non-tribals') on the basis of region and community. This 'insiders'- 'outsiders' relationship sometimes takes the form of cliques leading to mutual hostility and mistrust, thereby, adversely affecting bureaucratic performance and efficiency.

**Individual Factor**

Individual factors like 'lack of initiative', 'devotion to one's duties', 'punctuality', etc., are also considered to be a factor responsible for administrative inefficiency and account for 13.66 percent of the total responses. Initiative and interest are personal traits and depend upon the complex interaction of different factors like family upbringing, the influence of social and educational institutions and bureaucratic culture.

Included in the individual factor are such traits as 'devotion to one's duties', 'ability to perform one's task', 'punctuality' and 'diligence'. These traits, however, have to be assessed at the stage of recruitment.

With a policy of large-scale reservations in government service (35 percent), it cannot be said that the best talents (possessing the qualities of devotion, diligence, etc.) are recruited in the public services of Meghalaya.
Economic Factor

"Bribery" and "monetary benefits" are included in the category of economic factors which accounts for 14.55 percent of the responses. And here we come across the interaction between corruption and inefficiency—the two inter-related aspects of bureaucratic dysfunction. Corrupt practices result in delay, and in turn, it is delay that causes corruption. A corrupt official deliberately makes delay in taking decisions or disposing of a matter, so that he can earn something by way of grease money. Very often, a bribe-giver does not wish to get anything done unlawfully, but just wants to speed up the movement of files and communication from department to department or from branch to branch of the same department. In certain offices, especially the executive offices, every movement of files is facilitated by "speed money." Unless and until "speed money" is paid, the official will not be found in his seat, and even if he is found, he will not give any attention to the client or will be unable to locate the relevant papers. Sometimes, even the bearer needs to be paid for locating the file in the chamber of the officer. The amount

35. This aspect of bureaucratic efficiency has been highlighted in the floor of the Assembly. Making charges against the Deputy Commissioner's office and the Treasury office in Shillong one A.L.A. observed "... I should say that it is a tragedy. It is an everyday happening that the bills do not move unless some money passes. A person who goes there for the bill will have to push a 5 or 10 rupee note and if this is not done, the bill will not move and he will have to go away. He is promised to pass the bill next day but then his bills are just blocked there. A person who has to get his bill passed in the Treasury has to change unaccountable rupees and alimony..." See Meghalaya Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol. 1, No. 1, (March-April Session, 1972), p. 99.
of speed money varies from case to case and from person to person. This has become such a matter of routine that a complaint becomes totally fruitless, its only effect being that it may invite harassment to the complainant.

Besides being one of the most unhealthy corrupt practices, it slows the wheels of bureaucratic machinery and is one of the most important causes of delay and inefficiency.

Remedial Measures against Inefficiency:

After discussing the causes of inefficiency, the corollary question is: what measures are necessary for making bureaucracy efficient? It is not easy to answer this question. However, we asked the respondents to name important remedial measures to be adopted for removing inefficiency from the public bureaucracy. The responses received were categorised into these:

1. Administrative.
2. Political.
3. Individual.

The responses show that none of the respondents suggested social

35. For the question, see Appendix C.
37. For analysis of the responses, see Table 6:5.
and economic measures as a remedy for bureaucratic inefficiency, although some of them considered social and economic factors to be responsible for bureaucratic inefficiency. They did not suggest social measures probably because they considered society an independent variable. The reason for not suggesting economic measures is probably for the close affinity between corruption and inefficiency. They perhaps thought that if one was eliminated, the other would cease to exist.

**Administrative Measures:**

Under administrative measure, we included responses like 'simplification of rules and regulations', 'proper co-ordination', 'proper personnel planning', etc., which accounts for 36.90 percent of the responses. This emphasis upon administrative measures is because of the fact that it is the immediate sphere with which they are concerned and that much can be done in the administrative sphere for improving its efficiency. This aspect has been discussed at some length in the preceding pages.

**Political Measures:**

Political measures account for 33.80 percent of the responses and
include responses like 'non-interference by the politicians', 'code of conduct for politicians', 'decentralization of political and administrative functions', etc. As we have already discussed, it is believed that there would be efficiency in the administration if politicians behave responsibly and do not interfere in the day-to-day working of the administration. Further, it has also been pointed out that if bureaucracy is to function efficiently, bureaucrats should not be made scapegoats. As one respondent commented:

Half of the bureaucratic inefficiency would be eliminated if our politicians are trained in a training school in the art of behaving with the administrators in a parliamentary democracy.

Measures for improving individual standard and ability:

Measures in this category account for 30.4% percent of the responses.

In this category, respondents emphasized the importance of recruitment of suitable candidates which depends upon the recruitment policy of the government.

It was suggested that recruitment policy should be made objective and scientific so that only the best candidates would be recruited. Besides, 30.

30. Although the bureaucrats, irrespective of their community, emphasized the need for effective recruitment policy, there were differences in their views over the question of reservation. The tribal officers are in favour of continuing the reservation policy while the non-tribal are opposed to it. The non-tribal officers hold that if 95 percent of the jobs in government offices are kept reserved, the best talent cannot be inducted in public service, and consequently, administrative efficiency will suffer. The tribal officers, on the other hand, defend the reservation policy on the ground that when about 90 percent of the people in the state belong to Scheduled Tribes and Scheduled Castes, 95 percent reservation for this category is not unreasonable.
the need for training has also been emphasised, recruitment of the best talents by itself is not an effective guarantee for increasing efficiency in the administration. Talented candidates must have proper and thorough training in the art of administration. In this connection, it may be pointed out that, excepting the Police Training School for subordinate police officials, there is no provision for training Civil Servants in Meghalaya.

Summary:

Dysfunction is an important aspect in the study of bureaucracy, which manifests especially in the bureaucracies of developing societies. Corruption and inefficiency are the two important manifestations of bureaucratic dysfunction. There is cause and effect relationship between corruption and inefficiency, and hence, none of these can be studied in complete isolation of the other.

The bureaucratic perception of corruption includes bribery, using official position for non-official purposes, using official staff, stationery and vehicles for personal use, and showing favour to relations and friends.
all of which are opposed to the name of Weber's ideal rational bureaucracy.

The bureaucrats consider moral, economic, political, structural and cultural factors as being responsible for corruption in public bureaucracy. Among the remedial measures to eradicate corruption, they suggest societal, economic, political and structural measures. The absence of any remedial of any measures in the shape of individual morality is perhaps due to the fact that morality is dependent upon the value structure of society and it is because of this fact that societal measures have been emphasized by the bureaucrats.

The other aspect of bureaucratic dysfunction, namely, inefficiency, is a major obstacle in implementing various programmes of development. In the present study, it is found that the respondents consider administrative, political, social, individual and economic factors responsible for bureaucratic inefficiency; and for removing inefficiency, they suggest administrative, political and individual measures. The respondents do not suggest social and economic measures for removing inefficiency, though they consider social and economic factors responsible for bureaucratic inefficiency. The absence of social measures can be attributed to the fact that they consider society an independent variable, while the absence of economic measure can be accounted for by the close affinity between corruption and inefficiency.