

**AN EXPLANATORY REVIEW OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN
BRITAIN AND INDIA**

Shehu Sani

Department of Public Administration
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
Shehusani1982@gmail.com

&

Musa Idris

Department of Public Administration
Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
Midris@abu.edu.ng

Abstract

Recent emphasis on comparative studies in social sciences has expanded the domain of social analysis beyond the earlier narrowed emphasis on "Western" culture bonds. The comparative study goes beyond the Western administrative system. It also covers the developed and developing societies with the aim of bringing out the features that are similar and the differences. This paper seeks to make a comparison between the system of administration in developed British society and the developing Indian society. This enables the understanding of the pattern and practice in the two states. It is also pertinent to know whether Indian Administrative system as former colony of the British has maintained the Colonial structures and practices, discarded the colonial institution or maintained and improve the inherited practices. This will serve as a lesson on the relationship between developed and developing states, colonial state and the colony as well as the development of their public bureaucracies. To achieve this, exploratory research from existing literature was utilized. Development administration and Bureaucratic Approaches were used to guide the study. Recruitment, training, promotion, compensation, discipline, performance appraisal, Hierarchy, condition of service, relationship between bureaucracy and executive were also used as a variable of comparism. It was found that, public administration in Britain and India have utidergone series of reforms. However, the British system influences the Indian Public Administration. Britain has more dynamic, orderly, symmetrical, prudent, articulate and cohesive bureaucracy, while India has more structured and more decentralized public services.

Keywords: Bureaucracy, Public Service, Comparative Public Administration, India, Britain

Introduction

This paper is devoted to the comparison of civil services/servants that assist the government in day-to-day affairs of various executive functions. There is no universally accepted explanation what constitutes a civil service. For instance, in India and the United Kingdom, there is no legal definition for civil servants. Strikingly, college professors and school teachers are included in the civil servants list. Federal countries like India have state-level recruiting agencies normally controlled and directed by national as well as state executives. Though there are some uniform patterns of establishing the civil service system in these countries, there are also significant differences among them in terms of recruitment, conditions of services etc.

The central question of public administration in modern governments rests with the public personnel management (Henderson, 1968). To a very large extent the nation's ability to achieve the goals through public administrative action depends upon the performance, honesty, and motivation of public employees. Personnel administration covers the problems of recruitment, training, remuneration, promotions retirement etc. It also includes the allied activities such as performance evaluation, position classification, morale and discipline among the members of public services. Personnel administration is generally studied in terms of institutions and principles. But it should be remembered that the constitution of organizations and governments are not mere charts and works by taking the major contents of personnel administration such as recruitment, training, promotion discipline, and superannuation we can apply it to different countries and compare them with one another. Such comparison is useful to identify the relative merits and defects of a system of personnel administration. Secondly, it may be helpful in importing new ideas and institutions from one country to the other. The purpose of comparison may well be more than describe two or more phenomena (persons, areas, events and institutions). One pre-requisite of judgment about the institutional arrangement is to compare and contrast them with other similar institutions. When we compare the administration and its working in the Britain and India, the primary intention is to point out the major differences and similarities.

In comparing personnel administration of different countries, it would be sensible to select countries which roughly have similar socio-political and economic conditions. Our comparative study of personnel administration in Britain and India have many common characters. The common features are that they are democratic governments, urbanized societies, have a high standard of living, with extensive

social services, with legal rational administrative systems, and large and highly qualified bureaucracies subject to various kinds of control (Riggs, 1966). Though India subscribes to some of these common features, it is predominantly an agrarian society; less urbanized and is passing through a transitional period with more of unsettled personnel administrative problems. The paper seeks to analyse the public bureaucracy in India and British and make a comparison in the two system to appreciate the areas of divergence and convergence in public administration in theory and practice.

Historical Background of Personnel System in Britain and India

Merit based recruitment and rational-legal modes of personnel administration in Britain started only by the nineteenth century. The modern personnel administrative system in the Britain was formed by two major official investigations of civil service: The Northcote-Trevelyan Report 1854 and The Fulton Report, 1968. Generalist administrators have been a unique contribution by the British experience of administration to the world. The Northcote-Trevelyan report recommended for merit system of recruitment and also firmly affirmed the need for generalist service. The Fulton committee strongly opposed the generalist cadre of British top civil posts and it wanted to induce more professionalism into the service. According to Arora (1979) Out of 158 recommendations the most striking recommendation was the creation of career management approach to public services. Thus, a permanent civil service systematic recruitment, and a clear division of authority and uniform rules for civil servants emerged only in the early part of the nineteenth century.

Indian personnel system of administration has been largely a product of British colonial rule. In fact, the present roots of Indian administration can be traced back since the establishment of East India Company in India on December 31, 1599. In 1858, the company was abolished and the ruling power was assumed by the British Crown. Recruitment to top civil service posts was done by the British Imperial Power in London. The rest of the subordinate and clerical service was recruited locally. The Indian Civil Servants (ICS) were the agent of the British government recruited by the Secretary of State for India. To recruit Indians for civil service, a separate civil service called the Statutory Civil Service was created in 1879 (Parekh, 2008).

India inherited a personnel system under an enslaved condition. The British colonial service was largely confined only to tax collection and for regulatory

purpose. People were totally alienated to such civil service system. That is why after independence; India instituted several committees and commissions to reform the system of administration in order to cope up with the development attained by European countries. In more democratic states like the Britain and India one can witness the evolutionary nature of personnel system (1959). The system of personnel administration differed in these countries on the basis of peaceful constitutional development, new economic challenges, expansion of social services, changes of leadership through peaceful means and a host of other non-revolutionary factors in the respective countries against their historical and social factors (Binder, 1999).

Development in Civil Services in United Kingdom and India

In ancient India, the system was laid more upon military service than the public service. In Kautilya's *Arthashastra*, many facts relating to the public services have been mentioned (Peelee, 2014). He threw light upon the personnel working in the country and the appointments and conditions of the service of the Ambassadors. During the middle period under Muslim rule the public service had a fast development, because of their significant role. Prof. Jadunath Sarkar's 'Mughal Administration' has mentioned that during the Mughal Period, public services were organized in the administrative matters. The Mughal Subedars organized a few types of public services and determined their functions, powers and responsibilities (Delassay, 2014). With the advent of East India Company the spoil system was encouraged. The expansion of the functions of East India Company gave rise to the organization of two types of services – covenanted and un-covenanted (Rathod, 2015). It is well-known that Lord Robert Clive forced the servants of the company to enter into the new covenants with the company by which they bond themselves not to engage in private trade or accept presents. It was for this reason that the services came to be known as the Covenanted Civil Service. According to Viswanathan (2002) From 15, August 1947 up to enforcement to new constitution from January 1950, the Public Service Commission established by the British rule went on working till Indian Government set up a Union Public Service Commission. On the request from the Government of India, Prof. A.D. Gorwala and Prof. P.H. Ableby submitted their reports regarding civil services in 1953 & 1956.

Indian Institute of Public Administration (IIPA) in 1954 was established for research and study of problems concerning Indian administration (Guy, 2008). Administrative Reforms Commission (ARC), in 1966 was appointed which

submitted many valuable suggestions regarding reforms in the administration. On the recommendations of the 3rd Lok Sabha Estimates Committee, a Personnel Department was set up on 27 January, 1970. In 1972, an Advisory Council concerning personnel administration was appointed. During the period of emergency from 26 June, 1975 to March 1977, like other aspects of national life, the civil services were also unaffected. During 1988-89, the Personnel and Administrative Reforms Department started a special drive for filling in the vacancies in all the Central and State Departments, for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. It was decided that there served vacancies shall not be filled by the general candidates (White, 1930). In 1990, the Janata Dal government declared some special concessions for a year, for reappearing at the competitive examinations of U.P.S.C. Here it was provided that all those candidates who were over age or had already appeared thrice could reappear.

The transformed Trevelyn British Civil Service (1854), was mainly concerned with the reconciliation of intellectual qualities with loyalty, integrity and discretion. The Haldne Committee of 1918 was concerned with the question of how an administrator should reflect and think in the context of First World War reconstruction process. The Victorian model of civil service system survived virtually unscathed in the post 1945 era of welfare state and regulated the British economy also. The British Civil Service was further expanded and diversified during the Second World War and successfully met the challenges of that crucial time. However, the basic inputs into civil services in the UK remained the same which was formulated by Northcote-Trevelyn reforms. The recent structural reforms in British Civil Service were largely inflicted by the recommendations of the Fulton Report (1968). According to Nevil (2001), the civil Service since 1979 has been radically changed by imposing strong managerial view of civil service functions (Ralph, 1986). Of late, the Management Consultancy Group's report offered the best and most radical re-assessment of the scope and purpose of civil services in the central government and the qualities they require. During 1988, Sir Robin's Report emphasized the need for greater accountability and responsibility of the civil servants with regard to budget proposal, policies and the increase of managerial efficiency (Bhambri, 2008). Therefore, the civil service in the Britain at present has been gradually evolved from a traditional pattern to a modern managerial orientation.

Position – Classification in Britain

The British Civil Service falls into two large groups: The Industrial and Non-Industrial Workers.

Non-Industrial workers which are Civil Service fall into the following Treasury classification: 1) Administrative, 2) Executive, 3) Clerical and Sub-clerical, 4) Typing, 5) Inspectorate, 6) Professional, Scientific and Technical, 7) Ancillary Technical, 8) Minor and Manipulative, 9) Messengers and Porters.

Position – Classification in India

According to Biswanth (1989) in India, the services fall into the following classes: 1) The All-India Services, 2) The Central (Union) Services Class I, 3) The Central (Union) Services Class II, 4) The Provincial (State) Services, 5) The Specialist Services, 6) The Central Services Class III, 7) The Central Services Class IV, 8) The Central Secretariat Services Class I, II, III, IV.

All India Services

This establishment ensures uniform standards of Administration. All India Services are likely to immune from the stresses and strains of local influence. Its personnel are recruited by the UPSC, and are required to service anywhere in India or abroad. The personnel of IAS & IPS are allotted to the various states on the basis of a fixed quota. The constitution authorizes Parliament to legislate for the creation of one or more All India Services common to the Union and the states on a resolution being passed by the Rajya Sabha supported by not less than 2/3rd of the members present and voting. In 1963, three All India Services were created, they are; 1) The Indian Service of Engineers, 2) The Indian Forest Service and 3) Indian Medical and Health Service (Bansal, 2003).

The Class-I Central Services

These occupy senior posts in their respective departments. They are also appointed to posts in the central secretariat and other administrative posts under the Government of India. Recruitment to these services is made on the basis of the result of a combined competitive examination which is held by the UPSC to select candidate for the All India Services and the Class I and Class II Services. The important class I services are: 1) Central Secretariat Service 2) India Audit and Account Service 3) Indian Postal Service 4) Indian Revenue Service a) Customs Branch (Indian Customs Services Class I) b) Central Excise Branch (Central Excise Service, Class I) c) Income-tax Branch (Income-tax Service, Class I). 5) Indian Defense Accounts Service (Kothari, 1976).

Gazetted and Non-Gazetted Classes

Another basis of classification is that of gazette and non-gazette classes. All those positions, the names of whose incumbents are published in the Government Gazette

for matters of appointment, transfer, promotion and retirement are gazetted. Ordinary class I and class II are gazetted classes. Class III & IV are non-gazetted.

Methodology

For the purpose of this paper, explanatory research from existing literature was utilized. This involves literatures from books, journals and online publications related to the two countries under study. Content analysis method was also utilized in order to present and analyze the data thematically.

Two approaches/models of Comparative Public Administration were employed. The first is the development administration model as it shows the transformation through various reforms and committee recommendations which strengthen the administrative machineries capable of implementing national policies in both countries under study. It also showed the dynamism in the administrative system, particularly on issues of goal orientation, change orientation, progressiveness, participation and responsiveness.

Likewise, the Bureaucratic approach was also used to show how public bureaucracy operates in the two countries under study. Issues of Recruitment, training, promotion, abstract rules, discipline, performance appraisal, compensation, condition of service and the relationship between public bureaucracy and other institutions of government like executive legislature and political system were reviewed and compared between Britain and Indian Public Administration.

Discussion and Results

Comparative Analysis of British and Indian Public Service

According to Henry (2016) While designing a successor civil service, the Indian Political leaders chose to retain elements of the British structure of a unified administrative system such as an open-entry system based on academic achievements, elaborate training arrangements, permanency of tenure, important posts at Union, state and district levels reserved for the civil service, a regular graduated scale of pay with pension and other benefits and a system of promotions and transfers based predominantly on seniority. In post-Independence India, great emphasis was laid on the administration of planning as stated in the Third Five Year Plan, with the aim to ensure high standards of integrity, efficiency and speed in implementation.

Efforts by A.D. Gorwala

The first serious attempt to review the working of public administration was entrusted to Mr. A.D. Gorwala, an ex-ICS official by the Planning Commission. He did not challenge the fundamental assumptions lying Indian bureaucracy, but his concern was to strengthen the model by removing some of the ills that had crept into it. "... .. though sound in essentials and capable after improvement of undertaking arduous tasks, different in kind and degree, and is at the present moment run down. The parts removed from it were replaced by those of inferior workmanship" undoubtedly impairing efficiency.

The Santhanam Commission

In 1962 the problem of corruption in Public Services assumed serious dimensions. The Government of India appointed a High Power Committee under the chairmanship of Santhanam. Commenting on the scope of corruption, the santhanam committee observed. The general impression that it is difficult to get things done without resorting to corruption and that the incentive to corruption is stronger at those points of organisation where substantive decisions are taken in matters like assessment and collection of taxes, grant of licences, determination of eligibility for obtaining licences, giving of contracts, approval of works and acceptance of supplies. "Corruption can exist only if there is someone willing to corrupt and capable of corrupting.

Political Neutrality

In Britain, between 1948-49, a Master-man Committee on Political Activity of civil servants was appointed to consider exhaustively the problem. The analysis of the committee's report can throw light on the following issues involved.

1. Parliamentary candidature and services, 2. Other political activities in the National field – Party and Non-party by: i. Individual Civil Servant; ii. Members of the Civil Service Staff Association and 3. Participation in Local Governments, especially, membership of local councils and committees.

Parliamentary Elections

In the views of Brown (1979), Parliamentary Candidature of members of the service in Britain was completely forbidden till 1927. It was imperative for a public servant to resign from the service as soon as he announced his candidature for election to the Parliament. But by 1927, the government through the servants of the crown (Parliamentary Candidature) (Rules 1927), exempted industrial employees of the

service department from this prohibition. Placing the industrial services into safe category and recommended them the Parliamentary candidature without the member of prior resignation. The committee allowed the Industrial class – the candidature one month leave for Parliamentary candidature, and also the re-entry into service after their tenure of Parliamentary membership was over (Provided they had a decade service to their credit). In India, there is no permission for any class of government employees to become parliamentary candidates. They are forbidden of such candidature without resigning from their present government service.

Other Political Activities

Include the following: i. Holding office in a political organization, national or local. ii. Speaking on political platform on party political matters. iii. Writing letters to the Press, publishing works, pamphlets or party/political matters, or criticizing the government. and Canvassing.

In Britain the public servants may belong to political parties and vote, but as regards the other activities, the rules require that the civil servants maintain a reserve in political matters at all times. They should not take part in political controversy. They are equally forbidden to accept a political party office, i.e., President, secretary or Treasurer etc. Additionally, the employees of industrial organization are exempted from the above restrictions (Rathod, 2007). In India, all classes of employees without exemption are forbidden to take part in any of the political activities cited above.

Local Self-Government

Since 1909 in Britain, participation in local self-government has been allowed to the officials subject to permission by the Head of the Department. Since local government are no longer political and the national parties have entered in to this field (Local self-governance), the permission for the civil servants remains. In India, for example, public servants are allowed to become candidates for election to the local bodies subject to permission of the Head of the Department. However, it is forbidden for them to participate in elections. A departure from this procedure would not be possible in the special circumstance of our country (the Nigerian situation).

Freedom of Expression

In Britain, the Master man Committee were not in favor of banning expression of opinion by the civil servant on non-party matters of public interest, provided it was in moderation and was written in his private capacity. Today, the government

service comprises a large number of technical experts and scientists who should be able to make their contribution to learning by writing and participating in outside conferences and discussions of a non-political nature. But the following safeguards are essential, in this connection: a) The government servant should not criticize his own department even in non-political matters. b) Permission from the Departmental Head should be sought for attendance at outside discussions and conferences. c) Such attendance would be in his individual capacity, and the expression to be his individual expression. d) The public servant must confine himself to the question of facts only. e) The need of observance of the official secrets Act, must be borne in mind. In India, the practice requiring freedom of expression is similar to that of Britain.

Trade Unions

Though Trade Unions in government services are comparatively and have recently developed, their growth is extraordinary and their effects on personnel administration are far-reaching. Accordingly Stahl (2009), "employees join unions in some instances because they feel that some form of solidarity is necessary to protect their interests against the enlightened management".

1. Right to Form Associations:

In Britain the public sector employees are given full liberty to form their unions hence there is no restriction upon them to keep aloof from the political parties. But generally, they keep their unions separate from the party policies, even though the postal union is affiliated with labor party.

In India the legal status of public sector employees unions is determined by Article 19 of the constitution. With article 309, for example, clause (1) of Act 19 confers on all the citizens the fundamental right of freedom of speech, expression, assembly, association etc. Ironically Clause (2) empowers the state to impose reasonable restrictions on the exercise of these rights in the interest of the security of state.

2. Right to Strike:

In Britain, Civil servants have a right to form their association. Strikes are not forbidden there; but if a civil servant resorts to strike, a strict disciplinary action can be taken against him. The punishment for this action varies from reprimand to dismissal with a loss of pension benefits. In India equally, though strike is not prohibited by law, it constitutes a breach of discipline.

Financial Administration

In both India and England the budgets are approved by the legislatures and departmental heads are authorized to spend money within the ceiling fixed by the legislature for each head of account. If there is any need or necessity for the appropriation of money from one head of account to the other, the legislature will have to be approached (Farazmand, 2001).

In India, the House does not turn itself into the committee of the whole House as it is in England. In India, the Finance Minister is required to make his budget speech before the budget is presented in the House. But in England, this stage comes much later. Unlike India, in England, there is no procedure of separately presenting Railway budget. In India, the upper House (Rajya Sabha) is required to pass the budget within 14 days whereas in England the period allowed to the Upper House (House of Lords) is 30 days. In England, amounts put under consolidated fund are neither discussed nor voted, but in India such amounts are discussed, though not voted.

In England, the control is from within i.e., the department head is not required to seek the advice of the treasury for incurring expenditure. He is himself supposed to be the competent authority for spending the money. On the other hand in India the control is from without. The Ministry of Finance as the most competent authority in all matters is expected to give final verdict in all financial matters. If there is any difference between the departmental head and the Ministry of Finance, it is the Ministry's view that prevails as against the view of the department's head.

India has largely borrowed from England the system of controlling the finances. But Indian system is materially different from what it prevails in England. In England all the accounts are centralized in the Bank of England. After the budget is passed the departmental accounts officer are authorized to draw the money. After the Bill is passed a pay order is issued on the Paymaster General. Then copies of the orders which have been carried out and payment made are sent to the Comptroller and Auditor General (CAG) in the form of daily accounts statement.

Civil Servants and Executive Relationship

It is important to study the relationships between the civil service and other sectors of the political system, viz., government (executive), the legislature and intermediary organizations like political parties and pressure groups. Proper understanding between the executive and the civil servants will mitigate the

problems they are supposed to manage. While these aspects of relationship are different to identify and to quantify in various countries, it can be relatively understood by comparison of one country with other. The permanent status of senior civil servants in Britain contrasts with the politically dependent status of top civil servants in India. Secondly, in a parliamentary form of government the minister spends less time in matters of administration as can be seen in India and Britain. Therefore, it can be said that the relationship between ministers and civil servants is largely confined in the areas of policymaking. The political power of civil servants is quite often determined by the relationship between them. In some instances, the power of civil servants is increased by the delegation of powers by the executive to the civil servants, like the case in India and the Britain.

Legislative Control

In any representative democratic government, whether Parliamentary or Presidential, the Legislature is the supreme organ of the government as it consists of the representatives of the people. It reflects the will of the people and acts as a custodian of the interests of the people. Hence, it exercises control over administration to hold it accountable and responsible. However, the system of legislative control over administration in a parliamentary form of government (Britain and India) differs from such control in a presidential form of government (U.S.). The system of legislature control and the techniques of Parliamentary form of government (India & Britain) are not practiced in U.S.A. The reason for such difference lies in the 'theory of separation of powers' which is the basis of presidential government like the U.S.A.

Executive Control:

According to Basu (2004) Executive control over administration means the control exercised by the chief executive over the functioning bureaucracy. Such control is exercised in India and Britain by the Cabinet and the Ministers (individually). In India, the Cabinet formulates administrative policies and enjoys the power of direction, supervision and coordination with regard to its implementation. Through political direction, the Minister controls the operations of administrative agencies working under his ministry/departments. The departmental officials are directly and totally responsible to the minister. The administrative system i.e., civil services or bureaucracy whether in the Britain, or India, is status quo oriented and hence resists change. It does not receive new policies, plans, programmes and projects formulated by the executive with positive mindedness. In fact, the various organs of the administrative machinery seek to strengthen their position vis-à-vis other

agencies, and the executive, by alliances with legislature and pressure groups, as well as by calculated support building campaigns directed at the general public. They develop vested interests not only in programme areas, but equally in established ways of doing things, which enhance the self-consciousness and strategic position of bureaucracy. Due to this, the bureaucracy resists new programmes and methods as they threaten bureaucracy's strong position. Under such circumstances, the executive appeals to the public opinion.

Evaluation of Civil Servants

Top civil servants in India are evaluated on the basis of seniority cum- merit and half yearly confidential report. The members of Union Public Service Commission are also involved in preparing the list of names for top civil service posts and the ministers select civil servants from the prepared list. But in Britain, capacities and qualification of employees are closely scrutinized and will be selected by the departmental head. The major techniques in the appraisal areas are follows: 1) Rating scale. 2) Essay Report-Focusing on employee's need for further training and his potential and ability to obtain results. 3) Check-list-It consists of statements about the employee's performance. The rater checks the most appropriate statements. Some of these may be given greater weight than others in reaching an overall appraisal. 4) Critical incidents-It is an approach requiring the supervisor to keep a log of employees, performance, by indicating incidents of both good and poor performance. 5) Forced choice-This requires supervisors to rate employees on the basis of descriptive statements. 6) Ranking-It is a process where there is comparison of employee with the other. 7) Forced Distribution-It requires the rater to place employee in categories such as top 5 per cent next 10per cent, next 25 per cent and so on. Combinations of these techniques are used in appraising the civil servants for their promotion or for appointing them in top civil service posts. Thus, there is a strict application of scientific management principles in selecting meritorious people (Eneanya, 2011).

According to Ngu (2001) In India public servants have to pass the efficiency bar test to justify grant of increments. Only the minimum level of efficiency is required to justify for promotion or for an increment. A committee is constituted in each department and it records its findings to the suitability otherwise, of an employee to cross the efficiency bar and the competent authority on the basis of the funding of the committee, issues orders either permitting or stopping the employee cross the efficiency bar.

Conditions of Service and Discipline

A good condition of service and common codes of conduct are pre-requisite for modern civil service system. Today, many governments adopt certain rights and liabilities of civil servants. If there is any violation from the codes of conduct the civil servants are liable for punishment. Disciplinary action can be taken for inattention to duty, carelessness, lethargy, loss of property, inefficiency, immorality, insubordination, lack of integrity, *viz.*, corruption, etc., and violation of the established code of ethics and failure to pay debt (Otenyo, 2006).

In Britain and India, there is restriction for remunerative activities outside the service. It is also mandatory for the civil servants in these countries to declare the occupations of their spouse. Civil servants are generally prohibited from business activities. All such restrictions are imposed on civil servants not only to safeguard the interest of the state, but also to protect civil servants from becoming an easy prey to corruption. In India, counterparts were liable for ordinary breaches of the criminal law such as embezzlement or fraud. In Britain the common conducts rules of civil servants are again derived from the Hatch Act of 1940. But the Act does not specify what they prohibit. However, in case of India, the All India services (Discipline and Appeal Rules, 1955) are specific in nature and wider in its scope. Indian civil servants arbitrary dismissals are protected by virtue of Article 311 of the constitution. There is scope of appeal in disciplinary proceedings but it can be withheld by the deciding authority.

In the Britain up to a certain level every civil servants work is the subject of confidential annual reports by the head of his unit in which he serves. Like the India discipline is maintained by the administration of reprimands and penalties such as stoppages and forfeiture of annual increments, loss of promotion, and suspension from duty, in the last resort dismissal without pension or gratuity.

Recruitment in United Kingdom and India

Formal education is a pre-requisite for entrance in public jobs in India and England. Aptitude test is popularly organized in British for the defense and other technical services. In 1909 the use of interview device was made in England. Thereafter, it became a regular practice of the selection process for the Administrative class. In India, too, it is an integral part of the higher services. It aims to test the sharpness, alertness, intelligence and quick mindedness of the candidate. His potential qualities of leadership and his vigor and strength of character can be also assessed by this system of test.

The Macaulay Committee which gave India its first modern civil service in 1854 recommended that the patronage based system of the East India Company should be replaced by a permanent civil service based on a merit based system through competitive entry examinations. The Report insisted that the civil servants of the company should have taken the first degree in arts at Oxford or Cambridge University. After 1855, recruitment to the ICS came to be totally based on merit. The report of the CS Commissioners pointed out that of those who entered the ICS between 1855 and 1878, more than 2/3rd were university men, equipped with liberal and finished education. Initially, the ICS sought its recruits from Oxford and Cambridge. Subsequently, it opened its doors to Indians and from 1922 onwards the ICS examination began to be held in India.

In India and Britain definite educational qualification is required. In India there is 30 per cent reservation for female sex. The reservation also extends to the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes in India. Reservation of civil service posts for certain minority classes is not much in vogue in Britain. A striking feature of recruitment after the Fulton Committee Report (1968) has been on tapping private sector expertise in civil service recruitment in the Britain. India and Britain relied more on non-specialists in the career civil service system. It rested on open written examinations set by the civil service commission in academic subjects. After the successful written examinations, the candidate's personality is tested by interview methods. For the past 50 years in Britain, there are three kinds of non-specialist civil servants being recruited by fixing the following qualifications. 1) Administrative class-recruited primarily from university graduates, Age 21-28 years. 2) Executive class-recruited at matriculation standard, minimum age 18 years. 3) Clerical class-required qualification is a pass in the first major school examination (General Certificate of Education). Minimum age is 15 years but recruits are accepted up to the age of 59.

In India, young men and women in 18-28 age groups enter the services. For specialized jobs experienced persons are appointed. Like Britain practice even in India, a university degree is not essential to all clerical, central class III and state subordinate non-clerical services. The minimum educational qualification fixed for these services is a secondary or intermediate certificate (certificate of general education). For Upper Division Clerk (UDC) and central class III non-clerical services, a pass in plus 2 is essential. A university degree is required for All India and central, class I, central class II (gazette and non-gazetted) and state subordinate (gazetted) services. Recruitment to the All India Central Services (class I) is made

on the basis of common entrance examination. It consists of three sequential examinations. They are: 1) Civil service preliminary examination (objective type question-for screening purpose). 2) Civil service main examinations. 3) Interview (personality test). The three levels of recruiting method somewhat unique in India, is a time consuming process not found in Britain. It is practiced in India in order to filter non-serious and average candidate. This system of recruitment has been followed in India since 1978 on the recommendation of Kothari Committee Report (1977).

Training

Both India and Britain offer training to their civil servants from a more generalist service requirement. Training both in India and Britain are fashioned in such a way as to fulfill the needs of generalists. In Britain, the Civil Service College (CSC) (1970) imparts training in three main ways: 1) Post-entry training for administrative recruits in economic, financial or social areas of government. 2) Courses in administration and management for specialists. 3) Conducting research into administrative problems.

In India, there are varied types of training for the highest civil servants (IAS). It is conducted by the Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration at Mussoorie. The training consists of the following: 1) A foundation course which provides an introduction to the constitutional, political social, economic, legal, historical, and cultural administrative framework within which the service function (3 months). 2) Winter study tour. 3) One year district training organized by each state government.

One unique feature of the British training institute is that it organizes a wide range of shorter training courses for local government staff, industry, and the lower rungs of the civil service. While the British training programmes are largely a product of their own tradition and based on the functional requirements of 'generalist' cadre of various departments, the Indian counterpart on the other side still holds the legacy of ICS tradition. Training for IAS officers is more oriented towards emulating the life-style of British officers. Attendance for lecture classes and for physical training is compulsory. But in British, attendance at any or all of the courses is not mandatory. An Indian trainee on the whole spends two years in the training period, but the total period of formal training for British civil servants covers only 22 weeks.

The major weakness of training in Britain is largely due to the lack of in service training or indoctrination for specialist groups. In India, the kind of training imparted to the civil servants moulds them into colonial officers in proxy and in fact, they are highly isolated from the rest of the mass. Highly valuable training has been introduced in Britain since 1963 by the Centre for Administrative Studies (CAS). These features are absent in the administrative training for the Indian Civil Servant. As a result, the administrative training in British looks more scientific than the Indian training system. However, social sciences still occupy an important role in shaping the behaviors of civil servants for general administration of the country. A managerial approach in the field of training is much in vogue in Britain. It is unfortunate that Indian civil servants have not so far been exposed to the world of 'Management Sciences,' particularly in the field of quantitative techniques to measure social and economic development of the Country. The Seventh Plan in India focused on the need for an overall reform in training of government personnel. Upgrading training capability, particularly in the context of policy advice, organization, management of information and manpower planning are some of the important strategies aimed for socio economic development in the Seventh Plan of India. An independent ministry of personnel and training was brought into being in March 1985.

In both India and Britain post-entry training at senior levels is primarily concerned with aiding the civil servants to manage conflicting policies and its related organizational issues. Policy oriented training for Indian civil service for reasons unknown has not been so far imparted.

4.3.5 Training Institutions

In Britain, training is imparted to civil servants by Civil Service College (CSC). It comprises headquarter and two regional centers. It was established on the recommendation of Asheton Committee Report. The headquarter is a residential centre at Sunningdale Park. The regional centres are in London (nonresidential) and Edinburgh (residential). Most of the training for executive and clerical staff is carried out by departments with some inter-departmental co-ordination, and the CSC gives general guidance and advice. External training in management is provided at the Administrative Staff College at Henley. Training for diplomatic service is provided by the Royal College of Defence Studies of London.

In India, training institutions were under the control of Home Ministry and in 1985, it was separated and now it is under the control of Ministry for Personnel and

Administrative Reforms. In the post-independent period, the first training institute was started in 1957, known as IAS Staff College at Shimla. An amalgamated sister training institution was formed in the year 1959 known as Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration. There is also separate training institutes for other services which are as follows: Indian Police Service-Central Policy Training College, Mount Abu, Indian Audit and Account Service-Indian Audit and Accountant Training School, Shimla, Income Tax Service-Income Tax Service School, Nagpur, Railway Staff College, Vadodara, Central Secretariat Service-Central Secretariat Training School, New Delhi, Administrative Service (Middle level)-Administrative, Staff College, Hyderabad, Community Development Service-Central Institute of Study and Research in Community Development, Mussoorie.

Promotion and Performance Evaluation

Both in Britain and in India, seniority is the primary basis of promotion of civil servants. But in India, there are certain reservation of positions for certain castes such as SC and ST not based on the length of service. At present reservation at the rate of 15 and 7.5 per cent scheduled castes and scheduled tribes respectively exists. 1) Promotion by limited department competitive examination in groups B, C, and D. 2) Promotion by seniority subject to fitness in all groups A, B, C, D. 3) By selection from group B to the lower rung group A and groups B, C and D. In all modes of promotion, where reservation is applicable, 40-point roster is to be maintained to determine the number of vacancies going to the share of SCs/STs. Besides, there are certain defined categories of the handicapped for which the Indian government has provided reservation in Class III and Class IV posts to the total tune of 3per cent of the vacancies.

At the top of civil service administration in the UK, promotions are made on merit but at the lower levels promotion tends to take place in accordance with seniority rules agreed to by the staff union. Such automatic promotion at the lower levels was criticized by Fulton Committee report and suggested introduction of promotion by merit for the entire administration.

Administrative Reform Commission (1966) in India also voiced similar viewpoints in some selected administrative departments both at middle and top. But it has not been implemented so far and the seniority principle is continued in India in the field of 'pure' administrative services. After the introduction of 'open economy' in India (1990-94) merit principle based on performance appraisal has been gradually

introduced in most of the public sector units in order to increase the spirit of competition at the international level.

Salary for Personnel

From the point of view of general standard of life in respective of countries, the most highly paid civil servant was only from the Britain and the least paid is from India. Even if we compare with other Asian countries like Pakistan and Sri Lanka, the Indian counterparts are less compensated. In India, fixation of salaries for civil servants has been made by several pay commissions constituted by the centre for central civil servants and state pay commission by the state government.

In the United Kingdom, fixation of pay for civil servants is done by appointment of a committee of the Treasury Department. Salary for civil servants since 1971 was fixed on the basis of 'priestly formula' which recommended relatively higher pay scales. It is based on government income policies and by a fair comparison with outside world and private sectors. There is also Civil Service Pay Research Unit in the Treasury Department which may also come with proposals of recommendations. The criterion for fixation of pay structure is simpler in Britain and more complex in India.

Retirement Benefits

Tenure systems in public services are of three kinds. They are: 1) A fixed term of years or on attaining maximum age for retirement. 2) At the will of the appointing officer. 3) For life. Normally, retirement age is fixed on the basis of life expectancy on an average as well as on other administrative, socio-economic factors. For instance, in highly populated countries like India, the retirement age can be considerably reduced for certain administrative jobs. A less populated state may fix the retirement age at the maximum.

In Britain, Civil service pension have been governed comprehensively by non-statutory (superannuation act) enabling act. Therefore, it is possible to change pension without further legislation. Ten years minimum service is required to receive pension. Civil servant is eligible to receive annual pension of one-eighth of his average salary over the last three years of service. Temporary civil servants who have served five years or more are eligible to receive a lump sum quantity. No contribution is made by a civil servant towards his pension. Widows and children of the pensioner will get pension through contributory scheme. Superannuation benefits are the same for men and women, except that an established women civil

servant who chooses to resign on marriage after not less than six years' of reckonable service may be granted a marriage gratuity of one month's pay for each completed year of her established service, subject to a maximum of 12 months pay. In India, Pension is related to the length of qualifying service rendered by the civil servant. Pension is calculated on the average of the emoluments drawn by him during ten months immediately preceding the date of retirement. Full pension is admissible to a civil servant who retires after completing 33 years of qualifying service. Pension is determined at 50 per cent of the average emoluments subject to a maximum fixed by the latest pay commission. Proportionate pension is admissible after completing 10 years of qualifying service. Family pension is payable to the family of an employee on his death in service/after retirement on monthly pension. There are three kinds of percentage fixed for different pension amount (30%-20% and 15%). Pension will automatically increase after the pay increase of the civil service.

Conclusion

From the comparison of administrative systems of Britain and India, it is evident that, there are no much differences in the two states. The differences in their features clearly reflected both countries political systems and histories. In Britain, the representative institutions are strong because they evolved earlier, hence bureaucracy is weak and slow in acquiring professionalism. However, it was understood that Indian administrative system is a product of British colonial administrative traditions and the ideals of democratic welfare state which was constitutionally adopted in India after independence. Among India's colonial legacies, perhaps the most well developed institution, which the Britain left behind, was the Indian civil services. Indian bureaucracy suffers colonial ethos and is greatly dysfunctional, authoritarian, unresponsive and paternalistic in its public dealings. It also displays demerits of the Weberian model, by its recurrent tendencies towards delay, rigidity and obsession to rules and regulations at the cost of performance. Under the Britain Bureaucracy, civil servant is an establishment of the crown and its affairs are almost exclusively control by orders in council or other executive action. External control over bureaucracy in Britain is extensive. However, Britain has more orderly, symmetrical, prudent, articulate and cohesive bureaucracy than India. Do to the long standing administration in Britain, Public administration is more solid determining the future of the state than what was obtainable in India.

References

- Bansal, P (2003). *Administrative Development in India*, New Delhi Publishers Limited.
- Basu, R. (2004) *Public Administration: Concepts and Theories*. New Delhi; Sterling Publishers Limited.
- Bhambri, C. (2008) "Bureaucracy in India –Challenges of the Eighties," *IIPA*, 28(3) PP 521-522.
- Biswanth, S. (1989) "Political Activities of Public Servants in India," *IIPA*, 11(2), PP 236 – 237.
- Brown, P and Steel, D (1979), *The Administrative Process in Britain*, London Publishers Limited.
- Budget Speech of the Union Finance Minister in Lok Sabha on February 28, 1983.
- Eneanya, A.N (2011) *Comparative Public Administration*, University Press limited.
- Farazmand, A (2001) *Handbook of Comparative and Development Public Administration*, New York, Madison Publishers, Limited.
- Fourth Pay Commission Report, Finance Ministry, Government of India, 1984.
- Fred W. Riggs (1964) *Administration in Developing Countries; the theory of Prismatic Society*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
- Fulton Report (1968) "Government of India Administrative Reform Commission, Report on Personnel Management," April, 1969.
- Guy P. (2008) *The politics of Bureaucracy: A Comparative Perspective*. New York; Longman Publishers Limited.
- Henry, B (2016) *Comparative Study of Civil Services System in India*, United Kingdom and U.S.A. *Journal of Political Science* 23(16).
- Kavanagh D. and Peelee, G. (2014) *Comparative Government and Politics*, New York; West View Press.
- Keith. H (1966) *Emerging Synthesis in America Public Administration*, Asia Publishing House.
- Kothari, R (1976) *Democratic Policy and Social Change in India: Crisis and Opportunities*, New Delhi: Allied Publishers.
- Leonard B. (1999) *Political Development in changing society* Berkeley, Press Toronto.
- Mattei, D. and Delassay, D. (2014) *How to compare Nations: Strategies in Comparative Politics*, London: Chattam House Publishers.
- Ngu, S.M (2001) *Government and Administration in Europe and America: A Comparative and Evolutional Perspective* Ilorin; Dada Press Limited.
- Ngu, S.M. (2001) *Government and Administration in Asia and the Middle East*. Zaria; Sheriff Salam, Press.

- Northcote Trevelyan Report (1854)
- Otenyo, E. and Nancy, L. (2006) *Comparative Public Administration: the Essential Readings*; London; *JAI Press Publication*.
- Parekh, B (2008) *Some Reflections on the Hindu Traditions of Political thought in Modern India*, *New Delhi Publishers*.
- Ralph, B. (1986) *Asian Bureaucratic System: Emergent from British Imperial Tradition*, *Durban Duke University Press*.
- Ramesh K. Arora (1979) *Comparative Public Administration*, A Publishing House, New Delhi.
- Rathod (2007) *Comparative Public Administration*, *Delhi, Rajdhani Printers*.
- Rathod, P. (2005) *Indian Administration*; New Delhi. *Common Wealth Publishers*.
- Report of the Committee on Civil Service Examinations, New Delhi, Union Public Service Commission, 1976.
- Robert V. Presthus (1959) *Social bases of Bureaucratic Organization*. *Oxford University, Press*.
- Viswanathan, N. (2002) "Policy making in India: An Introduction", *Third Concept: An International Journal of Ideas* 6(68) pp 42 – 43.

**APPENDIX
COMPARISON OF INDIA AND BRITISH POLITICAL AND
ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEM**

Sl. No.	Element of Comparison	India	U.K.
1.	Type of constitution	Written and blend of Rigidity and flexibility	Unwritten and flexible
2.	Nature of State	Federal system with unitary bias	Unitary and Monarchy
3.	Type of Government	Parliamentary	Parliamentary
4.	Type of Legislative	Bicameral (Parliament – Rajya Sabha & Lok Sabha).	Bicameral Parliament House of Lords & House of Commons
5.	Model of bureaucracy	Weberian	Weberian
6.	Political Rights of Civil Servants	Restricted	Restricted at Higher level & Permitted at Lower level
7.	Right to strike of civil servants	Not denied legally	Not denied legally
8.	Recruitment of Civil Servants	Merit system	Merit System
9.	Right to Association of Civil Servants	Given	Given
10.	Retirement age of civil servants	58-60 years	60-65 years
11.	Central recruitment agency	Union public service commission	Civil service commission
12.	Central personnel agency	Ministry of personnel, public Grievances and pensions	Treasury (1612) and office of the minister for civil service (1987)

13.	Basis administrative unit	Ministry	Ministry
14.	Governmental organization regulated by	Executive	Executive
15.	Central training agency	No Central Training Agency (Multiple Training Agencies are there)	Civil service college (1969)
16.	Type of classification in civil service	Position	Rank
17.	Historical basis of recruitment	Patronage of merit system	Patronage system
18.	Type of budget	Double	Single
19.	Financial year	April to March	April to March
20.	Central Planning Machinery	Planning Commission	No Centralized Planning body
21.	Central Auditing Agency	Comptroller and Auditor – General	Comptroller and A – General auditor
22.	Citizenship	Single	Single
23.	Type of Franchise	Universal Adult franchise	Universal franchise adult
24.	Party System	Multi	Two Party
25.	Major Political Parties	Congress, B.J.P. & Others	Conservative and labour
26.	Political Order	Liberal – Democratic	Liberal – Democratic
27.	Head of the State	President	King/Queen

28.	More Powerful House	Lower House (Lok Sabha)	Lower House (House of Commons)
29.	Autonomy of Local Governments	Less Autonomy	Less Autonomy
30.	Judicial Review	Present	Absent