



## SOME EMERGING ISSUES OF HUMAN RESOURCES AND PUBLIC SECTOR REFORMS IN INDIA

DR. S. MOOKIAH\*; N. SUJA\*

\*Centre for the Study of Social Exclusion and Inclusive Policy,  
Manonmaniam Sundaranar University,  
Tirunelveli – 627012, India.

\*\*Ph.D Research Scholar, Department of Economics,  
Manonmaniam Sundaranar University,  
Tirunelveli – 627012, India.

### ABSTRACT

*The field of development administration seems to owe its existence, not to a patented disciplinary methodology or set of concepts, but to the practical needs of administrators and academics who have responded to demands for action and explanation in the face of concrete phenomena and operational necessities. So Weidner defined development administration in terms of "the process of guiding an organisation towards the achievement of progressive political, economic and social objectives that are authoritatively determined in one manner or another" (Weidner 1962:98). The key to this approach and its major analytical problem, as Weidner himself recognised, is the existence of national goals which may be regarded as "authoritatively determined. Nonetheless, this approach distinguished development administration from the "law and order administration" characteristic of colonial regimes, which is often the historical precursor to development administration in specific countries, and is easily identified as less interested in change and more interested in the maintenance of the status quo (Hope 1984:68)*

*So one way of locating development administration as a distinct area of administration has been to see it as self-consciously achievement oriented and that achievement has focused on changing existing practice.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Developing Administration- Administration Agencies- HRM Labour Relations- Public sector Reforms.*

## INTRODUCTION

The field of development administration seems to owe its existence, not to a patented disciplinary methodology or set of concepts, but to the practical needs of administrators and academics who have responded to demands for action and explanation in the face of concrete phenomena and operational necessities. So Weidner defined development administration in terms of "the process of guiding an organisation towards the achievement of progressive political, economic and social objectives that are authoritatively determined in one manner or another" (Weidner 1962:98). The key to this approach and its major analytical problem, as Weidner himself recognised, is the existence of national goals which may be regarded as "authoritatively determined. Nonetheless, this approach distinguished development administration from the "law and order administration" characteristic of colonial regimes, which is often the historical precursor to development administration in specific countries, and is easily identified as less interested in change and more interested in the maintenance of the status quo (Hope 1984:68)

So one way of locating development administration as a distinct area of administration has been to see it as self-consciously achievement oriented and that achievement has focused on changing existing practice. In this way development administration has come to involve administrative development in terms of the improvement of the capacity of government to implement development programmes and the manner in which an administrative system reacts to social change.

If social change and the administrative response to it are adopted as the central focus of development administration, a number of conceptual tools become available. It is then possible to use the systems approach to establishing the complexity and interdependence of factors in administrative development. It will, however, be necessary at the same time to reject the assumption of the crudest systems literature which sees change as the manifestation of universal laws and to place instead the action of people at the centre. Similarly it may now be possible to use functionalism in its emphasis on systems-relevant consequences while rejecting the assumption of equilibrium and evolutionism. In this way "development" is seen not as a natural process but as an outcome directed and determined by the action of real people. So development administration becomes not only, or even principally, concerned with an outcome, rather the focus is shifted to process.

In this conceptualisation, development administration takes on all the political complexity of competing interest. In turn, once process is established as the central focus the endless argument over the measurement of outcomes becomes less vital and instead it is possible to focus on identifying improvements in administrative capability. The importance of process in development administration also goes to the nature of the field and its differentiation from related areas of concern. Hope and Armstrong have argued, for instance, that while development administration is but one factor in economic growth, its importance is strategic in that the administrative system determines the method of implementation of development policy and is subject to deliberate social control and change (**Hope and Armstrong 1980:320**). So not only does the end not justify the means, but the means have a determinative impact on the end. This clearly places the behaviour of people and the organisations through which that behaviour finds

expression in the centre of the development picture. For the present purpose it opens an avenue for conceptualising the role of human resource management in development.

That avenue seeks to make limited use of the functionalist approach which defines development administration as "the public administration of economic development" so that the purposes of development administration are to stimulate and facilitate defined programmes of social and economic progress ...(and) development administration is the administration of policies, programmes and projects to serve development purposes (Hope 1994:63).

The limitations of such an approach, as already mentioned, lie in the assumption of political equilibrium and the consequent overlooking of the process by which "development purposes" are defined in any particular polity. For this paper, however, such functionalism is useful in focusing attention on the impact of organisations on the operation of the systems of development administration. Development purposes — whatever they are and however they have been established — are better served by effective, efficient, productive, organisations.

Before considering the role of human resources management in this, however, it is necessary to return to the issue of the nature of development administration to abstract one more set of concepts concerned with the nature of development institutions.

### **INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY AND DEVELOPMENT**

Whereas the development administration prescriptions of the 1960s and '70s assumed a benevolent state, the 1980s saw an increased cynicism in regard to state agencies, going as far as the development of the view that these organisations served the interests of their own members rather than those of the border community (Hewitt, et al. 1992.ch.5). In the same period the "counter revolution in development theory and practice" (Toye 1987:22ff) led by neoclassical economists challenged the idea that development should be led by governments arguing that private action was more effective. This challenged the very basis of much of the earlier development administration.

Critiques of the role of the state in development were also forthcoming from more political economists. The latter saw third world bureaucracies setting out to socially engineer their way out of poverty by providing basic needs, which they castigated the market for failing to do. While aware of the limitations of market mechanisms\* however, they were less inclined to consider "the inherent limitations of an imperfect bureaucracy" or the suitability of their states as Vehicles for the public good (Lai 1983:103,108). In short, the assumption that there is a public interest, which states will be competent to identify and willing to serve, took a battering on all fronts.'

This created the political space for a reform agenda, which in the area of development administration has focused, as already mentioned, on bureaucratic reform. While "market failure" had long been a rationale for government intervention, now "government failure" became an increasingly widely used term,. The basis for this was seen in the dismal results of state organised production, the inefficiencies in the implementation of development programmes and the domination of public agencies by the private interests of their senior officials.

The response of the US development administration commentators was to call for "system-wide transformation", so as to make administration a fit instrument for carrying out social and economic policies and achieving the socio-economic goals of development" (Hope 1984:79-80). This does little to address the cynicism regarding the role of the state and in practice seems to suggest that what works in the US will work anywhere. With some sensitivity to this criticism, citizen participation may be seen as a pragmatic, rather than an ideological, strategy for improving the development process (Bryant and White 1982:211). In practical terms the decentralisation of bureaucracies seems a means of improving participation, and there is some empirical evidence that this has brought development administrators closer to citizens encouraging greater understanding and co-operation (Covyers 1983:98-101). An even more pragmatic argument for the benefits of participation is that it improves the strategic "fit" between beneficiary needs and programme objectives so that participation facilitates implementation because motivation to build and exploit the benefits is stronger when participants have agreed on a course of action (Paul 1983:95-6).

Indeed, for the more political economists the antidote for the failures of state intervention was "public action ....(defined as) a matter of participation of the public in the process of social change" (Dreze and Sen 1989:259). "While public action may not be for public benefit and is almost invariably motivated by sectional interest, the pluralist assumption has its own implications as to the role of the state as an impartial umpire above the squabbles of competing groups. The public action approach meets this objection with the view that the state can be reformed or "reversed" (Chambers 1988). This would be achieved by reforming the operation of administrative agencies. Bureaucracies would be decentralised so that they were closer to the communities they "ought" to serve and they would be diversified so that they, reflected more accurately community variety. At a more micro level this type of bureaucratic reform would enhance the status of front line staff, create control systems which encourage interaction with service users and localise both control and resource allocation (Mackintosh 1992:85ff).

Such an approach has played a part in the reaction to policies of economic rationalism in Britain (LEWRG 1979), where political traditions add some credence to the pluralist assumptions concerning the role of the state. It is hard to see it working in environments in which people lack the freedom and organisational experience to exert pressure on state agencies or indeed where the state agencies themselves have a tradition of legitimacy not based on European political theory.

The point is that historically the institutional concomitant of development administration as "a carrier of injurious ideas" has been the creation of state agencies charged with development responsibilities (Fainsod 1963:2). As the performance of these agencies proved disappointing, development administration commentators stressed the need to enlarge the capacity of government (Riggs 1971:73) identifying "the mobilisation of bureaucratic Skills for speeding up the development process" as essential (Garcia-Zamor 1973:422).

The assumption that development administration would be successful did not take serious account of the fact that many projects at both micro and macro levels simply failed (Quah 1979:25-36). For their part the neo-classical economists urged the abandonment of the central role of state agencies. In practice, however, such recommendations tended to be subject to the

"orthodox paradox" (Kahler 1990) in which the supremacy of financial, as against spending, ministries resulted in the straightening of some core state functions as the executive branch of government gained enhanced control over key economic variables. Meanwhile the development administration theorists stressed equity (Berg 1988), the perceived failures of the neo-classical economists (Toye 1987) and noted the return of the state as a central player (Evans et al.1985).

What then can be taken from this general discussion of the character of development administration, which may assist in establishing a role within it for human resource management? Four points seem to stand out:

1. development administration is achievement oriented, progressive and involves change;
2. development policy is a process involving a symbiosis of policy making and implementation;
3. the nature of state power and its forms in particular countries will have a determinative impact;
4. the growth of administrative capacity is crucial to the chances of successful policy reform.

## **HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN DEVELOPMENT**

Human resource management, for its part, is also fundamentally concerned with achieving change. Like development administration, human resource management is best regarded as a field of interest involving analytical tools and perceptions drawn from many disciplines economics, sociology psychology, political science and law being among the more obvious. From a management point of view the focus of human resource management is not at the macro level of social change but at the micro level of organisational innovation, with its core interest relating to the use of human resources within organisations in the most efficient, effective and productive manner.

On one hand this involves a development from a limited personnel function which sees management concerns with personnel elevated into a more strategic concept of the role of employees in achieving the objectives of the organisation. So, for instance, the personnel issue of individual performance is transformed, under a human resource management approach, into a strategy of overall workforce motivation and productivity. This in turn takes human resource management into two other areas of traditional management focus: organisational behaviour and industrial relations. An effective strategy for achieving organisational objectives through innovative management of employees will obviously involve organisational behaviour concerns such as organisational design and culture as well as industrial relations issues such as decision-making, workforce participation, grievance procedures and dispute settlement.

So from a management point of view human resource management involves a "strategic contingent" approach to' management of employees integrated with the objective of the organisation (Gardner and Palmer 1992:5-6). For a development administration committed to the

achievement of certain goals there is clearly a potential overlap with human resource management/in the area of improving functional efficiency. In particular, bureaucratic reform — especially where development objectives are clearly stated as the motivation for change appears at face value to share much with the strategic contingent human resource management approach.

On the other hand there are also broader policy implications which give such an approach an additional area of potential overlap with the concerns of development administration. These involve the issue of labour policy in general and the institutional arrangement required for the achievement of economic development objectives. In this regard it may be that the micro focus of human resource management on the strategic role of employees in the achievement of organisational objectives also has macro applications in relation to the role of workers in the achievement of national development objectives. It is noticeable that those nations which have achieved high levels of economic development have also been characterised by labour force commitment to productivity. So the "East Asian miracle" (World Bank 1993) is not just a miracle of policy or even of management. It is also a miracle of labour and employment relations.

Recent academic commentary on the role of labour in this process has been influenced by the perception that labour subordination" is the neglected reality of this economic growth (Deyo 1989) and a collection of Asia-Pacific regional country studies provide numerous examples of this position (Frenkel 1991). In general this scholarship sees itself as radical and sometimes as Marxist. The dilemma it faces in respect of worker behaviour is the same faced by Marx. Just as western European workers did not rush to join the socialist revolution he predicated, so Asian workers have accepted a level of managerial control which bemuses some non-Asian commentators. The traditional Marxist response to this situation is the concept of "false consciousness". The radical industrial sociologists have a more sophisticated view involving the concepts of pragmatic acceptance of the harsh realities of industrial life. But the impression remains that they are deeply disappointed that workers do not behave as they would like them to. A typical response of the industrialising elites to such intellectual criticism has been that for the majority of people in the region having work at all is something of a miracle and if the means of providing it infringes notions of political correctness derived from European political theory that is not too much of a problem (Goh 1977)

The point, however, is that one way or another labour policy has played a vital part in the achievement of this most spectacular economic growth. If other nations are to emulate this, they will need not only to get the macro economic settings right. They will also need to establish their own arrangements which allow the development of a committed workforce willing and capable of partnering capital in the achievement of economic development. At both the macro level of labour policy and at the micro level of organisational management labour relations scholarship has a contribution to make.

## **LABOUR RELATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT**

Since the end of the Second World War a considerable literature has developed purporting to address the labour relations experience of countries seeking to achieve economic development. In its initial period it was the work of North American and European

commentators who cast themselves in the role of advisers to governments and managers in such nations . This association of scholarship with operational need has had a similar impact to that observed earlier in this paper in respect of the same conjunction in the field of development administration. It resulted in a highly prescriptive literature, which neglected the process by which current systems and practices have come into being. In terms of labour policy this poor scholarship has failed to develop an analytical methodology and even overlooks the definition of commonly used terms. I have argued elsewhere that this has provided a poor basis upon which to evaluate actual experience of labour relations within a development context and has served to entrench assumptions based on experience in "developed" nations (Hess 1986:226).

One of the earliest and most systematic attempts to relate a broad theory of economic development to labour relations was that of the American^ commentators Kerr, Dunlop, Harbison and Myers (1962). Their starting point was the impressive and unexpected performance of the economy of the USA in the 1950s. Continued growth rates and accompanying industrial peace encouraged them to predict "a world wide society of pluralistic industrialism" in which the obvious benefits of industrialism would allow industrialising elites to lead their less enlightened fellow citizens along a path sign-posted by these commentators themselves (Kerr et al. 1962: 2ff). Popular US authors such as the economist J.K. Galbraith and the sociologist Daniel Bell agreed that industrial conflict was a thing of the past and that the future of development lay in workers and employers sharing the aims and benefits of increased productivity (Galbraith 1962:262, Bell 1996 0:375). The impact of this consensus was enormous with the "propagation of a model" becoming the norm in labour policy for "developing" countries (Windmuller 1963:569). In this regard the International Labour Organisation (ILO) played a significant role presenting the governments undertaking policies of development with a set of conventions and recommendations which were often adopted in lieu of a coherent policy or even alongside contradictory practice (Shafi 1960:320).

In specific terms the model for the development of labour policy offered by the industrialism approach was extremely optimistic on the question of workforce support for development and saw the real need as being the establishment of institutions to express, what was from this perspective, the established fact of co-operation. So the underlying problem in the transition from a traditional to an industrial society is not the adaptability of man. His capacity and eagerness for change is infinitely greater than is commonly recognised. The more fundamental factor is the suitability and adaptability of institutions (Kerr et al 1962:185-6).

For the ILO this has meant principally the establishment of a "web of rules" which would codify employment practices and legitimise the state's continued intervention as the impartial third party between management and labour. The case of Pakistan in the early 1980s as presented by Schregle was typical:

The emphasis of the labour policy ... was on sound and healthy relations between employers and workers as a prerequisite for the productivity and industrial peace which was considered essential for economic progress (Schregle 1982:6).

The ILO's attachment to tripartism has not, however, been shared in practice by the majority of such governments and the relevance of Pakistan as an example in this respect seems particularly inappropriate. Most notably the incorporation of organised labour into state decision-making has not been favoured by the most successful of the governments undertaking programmes of economic development. This points to the two central weaknesses in the arguments of those who have urged tripartism as a norm of labour policy. On one hand workers have not automatically been the enthusiastic partners in development which this approach assumes. On the other hand many newly independent states have sought even more direct control over organised labour than their colonial predecessors.

To look at it from another angle, industrialising elites have often had resort to the most punitive sanctions to create the conditions for worker co-operation. Where this has been successful, as in Singapore and China, it has often been achieved under strong state organisation (Fong and Cheng 1978 Hearn 1977). This echoes the political scientists' argument that strong or populist states are more likely to be able to implement policies because of their ability to crush or incorporate real or potential opposition. While recent studies of the implementation of reform policies have "found little evidence for a relationship between economic reform and political authoritarianism" (Bates and Krueger 1993:459), in labour policy both the forcible exclusion of worker organisation from the decision-making process and the physical elimination of active members have been seen as effective in terms of reducing labour opposition to development policies (Angell 1972:79, Armstrong and Shenk 1982)

There are also, however, examples of incorporation as a successful strategy. From the populism of the Peronist regime (Baily 1967:151) to the more accommodative arrangements adopted in more recent years in Singapore (Leggett 1993:243), there is a line of commentary which stresses the benefits to labour policy and economic policy in general of bringing workers and their organisations to the bargaining table. Recent commentary of this sort avoids the older ILO assumption of tripartism as a self-evident political good and presents more subtle arguments regarding the effect of particular union structures on overall economic performance (Standiig 1992). It shares with the earlier commentary, however, a difficulty of fact: the majority of governments adopting policies of economic development have not accepted an accommodative approach in anything other than rhetoric.

It may well be that preferences in this matter have as much to do with timing as with ideology. As economies develop and employ more highly skilled labour the prospects for accommodative arrangements seem to increase. Citing examples from nations as different as Singapore, Thailand, the Philippines and Malaysia, Sharma posits the changing level of industrialisation as the most likely cause of alterations in relationships between organised labour and the state. So in a newly independent nation, principally involved in primary commodity production with an unlimited supply of labour, unions are likely to pursue political rather than economic goals and the nationalism of independence is likely to create a co-operative atmosphere. As an economy develops, shortages of skilled labour will create conditions favourable to the growth of economic unionism at the same time as governments are under pressure to contain wages and inflation to stimulate local savings and investment. This is the classic conflict situation. Finally, a yet higher stage of industrialisation may produce a more

favourable climate for foreign investment, permit wage increases and allow the sort of guided collective bargaining observed in Singapore (Sharma 1991:94).

At the macro level of national policy then it appears that the potential for the application of human resource management insights is yet to be realised. What is clear enough is that further research is needed on the nature of the arrangements which have contributed to a shared commitment to productivity in those nations where this has been observed and on the factors which have inhibited such labour/management co-operation in those nations where it is not a characteristic of economic activity.

### **MANAGING ORGANISATIONS IN DEVELOPMENT**

It is, however, at the micro level of organisational strategy that human resource management has had the greatest appeal. Here it is associated with a range of efforts to improve management, between which it is difficult and unnecessary to differentiate in terms, for instance, of which constitutes organisational behaviour, with industrial relations and so on." The distinguishing feature of human resource management approaches is to be found in the strategic value they assign to human resources.

In its simplest form this approach is merely an extrapolating of Adam Smith's view that economic activity is ultimately a private matter. Just as the unnecessary intervention of the state is seen as an impediment to enterprise in general, so the intrusive supervision of a managerial hierarchy is viewed as counter-productive to productivity within an organisation. From "above" this involves the realisation that no manager or supervisor has all the wisdom necessary to guiding each individual worker. From "below" it centres on the view that "if workers are trained properly and granted some autonomy, they will reach the best possible decisions about how. best to do their jobs" (Ouchi 1989:8).

There are many permutations of this approach with US scholars particularly having focussed on the technical aspects of industrial organisation in line with the scientific management school pioneered by F.W. Taylor. Typical of the dead ends into which this obsession with detail has led is the decades of attachment in US schools of management to multivariate statistical analysis of organisational structure exposed by Lammers (1974). The more recent view is that the US scholarship has misunderstood both Smith and Taylor. It misses the power of Smith's insight regarding the motivation of economic activity and hence fails to realise the potential for improving the quality of work-related decisions offered by participative management practices. The nature of Taylor's contribution is itself the topic of considerable controversy with recent scholarship revising previous over-emphasis on the technical features of scientific management in favour of a focus on cultural and even philosophical elements of Taylor's views (Taska 1992; Warner 1994). The point of this is that while the technical features of scientific management have been rendered outdated by technological change, the cultural and philosophical elements of Taylor's views remain powerful in underlying management attitudes and are often, incorrectly, quoted as legitimising reactionary practices.

The implications of this debate for human resource management practice are in some ways parallel to those gained from sociological literature regarding the nature of organisations

and the concepts of organisational culture and power. A principle difficulty in reforming the way in which organisations operate remains the fact that management is likely to be more pre-occupied with its own status and power than with enhancing productivity. This provides echoes of the economists' complaint that good policy is often not put into practice because it offends vested interest. As has been found in Australia in the last decade micro economic reform which focuses on work practices will also face "irrational" opposition.

So the very fact that a human resource management approach is likely to come to organisations as part of a process of restructuring means that it will offend some managers and supervisors, especially where they have not been part of the decision to change. A brief review of the aspects which are most likely to cause such offence will also serve as an overview of the major elements involved in a human resources approach to organisational reform.

The first is in the design of the organisation itself. Here a strategy which emphasises the contribution to be made by human resources clearly implies the efficiency of flatter management structures. Hierarchy is seen as a hindrance to productivity precisely because it places many layers of control between employees and management and thus separates operational and strategic considerations. Far from being an exercise in "rational authority" in the Weberian sense, such hierarchy is seen as principally concerned with the maintenance of power structures. In terms of development administration the removal of layers of supervision also has implications for a closer relationship between policy making and implementation. Some labour relations literature, however, goes beyond this in urging not just that function and direction be brought closer together but that they be integrated through various means of workers participation in decision making (Davis and Lansbury 1986). The implications of this for bureaucratic organisation are enormous but the fact that it has had an impact on the efficiency of even Australian state owned enterprises should give those who dismiss it pause for thought (Davis and Lansbury 1988).

A human resource centred approach to skill formation will similarly have a far-reaching impact on organisational structure. In traditional management approaches this would be dealt with in terms of pre-employment training and there is a well developed literature in human resource planning and human resource development which emphasises the role of the state in providing such education, the gradual spread of more sophisticated approaches is seen in the fact that post-employment training has gained so much ground in recent years. The advantage to management is in a more skilled and more flexible workforce while for employees gains may be seen in the area of personal satisfaction and career paths. Dore's comparison between the approaches to training of Japanese and western companies establishes training as a touch stone of the adoption of a strategy based on the most efficient use of human resources (Dore 1973:264), while Yamashita's observation that "there is no rest from training for the Japanese employee at any level" (Yamashita 1989:42), shows just how central a tool of management skill formation has become, in what was for so long the world's most successfully growing economy.

The role of skill formation and career paths within an organisation has also been seen as playing a substantial part in the motivation of employees. As with organisational design, the literature in this area has a technical and a social strand. On the technical side much effort has been expended in developing the ability to measure productivity accurately. This has even been

the case in industries such as health and education in which the qualitative nature of the product makes the very effort to gain precise measurement controversial. The difficulty is that no matter how logical the methodology, that conclusions are biased by subjective judgement either in the assumptions or in the interpretation of data (Livy 1975:20). This means that shared objectives which would enable these judgements to be implemented are almost impossible (Thomason 1980:45). In such cases it comes down to a matter of judgement and in the human resource management approach, this places the manager in the untenable position of judging the personal worth of his subordinates, and of acting on those judgements. No manager possesses nor could he acquire, the skill necessary to carry out this responsibility effectively (McGregor 1987:69).

A more sociological approach to this issue is seen in the quality management literature, which stresses system performance and condemns the obsession with measuring individual performance as one of management's "deadly diseases" (Deming 1986:98).

The general proposition, however, remains and those who follow a human resource strategy for management claim that it has the potential for transforming an indolent workforce into one which shares the productivity aims of managements. Put in this form the human resource management equation seems to be based on the assumption that it is management which has set the agenda and that therefore human resource management practices are simply a means of gaining employee compliance with pre-established management objectives. So the whole exercise is seen as a charade or a confidence trick. It is undoubtedly true that much reform presented under the banner of human resource management is simply a legitimisation of traditional managerial control in which the more things change the more they stay the same, particularly with respect to questions of control.

There are, however, examples of situations in which the shared aims have been achieved through real accommodation. In practical terms this depends heavily upon the attitudes of management and only in a few countries has this been the subject of systematic study. The general conclusion of such research as has been conducted appears to be that the potential erosion of managerial prerogatives remains the major obstacle (Gardner and Palmer. On the other hand, even the strongest trade union movements have only been able to achieve "bargaining at the margins" of managerial authority. By contrast some organisations adopting a strategic approach to human resources have seen a genuine diminution of such authority in favour of more participative practices over a period of time (Cupper 1976,1977,1980). There is a debate as to whether it is rigidities in the production system or philosophical commitment (Palmer 1983:31-35) which motivates management to take employees into their confidence. Either way there is clearly a need for more and more systematic study of the effects of such schemes over time. While there are now case studies of such situations in the US, Europe, Japan and even Australia, there are problems in this area of scholarship. One is that the applied micro nature of the work it entails means that organisations must be prepared to allow researchers access to intimate details of their operations. Few have been willing to do this, especially where they regard their management strategy as central to their competitive success.

Another is the issue of applicability across cultures. Most of the human resource models available in the literature originate in the US or Japan. It is unclear whether these practices will transfer to other environments. Certainly Philippines scholars report that Japanese firms

operating in their country do not replicate their home based labour management strategies (Amante et al. 1992) and there are simply too few studies of local management practices to make any conclusion about the actual effect of human resource management in most countries undergoing economic development.

This is despite the fact that human resource management has been on the agenda of newly industrialised countries since the early 1980s. Wilkinson and Leggett report that the populist management literature of this period with its emphasis on this approach (Vogel 1979; Ouchi 1981; Peters and Waterman 1982), was "compulsory reading for Singapore's technocrats" (Wilkinson and Leggett 1985:15). What they don't elaborate on is how much effect this had. It is interesting, however, that in the highly interventionist environment of the newly industrialised country, the state played a major role in management training in which "human resource management became a buzz word" (Leggett 1993:f/n9) and presumably saw it in the context of a traditional state role in human resource development.

In summary, then there would appear to be plenty of potential for human resource management practices to play a role in organisations in developing countries. At this stage there is insufficient research to enable firm judgement as to the effect this is having. This is not aided by the status of the more populist literature in the newly industrialised countries, where the language of human resource management plays a large part in the rhetoric of management but is not complemented by detailed micro level research to establish its actual impact.

## CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper has been to locate' a role for human resource management within the field of development administration. Since the latter is at least partly about public sector management there is a high degree of overlap and a number of avenues through which this objective could be realised. The most general area is that of the need for reform of bureaucratic structures and the growth of administrative capacity this reform seeks to address. In the development reform policy debate, most attention has been focused on macro-economic policy and how to get "good policy" adopted through particular political structures. Bates and Kreuger's recent collection of case studies provides material on the difficulties of this from the perspectives of both economics and political science, emphasising the dilemma that good policy is not always good politics (Bates and Kreuger 1993:454ff).

Even where that situation is resolved, however, an additional problem arises. Even where there is broad support for a particular policy direction, implementation is likely to fail unless congruent micro-level reforms are also achieved. In practical terms this comes down to precisely the sort of organisation-level issues addressed in the human resource management literature. These can be tackled piecemeal, and usually are, as management reacts to particular crises. An organisational strategy based on human resource management can integrate such responses in systematic way so that they flow logically from an organisation's overall orientation. In terms of winning employee support, this has obvious advantages. If it is true that means of reform will determine its ends, such a co-operative approach at the workplace has potential beyond the particular organisation.

The current dilemma of development administration, that good policies are known in theory but not implemented in practice, will not be resolved by policy debate. It can only be resolved by the actions of people within organisations. This article argues that a human resources strategy has a lot to say about how that might best be done. A judgement about the details of the application of such a strategy in situations of economic development is, however, currently constrained by lack of appropriate research on the operation on organisations, the approach of management and the record of schemes of reform.

## REFERENCES

Amante, Maragtas, Marie, S.V., Aganon E. and Rene E. Ofreneo, Japanese Industrial Relations Interface in the Philippines, School of Labour and Industrial Relations, University of the Philippines, Quezon City,

Angell, A. (1972), Politics and the Labour Movement in Chile, Oxford University Press, London.

Armstrong, R. and Shenk, J. (1982), El Salvador: The Face of Revolution, London, Pluto Press.

Baily, S. (1967) Labour, Nationalism and Politics in Argentina. New Brunswick. Bates, Robert H. and Anne O. Krueger (1993), Political and Economic Interactions in Economic Policy Reform: Evidence From Eight Countries, Blackwell, Cambridge Mass,

Bell, Daniel (1960), The End of Ideology, Glencoe, Illinois.

Berg, Elliot (ed) (1988),- Policy Reform and Equity : Extending the Benefits of Development, Institute for Contemporary Studies; San Fransisco.

Bryant, Coralie and White Louise, G. (1982), Managing Development in the Third World, Westfield Press, Boulder, Colo.

ibers, R. (1988), "Bureaucratic Reversals and Local Diversity", IDS Bulletin 19 (4): 50-56.

Covyers, Dinna (1983), "Decentralisation: the Latest Fashion in Development Administration", Public Administration and Development, 3(2), pp-97-109.

Cupper, Les (1976), "Worker Participation in the Dynavac Organisation", Journal of Industrial Relations, 21(1), pp.51-62.

Davis,\*Ed and Lansbury, Russel D, (eds) (1986), Democracy and Control in the Workplace, Longman, Cheshire Melbourne.

Davis, Ed and Lansbury F^ijssel D. (1988), "Consultative Council in Qantas and Telecom: a Comparative Study", Journal of Industrial Relations, 30(4): 546- 565.

Doming, W. (1986), Out of Crisis, frfrT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Deyo, Frederick C. (1989), *Beneath the Miracle: Labour Subordination in the New Asian Industrialism*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

Dore, R. (1973), *British Factory: the Origins of National Diversity in Industrial Relations*, Allen and Unwin, London.

Dreze, J. and A. Sen (1989), *Hunger and Public Action*, Calrendon Press, Oxford.

Evans, Peter, Rueschmeyer, Dietrich and Sftocpol, Theda (eds) (1985), *Bringing the State Back In*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Fainsod, Merle, (1963), "The Strucutre of Development Administration", in Irving Swerdlow (ed), *Development Administration: Concepts and Problems*, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse N.Y.

Fong, P.E. and Cheng, L. (1978), "Changing Patterns of Industrial Relations in Singapore", in E.Kassalow and U.G. Damachi (eds), *The Role of Trade Unions in Developing Societies*, International Institue of Labour Studies Geneva: 32-50.

Frenkel, Stephen (Ed) (1993), *Organised Labor in the Asia-Pacific Region: a Comparative Study of Trade Unionism in Nine Countries*, ILU Press, Ithica

Galbraitrj J.K. (1992), *The New Industrial State*, Hamish Hamilton, New York.

Garcia-Zamor, Jean-Claude, (1993), "Micro-Bureuacracies and Development Administration", *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 39(4): 417- 423.

Gardner, Margaret and Palmer, Gill (1992), *Employment Relations: Industrial Relations and Human Resource Management in Australia*, Macmillan, Melbourne.

Geddes, Barabara (1992), *The Politicians'Dilemma: Reforming the State in Latin America*, University of California Press, Bekeley and Los Angeles,

Goh, Keng Swee (1977), *The Practice of Economic Growth*, Federal Publications, Singapore .