After making a survey of the socio-economic background of the bureaucrat in Meghalaya, it is useful to study the organisation in which the bureaucrat work. An organisation exists in order to fulfill certain specific goals. Without specific goals, there can be no organisations; and similarly, no goals for the common good can be achieved without organisations. That is why an organisation is defined as the co-ordinated activities of two or more persons for the achievement of some desired object. So, in an organisation there are two things: first, the co-ordinated effort, and second, the object. The second is dependent upon the first which, in turn, is dependent upon the willingness of the individual contributors. The willingness of the individual is not an independent variable to be assumed indefinitely. "The continuance of willingness also depends upon the satisfaction that are secured by individual contributors in the process of carrying out the purpose. If the satisfactions do not exceed the sacrifices required, willingness disappear, and the condition is one of organisational inefficiency. If the satisfactions exceed the sacrifices, willingness persists, and the condition is one of efficiency of organisation."

And since the satisfaction is derived from both the structural and functional aspects of an organisation, it is necessary to study these aspects of the organisation in which the bureaucrats work. Such a study will serve to highlight some of the problems the higher bureaucracy faces in Meghalaya as an instrument of development.

Organisation has two aspects: one is formal, and the other is informal. In this chapter, we shall first deal with the formal aspect of the organisation, and then with the informal aspect followed by a study of the job-satisfaction of the bureaucrats.

**Formal Organisation:**

By formal organisation is meant a formal structure of authority and a planned system of co-operative effort in which work sub-division are defined, arranged, and co-ordinated for the attainment of specific objectives. Though informal factors play a more important role in the functioning of an organisation, the formal organisation also influences the behaviour pattern of its members and deserves special attention. Pointing out the dangers of inadequate attention to formal organisation, Barnard writes:
To me, this failure of attention is like leaving a vital organ out of anatomy or its function out of physiology. Careful inspection of the observable actions of human beings in our society—their movements, their speech, and the thought and actions evident from their action and speech—shows that many and sometimes most of these are determined or directed by their connection with formal organisations. This is most obviously true of the actions of persons as employees and housewives, which occupy perhaps one quarter of their time, but most persons in their “non-working” hours are members or participants in other organisations.

In this section, dealing with the formal bureaucratic organisation in Meghalaya, attention will be confined to the formal structure of bureaucracy in relation to hierarchy, procedures of work, and career pattern.

**Hierarchy**

Hierarchy is considered to be an universal principle of organisation and the Meghalayan bureaucracy is no exception. Like any other bureaucracy, the bureaucracy in Meghalaya is hierarchically organised, being linked by a chain from top to bottom in an unbroken manner. The Secretariat occupying a key position in public bureaucratic system is located in the state capital, Shillong, with districts and blocks and villages as the main field units.


The working of the public bureaucracy can be broadly divided into two: general bureaucracy looking after the general administration and the technical bureaucracy looking after the technical or specialised side of the administration. Corresponding to these, there are two types of departments: non-technical departments and technical departments. The non-technical departments deal with the affairs for which no specialised knowledge is required. The Secretariat in the capital and the office of the Deputy Commissioner in the district deal with the general affairs of the government. Technical departments are entrusted with work, the right performance of which requires specialised or technical skills in a definite field and persons recruited to such departments generally have technical qualifications acquired in technical institutions.4

Operating within a parliamentary framework of government, the State Chief Minister is both the political and executive head who is assisted in his work by other Ministers. Each Minister is in-charge of one or more departments, depending upon the allocation of portfolios.5 Although in theory, the Ministers are both the political and executive heads of their respective departments, in reality, the Ministers are more political heads than administrative


heads. The administrative heads of the departments are the Secretaries who function under the direction of the Ministers.\(^6\)

The bureaucracy of the state is headed by the Chief Secretary who is a senior member of the Indian Administrative Service. The Chief Secretary is responsible for the organisation and work in the government as a whole and operates directly under the control of the Chief Minister and the Cabinet.\(^7\) The rest of the staff are organised ministry-wise under the administrative control of the Secretaries to Government (sometimes Commissioner or Special Secretary). The Secretaries are generally the members of the I.A.S., and sometimes a Secretary heads more than one department\(^8\) and may be under the ministerial control of more than one minister, thus violating the principle of unity of command. Below the Secretary, there is a Joint-Secretary, who is also a member of the I.A.S. in Meghalaya. The Secretary or Joint-Secretary is assisted by Deputy-Secretaries who are drawn from both the I.A.S. and the State Services (A.C.S. and M.C.S.). Though the members of both the I.A.S. and State Services are appointed Deputy-Secretaries, it represents the beginning of career in case of the members of the I.A.S. while it is generally the end of the career.

---

6. Ibid.
8. Ibid., p.98.
in case of the members of the State Services, below the Deputy Secretary, there are Under-Secretaries (also called Officers on Special Duty) who generally belong to the State Services or are promoted from the rank of Superintendents. Below the Under-Secretary, there are the Superintendents of different branches who, in some cases, are assisted by Assistant Superintendents. Below the Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents, there are Upper Division Assistants and Lower Division Assistants who are entrusted with the different functions of the branch. Below the Upper Division Assistants, Stenographers and the Lower Division Assistants, there are Typists. At the bottom of the hierarchy, there are the Peons and menial workers (called class IV staff).  

At the district level, the Deputy Commissioner is the head of the administration, who is generally a member of the I.A.S. Besides his responsibility for the maintenance of law and order and the collection of revenue, the Deputy Commissioner is also responsible for different development projects in the district. The Deputy Commissioner is assisted in his work by Additional District Commissioners also known as Additional District Magistrates and a number of Extra-Assistant Commissioners. The Additional District Commissioners

9. For the hierarchical organisation of the State Secretariat, see Chart 4:1.
are the members of both the I.A.S. and the State Services while the Extra-
Assistant Commissioners are drawn from the State Services.

The office of the Deputy Commissioner is the nerve centre of district
administration and involves most complex and exacting responsibilities.
Following the colonial tradition, many duties and responsibilities are assigned
to the Deputy Commissioner which resulted in the diffusion of responsibility.
In this connection, Dr. Paul H. Appley has aptly observed:

He is impersonally assigned by 'Government'—which is everybody,
and more or less responsible to every ministry carrying on functions
in his area. No ministry knows how much of his time it is entitled to,
and none has any capacity for insuring that it receives that portion
of his time and energy. The result has been a halting and rather
unclear removal of certain functions and personnel from his direct
jurisdiction, but this arrangement involves in its own turn an
interaction of the responsibilities and personnel of the ministries
of health, education and agriculture, along with the home ministry
and the ministry of finance, in association with the development
and/or Community Projects Office, and some lingering associations
with the Collector. In a technical, administrative sense no one is
really responsible for anything of such importance, and all share
in responsibility for almost everything.10

In case of technical departments, there are other administrative units (known as Directorates) located outside the Secretariat. Besides Law and P.W.D., other technical departments are headed by the generalist Secretaries and consequently, there is a division of work between the generalist head and the specialist or technical head. The generalist head, i.e., the Secretary, looks after the general administration and advises the minister in the formulation of policy; the technical head looks after the technical affairs and is responsible for the implementation of policy as formulated by the minister. The technical heads are designated differently in different departments though 'Director' is the common designation. The relation between the generalist head and the technical or specialist head gives rise to the common debate- 'Generalist versus Specialist' which is discussed elsewhere in this chapter. However, the technical head or the Director is assisted in his work by subordinate officers designated as Joint-Director and Deputy-Director. Below the Deputy-Director, there are generally Assistant Directors, who are area officers in-charge of areas functionally designated for administrative co-ordination. The technical departments have district officers posted at the district headquarters. They are designated differently in different departments, and head the units at the district level.

11. For the hierarchical organisation of a technical department, the P.W.D., see chart 4:2.
The Deputy Commissioner, as the administrative head of the district, is responsible for the co-ordinated functioning of the district offices of different departments.

Thus, we find that the hierarchical line of authority is intact and every officer is tied in a unified and single chain of command controlled by the Chief Secretary and the Chief Minister through the departmental heads. But a look at the hierarchy shows that, the number of posts become few and far between at the upper level. There is one-to-one relationship at the upper reaches of the hierarchy which results in excessive concentration and overloading.

**Procedures of Work**

Work in the government departments starts with the receipt of a communication in an office. The communication is first passed on to the dealing assistant after it is registered by a lower assistant. The dealing assistant provides relevant information in writing and passes it on to the next higher level, i.e., the Head Assistant or Assistant Superintendent or Superintendent as the case may be. In this way the file keeps on moving from table to table and from level to level for the disposal of business depending upon the nature
and importance of the issue concerned and the dedication and interest of the officials. The government delegates authority to the Head of the Department who, in turn, issues guidelines and directives to subordinate officials for the disposal of the governmental business. The less important things are generally disposed of by the Superintendent or Under-Secretary, while disposing of the business, the officials generally tend to follow more the precedents, rules and regulations than to consider the importance and situational aspects of the cases. Rules are so complex and varied in nature that sometimes the disposal of an issue requires the concurrence of half-a-dozen departments or branches which results in delay and, in extreme cases, kills the issue itself. Besides, everything in government departments is done in writing which not only multiplies the number of files and papers but also causes delay. This formal aspect of hierarchy—strict adherence to rules and regulations and written communication, being the method of work of the bureaucracy resembles Max Weber's conception of rational bureaucratic system.

The strict observance of rules and regulations and dependence upon precedents not only causes indeterminacy and delay but also creates confusion and discourages the spirit of initiative and enterprise which are of great
importance in the administration of a country committed to the goals of nation-building and socio-economic change. This strict observance of rules and adherence to precedents by Indian bureaucracy has been considered to be a legacy of the colonial past.  

The complex and varied set of rules and regulations were introduced by the colonial rulers as a means of maintaining control over the large number of Indian subordinates with varying levels of training and outlook who were dispersed far from the administrative centres. After independence, not only the rules and regulations introduced by the colonial rulers were continued and multiplied but the rule-bound behaviour of the bureaucrats with self-defeating consequences also continued. "Too much adherence to procedure has a propensity of engrossing the whole individual. The repetitive acts yield psychological satisfaction and habits become ends in themselves and substitute for thought, instead of aid to thought. A case of custom develops and hardens, hindering adaptation to changed circumstances." Rules are based upon predictable occurrences and problems. But in the changing environment of a

developing nation, it is difficult to predict what the next problem will be. Thus the bureaucratic dependence upon rules and regulations "... may lead to preservation (that is, the continuous application of the old rules, although they no longer cover the situation), or to the postponement of decisions, or to the passing upward of problems for increasingly higher level action. None of these responses is adaptive to the changing conditions that prompt them... From the organizational viewpoint, they are dysfunctional, because they lead at best to delay, and at worst to a failure of communication and organizational self-evaluation."  

Organizational Incentives:

Promotion

Incentives play an important role in improving the efficiency, morale and performance of the employees in an organisation. "Incentive" may be defined as an opportunity, attraction or encouragement to individual to do his best out of a hope of gain or fear of loss.  

Unlike in other fields where profits are directly related to work performed, the problem of incentives in a public services is a difficult one.  


17. Ibid.
in private business organisations is not applicable in the case of public services, this does not mean that there is no incentives for good work in public services. In the bureaucracy, there are incentives for good work through increments, promotion, pension and recognition. Here we shall discuss the system of promotion as a major incentive for improving efficiency and performance in the public services.

Promotion may be defined as a process which involves the assumption of higher duties and responsibilities by an employee accompanied by higher status and salary. It covers both advancement between grades within the same class and between different classes. The system of promotion and advancement affects not only the quality of the entrants to the Civil Services but also the efficiency of the administration as a whole.

18. Ibid.
20. In Meghalaya, the intra-service promotion from M.C.S. to I.A.S. has not yet been put into effect because the M.C.S. is yet to be recognised by the Government of India. The State of Assam and Meghalaya have a joint cadre of I.A.S. Hence, promotion to the I.A.S. has to be made from both the State Services, I.A.S., A.C.S. and M.C.S. Since, M.C.S. is a new service, it needs to be recognised by the Government of India before making promotions of the M.C.S. officers to the cadre of I.A.S. But after the creation of the state of Meghalaya, all Assam Civil Service Class II officers, who opted for Meghalaya, were upgraded to the M.C.S. Class I as there is no classification in the case of the M.C.S. And it is because of this fact that the Govt. of Assam raised objection to the Govt. of India about the promotion of the M.C.S. officers to the cadre of I.A.S. on the ground that it would create dissatisfaction amongst both the A.C.S. Class I and Class II officers serving under the Government of Assam.
In Meghalaya, the principle followed in the case of promotion in class I services is merit-cum-seniority. Merit is judged on the basis of Annual Confidential Reports written for each officer by his immediate superior. The Reviewing Officer offers his own remarks and may moderate or add to the remarks of the Reporting Officer. He further grades the officers into five categories: 'Outstanding', 'Very good', 'Good', 'Average' and 'Below Average'. He also communicates the adverse remarks, if any, to the officer reported upon; one copy is attached to the officer's Confidential Report file and the other is sent to the Head of the Department or Service or the Secretary of the Ministry to which the officer belongs. Here it is filed after a review and counter-signature in token of accepting the remarks of the Reporting and Reviewing Officers; at this level, such modifications and additions in the previous remarks are made as are considered necessary.

Although, the rules for promotion in all services lay emphasis upon merit as the chief criterion, it cannot be said that there is a uniformity in the application of this principle; generally there is a hesitant synthesis of

23. Ibid.
24. Ibid., pp. 148-149.
seniority and merit in different services. Whatever the extent of merit as a
criterion, it is judged on the basis of the Confidential Reports in all services.

All promotions are generally decided by the government on the basis
of the recommendation of a Promotion Committee, the composition of which
varies from service to service. The Public Service Commission is consulted in
case of the promotion of those candidates who are recruited through the Public
Service Commission. Though the Commission is consulted, its advice is not
binding and sometimes promotions are made in utter disregard of its advice.

However, the Promotion Committee considers the records of all the
officers eligible for promotion which is twice the number of expected vacancies.
First it excludes those who are considered unfit for promotion due to very
adverse remarks. The Committee then grades all officers on the basis of
confidential records. The list is prepared by placing the names in order of
'Outstanding', 'Very good', 'Good', without disturbing inter-se seniority
within each category. As a result, there is a scramble

26. For instance, of the non-acceptance of the Commission’s advice, see the
Seventh Report of the Pakistan Public Service Commission, April 1, 1971
to March 31, 1972.
for 'Outstanding' categorisation because of the premium placed on it in the system of promotion and due to this any officer who is graded as 'Good' or 'Average' has very little prospect of promotion because those graded as 'Outstanding' and 'Very Good' supersede him.

The promotion system as a whole constitutes an important factor which may cause satisfaction or dissatisfaction amongst the bureaucrats, thus, affecting the efficiency, morale and performance of the bureaucratic organisation. This aspect of promotion will be discussed later in this chapter. It needs to be emphasized here that in order to be accepted by the employees, a promotion system should not only be fair and just but it should also appear to be so. Our study shows that in Meghalaya, personal, social and political influences pervade the promotion system in the public services. This is evident from the reports of the Union Public Service Commission and Public Service Commission of the Meghalaya State. 28 Frequently, promotions to higher posts are determined by political pressures and social connections. The factors of caste, tribe, religion, language etc., play a great role in promotion and act as a disincentive on persons who do their work

See also the Seventh Report of the Meghalaya Public Service Commission, April 1, 1978 to March 31, 1979.
efficiently and are devoted to public interest. As Prof. Bhalerao has observed:

The Civil Servants for being promoted must not displease his minister and important political officer. He has to keep proper relationship with his superior officer and his family. If he belongs to the same caste or sub-caste or comes from the same region as his superior officer, he may expect better chances of promotion. He must use the language which his boss understands and must be 'his Master's Voice'. To him, truth and fairplay are values subordinate to the goal of promotion. Promotions in Indian Public Service are thus frequently governed by political, social and personal considerations; this has led to a great deal of frustration among the public servants.

**Salary and Pay-Scales**

The composition of an organisation is considerably reflected in the pay structure of its employees. A sound and uniform pay structure is a prerequisite of an efficient bureaucracy. It not only affects the tone and temper of the existing members of the bureaucracy but also has an important bearing upon the human material recruited to public services.

In the Government of Meghalaya, there are at present 23 scales of pay divided equally between primary and secondary scales. The minimum basic salary for a lower official is Rs.300/- per month whereas the maximum basic salary is Rs.3000/- per month.

---

salary for the higher official is ए.2,500/- per month. Thus, the ratio between the lowest and the highest pay-scale is 1:8.33 (pre-tax) and 1:6.33 (post-tax). Besides, the super-time scale posts of the I.A.S. have salaries between ए.2,500/- and ए.2,750/- per month. These are basic salaries excluding special pay, dearness allowance and other compensatory allowances.

Even a casual glance at the existing pay structure in Naghalaya indicates that it is a relic of the colonial past. It appears that the pay structure is not based upon any rational or well thought-out principle. With increase in prices and cost of living which affects all the people, a IV grade employee has to maintain his family with a salary of ए.500/- per month, whereas an I.A.S. officer in the super-time scale receives a total salary of more than ए.3,000/- per month. Although there is no glaring disparity of ratio, there is no correlation between the salary of the higher and the lower level bureaucrats. It appears that the criterion on which the pay structure is based is the dignity and status of the posts and not the quantum of work performed.

Retirement

The case for retirement of public officials arises from the fact

---


32. Ibid.
that after a certain age, mental and physical faculties tend to decline gradually, rendering the incumbents unsuitable for active service. Thus, the retirement system aims at increasing the efficiency in public services by eliminating the old and disabled bureaucrats and by injecting new blood and fresh ideas by recruiting the young and energetic persons in positions from which old bureaucrats have retired. The system also provides economic security to the bureaucrats and removes the temptation of bribery and corruption while in office. It further acts as a source of attraction for talented persons to join public bureaucracy.

The retirement age in case of public bureaucracy in Meghalaya is 60 years. There is also the provision of pension after retirement and family pension to wife and dependent children in case of death.

Informal Organisation

So far, we have discussed only the formal aspect of an organisation. Besides its formal aspect, there are also informal aspects which have a great impact on the nature and functioning of the formal organisation.

34. Ibid., p.37.
Factors of organisations are an inevitable and universal feature of formal organisations. Man is by nature a social animal and it is his innate desire to live in company with his fellow beings. Unlike a piece of machinery, man has social needs, which can be satisfied only through social relationships. The formal organisation itself provides a framework for social interactions among the individuals which significantly influence their behaviour and role performance. In an organisation, persons work together and come in contact with one another. From these contacts and collective working, there arise interactions between persons individually which are of a social nature. From these interactions, there develop certain social relationships among individuals which have a decisive influence on the working of organisations.

The personalised relationships based upon informal patterns of interaction form a basic part of the formal organisation. A study of the latter is incomplete without a study of the former because "you cannot understand an organisation or how it works from its organisation chart, its character, rules

37. Ibid., p.114.
and regulations, nor from looking at or even watching its personnel. "Learning the organisation's ropes" in most organisations is chiefly learning who's who, what's what, why's who of its informal society. Recent studies like those of Peter M. Blau's The Dynamics of Bureaucracy have emphasized the importance of informal relationships in organisations.

Informal relations are personal interactions based on knowing each other as individual personalities belonging to different social groups and displaying spontaneity towards each other. It refers to the unplanned, informal set of groups, friendships, and attachments that inevitably develop as a result of social attitudes, values and relationships when people are placed in regular proximity to one another.

Such personal interactions which form the basis of informal relations may be formed within the office or outside the office. But basically such relationships emerge due to the formal interactions within the office. These relationships may emerge due to a variety of reasons and have consequences on

39. Ibid., p.121.
42. Singh, op.cit., p.113.
personal as well as organisational goals. To an individual, it may serve the
function of providing a sense of security and also act as a mechanism for the
outlet of strains and anxieties. Thus, it serves the function of tension
management for an individual.\textsuperscript{43}

In regard to the goal achievement of an organisation, the informal
relationships may be positive, negative or neutral.\textsuperscript{44} It is positive in relation
to the goal achievement of the organisation in so far as it develops co-
operation among the various members of an organisation and provides a social
unit of framework within which agreement on working judgements and decisions
are made. It is negative when antagonism dominates the outlook of members of
an organisation and the relationship between them takes the form of a clique.
It is neutral when the relationship between the members of an organisation is
independent of their working relations and focuses on pure socialibility as the
reason for its existence. In other words, informal relationships may be
functional or dysfunctional to the bureaucratic system.

In the following section, we shall study the informal relationships

\textsuperscript{43} \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 103-104.
\textsuperscript{44} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 103.
amongst the higher bureaucrats in Meghalaya, and we propose to classify these
to relationships under three separate headings, viz.: 'insiders and outsiders',
'generalist and specialist' and 'I.A.S. and non-I.A.S.'.

Insiders and Outsiders

To understand the informal relationships among the higher bureaucrats
in Meghalaya in terms of 'insiders and outsiders', it is necessary to have some
understanding of the general social features of Meghalaya because an organisation
is a 'miniature social system'. The personalitines and behaviour of individuals
are moulded by social values and institutions. Society provides a web of
values and expectations that determines the individual's character and his
ethical beliefs. The Meghalayan society, today, is broadly divided into two
groups: 'insiders' and 'outsiders'. The membership of these groups is not
based upon the place of birth or residence but community. Tribals are
considered to be 'insiders'; i.e., the sons of the soil, whereas non-tribals, irrespective of their place of birth or residence, are
considered to be 'outsiders'. This general feature of the society is also

reflected in the bureaucratic system. The tribal bureaucrats are close to one another and form the group of insiders; the same is the case with regard to the non-tribal bureaucrats who constitute the group of "outsiders." The bureaucratic rank or hierarchical position does not stand in the way of relationship amongst the groups members. Irrespective of the form and extent of such relationships which are based on psychological, social and other such factors, the members of the groups are sympathetic towards one another. This sympathy is not limited amongst the group members but extends beyond the group to the people who are to be administered. The bureaucrats are generally sympathetic to a client who happens to be the member of their own group and apply rules selectively. This aspect of the higher bureaucracy in Meghalaya has resemblance to what Fred I. Rige calls the "bureaucratic elite" feature in his Prismatic-Scale-Model.

The attitude of the members of the two groups towards each other is marked by resentment and lack of sympathy. The outsiders consider the insiders undeveloped and unsophisticated and not yet fit for doing the developmental work.

undertaken by government which requires initiative, skill and innovation. There
are stories often told by the 'outsiders' of how tribal officials, being
ignorant of rules and regulations, sought help from the non-tribal officials.
Further, the 'outsiders' consider the 'insiders' incapable and inefficient who
were recruited only because of their tribal origin. And as a result of the
recruitment of such relatively less efficient tribal bureaucrats, the non-tribal
bureaucrat consider themselves overburdened with complicated and strenuous
work which requires energy, sustained application and time, but without any reward.

As one 'outsider' commented:

I am given all the more complicated cases than those given to
my colleagues (tribal officers) working in this court. The settlement
of some of these cases requires time and energy which is four times
more than what my colleagues devote. But our efficiency will be
decided by the number of cases we successfully decide and not by the
nature of the cases we are to decide.

Similarly, the outlook of the 'insiders' toward 'outsiders' is not a
happy and favourable one. The 'insiders' consider the 'outsiders' self-seeking
and not really interested in the development of Meghalaya. They are interested
in making money and administer without knowing or even understanding the problems.
of the state. Almost 70.00 percent of the tribal bureaucrats agreed with the statement that the higher officials from outside the state did not understand the local problems and were not interested in developmental activities, while only 29.98 percent disagreed with it. The viewpoint of the officials who agreed with the statement is well expressed in the following comment of a tribal officer:

How can the outsiders work for the development of the State? Development requires first, the proper understanding of the problems and then, working with a heart full of sympathy for the area and the people facing the problems. The outsiders (both from within and without) do not and cannot understand the problems. The outsiders from without are transplanted here who do not know the ABC of our society. They are serving here because they want money at the end of the month and after retirement they will go to their homeland, and consequently, they do not bother about the development of the state. The outsiders from within are mostly from Shillong and their horizon does not extend beyond Shillong. As a result, they are also not acquainted with the Meghalayan society outside Shillong and, above all, they do not identify themselves with our society and always think in terms of Bombay, Madras, Calcutta, Delhi or other places where their community can live. So the outsiders from within are also not interested in the development of the state.

---

47. The same opinion prevails amongst a section of political leaders also. Emphasising the need of employing more tribals in the government jobs an ex-M.L.A. ( sometime M.P. also) Shri Hopingstone Lyngdoh said "...I do not blame the outsiders; they must also get employment here or in their home state. I say that the distribution of responsibilities must be there and our people can look after our state in a better way. They will work not only for the sake of pay but also for their family, their state and their country." See Meghalaya Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol.VIII, No.6, (Budget Session, 1974), p.403.

48. See Table 41.

49. For the statement, see Appendix C.
On the other hand, the viewpoint of the tribal officers who do not agree with the statement is well brought out in the comments of an officer who said:

Development requires understanding of the problems and commitment to society. One can understand the problem provided one is sincere and committed to the task. The sincerity and commitment are the human qualities which can be possessed by any one irrespective of one's community. There are some outsiders who are really dedicated to the task of development and are sincerely working for it. They are generally in an advantageous position than us, the tribal officers, because they are not subjected to the same social pressures as we are and can work independently and impartially.

But what is surprising is that a considerable number of non-tribal officers i.e., 46.15 percent of the sample are in conditional agreement with the statement, while 49.72 percent disagreed and 5.13 percent remained neutral. The argument of the non-tribal officers, who disagree with the statement have similarity with their tribal counterparts that work for development does not depend upon the community of the administrators. On the contrary, it depends upon the interest and sincerity of the officers who work for development. And these qualities of interest and sincerity are human qualities, independent of caste, community and creed.
The bureaucrat who conditionally agreed with the statement are of the view that it is not correct to say that the 'outsiders' do not understand the problems of the state although they are indifferent towards the state's development. The main reason they put forward for such an indifferent attitude is fear of insecurity. As one of them commented:

"How can I be interested to work for the development of the state where I do not have any security? I am working here but I cannot buy a plot of land of my choice because of the Land Transfer Act. In future, my relatives or friends from other areas would be unable to visit me at their will because of the proposed Inner Line Permit Bill. My children will not get a job here because of the reservation policy of the government. So, I cannot live here permanently. Circumstances will force me to go out after my retirement. My children will have to find out jobs outside the state. So, how will it affect me if the state remains undeveloped? When I cross my age limit, I cannot find out another job. As I need money to feed myself and my family, I must somehow continue with my present employment, though I will continue it without much interest in it."

The government and the political parties are considered responsible for this widespread feeling of insecurity among the non-tribal officers. As a non-tribal officer said:

"The non-tribal administrators do not work for the development of the state, not because they do not understand the problems nor because
of their lack of interest in developmental work but because they are suffering from a fear of future insecurity—a fear that is not limited to the non-tribal administrators alone. The whole non-tribal population in Nagalaya shares this fear and no one is certain about his future. This fear was not all along present here. There was a time when this area was considered to be the island of peace and tranquility in the troubled north-eastern region. But beginning from the sixties, the politicians and political parties started injecting a fear psychosis in the minds of the non-tribals, and, by late seventies, I think this fear has struck deep roots. If you go through the party manifestoes and speeches of political leaders during the period, you will find that they have blamed the non-tribal population for almost all the problems and sorrows (although this was not based on fact) and promised to solve them in different ways.50

One thing that is strikingly common in the responses of both tribal and non-tribal officers who agree with the statement is that the outsiders are not interested in the development of the state. They attribute this to a lack of a feeling of belonging to the state and society. And this lack of feeling is the result of a lack of sympathy according to the ‘insiders’, whereas it is the result of a feeling of insecurity according to the ‘outsiders’. Our

50. It may be pointed out here that sometimes reference is made to the State Legislative Assembly goes against the confidence and morale of the bureaucrats, especially the non-tribal bureaucrats. As for instance, some members even criticized the communal composition of the higher bureaucracy in the state. Moving the no-confidence motion in the year 1975, Shri N.N. Majum, leader of the FDIC (which was a partner in the coalition government of O.C. Pugh in the year 1975-79) attacked the government for having non-tribal I.A.S. officers in the top positions of the administrative hierarchy and demanded the immediate appointment of tribal officers in these positions. See Nagalaya Legislative Assembly Debates, Vol.X, No.8 (the 2nd and 4th April, 1975), pp.99-100.
findings regarding the 'insiders'- 'outsiders' relationship raises a basic question faced by the higher bureaucracy in the state- which group of bureaucrats is equipped to implement the development plan?

Besides, the division of the higher bureaucrats into the two resenting groups- 'insiders' and 'outsiders', adversely affects congenial and co-operative relations among the members of the higher bureaucracy- a factor that facilitates communication and effectiveness.51 Further, the fear of insecurity in the minds of a section of the higher bureaucrats causes frustration which does not permit them to work whole-heartedly for the development of the state. These are two important problems faced by the higher bureaucracy in Meghalaya which need serious attention by leaders and policy makers in Meghalaya.

**Generalist and Specialist**

As we propose to discuss here the relationship between the 'Generalists' and the 'Specialists' in Meghalaya, we may start with working definitions of the terms 'generalist' and 'specialist'. The term 'generalist' refers to

those officials of general educational background whose primary purpose is to assist and advise the ministers in the formulation of governmental policies and carry on general administration. The 'specialists', on the other hand, are those officials who are recruited to the public services on the basis of their specialised and technical qualifications and perform functions of a technical nature.

This aspect of the organisation, viz., the relationship between the generalist and the specialist came to the forefront and acquired great importance with the assumption of the welfare activities by the government. The changing balance in favour of welfare activities has compelled the government to accept greater responsibilities in the fields of science, technology and economic development. This is more so in a developing country where the public sector is better equipped to organise scientific resources to promote desired changes in social, economic, scientific and technological spheres.

In India, the administrative machinery has been dominated by the generalists since the British days. "Historically, the Civil Service in India has been designed as a generalist one with the leadership role at all levels
and in all spheres of administration reserved for the Indian Civil Service, set up in 1854.\(^\text{52}\) Although after independence, India continued the administrative system of the Colonial period unchanged and unbroken, the predominance of the generalists did not remain unquestioned. The specialists started voicing their discontent against the predominant role of the generalists as more and more specialists were inducted into the different fields of the government service with the adoption of the system of planning in the early fifties.\(^\text{53}\) The specialists were dissatisfied with the role traditionally set for them and demanded for change in the country’s bureaucratic structure began to gather momentum. It was in this context that Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi said in 1967:

> It is odd that the greatest doctors and engineers in the country, who could be rated as the leaders of the profession and who save lives or add permanent assets to the nation, can rarely hope to receive the pay or status of Secretaries of Ministries. The brightest of our young men and women choose engineering and medicine. If they happen to go into government, they are very soon overtaken by the general administrator. This must change and I am trying to change it. The administrative system must reflect an individual’s contribution to human welfare and economic gain.\(^\text{54}\)

---


\(^{53}\) Ibid., p. 3.

The dominant position of the generalists in administration and the need for technical specialisation for scientific, technological and economic development have led to the problem of relationship between the generalists and the specialists. The efficiency and effectiveness of the administrative system depends upon a solution to this problem and a recognition of their respective roles in the implementation of the country's developmental programmes.

Here we propose to discuss the relationship between the generalists and the specialists in the administrative system of Meghalaya, a proper understanding of which requires some knowledge about the status of the specialists in the administrative system of the state.

Meghalaya, like other states of the Indian union, has a generalist-dominated bureaucratic system. In all departments, except Law and P.W.D., the generalists head the departments who advise the ministers in the formulation of policy. In the case of technical departments like those of Health, Public Health Engineering, Forests, Agriculture, etc., the generalists of the I.A.S. cadre are the Secretaries. In such technical departments where Secretaries are generalist administrators, the specialists head the field units commonly
known as Directorates and are designated as Directors. In some cases, the Director is also designated as the Additional Secretary to the Government (as in the case of the Director of Public Health Engineering who is also Additional Secretary to the Government). Even in some field units, the Director is a generalist administrator as in the case of the Director of Public Instructions who does not possess technical qualifications or experience in the field of education but is an officer of the I.A.S.

However, the specialists are subordinate in status to the generalist Secretary of a department and this is found to be one of the common causes of resentment among the specialists. They do not have direct access to the Ministers and consequently, they do not have direct share in the formulation of policy. The generalists advise the ministers in policy formulation; the specialists have voice in the process only through the generalist secretaries. Once the policy is decided, the specialists are consulted as to the best method of carrying out that policy. With regard to their pay-scales also, the specialists are in a disadvantageous and inferior position.

It is in this background that we studied the relationship between the generalists and the specialists in Meghalaya and found that this is one of the
weakest links in the chain of bureaucratic relationship in the state, while 
commenting on a statement about generalist domination, all the specialists 
without any exception expressed their opposition to the present system. They 
branded the present system as 'amateurs of the generalist', and considered 
the present system as expensive and unproductive, that the specialists resent 
more is that sometimes a junior generalist with inferior academic background 
occupies a position which is higher in status and prestige than a senior 
specialist with a superior academic background. This according to the specialists, 
has a demoralizing effect upon their initiative and enthusiasm. The specialists 
strongly express the conviction that development work is bound to suffer unless 
the present system of generalist domination is ended. One specialist angrily 
commented:

what to speak about the generalist domination? Who would listen 
to us? Our cry will fall on deaf ears because we are not to advise 
the minister in making policy. After independence, we took up planning 
to make rapid changes in social, economic and scientific fields,
the effective implementation of which requires a change in our 
administrative system. Unfortunately, the Colonial administrative 
system was continued without any substantial change in it, but this

55. For the statement, see Appendix C.

56. In our example we had specialists from three technical departments of P.W.O., 
P.H.E., and Health. Of these three departments, P.W.O., had a specialist 
as the Secretary. But even the specialists belonging to P.W.O., were 
upset by the present arrangement in Meghalaya and drew attention to 
examples of illogical arrangements from other departments.
is unsuitable to a modern welfare state. In a modern welfare state, officials from every branch of administration must be given due share in the organisational set-up on the basis of merit, if the co-ordinated effort of all is to be enlisted for the implementation of welfare policies. Otherwise, the hope of an equalitarian society will be a distant dream.

Look at the situation in Meghalaya. The specialists are not given recognition for their merit, technical specialisation, and seniority. For everything, they have to depend upon the generalist Secretary who is a layman without enough knowledge in the field (sometimes junior to the specialists also). This certainly has an adverse effect upon the initiative and drive of the experts who are considered to be the vehicles of scientific revolution. You cannot ignore the psychology of men. Psychologically a man gets depressed when he has to work under a boss who is not only junior to him but also inferior in ability. If you take the career pattern of the generalist and the specialist serving under Meghalaya Government, you will find that the career and ability of the specialists are superior to those of the generalists. For entering into the generalist administrative service, the academic qualification required is graduation from a recognised university, but to get admitted in an institution of medicine or engineering, one must have a bright academic career and a professional degree. But this career is finally considered inferior to that of a generalist as soon as one is in the Government Service. So, how do you expect us to be dedicated to the cause of society when we are not given our due? How shall we maintain our initiative when we find that a man with equal career (sometimes inferior also) occupies a position which is higher in status as well as in pay.

The generalists on the other hand, are not unanimous in their view.
A substantial number of generalists does not find any fault in the present system and consequently ignore the question regarding the need for any change in the present set-up. They disagree with the charge that the specialists are not given their due share and defend the system on the ground that it is well-balanced. With regard to the formulation of policy, they are of the view that the specialists are consulted at some stage or other although ultimately, it is the Secretary (may be a specialist or a generalist) of a department who advise the Minister. This is defended by them on the ground that "generalisation" itself is a specialisation, and, above all, the technical aspect is only one aspect of a policy. Besides the technical aspect, the other aspects like social and political factors need to be considered and these aspects can be well-considered only by a generalist who has experience in diverse fields of administration. They justify their official status and salary on the ground that they are appointed only after qualifying themselves in a competitive examination of very high standard. Here specific mention may be made about a consent that was given by some generalists, while commenting on the low salary the "specialists" receive in comparison to the "generalists". They pointed out

57. 55-00 percent of the generalists (44 out of 80) mostly from the I.A.S., A.S., and a few senior members of A.C.S. are of the view that the present system is alright.
that extra sources of income (like medical practice by some doctors although they receive a non-practising allowance) were available to the 'specialists' which do not exist for the 'generalists'.

The other group of 'generalists' which holds a different view is surprisingly from the junior members of the State Services. They seem to be sympathetic towards the claim of the 'specialists' and recognise the need of some change in the present system although they expressed the difficulty involved in any such change. This group of 'generalists' does not consider the present system as a generalist-dominated one. To them, it is not a question of domination; it is rather a question of assignment of duties which goes contrary to the interest of the 'specialists', destroying their initiative and drive. They are of the view that there should be a unified civil service in the state instead of so many classes of services, as it will enable everyone to aspire for higher posts, depending upon one's merit. This will eliminate the feeling of deprivation and will make everyone work hard for being appointed to posts at the higher level, thus increasing efficiency in public administration.

Thus, it appears that while the specialists are aggressive towards,
and dissatisfied with the present system, the generalists have a defensive posture. The specialists reject the system out-right while the generalists defend the system although a group of these favour some change in the system. The generalists defend the system, as they do not want to have any encroachment on their position and authority. The other group of generalists, especially the junior (State Service) group, is in favour of a unified Civil Service because they are also the victims on account of so many classes of services. They defend their position against the 'Brahminic' attitude of their fellow colleagues belonging to the I.A.S. through the establishment of a unified Civil Service. The most disturbing element that appears here is the strained relationship between the 'generalists' and the 'specialists' which is detrimental to the effective implementation of development plans and programmes. For rapid development what is required is that both the generalists and the specialists must work in cooperation with one another and not in a strained atmosphere of mutual hatred and jealousy. But this spirit of co-operation and an understanding based on each other's role is substantially lacking in the relation between the 'generalists' and the 'specialists' and thus, is dysfunctional to the developmental goals.
I.A.S. and non-I.A.S. groups

With the rapid development and expansion of the activities of government, there is a greater need for close co-ordination, co-operation and understanding among officers of different grades and services. In this context, it is interesting to study the relationship between the 'I.A.S.' and 'non-I.A.S.' officers serving under the Government of Nagaland. This aspect of the bureaucracy in India is a unique feature and deserves special attention.

After independence, we continued the parallel system of all India Services and the Provincial Services, a system that was created by the Britishers in order to maintain their hold on India while giving some concession to the Indian demand for more representation in the administration of the state. The all-India Services, namely, the I.C.S. was the repository of all powers during the British period and was composed of mostly the 'Oxbridge' graduates of the middle class elite families of England with a few Indians. The members of the I.C.S. occupied all key positions of authority and decision-making in the government and were considered to be the instigators of British imperialism in India. The Provincial Services were composed mostly of Indians and were subordinate to the I.C.S. not only in terms of authority, status and prestige but also in terms of pay and other service conditions. The system was continued
after independence with the replacement of the I.C.S. by the I.A.S. and the Provincial Services by the State Services. Like its predecessor, the I.C.S., the I.A.S. is an all-India service, recruited and managed by the Government of India although there is no permanent cadre of the I.A.S. at the centre. The I.A.S. officers after recruitment are allocated to different states and serve the Central Government at one or other stage of their career on deputation. The I.A.S. has inherited much of the status and prestige of the I.C.S. and is considered to be superior to the State Services. The members of the I.A.S. occupy key positions in both the Central and the State Governments. The State Services, on the other hand, are managed by the State Governments and the officers of the State Services serve their respective State Governments. Their salaries and other conditions are determined by the State Governments and are generally much inferior to those of the I.A.S. These wide disparities in the conditions of service of the I.A.S. and the State Services have the effect of breeding 'superior' and 'inferior' class consciousness between them. In this connection, the following comment contained in the first Five Year Plan of Pakistan is relevant to the Civil Services in India:

The existence of so many services of a general character as distinct entities divides the total general work of the government into watertight compartments, militates against the pooling of
administrative resources, encourages class consciousness and mutual jealousy, creates conflicts in many common areas of administration and prevents the maximum utilization of talents in accordance with aptitudes and emotional pulls, to mention only a few of the evils resulting from it.58

In our study of the 'I.A.S.' and 'non-I.A.S.' officers in Nagalaya, we find that the relationship between them is one of the sources of strain in the higher bureaucracy in Nagalaya. The relationship between the two groups is not one of friendship but of mutual antagonism and jealousy. Both the group members are well aware of their status and there is no free mixing between the members of the groups. Undoubtedly, there are some exceptions here and there, but in general the relationship between the members of the groups is mostly regulated more by formal official procedures and less by informal code of conduct. The status differences are visible in their office equipment, secretarial assistance and in the degree of accessibility. An I.A.S. officer, senior or junior, is considered more important than his colleagues in the State Services and is not easily accessible to his subordinate or to the visitors. The status differentiation can further be marked in the quality of

furniture and other such commodities that are available in the offices of
the I.A.S. and non-I.A.S. officers.

And it is probably this awareness of status differentiation which injects
a superiority complex in the mind of the I.A.S. officers, a factor which is
agreed to by all the 85 'non-I.A.S.' officers in the sample, while consenting
on a statement 59 all the 'non-I.A.S.' officers but one consider the superiority
complex of the I.A.S. officers as unjustified, unfounded and counter-productive.
These officers sharply reacted to the present system under which all higher
positions in the government are virtually the monopoly of the I.A.S. officers. 60
Another source of discontent with the I.A.S. officer is their comparative
young age and inexperience. Some 'non-I.A.S.' officers even went to the extent
of saying that the I.A.S. officers are undemocratic and bear the stamp of
imperialism. As one 'non-I.A.S.' officer said:

The I.A.S. has its origin in the traditional I.C.S. which was the
pillar of British imperialism in India. Our Constitution has
contradicted the democratic ideal of state administration by providing
for an all-India service whose members run the administration
of the state. The I.A.S. inherited not only the structure from

59. For the statement, see Appendix C.
60. At the time of the study all the posts of Secretary to Government except
two were occupied by the I.A.S. officers. These two were Departments of
Law and PWD, which were headed by a Lawyer and an Engineer, respectivley.
No officer of the State Services was found to be above the rank of
Deputy Secretary.
its parent body, the I.C.S., but also the behavioural and attitudinal features. The I.A.S. officers, like the I.C.S., consider themselves to be heavenly-born with superiority over all others. They consider the officers of other services as inferior to them. In a word, they consider themselves to be the rulers and masters of this country. This feeling of the I.A.S. results from their higher pay, time-bound promotion and, above all, their placement above the shoulders of so many senior officers of other services. This is not definitely in conformity with the maintenance of morale and self-respect of the 'non-I.A.S.' officers. The present system gives birth to a feeling of class and status consciousness and results in the lack of cooperation amongst different services which goes against the principle of sound and healthy administration.

The lone 'non-I.A.S.' officer who justifies the superiority complex of the I.A.S. officer is surprisingly an I.C.S. officer who was originally in the I.C.S. class II service. His argument was that the I.A.S. officers were undoubtedly superior in intellect and skill to the officers of the State Services.

On the other hand, 21 I.A.S. officers out of 25 did not agree with the statement that the I.A.S. officers live in ivory tower and look down upon officers belonging to other services. They argue that in a hierarchical organisation, a certain status is associated with every level which would
the attitudes and values of the officers belonging to that level and the I.A.S. officers are not an exception. They have the values and attitudes developed in them by their service which is considered to assume the form of a superiority complex by the 'non-I.A.S.' officers. But the people who call such values a superiority complex themselves are not free from the values and attitudes of their profession and service or a feeling of superiority complex in relation to subordinate colleagues.

The other four I.A.S. officers in the sample who were promoted from the State Services, hold a different view. They share the viewpoint of the non-I.A.S.' officers that the I.A.S. officers have a superiority complex and consider the officers of other services as inferior to them. It is to be noted here that these promoted officers occupy an inferior position in the hierarchy. Although they belong to the I.A.S. cadre, they are considered inferior by their fellow colleagues in the I.A.S. It is perhaps this which makes the promoted I.A.S. officers subscribe to the view of the 'non-I.A.S.' officers.

On an examination of the views of the 'I.A.S.' and 'non-I.A.S.' officers regarding the higher status consciousness and superiority complex of the I.A.S. officers, there appears to be an element of truth in the criticism
of 'non-I.A.S.' officers against the I.A.S. officers. The simultaneous existence of so many services with varying service conditions in the same set-up createsclass-consciousness, a consciousness which hinders co-operation among different units of the organisation. When development work requires a co-ordinated effort on the part of different units, "the existence of numerous special services and the absence of a unified and comprehensive public service exaggerates jealousies, rank consciousness and delay in cross-reference and other communication".61 This aspect of higher bureaucracy is not a unique feature in Meghalaya but is a common feature of all the states of the Indian Union.

However, from the above discussion it will be wrong to assume that the I.A.S. officer is a united and well-knit group. Though apparently, it appears to be so. Even among the I.A.S., there exist sub-groups formed around caste, community, religion and language affiliations and political loyalties.

Job-Satisfaction of the Bureaucrats

After considering the informal relationships of the bureaucrat

in the preceding section, we will now discuss the job-satisfaction of the bureaucrats in Meghalaya. The question of job-satisfaction occupies an important place in the study of organisations. Since much of the success of our development plan depends upon the bureaucracy, the bureaucrats' own perception and attitude towards their work-setting and their personal problems and the satisfaction they derive from their work are of immense significance.

It is the job-satisfaction through which one expresses the way in which one is adjusting to his task and to his role within the organisation. Although satisfaction is a psychological phenomenon and is subjective in character, varying from individual to individual, we propose to study the job-satisfaction of the bureaucrats in relation to the nature of work, salary, promotion chances, status and prestige. As Arnold S. Tannenbaum said, "The responsibility, respect and recognition along with greater material rewards associated with status contribute significantly to the satisfaction of important needs and to a sense of self-esteem". Status and self-esteem not only affect the satisfaction of organisation members but also their mental


64. Tannenbaum, op.cit., p.41.
But a study of the job-satisfaction of the bureaucrats by itself is not of such importance unless it is studied in relation to the motivation of the bureaucrat in joining their jobs. We made a brief study of the latter in the present investigation. In studying the factors that activated the bureaucrats to join the public service, we asked them as to why they chose public service as a career, and found a wide variety of responses, which were classified into two groups: 'interested' and 'no alternative' group. We found 54.55 percent of the bureaucrats had joined the public service because they were interested in it, while 45.45 percent joined the public service because they had no other alternative but to join it. If we analyze the responses of the two groups, we find that the responses of the interested group are uniform and simple. The members of this group joined the public service because they were attracted by the security, power, and social position provided by it. As one of them commented:

'What better career could be expected than a career in the Civil Service? It provides security; not only security, but also power

65. Ibid.
66. See Table 4:2.
and prestige. With the rise in hierarchy, one gets more and more power to do good or bad. The public looks upon the highly placed Civil Servant with much awe and respect. So, when one has both money and power, one occupies a prestigious position in society.

What the bureaucrat said above represents the general Indian attitude towards the Civil Service. Civil Service had always a high place in Indian society, and the only lucrative avenue open to middle-class youth. Although, with scientific and industrial development, other fields have become as lucrative as, and, some of them even more than, the Civil Service, but the Civil Service, especially the higher ones, has still enough glamour to attract the middle-class youth.

The responses of the "no-alternative" category are not so simple as those of the "interested" category. An analysis of the responses showed that some of the bureaucrats of this category did not have career planning. On the completion of their academic career, they were looking for jobs and got into the Civil Service. While others were trying for jobs other than Civil Service but having failed to secure them, they appeared in the competitive examination and got into the Civil Service. As an officer of the former
category said:

I did not have any plan about my career. The only plan I had was to find out a job after my examination, so that I could earn something and help my family. Accordingly, as soon as my examination was over, I was looking for a job and made application wherever I was eligible to apply. My list included posts from a clerical job in a business firm to a post in the Indian Administrative Service, and ultimately, I got into the I.E.S.

The above observation is a reflection of the condition of the middle-class youth in Indian society today. Most of the middle-class youth do not have any career plan or freedom to choose and go to educational institutions for obtaining a degree as a passport for competing in the job market. And the job-market being scarce, no option can be exercised. So, the entry into a job becomes a matter of chance unrelated to one's own aptitude or motivation.

However, the responses of the bureaucrats in the latter group highlight the problem arising out of the scarce employment opportunities in India. As one of the bureaucrats of this group said:

I had the choice of scientific career but I failed to get one. I failed not because of my qualifications but because I did not have any links with the higher-ups. Thus, having no alternative,
I had to join the government.

As our study of the motivation of the bureaucrat for joining the public service shows that a majority of the bureaucrats joined the public service because of its security, power and prestige, a question naturally arises: how far do the bureaucrats find these conditions present in the public service and how far are they satisfied with the conditions existing in the public service and with their work? This question can be answered from the study of the job-satisfaction of the bureaucrats in relation to the nature of work, salary, promotion chances and status and prestige. For studying the satisfaction of the bureaucrats we asked a general question* and found different types of responses.

Nature of Work

In our study of the satisfaction of the bureaucrat with the nature of work, we found that 57.27 percent of the bureaucrats were satisfied with the nature of work while 42.73 percent were dissatisfied.**

---

* For the question, see Appendix C.
** See Table 4:3.
The reasons put forward for satisfaction with the nature of work include: interesting and challenging nature of work, scope for doing something concrete, and the responsibility that makes one feel important for the organisation. The reasons for dissatisfaction include such factors as: wrong placement unrelated to one's interest and aptitude, mechanical and routinised nature of the work and the complexity of rules and regulations which makes work difficult.

The dissatisfaction with the nature of work is expressed more by the technical bureaucrats than the non-technical bureaucrats. While 37.50 percent of the non-technical bureaucrats are dissatisfied with the nature of work, the relevant percentage in the case of technical bureaucracy is 59.97.

Again, among the technical bureaucrats, the dissatisfaction is more among the doctors than among the engineers. 60.08 percent of the doctors and 55.00 percent of the engineers are dissatisfied with the nature of their work. This widespread dissatisfaction among the technical bureaucrats is mainly due to a lack of scope for the use of their specialised knowledge and training. As a doctor said:

I find it very difficult to get any satisfaction from my work.

If one is to be satisfied with one's work, one must have the scope

69. See Table 4.4.
for doing some useful work, but I find it very difficult to do any concrete work for which I am fit. Since I am a doctor, I am to do the work relating to medical profession. But here most of my energy is lost in writing letters and doing correspondence with so many departments. For doing a little bit of thing, I need to wait for month after month because there are hundreds of rules and regulations.

If we analyse the satisfaction of the bureaucrats according to their service, the I.A.S. tops the list of 'satisfaction with work', while 76.00 percent of the I.A.S. officers are satisfied with the nature of their work; the relevant percentage in the case of the A.C.S. and the R.C.S. is 60.00 and 55.00 percent, respectively. Thus, we may conclude that the higher the service more is the satisfaction with the nature of work.

Satisfaction with Salary

Salary occupies an important place in a bureaucratic system. It is the salary on which depends the standard of living that can attract capable persons to join public service. It is again salary which, to a great extent, determines the social status of a bureaucrat. Consequently, salary constitutes an important source of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the bureaucrats.
In our study, we found only 30.00 percent of the bureaucrats to be satisfied with their salary while 70.00 percent are dissatisfied with it. The common cause given for dissatisfaction is the high inflation rate and the fact that it has gone beyond their capacity to make both ends meet. While the value of money was falling, the salaries of the bureaucrats remained almost the same. One I.A.S. officer angrily burst out when he was asked to comment on his present salary. He said:

"How can you expect us to be satisfied? You people look at the sum that an I.A.S. officer draws at the end of the month. Undoubtedly, this sum is three to four times more than what a clerk draws at the end of the month, but this is only one side of the picture. Our salary has not been increased proportionately to other services. The salary of clerk has increased by not less than 20 times during the last fifty years, but what is with us? Our salary has remained almost the same. We are drawing almost the same amount that an I.A.S. officer drew fifty years back, but during these fifty years, the value of money has gone down by thousand times. So how can we be satisfied?"

Undoubtedly, a high inflationary rate is a major source of dissatisfaction not only among the bureaucrats but also among the people in general. The other reasons assigned for dissatisfaction with salary are more

70. See Table 415.
personal than general like family burdens and high aspirations.

The causes for satisfaction with the salary are found to be moderate aspirations, less family burdens and availability of family sources of income. And here we find a relation between economic background of the bureaucrat and the satisfaction with salary. Out of 33 bureaucrats in the 'satisfied' category, 20 are from the family of five thousand rupees or less annual income bracket, whereas 50 out of 77 bureaucrats of the 'dissatisfied' category have had an economic background of five thousand rupees and more per annum. Thus, the higher the economic background, less the satisfaction with salary, and the lower the economic background, more the satisfaction with salary. The reason for this is that a bureaucrat from a higher economic background has high aspirations which he cannot fulfill with his salary, and consequently, remains dissatisfied. A bureaucrat from a lower economic background has low aspirations which can be fulfilled with salary.

Again, the technical bureaucrats are found to be more dissatisfied with the salary than the non-technical bureaucrats. 71 76.67 percent of the

71. See Table 4:8.
technical bureaucrats and 67.50 percent of the non-technical bureaucrats are found to be dissatisfied with their salaries. This higher rate of dissatisfaction among the technical bureaucrats can be attributed to the fact that the technical bureaucrats find themselves at a disadvantage in comparison with their fellow contemporaries in private organisations who earn much more and maintain a much higher standard of living than what the former do.

Among the non-technical bureaucrats, the I.A.S. officials are most satisfied followed by the A.C.S. and M.C.S. officials. 35.00 percent of the I.A.S., 33.33 percent of the A.C.S., and 30.00 percent of the M.C.S. are satisfied with their salaries. The higher rate of satisfaction amongst the I.A.S. officers can be attributed to the fact that their salaries and other service conditions are determined by the Central Government which are better than those of the State Services. The difference in satisfaction between the two State Services, namely, the A.C.S. and the M.C.S. may be due to the fact that the A.C.S. officers, by virtue of their seniority, occupy higher positions than those of the M.C.S. officers and, thus, they receive a salary higher than those of the M.C.S. officers. Furthermore, the annual increments of most of the M.C.S. officers have been held-up for not being confirmed in the service.
due to the non-regulation of departmental examinations by the government, and consequently, more I.C.S. officers are found to be dissatisfied with their salaries.

Satisfaction with the Promotion System

Promotion chances constitute another important source of satisfaction or dissatisfaction among the bureaucrats. Public bureaucracy is a hierarchical organization in which the career of a bureaucrat is related to the avenues and chances of promotion available to him. Although, the methods and chances of promotion vary from service to service, the principle generally followed in case of promotions is merit-cum-seniority which has already been discussed in the first part of this chapter. Here, we shall study the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the bureaucrats with the existing promotion system in Nagalaya. In the present study, we found that 44.55 percent of the bureaucrats are satisfied and 55.45 percent of the bureaucrats are dissatisfied with the method and chances of promotion. The reason which the bureaucrats advance for their satisfaction is the objectivity of the promotion system.

---

72 See the Memorandum submitted to the Chief Secretary, Government of Nagalaya by the Nagalaya Civil Service Officers' Association dated 19th March, 1979.

73 See Table 417.
being based on merit and seniority. Seniority is a factor which cannot be tempered with and merit, mostly being judged on the basis of Annual Confidential Reports, is also, to some extent, free from subjective element. Although these bureaucrats express satisfaction, they point out that the chances of promotion are limited and that it is only after a long period of service that one is considered for promotion. Besides seniority and fewer chances of promotion, the other cause of dissatisfaction with the promotion system is its subjective nature. The dissatisfied bureaucrat objects to the irrational and arbitrary way in which their performance is evaluated and Confidential Reports written on them. The major drawback of the promotion system, according to these bureaucrats, is that the superior reporting officers seldom make correct and objective appraisal of the performance of their subordinates. Often personal and social relationships, personal likes or dislikes of the officer, caste, departmental factions and similar other considerations play an important role in the assessment made in the Annual Confidential Reports. One official commented thus:

Promotion is made on the basis of Confidential Reports written by a senior officer. But the system of maintaining the Annual Confidential Reports is not an objective one and often fails to assess the quality of the officer reported upon. Sometimes the superior officer does not know the subordinate officer on whom he is
reporting and does not have any idea about the situation and conditions in which the officer is working. Besides, personal bias and prejudices far outweigh the merit and work of the officer reported upon. The reporting officer can write freely without fear of spoiling relations with the officer reported upon by making 'colourless' entry. Since the report is called 'Confidential', no officer can get to know how he is faring or being assessed unless he misses his promotion or appointment to a selection post. So, the officer has no protection in case of 'colourless' entries and consequently, it has come to be a generally accepted principle of promotion that the boss must be kept pleased even at the cost of duties.

If we analyse the satisfaction of the bureaucrats with the promotion chances in relation to the service to which they belong, we find that technical bureaucrats are more satisfied than the non-technical bureaucrats.\(^74\) While 53.33 percent of the technical bureaucrats are satisfied with the promotion chances, the relevant percentage in case of non-technical bureaucrats is only 41.25. This difference in satisfaction between the technical and non-technical bureaucrats is due to greater and quicker promotion chances available to the technical bureaucrats because of the rapid expansion of technical departments and lack of technically qualified personnel in the State.

\(^74\) See Table 418.
Among the satisfied non-technical bureaucrats, the I.A.S. officers are first in the list. 60.00 percent of the I.A.S., 40.00 percent of the A.C.S. and 30.00 percent of the M.C.S. are satisfied with the promotion system. Here again, it can be said that the I.A.S. officers are more satisfied because the promotion chances for the I.A.S. officers are brighter than those available to the officers of the State Services. In case of the I.A.S., promotion is time bound. The least number of M.C.S. officers are satisfied with the present system of promotion because the promotion system in case of the M.C.S. has not been finalised and clearly laid out, leaving considerable scope for arbitrary promotion. Further, no M.C.S. officer until now has been promoted to the I.A.S. cadre due to the non-appointment of the M.C.S. by the Government of India.

Satisfaction with Prestige

Public servants enjoyed high prestige in the Indian society, especially during the British imperialist rule, when public bureaucrats were considered to be 'as-beep' by the ordinary people. In our study of the motivation of the bureaucrats, prestige was found to be one of the motivating factors. 

75. See the Memorandum submitted to the Chief Secretary, Government of Meghalaya by the Meghalaya Civil Service Officers' Association, op. cit.
is a complex interaction of many factors like pay, position in the hierarchy, authority to make decisions, power over others, contact with the higher-ups, various amenities available, and prestige in society.

In this study, a substantial number of bureaucrats, i.e., 61.32 percent were found to be satisfied with prestige. The reasons advanced for their satisfaction are: power to do good or bad, control over the people, access to important personalities, and amenities available. 38.68 percent of the bureaucrats in our sample were dissatisfied and the reasons they put forward for this dissatisfaction are increasing democratization, and a shift in the value system in society. One bureaucrat thus said:

No longer the government service has any prestige to-day. The British days are over. To-day, people need not bother about the Civil Servant. They have direct access to the ministers who can get the bureaucrat in line with them. The standard of living of the Civil Servant has also gone down. They are paid so poorly that they cannot follow the standard of living of their predecessors. Consequently, they are losing their position in society. Now, it is the business executives and the technocrats who have come to occupy the place of social elites. No longer, do the parents of prospective brides now look for a Civil Servant but for a business executive or a doctor or an engineer.

76. See Table 419.
However, there is no marked difference in satisfaction between
the technical and non-technical bureaucrat with prestige.²⁷ 61.25 percent of
the non-technical bureaucrat and 63.33 percent of the technical bureaucrat
were found to be satisfied with prestige. But if we analyse the satisfaction
of the bureaucrat in relation to the service to which they belong, the
I.A.S. is found to be the most satisfied group. 72.00 percent of the I.A.S.
officials are satisfied with the prestige that is associated with their
service. This is due to their superior position in the organisational hierarchy.
This finding also confirms the general view that the I.A.S., like its
predecessor, the I.C.S., is considered to be the most prestigious service by its
members at least, if not by the society.

Summary:
The efficiency of organisations is determined both by formal and
informal factors. The formal aspect refers to the structural arrangement and
framework of organisation which regulate the interaction and behaviour
patterns of the functionaries working in an organisation. Therefore, the formal
aspect of an organisation even if less important than its informal aspect,
needs to be considered in a study of bureaucracy.
²⁷ See Table 4(a).
The public bureaucracy in Meghalaya is hierarchically organised and linked by a chain from top to bottom. The work in this hierarchical system starts at the lower level and gradually keeps on moving to higher levels step by step. In the functioning of bureaucracy, rules, regulations and precedents are given more importance than the urgency and uniqueness of the issue under consideration which results not only in delay and sabotage of the issue but also detracts from the capacity of the organisation to adapt to new circumstances.

In the hierarchical chain, bureaucrats are promoted from lower level to higher level and the principle followed in case of promotion is seniority; seniority being judged on the basis of Annual Confidential Reports. The Annual Confidential Reports are generally written without a proper sense of responsibility and are subject to personal likes and dislikes and social influences. Consequently, the system of promotion is generally considered defective, thereby adversely affecting the morale of the public servants.

The pay of the bureaucrats depends upon the service to which they belong and the position they occupy in the hierarchy. There are in all 26 pay-
scales in Meghalaya having no correlation between the pay of the lower and the upper levels of the hierarchy.

Apart from this formal aspect of organisation, there is also an informal aspect which is so much a part of the formal organisation that we cannot think of the latter without the former. Informal relations in organisations is an inevitable and universally existent feature of the formal organisation and have important consequences for the functioning of bureaucracy.

In a formal organisation, the functionaries interact with one another as members of different social groups and from these interactions, there develop certain relationships among them to satisfy their psychological and social needs. Caste, community, language, religion and common interest may act as the basis of such relationships and may sometimes take the form of formal groups within the bureaucratic sub-system.

The bureaucracy in Meghalaya is broadly divided into two groups i.e., 'insiders' and 'outsiders' on the basis of the area to which the bureaucrat belong. The relationship between the two groups is one of resentment which stands in the way of cohesion and effective co-operation and, thus, adversely
affects the administrative system. Besides, a section of the outsiders is found to be indifferent towards the state and Nagaland society as a whole. The indifference may frustrate the implementation of the programme of socio-economic development of the state.

Within this broad classification of 'insiders' and 'outsiders', the bureaucrat may further be classified into the 'generalists' and the 'specialists' according to the nature of their functions. The top positions in the bureaucratic system are mostly held by the generalists which is one of the common causes of resentment among the specialist bureaucrats. This has developed a sense of deprivation among the specialists which may prove an obstacle to scientific and technological development in the state.

Again, there are antagonisms and conflicts between the 'I.A.S.' and the 'non-I.A.S.' bureaucrat. The I.A.S., having its origin in the colonial service, the I.C.S., is a generalist service and occupies a secure position in terms of salary, status and career which is envied by other members of the bureaucratic system. This one-sided distribution of status and reward among a few deprives others who nourish a feeling of animosity and a sense of injustice in them. This status differentiation gives birth to a feeling of class-
consciousness among the members of different services impairing their
"esprit de corps" and co-operation and, thus, obstructs the process of rapid
development.

The effective functioning and goal achievement of an organisation
depends upon the people who run the organisation, and the efficiency of the
functionaries to a great extent is influenced by the satisfaction which they
derive from their work and organisation. In other words, job-satisfaction is
an important dimension in the study of a bureaucratic system. But to make the
study of job-satisfaction meaningful, it must be studied in relation to the
activation of the bureaucrats for joining the service since activation and
job-satisfaction are related to one another.

Though a great majority (i.e., 54.35 percent) of bureaucrats in the
sample were found to be activated to join public service, in case of job
satisfaction the process is just the reverse. About the satisfaction of the
bureaucrats with different aspects of the job, we found the largest number of
bureaucrats to be satisfied with the nature of work and prestige while the
least number of bureaucrats were found to be satisfied with salary and promotion
chances. The least satisfaction with salary and promotion chances reflects
the concern of the bureaucrat regarding their material needs and career.

Regarding the nature of work and salary, the non-technical bureaucrats are found to be more satisfied than the technical bureaucrats. But regarding promotion chances and prestige, technical bureaucrats are found to be more satisfied than the non-technical bureaucrats.

However, in terms of service of the bureaucrats, we find the I.A.S. at the top of the list of satisfaction with the different aspects of the job. This indicates one-sided distribution of status, position, prestige and rewards among a few, thereby creating a wide gap between the different services. This creates a sense of deprivation in the minds of the bureaucrats and, consequently, there is animosity, jealousy and frustration. The pace of development in the state is bound to be slow because of the lack of co-operation and cohesion among the members of the higher bureaucracy.