

Attitudes and Development: The District Administration in Tanzania

Author(s): Louis A. Picard

Source: *African Studies Review*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (Dec., 1980), pp. 49-67

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/523671>

Accessed: 22-02-2016 23:06 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Cambridge University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *African Studies Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

ATTITUDES AND DEVELOPMENT: THE DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION IN TANZANIA

Louis A. Picard

At the heart of the development process, insofar as it involves governmental activity, is the attitude of the administrator who is supposed to carry out that policy. An administrator who is not committed to a policy can either simply ignore it, or if the policy seems threatening, actively work to sabotage it. In the final analysis, it is the administrator in the field who must act as the lightning rod in the linking of policy planning in the center to policy implementation in the rural district.

Development policy in Tanzania depends particularly upon the aptitude and the attitude of the district level administrator. Tanzanian socialism, with its emphasis on self help and cooperative effort, must be accepted by civil servants in the districts and regions who may be skeptical of much of the thrust of development policy. Heirs to an elitist administrative tradition, the Tanzanian district officer and his staff may have little financial incentive to implement a policy of egalitarianism which has at least some emphasis on the redistribution of wealth.

This study focuses on the issue of administrative attitudes in an attempt to determine to what extent the administrative and political changes which have occurred in Tanzania have been accepted at the district level. This article will first examine the attitudes of a select group of Tanzanian district level administrators and then compare these attitudes with those of their closest colleagues at the district and at the regional level. Focus will be on the role of the district development director and his administrative staff, whose primary function since 1972 has been to implement Tanzania's rural development program. The role of the district administrator, his relationships with functional staff and party cadres, and his perception of the role of the field administration in the development process will be the major foci of attention.

TANZANIA'S ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY

The attitudes of Tanzanian administrators must be seen against the backdrop of decentralization which occurred in Tanzania in 1972. Thus a brief survey of administrative developments in Tanzania since independence is in order.¹ At independence, Tanzania's field administration, like the rest of British Africa, was prefectorial in nature with a district and a provincial commissioner at the head of its two levels of regional administration. will be the major foci of attention.

Almost immediately after independence, in line with the developing ideology

African Studies Review, vol. XXIII, no. 3, December 1980

of Tanzania's elites (Pratt, 1976), President Nyerere decided to politicize the field administration by making the regional and district administrators political appointees and renaming the positions, respectively, regional and area commissioner.² Each of these political appointees was to be assisted by a civil servant, called the regional administrative secretary and area secretary, respectively. The goal was to ensure TANU (Tanganyika African National Union) party control over the civil service at the regional and district level, and to "challenge the historically dominant government bureaucracy at regional and district level and to ensure popular participation there" (Finucane, 1974: 27). In order to ensure party control over the bureaucracy at the regional and district level, the commissioner would also hold the post of TANU party secretary, assisted by an executive secretary on the party side, who was a full-time official employed by the central organs of the party.

The 1967 Arusha declaration, which nationalized major economic activities in Tanzania, set the nation along the path toward a socialized economy.³ The Arusha declaration and the later 1971 TANU party reforms (Mwongozo) were both touted as attempts to ensure party control and popular participation at all levels of government. Yet the reality of administrative relationships in Tanzania as perceived by political elites was quite different.

By 1970 a number of patterns had begun to appear in Tanzania's administrative structures. Both party and government elites perceived a number of bottlenecks in the system. The problem was thought to be structural, and the organizational structure of the administration slowed down or stopped all areas of post-Arusha economic and political policy as well as efforts at party control over the bureaucracy.

President Nyerere and other party leaders focused on several areas of concern, but the most important of these was the excessive and continuing centralization of decision-making in Tanzania. As Nyerere put it in his speech on decentralization:

District and Regional Officials . . . find all their ideas—and their enthusiasm—buried in the mass of papers flowing backwards and forwards to Dar es Salaam. For at present these officials have, in reality, very little local power. They have to consult the Ministries in Dar es Salaam for almost everything they wish to do, and certainly about every cent which they wish to spend. (Nyerere, 1972: 1)

Throughout the period since independence more and more decision-making had occurred at the center, with little discretion at the district and regional level (Picard, 1980).

President Nyerere announced the decentralization scheme in January of 1972.⁴ Structurally, decentralization meant a number of changes both in the district and in the region. Under the new arrangements, central government would employ all staff, even those working locally in the district or region. This meant that local government was completely abolished as a separate entity. The political commissioner in the district and region would remain in overall charge of the area but the administrative and area secretaries would be replaced by regional and district development directors (RDDs and DDDs). The development director would be the chief executive officer in the district and region and the position would also replace the old district council executive officer, and the DDD would incorporate those functions into his area of responsibility. Three officers would assist the development director: a personnel officer, a planning officer, and a financial officer. A number of administrative officers would assist the three above-named officials. In addition, each development director would be responsible for eight functional managers who would replace the existing ministerial representatives in the field. The areas covered were to be health, education, agriculture and natural resources, water,

land development, public works, and village and cooperative development. Vertical communication between the functional manager and his ministry would be replaced by horizontal communication at the district level with the district development director who would pass on all information and instructions from the region. This district development team was seen to have a structure not unlike the existing central government in Dar es Salaam. Government would allocate money for the regions and through the regions to the districts for development projects at the local level. Officials hoped that a substantial part of the agricultural program as well as small industrial and commercial developments would be the direct responsibility of the districts and regions. Local level institutions would also deal with local roads, water supply, health, and primary education (Nyerere, 1972: 5).

To replace the abolished district councils, the government established new district development councils (DDCs) under the district administration. These were to be composed of the elected members of the former councils, plus the members of parliament in the district. Also included were the area commissioner and the members of the district development team (above). In theory, the DDCs were to be the public bodies responsible for the use of the new powers at the district level. In practice, policy-making would follow a three-stage process. The district administration and the functional managers would write development plans and financial policies, then submit them to the TANU district executive committee, the region, and from the region to the prime minister's office. The district development and planning committee would assist the functional managers and the development director in the planning process. This committee is made up of one-quarter of the elected councillors (no less than ten), plus the area commissioner and the district development director as chairman and secretary of the body, respectively. Other members include the local members of parliament plus staff and functional officers of the district team. Acting as an executive committee of the development council, this body, in which elected officials are in a minority, is the chief decision-making body at the district level.⁵

Government saw the major benefit derived from decentralization as administrative. Transfer of technical staff from functional ministries to the regional and district administration was designed to provide the kind of coordination which is often lacking in a more functional arrangement of authority in which communication patterns rest on networks which run between the various ministries in the capital and their regional staffs in the field.

The governments also hoped through their decentralization process to reorient the attitudes of civil servants away from administrative routines and toward development activities. As Nyerere (1972: 10) put it, "It is intended that all these district level officials, and the commissioners, should be required to think and act in terms of development, and not in terms of administration on the traditional civil service lines." Some ten years after independence, if Nyerere's inference was correct, administrators at the district and regional level had failed to reorient their activities toward development tasks and away from their more traditional administrative patterns.

A final goal, at least implicit in the decentralization process, was to ensure party control over the administrative sector at the district and regional level and with this party control at least a modicum of local level democracy. As Nyerere (1972: 12) pointed out in his decentralization message, "this decentralized system should increase the reality of democracy in our society because it brings power closer to the people—they will be in real contact with those persons in Government and

TANU who have responsibility for development in their area." Further, as Anthony Rweyemamu points out, throughout the discussion of the decentralization scheme in Tanzania "the new proposals for decentralization have been explained in terms of giving more power to the people" (Rweyemamu and Mwansasu, 1974: 122).

THE INTERVIEW BASE

How effective have the decentralization reforms been in reorienting Tanzania's district level administrators towards a concern for economic development and local level participation? In order to discern administrative attitudes toward decentralization in Tanzania this author interviewed seventy-three district level administrators in the newly created Dar es Salaam Region.⁶ The Dar es Salaam Region was formed as part of the decentralization process when government decided to abolish city and town councils and integrate their staffs into the regional and district administration structure. The region, carved out of the Coast Region in January of 1974, was divided into three districts: Temeke District to the south, Ilala District to the west, and Kinondoni District to the north. The decision to disincorporate Dar es Salaam and other Tanzanian cities was a conscious one taken in an attempt to integrate the urban areas with the surrounding rural countryside. The three districts in Dar es Salaam Region radiate away from the waterfront/city center area. Thus each district includes both rural and urban elements (Canadian International Development Agency, 1975: 1-5; Dar es Salaam Regional Administration, 1975b: 1-2). The purpose of this division of the city has been explained as follows:

This way it is to be hoped that the disparities which could develop between the two sectors (rural and urban), were the city to remain a separate district, will be minimized. It is the aim of this Plan to distribute the budget in such a way that the benefits of all future development will be felt throughout the region. (Canadian International Development Agency, 1975: 1)

Current population figures for the region are difficult to obtain, but one estimate put the 1975 population of greater Dar es Salaam at close to 700,000 people. Of these, 550,000 people live in the urban area (78 percent) while 150,000 people (27 percent) live in the rural sector. Kinondoni District, with 350,000 people, is the most densely populated of the three districts; Ilala, with 208,000 people, is the most urban of the three; while Temeke, with 150,000 people, is the most rural district.⁷

Those targeted for interview included respondents from the three district administrations and the Dar es Salaam regional administration (n=64). Beginning with the political commissioner and development director in each division, an attempt was made to meet with all relevant actors from both party and government within the administrative unit. The major problem turned out to be how to define the Tanzanian equivalent to the district officer. Of crucial importance is whether or not the area commissioner or the district development director is the direct "descendent" of the colonial district commissioner. Of course the position is, in effect, a bifurcated one with each of these positions falling heir to some of the DCs functions. Crucial to this discussion is whether or not one could follow the government or the party hierarchy when classifying interviews. After examining the district and regional administration, it was decided to focus on the administrative role set in the Tanzanian context, leaving all party officials in effect as significant of others. For purposes of analysis, three basic interview types are suggested:

1. *Administrative officers.* N=24. Included in this category of administrator are the regional and district development directors and staff officers. These include the planning officer, the personnel officer, and the financial controller. In addition, each staff officer has a number of administrative officers working as assistants to him. The staff officers and their administrative assistants have similar academic backgrounds (they are for the most part academic generalists or public administration majors with a smattering of people with local government experience).
2. *Party officials.* N=10. Included in this category are the regional and area commissioners acting in their capacity as TANU party secretary. In addition, the TANU party chairman and the party executive secretary in each district were interviewed when possible. Ten of the twelve people in this category in the Dar es Salaam Region were interviewed.
3. *Functional manager.* N=30. These are representatives of functional ministries in the district which have been decentralized. These include the district education officer, the district agricultural development officer, the district engineer, the district ujamaa and cooperative development officer, the district water development officer, the district natural resources officer, and the district health officer. In all cases their regional equivalents were also interviewed.

CLASSIFICATION OF RESPONSE

All respondents were interviewed using an open ended questionnaire which consisted of thirty-five questions. For purposes of analysis, there were two parts to the coding process. First, each question was divided into between nine and twelve categories of response with similar answers being awarded similar integers. Then, in order to determine administrative views toward development, responses were reclassified according to four types of response. These four ideal types of collapsed response are intended to determine the orientation of the respondent toward development responsibilities. These patterns of response are:

1. *Routine administration.* The administrator sees his responsibilities largely in terms of routine activities with goals largely defined in terms of office maintenance and district order.
2. *Support administration.* The administrator defines the need for development in the district but sees his own responsibility as supportive with the introduction of new ideas and development schemes as being external to his areas of responsibility.
3. *Development administration.*⁸ The administrator defines his responsibilities in an area largely in terms of the introduction of social and economic change within the district. Both activities and goals are non-routine and are designed to implement Tanzania's stated policy goals of self-help and cooperation.
4. *Praetorian administration.*⁹ The administrator sees his primary responsibility in terms of the maintenance of political control over an area and the means by which he maintains this control are non-routine in their implementation.

ADMINISTRATIVE ATTITUDES IN THE DISTRICT

At the crux of this study is the question of the extent to which the district level administrator can function as a development administrator. Tanzania's decentralization scheme was the culmination of a conscious attempt to change the attitudes of the administrative officer both through political education and a national ideology. Since independence, and particularly since the 1967 Arusha

declaration, the government and party leadership has emphasized the promotion of economic development. As Cranford Pratt has pointed out (1976: 249-251), the Tanzanian pattern of national self-reliance since Arusha has emphasized what Tanzanians could do for themselves in terms of increased productivity (always being careful that class formation was not an inadvertent side result). Decentralization would ensure that development goals were communicated below the regional and district levels. Thus the attitudes of administrators toward development would be crucial to the success of Tanzania's development policy.

ATTITUDES TOWARD DEVELOPMENT

Interviews with administrative and party officials in the Dar es Salaam Region show that Tanzania political elites have been only partly successful in their attempt to alter administrative attitudes. Table 1 (page 61) shows how administrators perceived the responsibility of the district administration in 1975. A number of administrators and their district level colleagues used generalized terms such as coordinator to describe their responsibility or stated that the district administration acted as the head of the district. However, only a third of the district level administrators and few of their colleagues volunteered that the district administration's primary responsibility was to promote economic development or introduce social change. A number of administrators believed that the administrator had become less important over the years since independence and had become subordinate to the political party, TANU. Not surprisingly this was the district administration's role as perceived by half of the party officials interviewed. A common response was that given by a TANU district chairman:

A big difference between the district administration before independence and now is that during colonial times, the DC could give government commands while today the district administration has to follow what the party decided. (Interview number 32)¹⁰

In order to more systematically examine the responses, Table 2 (page 61) converts these same responses to the development matrix. Here it becomes somewhat more apparent that administrators are not unaware of development needs. Almost three-fourths of all administrative officers saw some form of change as the major responsibility of the district administration which should take an active role in that process of change, either in support of others or as an activity of the district development office itself.

There is, however, some lack of role congruence between the administrative officer and his significant others. While six out of ten of the party leaders agreed that the district administration should take an active role in the development process, they not surprisingly stressed the district administration's responsibility for implementing TANU policy. More important, the technical field staff, now called functional managers under the decentralization scheme, remained unconvinced that the district administration should take an active role in the development process. Only two of those interviewed indicated that the district administration was responsible for the promotion of economic development and only a fifth of those interviewed said that development was the major responsibility of the district administration. Half of the functional managers mentioned routine activities as the major responsibility of the district office. Such a lack of congruence between party and administrative officials could have implications for the ultimate success of Tanzania's development policy.

To what extent should there be further emphasis on a development role for the

district officer in the future? Table 3 (page 62) provides administrative responses to this question. Interestingly, in spite of the emphasis on mobilization and social change in the rhetoric of Tanzania's political leadership (or perhaps in part as a result of it), few administrators, including administrative officers themselves, in response to this question, advocated a more active role for the district administration in the development process. Most believed that there was need for better administrative support for the development process which would presumably be carried out by others. After ten years of experimentation, apparently what administrators at the district level craved were administrative structures that provide for stability rather than change at the district level. As one development director put it, "We are at the stage of the 'shakedown' cruise of a new ship. Now we must get the wrinkles out of the administrative process" (Interview number 38).

Nonetheless when more specific questions were raised as to the needs and priorities of the districts, administrators were aware of developmental needs at the local level. Each respondent was asked what his perceptions of the needs of his district were. As Table 4 (page 62) demonstrates, productivity was seen by most administrators within party or government as being the top priority within the three districts of Dar es Salaam Region. Food production and small-scale industry (cooperatively based) were major items mentioned by administrators and have been the major emphasis of the official statements about Dar es Salaam Region in the three years since decentralization has occurred (Dar es Salaam Regional Administration, 1975a). Further, there was some perception of a role for the district administration in the development process. When asked what they believed were the public goals that the district administration should be presenting to people in their district, two-thirds of both administrators and party officials said that developmental goals should predominate. In response to another question, over a third of the respondents indicated that the implementation and promotion of development projects was a major priority of the district administration (Tabulation number 35).¹¹ Nor was there, when a specific question was raised, serious disagreement between the officer and his colleagues in the party and in functional positions. When asked about the role of the district administration in the implementation of development projects the response was as follows:

*Should the district administration take an active role in development projects?
(in percentages)*

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
Administrative Officers	67	33
Party Officials	77	23
Functional Managers	66	34

It should be noted, however, that specific questions such as the above may be somewhat less reliable than the more general responses noted above in that they tend to put the administration on the spot—a negative answer suggesting that the respondent is anti-development.

In approaching the role of the district level bureaucrat caution must be used in order to not over-exaggerate the ideal of a development oriented administrator. The reality of administrative behavior suggests that the bulk of any administrator's time will be spent in routine maintenance activity. The paper must continue to move, the clients must continue to be served (the long lines of citizens every day at district headquarters in Tanzania give testimony to this); the tranquility of the district needs to be maintained. There can be little doubt, however, that President

Nyerere's desire to shift the attention of district level administrative officers from routine administrative tasks to development projects has only partly succeeded, at least among officers in the Dar es Salaam Region. While it may be argued that the rhetoric of development is easier to document than development activity, particularly when this rhetoric dominates the political horizon as it does in Tanzania, studies elsewhere have shown a much lower level of sensitivity to the development needs of the districts among field administrators than is the case in Tanzania (Picard, 1977).

What is surprising in fact, in light of the development rhetoric which dominates Tanzania, is the amount of caution shown by Tanzanian administrators with respect to development administration. General questions, as this study has shown, do not elicit a development orientation among administrative officers in the district and regional development director's office. It is only when specific development-related questions are asked that the administrator, perhaps because of the nature of the questions, begins to define a developmental role for the district administration.

GENERALIST-SPECIALIST RELATIONSHIPS

One of the major goals of the decentralization scheme was to restructure the relationships between the district administration and specialist administrators. If respondents in the Dar es Salaam Region are correct, this has been the most successful part of the decentralization scheme. Among all categories of interviewees, there is acceptance of the authority of the district administration (headed by the district development director) over the functional managers. Of those interviewed, three-fourths of all administrative officers, all but one of the party officials, and two-thirds of all functional managers interviewed believed that the development director had direct authority over the functional managers. As one district engineer put it, "there is a direct relationship between the district development director and the functional manager. He's my boss. All policy and communication goes through him" (Interview number 7). When asked specifically what their authority relationship with the development director was, those interviewed responded:

	<i>Administrative Officer</i>	<i>Party Official</i>	<i>Functional Manager</i>
	<i>(in percentages)</i>		
District director has authority over me	75	14	95
District director has no authority over me	15	85	5
Other	10	---	---

Decentralization was designed to introduce other changes besides bringing the functional managers under the control of the district development director. Each of the administrators interviewed was asked what changes have occurred as a result of the decentralization reforms. As Table 5 (page 63) illustrates, there is a lack of consensus on this question. The single most important change noted was the increased authority that the development director had over other departments. Few of any category of respondent (other than party officials) noted much increase in participation or more decision-making at the local level. A third of all administrative officers said that there was no change three years after decentralization had been introduced.

Put differently, however, a pattern did develop among respondents. At the end of the interview the question was repeated in a slightly different form.

Administrators were asked what effect decentralization had on the district. When the question was asked in this way, 40 percent of all those questioned thought that the major effect upon the district was the increased capacity of government at the district level to mobilize people (Tabulation number 28).

Decentralization was not without its problems, as seen by the administration and the party cadres in the Dar es Salaam regional administration. Two major post-decentralization criticisms dominated. First, almost all administrative officers interviewed felt there was still too much red tape within the bureaucracy (Tabulation number 29). Six out of ten of the party officials concurred. As one district planning officer put it: "What used to get bogged down at the ministry level now is held up by the region" (Interview number 43). The same spokesman went on, "There continues to be a lack of cooperation between the development director and his staff officers on the one hand and the functional managers on the other hand. Lack of cooperation by functional managers continues to cause difficulties and the functional managers continue to offer resistance here" (Interview number 43).

The functional managers also have a major complaint about decentralization. Of the functional managers interviewed, 60 percent indicated that they believed that the main problem posed by decentralization was that it isolates the functional manager from his home ministry and his counterparts at the regional level. Functional managers see communication as a major problem. All letters must go through the development director or his staff. According to functional managers this in itself results in a severe bottleneck to development activity. According to one ujamaa and cooperative development officer:

In some ways decentralization has caused more problems than it has solved. Though decentralization is supposed to cut down on red tape in fact it has increased. There is much less vertical contact between the functional manager and his ministry. All correspondence must be sent ufs [under flying seal] to the development director. Most communication at the higher level gets lost or delayed. (Interview number 2)

There has been in fact some resentment over the fact that decentralization has placed the functional managers under the district and regional development director. Functional managers are particularly concerned that promotion and evaluation has been taken away from their home ministry (which, they believed, was better qualified to evaluate them) and has been turned over to the development director who they felt lacked this capacity. Functional managers, particularly, tended to resent the age difference between themselves and the younger staff officers who were without specialized training, and were often placed in authority positions vis-a-vis the functional managers. In addition, the salaries of functional managers are considerably less than those of university-trained staff officers. To quote the ujamaa and cooperative development officer again:

The problem is we (functional managers) get no promotion and we are getting resignations every day. People in the department are complaining that the way promotions are given is unfair. Too much emphasis is placed on educational qualifications. Young people just finished with school are occupying higher positions than we do. (Interview number 2)

ADMINISTRATIVE-PARTY RELATIONSHIPS

A further goal of the decentralization reforms was to clarify political-administrative relationships at the local level. Table 6 (page 63) illustrates administrative perceptions of who the most important people in the district are.

Interestingly, most party officials relate most closely to the district administration and administrative officers relate to functional managers. Functional managers, however, relate most closely to fellow technicians. Most significantly, few of those interviewed indicated that party or political elites were the most important people in the district. Few respondents in any category said that local party leaders were the most important people in the district. If these responses are indicative of administrative attitudes throughout the country, neither the Mwongozo party guidelines nor the decentralization reforms have as yet resulted in increased prestige for local party officials.

Those interviewed were asked specifically what they thought the relationship between TANU and the district administration was. Table 7 (page 64) shows some rather astonishing results. Over a third of all administrative officers and over half of all functional managers said that the party had no direct authority over the district administration. One Health Department official, in describing the responsibilities of the TANU district chairman, put it succinctly: "He is a party head only. He hasn't anything to do with government matters. He mainly deals with TANU affairs I think," (Interview number 29). Even more astonishing, seven out of nine of the party officials interviewed indicated that the party had no direct authority over the district administration.

Among those interviewed, a common response of administrators (a fourth of those interviewed) was that the role of the party was primarily that of mobilizing people into self-help activities. As one agricultural officer put it: "The most important way that we see the party helping us is that we utilize the party to assist the functional managers to mobilize the people for self-help to assist us to complete our development projects" (Interview number 11).

There is confusion as well among those respondents interviewed about the relationship between the commissioner and development director. When asked specifically what they thought was the relationship between the district development director and the area commissioner, a fourth of the administrative officers, a fifth of the party leaders, and almost a third of all functional managers saw them as equal, while only nine out of all those interviewed believed that the DDD rather than the area commissioner was the head of the district.

It might be said that it is the responsibility of the commissioner as party secretary to maintain control of the district administration. These interviews indicate, however, that the Tanzanian administrators interviewed have not yet accepted this relationship. Excluding the development directors who do believe that they have a direct relationship with the commissioner, fifteen out of twenty of the administrative officers interviewed and almost half of the functional managers felt isolated from the commissioner and few thought that there was any direct authority relationship between the commissioner and themselves (Tabulation number 26). By way of contrast, all of the party officials interviewed indicated that they were directly responsible to the commissioner. This tends to suggest that increasing the authority of the development director and shifting the responsibilities of the commissioner to party activities has resulted not in furthering the goal of increased party authority over the civil service but has tended to further isolate the commissioner and the party from the civil service at the district level and made him increasingly dependent upon the development director as the chief administrative officer in the district.

PARTICIPATION AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

The failure by administrators within the district to perceive any responsibility toward the local party leadership has implications in terms of President Nyerere's stated goals with regard to increased local level participation. District officials see the district development council, with its link to the party as well as the administration, as the agency which is to ensure, through its major committee, the district development and planning committee, that there is some popular control over the policy-making process at the district level. In effect, however, as we have seen in our discussion of party officials, the odds are stacked against the political representatives, particularly in the district development and planning committee, Table 8 (page 64) illustrates the problem further. Three-fourths of all administrators see the district administration dominating the development council and the development and planning committee which for many is little more than a rubber stamp for administrative policy.

District level administrators see the councillors and the chairman of the council (who is the TANU district chairman) as local party representatives. Administrative views toward the local party representatives were presented above (see Table 6, page 63). Two-thirds of those interviewed stated that the district party had no authority over the district administration. The attitude administrators have toward the local party elites is transferred to the district development council and the district development and planning committee. Few of those interviewed saw the development committee as an autonomous political actor. Almost a third of the administrative officers interviewed saw local political and party leaders as there primarily to mobilize the local people to take part in district or sub-district self-help schemes. The party is, in effect, a resource the administrator can draw upon in order to further bureaucratic goals. As one administrative officer put it, speaking specifically of the district development and planning committee:

The head of the management team, all staff officers and functional managers, meet ahead of time to evaluate the projects proposed for the district. We, the team of experts, decide which projects should be implemented. We, then, through the development director, present these projects to the development and planning committee for their formal approval. (Interview number 54)

As another administrative officer put it, in a moment of frankness, "The politicians don't really have the education to understand what we do." (Interview number 68)

CONCLUSION

Although the evidence is incomplete, this examination of the attitudes of administrators and party officials in Dar es Salaam indicates that the results of Tanzania's decentralization scheme as it affects administrative attitudes, have been at best mixed. Government and party leadership in Tanzania have, through long and determined effort since 1967, have been able to partly reorient the attitudes of administrative officers toward rural development at the district and sub-district level. Interviews with administrative officers as well as those who work with them indicate that they see the need for non-routine administrative activity aimed at the introduction of social change and the implementation of developmental goals.

Nonetheless, two caveats are in order. First, administrators and their colleagues at the district and regional level are reluctant to list development concerns at the top of their list of responsibilities. Indeed, considering the commitment of

political elites to development goals, it is surprising that administrative commitments to development are not greater. Second, abstract acceptance of ideals of rural transformation do not automatically transfer into behavior. There is some evidence that the goals of development administration are lost in the administrative routines of the Boma (Picard, 1980). In spite of these qualifications, however, the evidence does show some perception of the district administration taking an active role in development projects. Also, the decentralization process, by giving the development director authority over the functional managers, gives the DDD the authority to enter into the development process at any point that he wishes.

It might be suggested that the type of administration which exists in Tanzania most closely resembles that of the integrated prefectorial system of administration (Smith, 1967: 44-77). There is effective control of the functional managers by the district administration and autonomous district councils no longer exist. However, to the extent that the political goal of Tanzania has been to ensure that the political party provides an element of political control over the administrative cadres, evidence in the Dar es Salaam Region suggests that this effort has not been successful. Bureaucrats do not recognize party leadership at the district level as having direct authority over the district administration. The bureaucracy, at least at the district level, sees the party as an element to be ignored if possible, or to be used to carry out bureaucratic goals, if not.

Nor have the political reforms in Tanzania done much to create an adequate mechanism for ensuring popular participation in the development process. Although decentralization has, according to administrators, given the district administration more ability to mobilize the population toward development efforts, it does not seem to have brought greater participation down to the district level. The role of the political party continues to be perceived by administrators largely as an agent of mobilization for self-help rather than as a mechanism of popular control. As a number of administrators have pointed out, the district development council and the development and planning committee continue to be seen by many administrators as passive agents of the district administration.

While some administrators might pay lip service to party supremacy, Tanzania administrators continue to distinguish between administrative and political responsibilities and see party politicians as having certain tasks, usually not directly connected with development, which are separate from those dealt with by administrative officials. A standard response to an inquiry continues to be: "That is a political matter. The politicians handle that. Administrators have nothing to do with the political process" (Interview number 68). The corollary is of course that politicians should therefore have nothing to do with the administrative process of development.

TABLE 1
 Administrative Officers' Perceptions
 of District Administration Responsibility
 (in percentages)

Classification of Response	Administrative Type		
	Administrative Officer*	Party Official†	Functional Manager
Primarily that of administration and financial responsibility	4	--	10
District Administration acts as an arm of government	4	--	7
Position is primarily that of a coordinator	21	10	21
District Administration acts as the head of district	21	30	41
Responsibility is to promote economic development and introduce social change	33	10	7
Responsibility is to implement TANU development policy	17	50	14
Total	100	100	100
	N=24	N=10	N=29

* Includes development directors and staff officers.

† Includes commissioners.

TABLE 2
 Administrative Officers' Perceptions
 of District Administration Responsibilities
 (in percentages)

Classification of Response (Collapsed Categories)	Administrative Type		
	Administrative Officer*	Party Official†	Functional Manager
Routine Administration	25	30	51
Support Administration	21	10	21
Development Administration	50	60	21
Praetorian Administration	4	--	7
Total	100	100	100
	N=24	N=10	N=29

* Includes development directors and staff officers.

† Includes commissioners.

TABLE 3
 Administrative Perceptions of the Future
 of the District Administration in Tanzania
 (in percentages)

Classification of Response (Collapsed Categories)	Administrative Type		
	Administrative Officer*	Party Official†	Functional Manager
Routine Administration	8	--	--
Support Administration	79	60	60
Development Administration	4	20	20
Praetorian Administration	4	10	--
Other‡	4	10	20
Total	99	100	100
	N=24	N=10	N=28

* Includes development directors and staff officers.

† Includes commissioners.

‡ These respondents felt that either the position of development director or of commissioner should be abolished in order to avoid duplication.

TABLE 4
 Administrative Perceptions of District Needs
 (in percentages)

Classification of Response	Administrative Type		
	Administrative Officer*	Party Official†	Functional Manager
Financial needs	--	--	--
Physical development	12	10	13
Social change	21	30	21
Productivity	67	60	63
Other	--	--	4
Total	100	100	100
	N=24	N=11	N=28

* Includes development directors and staff officers.

† Includes commissioners.

TABLE 5
 Administrators' Perception of Changes in Policy-Making
 Which Have Occurred as a Result of Decentralization
 (in percentages)

Classification of Response	Administrative Type		
	Administrative Officer*	Party Official†	Functional Manager
More participation	13	30	21
More decision-making at the local level	8	20	21
More development	16	20	21
More authority over departments	29	30	25
No change	33	--	12
Total	99	100	100
	N=24	N=10	N=28

* Includes development directors and staff officers.

† Includes commissioners.

TABLE 6
 Administrative Perceptions
 of the Most Important People in the District
 in Terms of Political/Administrative Activities
 (in percentages)

Classification of Response	Administrative Type		
	Administrative Officer*	Party Official†	Functional Manager
District Administration	20	78	24
Functional Managers	61	11	62
Local party/Politicos	14	11	3
Local, ward, and division level officials	5	--	10
Total	100	100	100
	N=22	N=9	N=29

* Includes development directors and staff officers.

† Includes commissioners.

TABLE 7
Perceptions of the Relationship
between the Party and the District Administration
in Tanzania
(in percentages)

Classification of Response	Administrative Type		
	Administrative Officer*	Party Official†	Functional Manager
Party has no direct authority/ Advise only	39	70	52
Party is primarily there to mobilize people/No authority	28	--	24
Party has authority over the district administration/Party policy must prevail	33	30	24
Total	100	100	100
	N = 18	N = 10	N = 26

* Includes development directors and staff officers.

† Includes commissioners.

TABLE 8
Perceived Administrative Relationships
between the District Administration
and the District Development Council
(in percentages)

Classification of Response	Administrative Type		
	Party Officer*	Functional Official†	Manager
District Administration has authority over Council	70	33	75
District Administration has no authority over Council	25	67	25
Not clear—Tension exists between the two	4	--	--
Total	99	100	100
	N = 24	N = 10	N = 28

* Includes development directors and staff officers.

† Includes commissioners.

NOTES

Research for this article was carried out in conjunction with field work done in Tanzania in February and in September through December of 1975. The writer is grateful to the Office of the Prime Minister, Dodoma, and the University of Dar es Salaam for their cooperation in the undertaking of this research. My gratitude also goes to the Officers of the District and Regional Administration of Dar es Salaam Region for their cooperation. Funding was provided by the U. S. Office of Education under the Fulbright Fellowship.

An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, March 21-24, 1979, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

1. Discussions of Tanzania's development toward independence include Maguire (1969), Listowel (1968), Taylor (1963), Austen (1968), Bates (1962), Chidzero (1961) and Stephens (1968). For a discussion of developments since independence see Bienen (1970), Tordoff (1967), Finucane (1974), Pratt (1976), Dryden (1968), Svendsen and Tisen (1969), von Sperber (1970), Samoff (1974), Penner (1970), Rweyemamu and Mwansasu (1974), Ruhumbika (1974), Cliffe and Saul (1972; 1973), Reyemamu (1974), Ingle (1972), Hopkins (1971), Hyden (1969) and van Hukken and van Velsen (1972). This discussion is limited to the mainland area only and excludes the offshore islands which make up Zanzibar. It should be noted that the name of the political party in Tanzania was changed in 1977 to the Revolutionary Party. For purposes of continuity, during the period under consideration, the earlier name of the party, the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU) will continue to be used.

2. See Tordoff (1967), Dryden (1968), Penner (1970) and Finucane (1974) for discussions of this. See also Dryden (1967a and 1967b) and Warrell-Bowring (1963).

3. The primary source material is contained in Nyerere (1968).

4. See Rweyemamu and Mwansasu (1974) for a discussion of the background issues which led to the decentralization decision.

5. There is also a regional development committee which is made up of civil servants and councillors from the district development committees. See Picard (1980: 447-49) for a discussion of this.

6. Under the terms of the research clearance granted to this researcher, access was limited to only one of the district's eighteen regions at a time. After the research in Dar es Salaam Region had been completed, a second region, Arusha Region in the north of the country, was opened up. However, because of a shortage of time and funds it was not possible to take advantage of this additional research opportunity.

7. The following figures are from estimates used by the Dar es Salaam regional administration. They show an increase between 1973 and 1976 of from 530,000 to 700,000 people. The 1975/76 Dar es Salaam regional development plan puts the population at 537,000 people with 133,000 in the rural area (Dar es Salaam Regional Administration, 1975c: 1-4).

8. This category comes close to the concept of development administration as it is usually used. Development administration has been a major concern of academics since the early 1960s. For most writers on the subject, development administration means the "administration of planned change" (Panandiker, 1967: 201). Major works on development administration include Swerdlow (1963), Riggs (1970), Braibanti (1969), Montgomery and Siffin (1966), Hart (1967), Morgan (1974) and Hyden, Jackson and Okumu, (1970).

9. With apologies to Samuel P. Huntington (1968: 78).

10. Out of consideration for the respondents interviewed, each of the 73 interviewees have been given a code number. This code number will be cited each time an interviewee is quoted or cited.

11. When a tabulation is not reproduced in the text, reference is made to the original tabulation on file with the author.

REFERENCES

- Austen, Ralph A. (1968) *Northwest Tanzania under German and British Rule*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Bates, Margaret L. (1962) "Tanganyika," pp. 395-483 in Gwendolen M. Carter (ed.) *African One Party States*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Bienen, Henry. (1970) *Tanzania: Party Transformation and Economic Development*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Braibanti, Ralph. (ed.) (1969) *Political and Administrative Development*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Canadian International Development Agency. (1975) *Integrated Rural Development Plan*. Dar es Salaam.

- Chidzero, B. T. G. (1961) *Tanganyika and International Trusteeship*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Cliffe, Lionel and John S. Saul. (eds.) (1972) *Socialism in Tanzania: An Interdisciplinary Reader Vol. 1*. Nairobi: East Africa Publishing House.
- Cliffe, Lionel and John S. Saul. (eds.) (1973) *Socialism in Tanzania: An Interdisciplinary Reader Vol. 2*. Dar es Salaam: East African Publishing House.
- Dar es Salaam Regional Administration. (1975a) "Dar es Salaam Regional Development Plan—the Drought and Food Campaign." Dar es Salaam: mimeographed.
- Dar es Salaam Regional Administration. (1975b) *Mpanga wa Maendeleo wa Dar es Salaam*. Dar es Salaam: mimeographed.
- Dar es Salaam Regional Administration. (1975c) *Shughuli za Maendeleo, Mkoa wa Dar Es Salaam*. Dar es Salaam: mimeographed.
- Dryden, Stanley. (1967a) "Local Government in Tanzania, Part I" *Journal of Administration Overseas* 6 (April): 109-20.
- Dryden, Stanley. (1967b) "Local Government in Tanzania, Part II." *Journal of Administration Overseas* 6 (July): 165-78.
- Dryden, Stanley. (1968) *Local Administration in Tanzania*. Nairobi: East African Publishing House.
- Finucane, James R. (1974) *Rural Development and Bureacracy in Tanzania: The Case of Mwanza Region*. Uppsala, Sweden: Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.
- Hart, Henry C. (1967) *The Village and Development Administration*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.
- Hopkins, Raymond F. (1971) *Political Roles in a New State: Tanzania's First Decade*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Huntington, Samuel P. (1968) *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Hyden, Goran. (1969) *Political Development in Rural Tanzania*. Nairobi: East African Publishing House.
- Hyden, Goran, Robert Jackson and John Okumu. (eds.) (1970) *Development Administration: The Kenyan Experience*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Ingle, Clyde R. (1972) *From Village to State in Tanzania*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Listowel, Judith. (1968) *The Making of Tanganyika*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Maguire, Andrew G. (1969) *Toward "Uhuru" in Tanzania*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Montgomery, John D. and William F. Siffin. (eds.) (1966) *Approaches to Development Administration*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Morgan, E. Philip. (ed.) (1974) *The Administration of Change in Africa*. New York: Dunellan.
- Nellis, John R. (1972) *A Theory of Ideology: The Tanzanian Example*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Nyerere, Julius K. (1968) *Freedom and Socialism/Uhuru na Ujamaa*. Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press.
- Nyerere, Julius K. (1972) "Decentralization." Dar Es Salaam: Government Printer.
- Panandiker, Pai V. A. (1967) "Developmental Administration: An Approach," pp. 199-210 in Nimrod Raphaeli (ed.) *Readings in Comparative Public Administration*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Penner, R. G. (1970) *Financing Local Government in Tanzania*. Nairobi: East African Publishing House.
- Picard, Louis A. (1977) "Role Changes Among Field Administrators in Botswana: Administrative Attitudes and Social Change." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin: Madison.
- Picard, Louis A. (1980) "Socialism and Field Administrator: The Tanzania Example." *Comparative Politics* (July): 439-57.
- Pratt, Cranford R. (1976) *The Critical Phase in Tanzania, 1945-1968*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reyemamu, A. F. (1974) *Toward Socialist Planning*. Dar es Salaam: Tanzania Publishing House.
- Riggs, Fred W. (ed.) (1970) *Frontiers of Development Administration*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Ruhumbika, Gabriel. (ed.) (1974) *Towards Ujamaa: Twenty Years of TANU Leadership*. Nairobi: East African Literature Bureau.
- Rweyemamu, A. H. and B. U. Mwansasu. (eds.) (1974) *Planning in Tanzania: Background to Decentralization*. Nairobi: East African Literature Bureau.

- Samoff, Joel. (1974) *Tanzania: Local Politics and Structure of Power*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Smith, Brian K. (1967) *Field Administration*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Stephens, Hugh W. (1968) *The Political Transformation of Tanganyika, 1920-1967*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger.
- Svendsen, Erik and Merete Tiesen. (eds.) (1969) *Self-Reliant Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam: Tanzania Publishing House.
- Swerdlow, Erving. (ed.) (1963) *Development Administration: Concepts and Problems*. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.
- Taylor, F. Claggett. (1963) *The Political Development of Tanganyika*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Tordoff, William. (1967) *Government and Politics in Tanzania*. Nairobi: East African Publishing House.
- van Hakken, P. M. and V. E. T. van Velsen. (1972) *Land Scarcity and Rural Inequality in Tanzania*. The Hague: Moulton.
- von Sperber, K. W. (1970) *Public Administration in Tanzania*. Munchen: Weltforum Verlag.
- Warrell-Bowring, W. F. (1963) "The Reorganization of Administration in Tanganyika." *Journal of Local Administration Overseas* 2 (October): 188-94.