THE PARADIGMS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION RE-EXAMINED: A REFLECTION

*B.C. Basheka
Uganda Management Institute
Kampala, Uganda

ABSTRACT

Public administration scholarship of the 21st century has tended to focus more on recent paradigms of New Public Management (NPM) and its successor paradigm of governance while largely ignoring the strong foundation of century old paradigms of public administration. This approach, if persistently allowed in African universities, will create a serious knowledge deficit among the new crop of African scholars in the discipline of public administration. Where efforts have been made to consider the foundational paradigms of public administration through a historical trajectory, emphasis is again given to the evolution of public administration from American and European contexts, completely ignoring the indigenous African systems of administration. Yet, pre-colonial Africa had not only one but several systems of administration and governance structures that ought to be known by African students and scholars of public administration. In this author's view, our effort to re-examine the paradigms of public administration is an urgent one and as African scholars, we must equally reclaim the African traditional systems of administration in our scholarship. This article examines the paradigms of public administration and explores some of the indigenous systems of administration that need to be advocated for in the teaching of public administration. The purpose of the article is to reflect on how public administration as a field of study has shaped up, thereby enabling young scholars to appreciate the epistemological contexts of the discipline but also to re-examine how modern administrative challenges could be addressed by revisiting the old principles and practices which occupied the minds of the earliest scholars. Of course not all such principles and practices could be applied in addressing the current challenges. From the deflation of the politics–administrative dichotomy by Simon in 1946 and the puncturing of the science of administration by Dahl in 1947, the discipline of public administration has suffered a lack of a unified theoretical framework. The NPM at least tried to bring back this uniformity but this was short-lived and many scholars soon had to declare its death during the 1990s. The article first explores indigenous systems of administration and then re-examines the paradigms of public administration from the politics–administrative dichotomy (1887-1926), through the principles of administration (1927-1937), the era of challenge (1938-1947), the identity crisis (1948-1970), from public administration to public management (1970 to early 1990), from public management to governance (1990-2008) and to the new public governance debate (2010 to date).

INTRODUCTION

Administrators have been (and will possibly always be) an important ingredient of any social organisation since man began living in organised societies. There is hardly any activity surrounding the life of a human being that is not influenced directly or indirectly by activities of public administrators. As such, society must tolerate the increasing presence of public administrators in the lives of the citizens and universities must accelerate their efforts to produce a cream of public administrators who have appropriate values and competencies to serve the public diligently. The teaching must be approached from the foundations of both the theory and practice. Shafritz et al. (2011:214) remind us that civilisation and administration have always moved hand in hand. Since ancient times, a city was defined by the walls created for its defence. Once primitive tribes gathered in cities – when they became civilised – they had to be sufficiently organised to build their strongholds and defend themselves from attackers. This necessitated a sophisticated system of administration. Owing to these developments, scholars became interested in developing a theoretical knowledge base for understanding how administrators did their work but also in developing skills perceived to be critical for developing a crop of public administrators to manage a variety of public tasks. As far as history records indicate, the 18th century noble, King Frederick William I of Prussia, created professorates in Cameralism in an effort to train a new class of public administrators. It was not until the 18th century that Cameralism, which concerned the systematic management of government, became a specialty of German scholars in Western Europe (Nasrullah, 2005:198).

As early as 124 BC, there was a university in China teaching administration (Simcox, 2010:118). While quoting Biot (1845:97) in Essai sur l'instruction publique en Chine et de la corporation des lettres, the author reminds us that the Imperial College called Thai-hio was not founded till 124 BC. This college was to admit 'fifty scholars, 18 years old or upwards, chosen from lists presented by the Minister of Rites on the one hand and the provincial officials on the other'. These pupils were regularly examined and promoted on merit. Admission to these scholarships was by nomination but unsuitable or incapable candidates were dismissed at the first examination, and the patron was punished for a bad choice. As a practical profession, public administration in China is traced to the Xia Dynasty, and even to the tribal community in primitive society (Zhang, 2001), although the systematic study of public administration in the contemporary sense did not last long into the 20th century. By 2 BC, there existed a civil service in China with 15 000 employees. Such a solid number needed a team of administrators who had to be trained in the whole 'science' of administration. However, the actual teaching of public administration in China was abolished in the 1950s only to start again around 1981 (Holzer & Zhang, 2002:6).

The first PhD students in public administration in that country were recruited in 1999 and had a completion period of their three-year programme in 2002. It should be appreciated that according to most accounts of medieval times, the ability to read and write, add and subtract was dominated by the few educated elites who served as public employees. Against this background, the need for expert civil servants whose ability to read and write would form the basis for developing expertise in such crucial activities as legal record-keeping, paying and feeding armies and levying taxes became a matter of necessity. As the European imperialist age progressed and the military powers extended their hold over other continents and peoples, the need for a sophisticated public administration grew and so did the need for a team of administrative staff. Thus, from a Western European perspective, scholars had no choice but to systematically build a foundation for the discipline of public administration.

Henry (1984:2) notes that advisors to rulers and commentators on the workings of government recorded their observations from time to time; and sources as valid as Kautilya's Arthasatra in ancient India, the Bible, Aristotle's Politics, and Machiavelli's The Prince all point to the long history of the practices of public administration. However, prior to the 19th century, most public administrations had problems that by all measures are equal to the current challenges of modern administrative systems. Early systems of administration were personal – based on loyalty to a particular individual such as a king or minister, instead of being impersonal, based on legality as conceived by an organisation or the state (Hughes, 2003:18). Their practices often resulted in corruption and misuse of office for personal gain; problems that are a cancer to modern administrative systems. Practices that seem alien in our contemporary times were commonplace in earlier administrative systems. Patronage employment in state functions was a very common occurrence, people were employed on the basis of nepotism, reliance on friends or relatives or paying bribes to be recruited. These problems must have influenced earliest scholars to propose systems of administration that were based on stringent rules and meritocracy. In modern times, the recurrence of these problems is commonplace. Promotions in public office are based on political 'correctness of managers' as opposed to meritocracy. Nepotism, patronage systems and tribalisation in public service job allocations are now a malaise that characterises most public administration systems at central, regional and local levels. These developments give us, as academics, an opportunity to reflect on the paradigms of public administration.

History ought to be an important tool for any discipline. It ought to be a 'walking stick' for an elderly discipline like public administration which prides itself on being more than 100 years old. Students of public administration must appreciate the fact that while the practice of public administration has ancient origins, the

study of the discipline is not very old. Despite objections by scholars such as Raad-schelders (1998) who contends that the study of public administration is hardly new because one can trace the contributions of Kautilya in India, Heredotous and Aristotle in Greece, Machiavelli in Italy, and Ibn Khaldun in the Middle East, the fact remains that serious theorising of the public administration discipline is not that ancient. Ancient writings were indeed available but the academic study of the discipline came years later. Von Stein, an 1885 German professor, is considered to have been the founder of the science of public administration though most public administration literatures attribute such to Woodrow Wilson of the 18th century who often receives accolades as the father of the discipline through his widely cited seminal essay published in 1887. In the time of Von Stein, public administration was considered a form of administrative law, but Von Stein believed this was too restrictive. He promoted the thinking that public administration needed to be regarded as an integrative science that needed to rely on pre-established disciplines such as sociology, political science, administrative law and public finance. In his view, public administrators needed to be concerned with not only the practice but the theory. His justification was based on the fact that the knowledge in public administration was generated and evaluated according to the scientific methods.

Wilson, a young professor of political science at Princeton University, published in the *Political Science Quarterly* of 1887 a seminal essay titled 'The study of administration'. The essay became influential, especially his proposal on separating politics from administration, as perceived strategy for promoting efficiency in government. This debate has continued to generate controversy among practitioners and academics to date. All these historical facts challenge contemporary public administration scholars and practitioners to appreciate the influence of ancient traditions in the structure and systems of administration. Neglect of these facts by scholars makes it difficult for young scholars and students to have a clear picture of the scope of public administration but they also lack an understanding of how modern administrative systems emerged. To avoid this problem, the teaching of public administration ought to systematically build on the foundations set by the rich history of the practices of public administration in many parts of the world. Of much relevance to African scholars and students of public administration should be the indigenous systems of administration in African universities. A need to reflect on how ancient systems were constructed and survived for centuries ought to provide an important template for a comparative analysis of administrative systems. Despite existing variations, scholars ought to appreciate that every society has historically had its collective systems that gave it a structure for organising the efforts of men and women to live harmoniously and contribute to the public interest. From a public administration point of view, these collective systems that existed in Africa before the colonialists constituted an African administrative system that must be part of the public administration scholarship.

This article contextually begins with an overview of the indigenous administrative systems. This debate is logically constructed through examining the ancient systems of administration in other parts of the world but later emphasis is placed on Africa. This effort is intended to 'deflate and puncture' any arguments by some scholars whose conscience tells them that pre-colonial African societies never had any sense of organisation and could therefore not have had any administrative system worth studying. The next section of the article is then devoted to the paradigms of public administration; a debate that starts from the politics–administration dichotomy, through the principles of administration, to the era of challenge, the identity crisis, from public administration to public management, from public management to government, through the global crisis and then from governance to new public governance. In each of these paradigms, the article examines the major assumptions and values that unified scholars. In this effort, most prominent scholars who championed the debate in each of the paradigms are discussed. Their ideas need to be re-examined in the context of the modern times. The last part of the article gives concluding remarks.

INDIGENOUS SYSTEMS OF ADMINISTRATION

History bears testimony that during the ancient and medieval periods, there were sound administrative principles to justify the governance of the times. On this subject, Cladden (1965:11) had the following to say:

> ...in the very beginning, when human society was taking shape as a consequence of the co-operative propensities of individual men, the allocation of different tasks, or jobs of work, to different persons according to their capacities, led to the emergence of the division of labor, about which students of social sciences and economics are constantly reminded. The household head or tribal chief as the first director general of his miniature realm began to find the task of running the show too much for him. His natural solution was to assign some of his responsibilities – perhaps to delegate some of his responsibilities – to an assistant or deputy. Hitherto he had himself carried out whatever administration was needed in his primitive society….the chief himself was certainly not aware that there was any such thing as administering….

The above quotation is only an example to confirm that practices of administration have had ancient history. There are good historical accounts that confirm the existence of administration by 1491 BC. During the exodus from Egypt, a story that is ably documented in the holy books, Moses followed the recommendation of Jethro, his father-in-law, to delegate authority over the tribes of Israel along hierarchical lines. Delegation and hierarchies later became key aspects for establishing most public administration systems and most scholars of management and public administration based their constructions of a public administration system on the principle of delegation. In 400 BC Plato recognised management as a separate

art and subsequently promoted the principles of specialisation, another important concept that influenced management and administration scholars. The principle of specialisation shaped the thoughts of advocates of the scientific school of management. Smith produced his great economics work, *The wealth of nations (1776),* in which he supported the principle of specialisation in his principles of market economy which have equally shaped the economics practices of many public administrative systems throughout the world, and more so the debate on New Public Management (NPM) since the 1980s. From these few examples the question emerges: What messages do we give our students of public administration as far as the administrative systems of pre-colonial Africa are concerned? Is there any effort among African scholars in the teaching of public administration in African universities to deal with indigenous systems of administration in Africa?

Literature confirms that pre-colonial Africa had accomplished a great deal in the areas of political and social organisation, architecture, city building, arts and crafts, commerce and trade, tax administration, grievance handling and discipline, as well as democratic arrangements. In a number of primitive societies, fighting was recognised as a legitimate means of obtaining redress for an injury, though not a means of dominating others (Mair, 1962). To the proponents of the colonial enterprise, 'pre-colonial Africa' was more than a dark continent inhabited by a bunch of primitive warring tribes who wandered in the jungle without any sense of human organisation (Njoh, 2006). Supporters of the colonial enterprise would possibly add that Africans should always show gratitude to the colonial masters for having saved them the misery and tribulations experienced before the advent of colonialism. Yet, the continent had robust and sophisticated administrative systems for managing affairs of public interest, especially given the historical periods of the time. Despite the problems that were experienced in some of the administrative systems by tyrannical leaders, most kingdoms had achieved a great deal in terms of social organisation. Shafritz and Russel (1996) report that in the African pre-colonial period, public administration was constructed as the king's largesse which comprised the goods, services and/or honours that the king, chief or clan head bestowed on those under his or her jurisdiction from time to time. The responsibility of ensuring that every member of the community had access to communally-owned factors of production, such as arable land, rivers and lakes, rested in the hands of these authorities. However, the leaders did more than the above as they also controlled the timing and rate of use of resources. They would, for example, determine which portion of the land had to be left fallow.

Leaders of the period had a regulatory function that fits perfectly under what Shafritz and Russell (1996) label the legal definition of public administration. In this connection as Njoh (2006) suggests, African leaders were pre-occupied with discipline and administering punishment to those who went against the established

rules. However, some of the systems of punishment would be described as having been very brutal and thus against human rights as known today. The continent had strong systems of ensuring harmony and discipline which were indicative of a well-organised society. However, Mair (1962) in her book on *Primitive government* states that 'it is a fact of history that it was the European peoples who discovered the others, and in most cases established political dominion over them, and not vice versa. The Europeans in her view possessed technical superiority in a number of fields and the techniques of the peoples who came under the European rule were rudimentary, and so could have been their systems of government. On this wrong perception, Ake (2000) observes that it is bad enough for the rest of the world to insist on representing Africa as the ultimate victim of original sin, a sad forsaken place where nothing good or noble ever happens. Indeed, one may argue that while Africans could have lived a 'miserable' life in one form or another, it is completely wrong to suggest that pre-colonial Africa was devoid of systems of administration or social organisation.

As more objective accounts of the pre-colonial systems of governance are exposed, it becomes clear as suggested by Mazrui (1986) that pre-colonial African societies had sound administrative systems that featured a variety of polities, including the city-states, empire-states, as well as conquest states. Pre-colonial Africa had not only one but several systems of administration and governance structures. The fragmented or highly decentralised systems were in the majority while the highly centralised polities were few and included the well-known kingdoms such as the Songhai Empire, the Ashanti Kingdom, the City-State of Benin, all in West Africa, the Bakongo Kingdom in Central Africa and the Buganda Kingdom in East Africa. African societies, throughout the centuries, were organised on the basis of a social contract. In the process, they had clear agreements regarding the ideas and principles that were to guide their political systems on the basis of which power and authority were to be exercised by the various elements of government (Njoh, 2006).

Traditionally, pre-colonial Africa had notions of well-functioning village democracy which was effectively applied in different contexts. These are facts that ought to find consideration in modern scholarships in democracy within the teaching of public administration. In traditional pre-colonial Africa, it was very common for members of the community or their delegated representatives to sit in public places to deliberate on general issues of public concern but also to decide on the necessary action. This is what is meant by the definition of public administration as 'implementing public action'. Public administration could, during the pre-colonial period, be taken to encompass everything that the king, clan head or village leader and his or her official deputies or assistants such as councils of elders did in their

official capacity. In many parts of Africa, especially in the British colonies where indirect rule was the norm, the indigenous systems of government survived and were used by the colonial powers alongside the colonial system of administration.

Jarret (1996) confirms that pre-colonial African polities typically comprised of three major bodies, namely a Council of Elders, Chief Priests and Moral Elders and Chiefs. These three bodies were tightly woven to form a single administrative system capable of executing functions ranging from mundane tasks such as using the talking drum to summon a meeting of the king's aides, to complex undertakings, such as planning and executing war. Each body was placed in charge of a well-defined set of activities. The council of elders was charged with the responsibility of conceiving, planning, implementing and managing the community's development projects. Projects such as public infrastructure building and maintenance, building and maintaining the chief's palace, and building and maintaining weekly markets fell under the jurisdiction of the council of elders. The idea of crime as an anti-social act certainly existed, and it was the concern of authority in society to restore and promote social relationships. Reconciliation and the restoration of social harmony were the objects of judicial proceedings, not retribution. Hence the importance attributed to compensation, and even ritual feasting as the outcome of a process of reconciliation was used.

The chief priests were comprised of people who were endowed with usually special spiritual powers and or/skills, which were more often inherited than learnt. They functioned as religious authorities and acted as a bridge between members of the community and their ancestors. Members of this body were also charged with the responsibility of educating the community on African spiritual laws, religious doctrines and principles. In this regard, they provided knowledge on the importance of living in harmony with the natural environment, including land, rivers, lakes, forests and why members of the community must see themselves as simply custodians and not owners of the natural resources. Furthermore, the chief priests also served as health official or medical practitioner as they were responsible for healing the sick. The moral elders (who would be the officials responsible for ethics and integrity in Uganda's case, for example) were responsible for teaching moral conduct and upholding moral standards throughout the community. They were also responsible for recording all major events that took place in their communities. In this case, they served as community historians. The fact that most pre-colonial African societies did not boast of a written culture does not mean they were incapable of recording information. This feat was accomplished through two main strategies:
- The most common involved storytelling. These stories were passed on from one generation to another until they became legendary.
- Through drawings or sketches. Such drawings and sketches have surfaced in caves and other artifacts uncovered through archaeological and other discoveries.

To further understand how the indigenous systems of governance operated, examples of the Songhai's empire, whose governance apparatus comprised among other units several ministerial bodies (Njoh, 2006), can provide an appropriate template. Prominent in the empire was a ministerial body in charge of agriculture and this was headed by an inspector of agriculture. This would be equivalent to the ministry of agriculture in modern democracies. There was also a ministerial body in charge of etiquette headed by a chief of etiquette and protocol. Yet, another ministry was responsible for the calvary under the leadership of the chief of calvary. But most striking was the ministerial body in charge of minority affairs which had several agencies responsible for the various minority groups resident in the empire. One such agency was in charge of the Berabic Arab affairs and another was responsible for white minorities. In that kingdom, jurisprudence, particularly justice, was an important issue. The leadership then acknowledged this in many important ways. The most notable was the creation of positions of chief of justice or cadi (qadi). The cadi's who were posted to major cities such as Djemne and Timbuctu throughout the empire were appointees of the king. They were responsible for dealing with common-law issues, disputes between citizens and foreigners or among citizens. The king or loyal justices were in charge of more serious crimes such as treason. Individuals found guilty were sentenced based on the severity of the crime. For example, some were sent to prison, while others were required to participate in community services. Serious offences were usually punishable by cruel means to avoid repetition of the same mistakes by others.

It is further reported in history that in one of the empires of Ghana, the king ensured administration of justice by having a group of army commanders who would come on horseback to his palace every morning. When all had assembled, the king would mount his horse and ride at their head through the lanes of the town and around it. Anyone who had suffered injustice or misfortune would confront the king and stay there until the wrong had been remedied. The king would ride in town twice every day and this method was famous as a method of justice. The justice machinery in the empire was at two levels. Examples of punishments included burying the guilty party alive, and chopping off one hand– a practice which continues today in modern Arab communities where sharia law is in practice. In some pre-colonial African societies, adultery was a serious offence. It was accordingly punished severely. If a man was caught in this practice, he was punished by having a sharpened bamboo stick forced into his penis and then having the stick broken. In other communities such as the Ngwa Ibo of Nigeria, the same crime was punishable either by death or sale of the offending party or parties into slavery. In some societies, if the offending party was a woman, she would be killed. To put things in perspective, instances of cruel and unusual punishments were commonplace in Europe around the same epoque. For example, during the reign of Henry VIII in England, the penalty for not attending church was punishable by losing one or both

ears. When King Henry's son came to power, he made the brawling in a church or church premises punishable by mutilation.

PARADIGMS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Public administration, especially conscious theorising about it, is not as old as its practice. Public administration has developed as an academic discipline through a number of stages. These stages are what this article terms the paradigms. Different authors have given their classification although there is a great deal of uniformity in their scholarships. Henry (2010:27), for example, classifies the paradigms under the politics–administration dichotomy (1887-1926); principles of public administration (1927-1937); public administration as political science (1950-1970); public administration as management (1950-1970); public administration as public administration (1970 to the present); and, governance (1990 to the present). The inclusion of public administration as a science as well as management within the same period from 1950-1970 reflects the unhealthy tension that existed in the historical development of the public administration discipline as will be elaborated on later in the article.

Dhameja (2003:1) refers to the crucial phases in the growth of public administration as 'partial narratives' and includes the dichotomy between politics and administration, scientific study and practice, the value–fact dichotomy which reduced public administration to an applied area rather than a normative theoretical paradigm, the theory-informs-practice viewpoint, comparative public administration and New Public Administration. This classification covers all issues that Henry identifies. As a modern profession and field of study, Dwivedi and William (2011:21-22) have grouped the development of public administration in two major epistemological phases. The first epistemological phase was the emphasis by Woodrow Wilson and Goodnow on separating politics from administration as the most single important reform that was needed to promote efficiency and remove the objectionable and immoral practices of spoils and patronage. The second related phase was the development of scienticism. This period was influenced by two major scientific principles of rationality/objectivity and quantification. The main purposes of these scientific elements was to remove biases and fallacies of human thought by searching for 'hard data', which could be measured, and presented in an objective and rational manner. The next part of the article now examines each of the paradigms in the development of public administration. This effort will logically begin from the first paradigm with the key assumptions and ideas of the various authors being given attention, to the latest paradigms and the questions being generated.

Period 1: The Politics–Administration Dichotomy (1887-1926)

The key assumption and strategy during this epistemological period was the idea to separate politics and the administration functions of government as a strategy for promoting efficiency and effectiveness. The period also believed that administration of the public sector was different from administration in the private sector. During this period, it was believed that as a strategy for promoting efficiency and effectiveness in the running of government, there had to be a clear distinction between those involved in the game of politics and those who were charged with the business of administration. This period was one in which the extension of administrative practice was believed to be a necessary step in improving government (Cox, Buck & Morgan, 2011:6). The first systematic writer of this time was Woodrow Wilson whose article entitled 'The study of public administration' that appeared in the Political Science Quarterly of 1887 set the ball rolling for the academic study of public administration. Wilson proposed four issues for study and discussion in his article, namely: (1) Separation of politics and administration, (2) Comparative analysis of political and private organisations, (3) Improving efficiency with business-like practices and attitudes toward daily operations, and (4) Improving the effectiveness of public service through management and training of civil servants, as well as encouraging merit-based assessment. The separation of politics from administration has been the subject of lasting debate. In his article, he emphasised the need to study public administration as a discipline separate from politics, arguing that, "Administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics and those administrative questions were different from political questions," and thus the field of politics was not the field of business. Table 1 presents the key differences between politics and administration and as such the jurisdictional areas of politics and administration, according to the advocates of the dichotomy.

Table 1: Dividing politics and administration

POLITICS	ADMINISTRATION
Deals with political questions	**Deals with business questions**
Deals with the "expression of the will of the people".	Deals with the "execution of the will of the people".
Deals with politicians and plays politics of the politicians	Deals with civil servants/technocrats and plays politics of the administrators

One becomes a politician by one's popularity, either through positive or negative popularity	One becomes a civil servant by one's intelligence, experience and qualifications
One becomes a politician through election	One becomes a civil servant through selection and formal recruitment
Prior training is not given to politicians and their qualifications are of low standing	Civil servants are professionals in various fields
Power is the centre of study in politics, i.e. process of capturing and retaining power	Running administration successfully, efficiently and effectively is the central focus here
Approve policies	Implement policies
Tell naked lies	Dress their lies with technicalities
Survive on talking loudly	Survive on writing a great deal
Rarely have a code of ethics	Governed by an ethical code of conduct

By 1900, in a ground-breaking book, *Politics and administration*, Frank J. Goodnow became a major proponent of the Wilsonian separation movement. Goodnow noted that there were two distinct functions of government, which he identified with the title of his book. *Politics*, he wrote, had to do with policies or expressions of the state will, while *administration* had to do with the execution of these policies (Henry, 2010:28). Goodnow, in his teaching career in 1884 at Columbia in the United States, taught history as well as administrative law. At the time Wilson made his publication, Goodnow was an adjunct professor and became a full professor of administrative law in 1891. In 1903, he was made an Easton professor of administrative law and municipal science. He subsequently became the first president of the American Political Science Association in 1903. The United States president (Roosevelt) made him a member of the commission to draft a new charter for greater New York, and President Taft chose him as a member on the commission of economy and efficiency.

Administration and management are concepts that have almost historically moved side by side, although management literally replaced administration during

the 1970s when it was felt that government administration needed to be done through borrowing private sector management styles. At the time of the politics–administration dichotomy, a number of American and European management scholars suggested a number of classical management principles that became influential in shaping the study and practice of public administration. First among these scholars was F.W. Taylor (1911), well known for his scientific principles of management. Cox, Buck and Morgan (2011:7) consider Taylor's work under their categorisation of 'Administration as a science' and confirm that the work of Taylor and the concept of scientific management were to have a profound effect on public administration for the entire period between the two world wars. Interestingly, the specific tenets of scientific management were quite similar to the already familiar views of the progressive era of the 1870s. Taylor believed that just as there was a best machine for each job, there was a best working method by which people should undertake their jobs. He considered that all work processes could be analysed in discrete tasks and that by a scientific method, it was possible to find "one best way" to perform each task (Mullins, 2007:43). Each job was broken down into component parts, each part timed and the parts rearranged into the most efficient method of working. Taylor's greatest public sector popularity came in 1912 after he presented his ideas to a special committee of the House of Representatives set up to investigate the Taylor and other systems of shop management (Shafritz et al.,2011:231). Taylor's comprehensive statement of scientific management principles was focused on what he called the "duties of management". He advocated for the following:

• Replacing traditional, rule-of-thumb methods of work accomplishment with systematic, more scientific methods of measuring and managing individual work elements.
• The scientific study of the selection and sequential development of workers to ensure optimal placement of workers into work roles.
• Obtaining the cooperation of workers to ensure full application of scientific principles.
• Establishing logical divisions within work roles and responsibilities between workers and management.

Taylor was an early advocate of efficiency as a non-partisan concept somehow divorced from politics. He believed that in order to improve efficiency, officials would have to place this goal above politics – a hard step for elected officials to take. Taylor saw a non-partisan personnel service as essential to increasing the quantity of work. Political officials and top administrators needed a change of heart toward a civil service mentality that would elevate merit over influence, working what he called "a great mental revolution in large numbers of men" (Taylor, 1916:9). Whereas scientific management focused on the productivity of individu-

als, the classical administrative approach concentrated on organisations in totality with emphasis on the development of managerial principles rather than work methods. Prominent contributors to this school include Max Weber, Henri Fayol, Mary Parker Follett and Chester I. Barnard. They were pre-occupied with studying the flow of information within an organisation and emphasised the importance of understanding how an organisation operated. For example, Fayol, a French executive engineer, developed a comprehensive theory of management that fundamentally shaped the academic and practical field of public administration. According to Shafritz *et al.,* (2011:231), Fayol's major work, published in France in 1916, was almost ignored in the United States until Constance Storr's English translation reading *General and Industrial management*, appeared in 1949. The following were the principles he advocated for:

- **Division of work:** Division of work and specialisation produces more and better work with the same effort.
- **Authority and responsibility:** Authority is the right to give orders and the power to exact obedience. A manager has official authority because of his or her position, as well as personal authority based on individual personality, intelligence and experience. Authority creates responsibility.
- **Discipline:** Obedience and respect within an organisation are absolutely essential. Good discipline requires managers to apply sanctions whenever violations become apparent.
- **Unity of command:** An employee should receive orders from only one superior.
- **Unity of direction:** Organisational activities must have one central authority and one plan of action.
- **Subordination of individual interest to general interest:** The interests of one employee or group of employees are subordinate to the interests and goals of the organisation.
- **Remuneration of personnel:** Salaries – the price of services rendered by employees – should be fair and provide satisfaction both to the employee and employer.
- **Centralisation:** The objective of centralisation is the best utilisation of personnel. The degree of centralisation varies according to the dynamics of each organisation.
- **Scalar chain:** A chain of authority exists from the highest organisational authority to the lowest ranks.
- **Order:** Organisational order for materials and personnel is essential. The right materials and the right employees are necessary for each organisational function and activity.
- **Equity:** In organisations, equity is a combination of kindliness and justice. Both equity and equality of treatment should be considered when dealing with employees.

- **Stability of tenure of personnel:** To attain the maximum productivity of personnel, a stable workforce is needed.
- **Initiative:** Thinking out a plan and ensuring its success is an extremely strong motivator. Zeal, energy and initiative are desired at all levels of the organisational ladder.
- *Esprit de corps:* Teamwork is fundamentally important to an organisation. Work teams and extensive face-to-face verbal communication encourages teamwork.

Among other management scholars, Mary Parker Follett, an American social worker and management consultant, was a pioneer in the fields of organisational theory and organisational behaviour. Along with Lillian Gilbreth, Follett was one of two great women management gurus in the early days of classical management theory and some writers regard her as the mother of scientific management, if Taylor is to be the father of the scientific movement. She was one of the first women ever invited to address the London School of Economics, where she spoke on cutting-edge management issues. In her writings, she admonished micro-managing, regarding it as "bossism". In her capacity as a management theorist, Follett pioneered the understanding of lateral processes within hierarchical organisations, the importance of informal processes within organisations, and the idea of the "authority of expertise" – which served to modify the typology of authority developed by her German contemporary, Max Weber. Follet advocated for the principle of "integration" or no coercive power-sharing based on the use of her concept of "power with" rather than "power over".

In the late 1800s, Max Weber (a German sociologist) disliked management of organisations on a "personal" family-like basis and the fact that employees were loyal to individual supervisors rather than to the organisation. He believed that organisations should be managed impersonally and that a formal organisational structure, where specific rules were followed, was important. He thought of authority as something that was part of a person's job and passed from individual to individual as one person left and another took over. This non-personal, objective form of organisation was called a bureaucracy. In the Weberian tradition bureaucracy was viewed "as the expression of rational and efficient administration" (Breton & Wintrobe, 1985:33). A bureaucratic organisation was the most efficient way to control the work of large numbers of people (Denhardt, 2000:30). Weber believed that all bureaucracies had to have the following characteristics:

- **A well-defined hierarchy**. All positions within a bureaucracy are structured in a way that permits the higher positions to supervise and control the lower positions. This clear chain of command facilitates control and order throughout the organisation.

- **Division of labour and specialisation**. All responsibilities in an organisation are specialised so that each employee has the necessary expertise to do a particular task.
- **Rules and regulations.** Standard operating procedures govern all organisational activities to provide certainty and facilitate coordination**.**
- **Impersonal relationships between managers and employees.** Managers should maintain an impersonal relationship with employees so that favouritism and personal prejudice do not influence decisions.
- **Competence.** Competence, not "who you know", should be the basis for all decisions made in hiring, job assignments, and promotions in order to foster ability and merit as the primary characteristics of a bureaucratic organisation**.**
- **Records.** A bureaucracy needs to maintain complete files regarding all its activities**.**

While the application of bureaucracy has received modification, it has largely remained unchanged in the teaching of public administration. Had it not been developed, the understanding of public administration would have been incomplete. During his days, Weber made significant contributions to the theories which formed a foundation for the subsequent theoretical frameworks. While Weber's theory has formed the traditional foundations of public administration systems, the emergence of managerialism and the new public management and governance agendas have sharply modified a number of principles that he advocated. However, despite these modifications, certain ideas of Weber's principles still apply in contemporary public administration. The idea for using original records is a principle that still applies. In the preface to the *Introduction to public administration,* the first textbook on the subject. White (1926) wrote that his book rested on four assumptions. First, it assumed that administration was a single process, substantially uniform in its essential characteristics whenever observed, and therefore avoids the study of municipal administration, state administration or federal administration as such. Second, it assumed that the study of administration should start from the base of management rather than from the foundation of law, and was therefore more absorbed in the American Management Association than in the decisions of the courts. Third, it assumed that administration was still primarily an art but attached importance to the significant tendency to transform it into a science. Fourth, it assumed that administration had become, and would continue to be, the heart of the problem of modern government. These assumptions have been elaborated by Storing (1965:39).

The politics–administration dichotomy provided a solid foundation for the theorisation and teaching of public administration. The core beliefs during the first period demanded that government be divisible into two functions or processes,

namely, decision and execution. Making decisions was the realm of politics and policy making. It was the area in which the processes of democracy were relevant. Executing decisions, however, which is the realm of administration, presented other problems and needed other criteria. To the processes of administration the methods of science, proved so powerful elsewhere, were relevant. The criteria were economy and efficiency; and economy can on close analysis be viewed as an aspect of efficiency. Through scientific research of the phenomena of administration scholars could derive principles of administration. While political scientists and lawyers engaged in this debate, no apparent solution was found. It remained an intricate field to completely separate politics from administration in the real process of running government. The contributions of the management scholars during this period were intended to establish an institutional framework through which efficiency and effectiveness would be promoted. Political science at the same time was the natural home of the study of public administration. Public administration was listed as one of the important sub-disciplines that constituted the field of political science. Earliest writers were formalistic, legalistic and believed more in institutions and structures that followed rules as a strategy for promoting efficiency in the running of government. The article now turns to the second paradigm in the development of public administration.

Period Two: Principles of Public Administration (1927-1937)

Public administration had a reputational zenith during this second phase (principles of administration) of its development (Henry, 2010:29). Both as a discipline and practice, public administration commanded a high degree of respect and its products were in great demand both in government and business during this period. It is reported that by 1925, for example, a person would not have talked about public administration so that people knew what that person meant. This perception changed during the principles period. As an academic backtrack, while there may have been between 30 and 40 public administrations programmes in universities and many subordinated to political science departments, between 1927 and 1936, the number of universities that had public administration as a course on their menu had quadruped (Stone & Stone, 1975:30). These were clear signs of a growing discipline. The rising stature of public administration was attributed to the Rockefeller family, whose interest in the field remained undiminished following its success with the New York Bureau of Municipal Research. Rockefeller philanthropies poured millions of dollars into the public administration profession, leaving "no important part of the public administration community...untouched' (Henry, 2010:29). The period saw a number of influential writings, among them *Principles of organisatio'* by Mooney and Reiley, *Creative experience* by Mary Parker Follet, Fayol's *Industrial and general management*, and the *Papers on the science of public administration* by Gullick and Urwick (Basu, 1994:14).

During this period, there was a claim that public administration had matured to become a science. As such, there was a belief that there existed certain 'scientific principles' (or proverbs as Herbert Simon Later called them) of administration that could be relied upon to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of government. The period saw a number of public administration scholars give what they believed constituted the core administrative principles that could shape the discipline of public administration. It was believed that the 'principles' of administration worked in any administrative setting regardless of sector, culture, function, environment, mission or institutional framework. One year after White's classic text, W.F.Willoughby's 1927 book entitled *Principles of public administration,* appeared as the second fully-fledged text in the field of public administration. Willoughby's principles had an American progressive tone, as did White's introduction, but the former's title indicated a new thrust of public administration. It was believed that public administrators would be effective if they learned and applied scientific principles of administration (Henry, 2010:29). With these two important publications, the academic programmes in public administration increased.

In 1929, the University of Southern California established the first independent professional school of public administration. The coming years were very fruitful in the practice and theory of public administration. In 1933 for example, President Roosevelt appointed the first woman in his cabinet to the position of secretary of labour. In the same period, the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) was established by the American Congress as an independent public corporation. In 1936, J. Donald Kingsley and William E. Mosher published the first textbook in the field of personnel entitled *Public personnel administration*. At the same time, John Maynard Keynes published his *General theory of employment, interest and money* which called for use of a government's fiscal and monetary policies to positively influence a capitalistic economy. All these were signs of a growing discipline and area of practice. Another significant author in the same year was E. Pendleton Herring in *Public administration and the public interest* where the author asserted that the bureaucrats by default must often be arbiters of the public interest.

In 1937, Gullick and Urwick, who were confidants of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, wrote their 'Papers on the science of administration' in the form of a report to the President's Committee on Administrative Science. They promoted seven principles of administration and, in so doing, gave students of public administration that snappy anagram, POSDCORB, which stood for planning, organising, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting (Henry, 2010:29). These principles have to date had lasting impact on the management and administrative discourse. Basu (1994:14-15) informs us that the main reason for the interest in administration, at least in the USA, was that following the catastrophic years of the Great Depression in the 1930s, the functions of the government had so rapidly

multiplied that there were not enough skilled government personnel to fill the welfare departments newly created under the New Deal. Therefore schools of administration were established quickly to train as many men and women as possible, in the techniques of administration.

Mooney and Reiley (1939) set out a number of common principles which relate to all types of organisations. They gave particular attention to (1) the principle of co-ordination – the need for people to act together with unity of action: (2) the exercise of authority and the need for discipline; (3) the scalar principle – the hierarchy of organisation, the grading of duties and the process of delegation; and (4) the functional principle – specialisation and the distinction between different kinds of duties. In the 1940s the discipline was subjected to searching criticism of its core beliefs, and heterodoxy came to replace orthodoxy. The criticism and new orienting ideas were clearly foreshadowed in the 1930s. In 1936 there had appeared *The frontiers of public administration,* a series of essays by John M. Gaus, Leonard D. White, and Marshall E. Dimock, in which these prominent figures of the orthodox period introduced points of view later to become important.

Kettl's (2000:8-9) article on 'Public administration at the millennium: the state of the field' reports that from its very beginning, public administration was one of the critical foundations of political science, and political science was the natural home of public administration. Despite this early marriage, however, public administration and political science soon nearly divorced. He notes that public administration promoted a short-lived training movement, devoted to preparing students for the public service with a curriculum independent of political science. Many public administrationists were unhappy about the outcome, and some political scientists found the partnership to be an uneasy one. The difficult issues of training for the public service and the role of such training within the association were to become central problems for public administration and its place within the discipline. Public administrations were never satisfied that political science recognised the importance of practical policy problems and education for the public service. There was concern that many political scientists struggled continually to advance theory-building in the field and cared little about professional training. The American Political Science Association had long listed public administration as one of its major fields. The connection was an uneasy one, but for better or worse, political science remained the home for the study of public administration (Henry, 1987).

Period Three: Era of Challenge (1938-1947)
By 1914, the American *Political Science Quarterly* had listed public administration as one of the five disciplines of political science administration, comparative government, public law, international law and political theory. Public administra-

tion was therefore one of the critical foundations of political science and political science was its natural home. But the two disciplines divorced when public administration started training people for public service with a curriculum largely independent of political science. By 1939, public administration had made great strides in its development into a science and in that year the American Society for Public Administration was formed with its quarterly journal, the *Public Administration Review*. The journal was used to propagate the public administration message. Today, the journal is still very actively used for communicating the public administration message. The American Society of Public Administration provided a forum for the scholars and practitioners to meet and exchange views which helped to spread theories and ideas, and led to the development of the science of public administration. This development in the USA was also aided by some management scholars who developed the scientific management movement in the country.

By 1940, public administration had acquired remarkable prestige and self-confidence within political science and in the practice of government. One-fifth of all doctoral degrees awarded that year in political science were in public administration (Martin, 1952:662). As management research continued in the 20th century, questions began to emerge about the interactions and motivations of the individual within organisations. It was advanced by some scholars that management principles developed during the classical period were simply not useful in dealing with the many management challenges of the time. In particular, the behaviour of individual employees needed further elaboration. The main theme during this period was the advocacy of the Human Relationship Behavioural Approach. The Human Relations school of Elton Mayo (to which Herbert Simon belonged) contributed a human dimension to public administration which encouraged the study of the individual and his behaviour in organisations. The use of psychological approaches in understanding individuals in the work places became a key ingredient for understanding public administration. With this development, public administration turned from a purely mechanical study of the process of policy implementation as projected by Willoughby in 1927 to a human subject interested in the role of the individual in the organisation and in devising means to get the best out of the individuals manning the administration. This shift was later to have a devastating effect on the discipline of public administration.

Max Weber, a German sociologist, developed in the early part of the 20th century what is known today as the organisational structure called a bureaucracy. Weber described his ideal type of organisation that he called a bureaucracy as 'a system characterised by a divisions of labour, a clearly defined hierarchy, formal selection, formal rules and regulations, impersonality and career orientation'. The most influential arguments against a bureaucracy were developed by Robert Merton. Merton

wrote in 1940 that there was a tendency for "the rules to become more important than the ends they were designed to serve, resulting in goal displacement and loss of organisational effectiveness". He argued that the demands on officials to conform to bureaucratic regulations led to ritualism, rigidity, and difficulties in dealing with the general public. Maslow (1943) in *The theory of human motivation* developed the hierarchy of needs, which is a theory in psychology. Maslow subsequently extended the idea to include his observations of humans' innate curiosity. His theories parallel many other theories of human developmental psychology, all of which focus on describing the stages of growth in humans. Maslow studied what he called exemplary people such as Albert Einstein, Jane Addams, Eleanor Roosevelt, and Frederick Douglass rather than mentally ill or neurotic people, writing that "the study of crippled, stunted, immature, and unhealthy specimens can yield only a cripple psychology and a cripple philosophy." He thus studied the healthiest one per cent of the college student population to make his conclusions. On his part, Paul Appleby (1945) argued that since "government is different" from private enterprise, public administration is different from business administration.

Dissent from mainstream public administration accelerated in the 1940s in two mutually reinforcing ways. One objection was to the politics–administration dichotomy. This dichotomy was rejected on the grounds that in an ideal world of government, it was difficult to separate politics from administration. It was argued that administration cannot be separated from politics because in its political nature and role, administration was not only concerned with policy decisions but also dealt with policy formulation. In an elaborate analogy of the nature of the dissent against the dichotomy Henry (2010:30) informs us that over the years, a peculiar pervasion warped what was likely the original meaning of the politics–administration dichotomy. 'Politics initially had meant only partisan and often corrupt politics. By the 1930s, politics had been expanded in its scholarly meaning to include public policy making, and public administrators, in accordance with the dichotomy, should not enter into the forbidden 'political' zone. It was at this point that the dichotomy became intellectually untenable though difficult to shed. Gaus (1950:188) hammered the last nail in the coffin of the politics–administration dichotomy when he stated in one of the leading journals of public administration of the time that "a theory of public administration means in our time a theory of politics also". With this declaration, the dichotomy died a natural death.

It is to be observed that the period saw not only the deflation of the politics–administration dichotomy but a simultaneous effort of puncturing the principles of administration. The contention was that there was no such a thing as a 'principle' of administration. Simon was also an important critic of the principles of administration and described them as proverbs. He advocated the behavioural approach

to public administration if the discipline was to be made scientific. He focused upon decision making as the alternative to the principles approach, noting that decision making was at the heart of administration and that the vocabulary of administrative theory must be derived from the logic and psychology of the human race. He out-rightly rejected the politics–administration dichotomy and recommended an empirical approach to the study of public administration. At the age of 31, Simon published his book (which was part of his PhD thesis) in 1947 entitled *Administrative behavior*. The aim of the book was to show how organisations can be understood in terms of their decision-making processes. Simon got a Nobel Prize in 1978 for his contribution to science with decision processes in economic organisations. In the same year, Simon published his *Administrative behavior* that presented one of the most likely ever known devastating attacks on the discipline of public administration, Robert A. Dahl, in the *Public Administration Review* published another formidable challenge to *The science of public administration* with its three-fold critique that required comparative inquiry. In an attack, Robert Dahl (1947:8) argued that, "as long as the study of public administration is not comparative, claims for 'a science of public administration' sound rather hollow." He argued that the evolution of the science of public administration was hindered by three problems which had to be resolved:

- The frequent impossibility of excluding normative considerations from the problems of public administration. The study of public administration must be founded on some clarification of goals.
- The need to study certain aspects of human behaviour limits the potentialities of the science of public administration. He criticised the tendency that existed to treat the organisation in formal technical terms and to regard human beings who constitute organisations as more or less material.
- The unscientific nature of the principles of administration which were based on examples drawn from limited natural and historical setting.

Henry (2010:32) has done a fine job in reminding us of the fearful reactions of these attacks. He suggests that at the time Simon obliterated administrative principles as the foundation of management theory, and with them those of public administration as well, he offered an alternative to the old paradigms. He proposed that there should be two kinds of public administrationists working in harmony: (1) those scholars concerned with developing 'a pure science of administration' based on a thorough grounding in social psychology, and (2) those concerned with 'prescribing for public policy'. To him, this enterprise in number two would not only not stop until it had swallowed up the whole of political science, but must absorb economics and sociology as well. Unfortunately, economics and sociology appear not to have been easy disciplines to swallow by the weakened public administration at that time. Political science, however, faced the unfortunate effect of disruption in its house.

Henry (2010:30-31) has summarised these dissenting views into what he calls "deflating the dichotomy and puncturing the principles". As a result, the two defining pillars of the discipline of public administration (the politics–administrative dichotomy and the principles of administration) were shattered. Herbert Simon's devastating work on *Administrative behavior* first appeared in 1946. It challenged public administration to abandon its single-minded focus on the structural and replace it with a concern for the behaviour of the individuals and groups within organisations. Simon suggested that organisations that have employees who understand and agree with established goals are more likely to succeed in achieving those goals. For Simon, employee concurrence with goals was more important to success than the structure of the organisation because, when necessary, information will use informal means to overcome structural barriers to achieving goals. The logical extension of this increased role of workers was the reality that policy and organisational goals can be determined by those same employees (Cox *et al.*, 2011). Once a stroke generated by Herbert Simon and Robert Dahl hit this unifying scholarship, the public administration scholars were left with no known home and focus.

Period Four: Identity Crisis (1948-1970)

Soon after the end of the Second World War, public administration's place within political science declined precipitously. Simple principles about the pursuit of efficiency, based in an administration separate from politics, seemed unacceptably shallow in the light of the war's administrative experience (Kettle, 2000:10). In 1948, Waldo attacked the gospel of efficiency in his book, *The administrative state* where he asked, "Efficiency for what?" He subsequently warned that public administrative efficiency must be backed by a framework of consciously-held democratic values. He tried to establish the direction and thrust of public administration as a field of study given that efficiency had dominated the administrative thinking prior to World War II. Within the period, Sayre attacked public personnel administration as "the triumph over purpose" (Shafritz & Hyde, 1997:74). In 1949, Selznick introduced and defined "cooptation" as "the process of absorbing new elements into the leadership or policy determining structure of an organisation as a means of averting threats to its stability or existence" (Shafritz & Hyde, 1997:147).

In the post-war years, public administration changed its character, scope and methods of investigation. What was left was a very 'sick' discipline of public administration. The dichotomy was declared dead in 1950, due to a major stroke by Simon in 1946. Its death was confirmed when J Gaus, a leading scholar, published his article, 'Trends in the theory of public administration'. The article appeared in the leading *Journal of Public Administration* and it stated that "a theory of public administration in our times means a theory of politics also". With this confusion,

public administration would never be the same again. Henry (2010:32) regards this period to have been that of 'Public Administration as Political Science', arguing that as a result of the related concerns, public administrationists drove back with some alacrity into the warm and engulfing sea of political science. Some political scientists, however, tried to drown their 'strange and unnatural' progeny in it. Some public administrationists began an exercise of re-uniting and reestablishing the linkages between public administration and political science but there were major issues to resolve. Political scientists were willing to absorb public administration into their larger and loftier realm, but the price of admission was high: public administration would shrivel to an 'emphasis', an 'area of interest' or even a synonym of political science (2010:32). Other public administrationists were simply not sure what they should be doing.

The leading students and writers of the postwar period adopted sharply different attitudes – whatever their other differences – on this matter. It has been generally agreed that while the phenomena of politics and the amount of policy making may decrease as one moves from the top of an administrative agency to its bottom, or into some of the technical processes or functions, they are still generally present to a significant degree; and at the level of chief executive or top management, where so much interest is focused, they are important matters indeed. The results of this recognition manifested themselves in a variety of approaches. For example, Simon's decision-making schema attempt to include the valuational as well as the factual. Some writers, such as Paul H. Appleby (1952), wrote searchingly on the interaction of politics and administration in a democracy. Others, such as Norton E. Long (1962), concentrated more sharply on politics-in-administration, on the power factor in administration. And yet others, such as Emmette Redford (1958), reflected on how the ethical or public–policy component is brought to bear on the technical component.

Kettle (2000:12) contends that during the 1950s and early 1960s, public administration suffered from lack of a theoretical guide and a comfortable disciplinary home. While it had come to the realisation that politics mattered, he asserts, it had not developed a persuasive explanation of how. Meanwhile, much of political science had convinced itself that public administration had little to offer a more behaviourally-oriented field. Although some public administration scholars started calling for peace talks with political science, the conditions of such efforts were stringent. Fesler (1975) raised worry that the field lacked focus and thus had no identity, noting that some critics had long felt the field was being "slowly nibbled to death" by the behavioural sciences. Political science scholars started developing theories to explain the challenges of the time and this was in complete disregard of the contribution of the discipline of public administration as they charged those in

public administration to have had a very serious poverty of theories. Public administration was accused of being concerned with mundane or low-level activities of government, unlike political science which was concerned with higher-level strategic activities. Public administration during this period lacked a natural home as the discipline was no longer welcome in the house of its youth -- political science. As a result, this period saw several reactions:

• A group of scholars decided to return to their mother discipline of political science but they were largely not welcome until they fulfilled certain conditions.
• Another group of scholars formed a new field of administrative sciences.
• Other scholars developed the development and comparative public administration sub-fields.
• There emerged calls for the separation movement of public policy from public administration -- agitating for the new sub-discipline of public policy separate from public administration.
•

The development and comparative administration group gained a high degree of recognition during the period. After World War II came to an end, there came about the independence of the colonies and the need for development of administrative systems suited to these colonies emerged. There had also been a challenge posed by Dahl on what public administration needed to do if it was truly to claim a place among the sciences. Scholars, therefore, found the need to arrive at generalisations in the field of public administration which would be applicable in the new independent countries which had diverse political, economic and social systems.

In 1953, the American Political Science Association appointed an *ad hoc* committee on comparative administration and in 1960 a Comparative Administration Group (CAG) that subsequently affiliated with the American Society for Public Administration (Heady, 2001:14) was started. Comparative and development administration, which trace their origins to scholars and practitioners of North America, set out to achieve greater understanding of the administrative culture and styles of decision making, nature and behaviour of institutions, and structures and functions of governance in other countries with whom their nations became involved during World War II (Dwivedi, 2011:24). A vigorous interest developed in comparing administrative processes and institutions (Guess & Gabriellyan, 2007) of developing countries. However, Björkman (2010) recently commented that the imposing nomenclature, status, and even the existence of comparative public administration has been repeatedly questioned and there are trenchant disputes, especially about the appropriate level of analysis as well as the conceptual units to be compared.

Jones (1976) reminds us that the 1950s and 1960s were characterised by the well-financed efforts of American and European experts to export administrative technology and thereby guide recipient countries toward modernisation. Ample resources as well as a pioneer spirit of optimism characterised the era of comparative public administration. Chaired by Fred Riggs, who is variously regarded as the 'granddaddy' of comparative administration, and with the financial support of the Ford Foundation, the period from 1962 to 1971 saw the CAG presiding over what many call the heyday of the comparative administration movement. The Ford Foundation gave its financial assistance on three conditions, one of which specifically related to the expansion of research in comparative development administration. The academic momentum in the 1960s accelerated rapidly. The field grew in numbers, funding and academic attention. According to Wart and Cayer (1990), over 500 members had joined the Comparative Administration Group (CAG) of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) by 1968. Even university curricula were not immune to the enthusiasm, and thus courses in comparative and development administration became far more common and, in some cases, were required. External events also tended to propel American academics and technicians abroad: the new thrust in Latin American affairs stimulated by the Cuban Revolution and the subsequent Alliance for Progress; the rapid decolonisation of Africa; the Vietnam War in Asia; and the formalisation of a standing foreign aid agency.

Cox *et al.* (2011:12) report that the late 1960s was a period in which many long-held academic notions were criticised and often rejected. Public administration, like many other disciplines, experienced just such a period of upheaval. This period is best symbolised by a conference held at the Minnowbrook Conference Center at Syracuse University in 1968. The purpose of the conference was to explore emerging theories of public administration, with particular emphasis on views that were anti-hierarchical and also people-oriented. Henry (2010:32), who refers to the 1950-1970 paradigm as 'public administration as political science', reports that public administrationists during this period were no longer really sure of what they should be doing and there was lack of a fully comprehensive theoretical framework. For their part, political scientists were willing to absorb public administration into their larger and loftier realm, but the price of admission was high: public administration would shrivel to an emphasis, an area of interest, even a synonym of political science. The intention was for them to drop any claim that public administration was an independent discipline.

Contextually, from 1948 to about 1970, the state was considered a central institution in the process of managing public affairs. The state was seen as an engine of social economic development and an efficient administration was regarded as

the primary agent in formulation and implementation of government development plans and programmes. In this context, administration as a concept was highly regarded compared to the concept of management. In this paradigm, management as a concept began to take over from administration. Within this period, most African countries had just moved from colonial domination and they had undertaken serious socialist-oriented policies, but they never improved their efficiency. The focus of inquiry among public administration scholars spanned the dynamics of state-building, nation-building and bureaucracy building – a field of inquiry that Esman (1991) rightly called development administration. Hughes (2003) weighs in to suggest that fostering economic growth via bureaucracy according to a Western model of rational administrative authority became the concern of development administration. Consequently, scholars and practitioners started looking for solutions elsewhere, particularly in the private sector. Moreover, government was accused of inefficiency, red tape, corruption, and general poor service delivery. Government was regarded as part of the problem not part of the solution. The only doctor seemed to be in the private sector. It was clear at the time, as conveyed from the writings of the period, that many of the states' most talented citizens had learnt to work the existing system to their advantage (Joseph, 1987). The exploitative, inefficient and ineffective performance typical of Africa's independence regimes flowed directly from the difficulty of creating national governing rule-systems, and the sub-optimal solutions that were reached (Jackson & Rosberg, 1982; Young, 1994).

Period Five: From Public Administration to Public Management (1970-1990)

Before the 1960s, government was regarded as a central pillar of any society, more so in the delivery of essential public services. However, by the 1960s and 1970s, government came under intense pressure, with its greatest charge listing problems of being ineffective, inefficient, and largely wasteful. By this period, mismanagement, nepotism, political patronage, large and rigid bureaucracy, and widespread corruption became the features of public administration machinery (Turner & Hulme, 1997). These were trying moments for the discipline of public administration. There was a call by citizens for efficient administration to replace ineffective and wasteful bureaucracy. The challenge was on how to address the problems to fulfill the legitimate demands from the citizens who wanted better services from their governments. As a panacea to the problems, it was suggested that public administration would have to distance itself from politics to answer this call and if at all it had to remain effective. Elected officials supported these arguments for they had long believed that the involvement of the administrators in politics (policy making) had unfairly affected their spectrum of activities. For example, in the United States of America, the Hoover Commission, chaired by University of Chicago Professor Louis Brownlow, was constituted to examine reorganisation of government. Brownlow subsequently founded the Public Administration Service

(PAS) at the University, an organisation which provided consulting services to all levels of government until the 1970s.

During the 1980s, governments (and academics) were unconvinced that the traditional system of administration provided an effective form of management of their public services, especially when compared to the robust systems used by the private sector. This thinking brought about the need to inject an entrepreneurial spirit in the running of government using techniques and approaches borrowed from business administration. New modes of delivering public services that relied on business-like styles were proposed. As a result of this thinking all governments, particularly those from the west, including the Scandinavian countries, suggested a comprehensive package of reforms seen as prescriptions to cure the ills of the public sector. It is within this period that somewhere a managerial approach began (Hughes, 2003:48). From the 1980s onwards, the state started rolling back in both developed and developing countries for various reasons, and the emphasis shifted from the state and the public sector to the private sector. The public sector was generally 'diagnosed' to have had an acute sickness whose symptoms manifested themselves in inefficiency and corruption, among others. With this diagnosis, the experts forcefully argued that the prescriptions had to come from an efficient doctor who was only to be found in the private sector. Government was a patient and it needed a doctor! The prescriptions to governments were very clear: liberalise, privatise and stabilise. The implementation was later to see a number of reforms right from the structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) through the capacity-building reforms of the 1990s and the new service improvement reforms of the 2000s.

Mutahaba (2010) helps us to understand that by the 1980s, public administration systems in many countries of Africa were characterised by a high degree of inefficiency and ineffectiveness. As a result, they were unable to effectively implement national development plans. In addition to internal weaknesses and institutional limitations, the weak performance of the public administrative systems emanated from increased dependency on donors for the implementation of development plans. Citizens were increasingly dissatisfied with their governments and governments seemed unprepared to address the citizens' demands. The majority of African countries had just obtained independence from colonial powers and most of the inherited administrative systems did not have well qualified people to run the complex machinery of government and to fill a big vacuum that had been left by the colonial powers. Most African administrators were in fact more 'thirsty' for power than the delivery of services. Most African countries, Uganda included, experienced political turmoil which affected the social, political and economic organisation of the state.

Adamolekun (2005) reports that at independence, most countries in sub-Saharan Africa inherited public administration systems that performed two key functions of a modern state fairly satisfactorily: assuring the continuity of the state, and maintaining law and order within each country's territorial areas. During this time, most countries moved quickly to recruit and train nationals to replace the departing colonial officials and to assure the steady supply of trained men and women for their expanding public services. There was also a reorientation of the service delivery function of the public administration from the interests of the colonial countries to those of the new states. In many cases, this meant more rapid expansion of the provision of services in agriculture, the social sector, and infrastructure than was the case during the preceding decades of colonial rule. Because of the problems that characterised governments, experts began to perceive the weaknesses to be in the strong-state central planning model. Something needed to be done quickly to address this perceived problem. This debate did not only take place in Africa but in developed countries as well. Emphasis was placed on utilising and reforming existing structures and systems rather than building new ones -- an incremental approach of a sort was recommended. Management improvement systems for achieving results were developed, often in cooperation with private and community organisations. Solutions were now sought more from management than from administration. A policy consensus favouring privatisation, deregulation, debureaucratisation and decentralisation often went hand in hand with criticism of the state's role and a campaign to reverse the growth of government machineries.

Eventually, all efforts were directed at weakening the state in society and there was a consensus that the size of the government had to be chopped and more responsibilities given to the private sector through a number of new, well-designed mechanisms for service delivery. During the period, there was a collective assault on the organisation of government and vehement questioning of the conventional and traditional ways of doing things. The modalities that had long been relied on to deliver government services became a subject of attack. A clear distinction between private and public administration emerged. A general trend advocating for more "client" or "customer" oriented approaches, decentralisation of authority and being more "business oriented" gained high momentum. There emerged what was labeled the New Public Management (NPM) movement. The ideas of the NPM were grouped into two strands, namely,,those ideas that derived from managerialism (which emphasised management in government) and those ideas emanating from new institutional economics, which emphasised markets and competition as a way of giving choice and voice. NPM became a collective name for a bundle of particular management approaches and techniques, many of which were borrowed from the private sector.

For much of the 20th century, Hughes (2003:48) reminds us, there was little difference between management structures or styles between the public and private sectors. Large companies were as hierarchical and Weberian as any government department. It was only from the 1950s or 1960s that problems of bureaucratic rigidity became evident in the private sector. The rise of the manager coincided with the realisation that the division of tasks and the writing of manuals to cover every contingency had limitations. It was argued that someone needed to take charge and also take personal responsibility over results. The apparent success of managers in the private sector led to concerns being raised that the public sector had fallen behind. Quoting from Pross (1986:73), Hughes (2003:48) has the following message on the same subject:

Since the 1950s, there has been a steady deterioration in the potency of... sources of legitimacy and thus in the status of the bureaucracy...Flaws in the merit system were the first to cause concern. It was accepted that the public service was scrupulously non-partisan and highly competent, but in the eyes of many these advantages were offset by a system of management that undermined efficiency and effectiveness. (Hughes, 2003:48)

Economic reforms emphasised the need for liberalisation of the economy by reducing controls, denationalisation, privatisation, private sector orientation and reliance on market forces. Political reforms, which included democratisation, decentralisation, increased people's participation and public accountability, had to accompany the economic reforms. In addition, administrative reforms that included de-bureaucratisation, downsizing of the public service, introduction of strong measures for combating corruption and enhancing productivity (Turner & Hulme, 1997; Hughes, 2003) were implemented. Major systematic cutbacks in public administration were undertaken in several Western democracies in the early 1980s. The State, which in the previous 20 years had been widely perceived as a necessary engine of socio-economic development, was now portrayed in negative terms and condemned for interfering in market forces. The mystique of the dominant state machinery successfully leading development could no longer be regarded.

Following the changed role of the state and growing demands for good governance globally, the New Public Management (NPM) paradigm emerged to implant a new approach into traditional public administration. This new approach was geared towards enhancing efficiency, productivity, improved service delivery and accountability (Hughes, 2003), and emphasis was oriented to results as opposed to the process – which was the orientation of traditional public administration. The new approach called for a reduction in the exclusive reliance on public bureaucracy for service delivery to a system that advocated for the increased use

of the private sector and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) as alternative mechanisms of service delivery. It gained unmatched gusto when in 1992, David Osborne and Ted Gaebler published their book, *Reinventing government*. The new model advocated for the use of private sector-style models, organisational ideas and values to improve the efficiency and service-orientation of the public sector. The politics– administration dichotomy and the principles period were long gone but still alive in reality!

Hughes (2003:58) has offered one of the strongest critiques of the politics-administration dichotomy. While defending the need for public management, he argues that the traditional model tried to de-politicise what was essentially political. He believes that to achieve political goals is the main function of any public service worthy the name. Public management recognises the essential political character of government: public servants work with politicians in an interactive process called management. Of course, politicians have the final say, but the unrealistic separation of policy-making from administration has been finally discarded. On this same point, Hughes (2003:58) retorts thus, "if one of the main characteristics of the managerial model is that managers take responsibility for the achievement of results, the relationship between the managers and politicians and managers and the public must alter". He adds:

In the traditional model, the relationship between the politicians and managers was narrow and technical, of master and servant, of those giving the orders and those carrying them out. Under the public management model, the relationship between the politician and the manager is more fluid and closer than before. It is not a narrow and technocratic form of management, as political authority still exists. Public managers are now involved in matters of policy , they are also involved in matters of strict politics, they are more often personally responsible for matters and will pay by losing their jobs if something goes wrong. Public management has become a form of political management and the relationship with political leaders has changed…the skill needed of a public manager is how to be a bureaucratic politician, to be able to interact with politicians and with the outside in a way that is beneficial to both oneself and the organization. (Hughes, 2003:58)

Some authors have defined NPM as a combination of splitting large bureaucracies into smaller, more fragmented agencies, encouraging competition between different public agencies, encouraging competition between public agencies and private firms and using economic incentives lines (e.g. performance pay for senior executives or user-pay models). The defenders of NPM regard individual citizens as "customers" or "clients" (in the private sector sense), rather than as citizens who own the governments from a democratic point of view. Some critics have had seri-

ous issues with this, charging that the New Public Management concept of treating people as "customers" rather than "citizens" is an inappropriate borrowing from the private sector model which does not have a firm position in the public administration standing. The argument is that because businesses see customers as a means to an end (profit), rather than as the proprietors of government (the owners), merely the customers of a business (the patrons), government cannot follow this logic. In New Public Management, while people are viewed as economic units, in public administration, the same citizens are seen as democratic participants. In fact, they are regarded as owners of government and civil servants and politicians are simply agents and should be subordinate to civilian authorities (Maserumule, 2009).

During the Clinton Administration (1992-2000), it is reported that Vice President Al Gore adopted and reformed federal agencies using NPM approaches. In the 1990s, New Public Management became prevalent throughout the bureaucracies of the US, the UK and, to a lesser extent, in Canada. Several reforms which mirrored the NPM model promoted the diminished role of the state in favour of the bulldozing dominance of market forces and this became the full gospel of the 1980s and early 1990s. By the late 1980s, there was widespread acknowledgment of a development crisis in sub-Saharan Africa and the decline of public administration in the majority of the countries was just one of the manifestations, albeit a critical one, given its responsibility for the important state functions.

Major reforms were a common feature in Uganda. Such reforms included: broad economic reforms; privatisation of public enterprises; decentralisation; retrenchment and downsizing of the public sector (through the broader public service reforms); tax administration reforms; outsourcing and contracting out; performance-based management; public financial management reforms; and public procurement reforms. This idea of exporting public sector economic reforms to developing countries was crystallised in the "Washington Consensus" in 1995 when it was generally accepted by major donors and international development agencies that trade, not aid, and private investment, not state money, would be more effective in bringing about sustainable development in less developed countries. In line with these new ideas, the involvement of the State in economic and social development was to be reduced, and government was to operate according to market-like mechanisms wherever possible. Between 1966 and 1986, Uganda went through a series of civil conflicts that culminated into the National Resistance Movement (NRM) capturing state power in January 1986. These conflicts reduced the country's level of economic activity through the destruction of economic infrastructure, dis-saving and capital flight that diminished the country's stock of physical and human capital.

The country's economic productivity was reduced by disruption and expenditure diversion to quell the civil strife to the extent that per capita gross domestic product declined by 40 per cent between 1971 and 1986. During the same period, most Ugandans retreated into the informal sector of the economy and this led the subsistence activities (excluding livestock and construction) to increase from 21 to 36 per cent of the economy. Therefore, when the NRM took over state power from the Okellos' Junta (September 1985- January 1986), which itself had come to power after two decades of economic and social decline (including Idi Amin's military dictatorship – January 1971 to April 1979), Uganda's economy and society were in total ruins. A year later, in May 1987, the government, with the support of the Breton Woods institutions, embarked on economic policy reforms whose major objectives were to ensure the reconstruction of the war-torn country and eventually lead to the recovery and development of the Ugandan society. These reforms centred mainly on the liberalisation of the economy and decentralisation of government services with the view of achieving development and elimination of abject poverty among Ugandans.

During the past few years, there has been a gradual move away from extreme market or government solutions. Market forces alone have not led to economic productivity and social progress. Apparently, it has been realised rather not too late that markets and civil societies will not thrive without a strong and competent public administration. This implies that administration has to reclaim its central place in the management of public affairs. The role of state machinery should and is to be viewed in the larger perspective of governance. Beyond conventional bureaucratic public administration, governments now incorporate legal and policy frameworks for proper policy environments, and appropriate measures to promote participatory systems for civil society to engage in policy formulation and programme implementation, as well as contribute to an effective and transparent process for control and accountability of government actions. Nonetheless, public administration must remain the pre-eminent locus and responsible guarantor of the public interest and a vital player within public management and governance. Short of this logic, service delivery will remain in abeyance. We now turn to the governance paradigm.

Period Six: From Public Management to Governance (From the late 1990s to 2008)

The belief that lack of 'good governance' might be the main hindrance to economic growth in Africa was firmly set in the minds of the international community following a World Bank report published in 1989 which categorically declared that, "Underlying the litany of Africa's development problems was a crisis of governance". By 'governance' it was meant the exercise of power to manage a nation's

affairs. Since then, the phrase 'governance' has attained the status of a mantra in the development business. It is presented as the 'discovery of new truths' that must be hammered into the benighted minds of African policy makers. The Africans themselves often consider it as one more item on the list of aid conditionality (Mkandawire, 2007:679). The new inspiration word came from African scholars although the current use of the concept diverges significantly from their own original understanding. In the preparation of the 1989 report, the World Bank did the then unusual thing of consulting African scholars and commissioning them to prepare background papers, apparently at the insistence of Africans within the World Bank; and it is from this effort that governance became regarded as an important element of any government machinery.

In the late 1990s, Janet and Robert Denhardt proposed a new public service model in response to the dominance of NPM (Stone, 2008). This successor model to NPM was labeled the digital-era governance. It focused on themes of reintegrating government responsibilities, needs-based holism (executing duties in cursive ways), and digitalisation (exploiting the transformational capabilities of modern IT and digital storage).One example of this is openforum.com.au, an Australian not-for-profit eDemocracy project which invites politicians, senior public servants, academics, business people and other key stakeholders to engage in high-level policy debate. Principles such as public participation, transparency, accountability, and subsidiarity have now been a part of our daily lives. The effects of these principles posed problems which were worth investigating. The number of problems was increasing and these problems were getting more and more complicated and displaying technical characteristics on a large scale when compared with the past (Dwivedi, 2011:129). With this realisation, there was a consensus that there had to be a shift from public management to governance.

In 1992, Osborne and Gaebler published their book *Reinventing government*. In 1997, there was the conception of virtual organisations and beyond**.** With the changes in technology, communication, and the global economy, there was a perceived decline of government's role in delivery of services. Globalisation and the emergence of the Internet exerted immense pressure on governments to reduce their sovereignty so that the earth may be governed as a planet (Henry, 2010:38). With these pressures, the institutional distinction between the public (at central and local levels), not-for-profit and the private sector emerged. The centre of argument was the role of non-state actors in the delivery of public services which had been the preserve of the public sector before the 1970s and the private sector in the 1970s, 1980s and early 1990s. In the latter part of the 1990s, governments were required to relinquish most of their traditional responsibilities to individual citizens, groups of citizens, engage in public–private partnerships, the not-for-profit sector, the private sector, the public authorities, associations of government

and other governments, as well as a host of other non-state actors. In this whole arrangement, non-state actors were required to play a critical role in the delivery of public services. In this ensuing debate, a clear distinction between government and governance emerged.

In governance, as Henry (2010:38) sums up, "we are moving away from government, or the control over citizens and the delivery of public benefits by institutions of the state, and we are moving towards governance, or configuration of laws, policies or organizations, institutions, cooperative arrangements, and agreements that control citizens and deliver public benefits. Government is institutional; and yet governance is institutional and networked." Much of the new thinking referred to above originated from the developed nations. It found its filtration down to developing countries through technical assistance and structural adjustment programmes. In the majority of countries in the developing part of the globe, they experienced rising debt levels and an inability to meet their international obligations. As a solution, most of these countries acceded to reducing the role of the state through implementing whatever prescriptions were suggested by the powerful nations of the world. The fall of the former Soviet Union and the democratising trends that followed also reinforced the move towards more market-based economic systems. However, while this reliance on market forces was being practised in many countries, there was evidence that market therapy, both shock and gradual, led to some economic dysfunctions and much social misery. Apparently there might be a role for the State after all, if only to moderate the negative social consequences of the unregulated market.

Hughes (2003:76) has done a fine job in making an articulate distinction between government and governance. He opines that government is the institution itself, whereas governance is a broader concept describing forms of governing which are not necessarily in the hands of the formal government. It is within this same context that concepts like corporate governance, local governance, and global governance emerged. Corporate governance, for example, was used to refer to how the private sector structures its internal mechanisms to provide for accountability to its stakeholders. While government may be involved through company law in the affairs of the private sector, there are a number of aspects in which it does not have much control. Governance is not the preserve of the government alone but certainly it is one of the key players. Other players that may include private sector organisations, the church, non-governmental organisations, professional associations, traditional cultural institutions, and a number of other citizens' groups are important ingredients of good governance machinery. Initially, governments, private institutions, and civil society organisations were seen as critical institutions of governance. It was believed that their participation was crucial in mobilising the knowledge and insight necessary to take advantage of the potential benefits of globalisation and to mitigate or prevent its potential threats. However,

inclusion of other players was seen, and continues to be seen, as a mechanism of increasing the whole spectrum of citizen participation.

After decades of debate on the mutually exclusive roles of the State and the market, it became clear that there are as many complementarities as oppositions in the roles of these two partners. Along with this change, there was also a growing acceptance of the fact that different cultural and political circumstances required different approaches in lieu of the notorious 'one size fits all' solution. Governance issues are topical in every discipline. In this regard, the concept has been applied in various contexts – economic governance, political governance, environmental governance, administrative governance, judicial governance, social governance, technological governance, global governance, corporate governance and local governance, among others. In their paper on governance and democracy as critical pillars for successful East African regional integration, Bana and Basheka (2011) have suggested that the use of political governance may provide an appropriate broader template for the discussion of governance and democracy matters. They believe that politics shapes the functioning of any government and the politics in the state determines the economics, as well as providing an appropriate administrative framework for the delivery of services. Problems in the politics of a country create problems in the whole functioning of society.

To better understand governance, new and sophisticated tools have been developed and are being used to measure the performance of governments. The results from such measurements are now taken seriously by African leaders, policy makers and academics across different fields. One such tool, the Africa Governance Index as reported by Rotberg and Gisselquist (2009), has been widely accepted and leaders, such as in Rwanda, have shown great interest in understanding what they can do to improve their ranking in a given category. However, some leaders dispute specific rankings, but this still implies the measurement system makes them aware of how their governance is perceived domestically and internationally. Some leaders have shown willingness to make changes in their own actions in order to change these perceptions. The index offers a report card on the accomplishments of each government for the years being investigated. The idea of the Ibrahim index is to measure this statistically, and be able to compare increases or declines in governance. The index results allow citizens of individual countries, and civil society institutions to accurately monitor how well their government is performing. The index is updated annually and even the sources of information are continuously updated both through the efforts of the measuring institutions and other related projects.

Period Seven: From Governance to Global Crisis (2008-2010)

For the period 2008 to 2010, no serious academic theory was advanced. The world economy was grappling with the global economic order that saw Washington change its policies. Uganda's economy is still suffering from the global crisis with inflation now at over 30%. This period could be described as a period of the crisis of identity of the public administration discipline but also a crisis of ideology to guide governments. Most criticisms have been made against the Washington consensus policies especially on trade liberalisation and elimination of trade subsidies. The agricultural sector has become the centre of this criticism. Their prescriptions did not work the way they expected. The importance of local economic development models has gained much recognition with the current global economic crises.

Period Eight: From Governance to New Public Governance (2010 to date)

To support the role of the state and ensure that its goals are fulfilled, public administration continues to evolve, absorbing new methods and adapting practices according to social and technological progress. Internal and external pressures, as well as cultural and contextual challenges, continue to maintain a formidable presence, thereby influencing the way not only government delivers public services but also the way academia perceive this role. The multiplicity and complexity of the problems facing different countries surely do not support the adoption of the 'one-size-fits-all prescriptions. As public administration continues the struggle to provide the foundation for maintaining confidence in the stability and continuity of the State, efforts to enhance its professionalism and integrity and to buttress its impartiality, legality and transparency are critical to the fulfilment of the State's overarching goals. This new role of public administration in improving overall governance is carried out in the context of and in response to local, national, regional and global pressures, as well as challenges for survival, development and change. This point Louw underscores in her article, *From public administration to governance*: *Science or ideology*, in the pages of this edition of the *Journal of Public Management*.

The big challenge for governance in the years ahead is to reinvent a framework for society that transcends the government structure, and moves towards a more inclusive and organic linkage of the roles of government, business and civil society. Within the changing context, another new public service model dubbed 'New Public Governance – NPG', an approach which includes a centralisation of power; an increased number, role and influence of partisan–political staff; personal–politicisation of appointments to the senior public service; and the assumption that the public service is promiscuously partisan for the government of the day (Peter, 2008). Osborne (2010) suggests that NPM and governance approaches fail

to address the complex reality of the design, delivery and management of public services in the 21st century. He thus proposes what he calls a more sophisticated understanding of public policy implementation and public service delivery. Such an approach moves beyond the sterile dichotomy of 'administration vs management' and allows a more comprehensive and integrated approach to the study and practice of public policy implementation and public service delivery. Some previous writers had suggested that the concern of public administration should be an integrated science that borrows from other disciplines, while those disciplines maintain their original identity. To this end, Osborne fulfilled of what the author had recommended.

He reports to us that NPG is neither presented as a normative new paradigm to supersede public administration and NPM nor as the 'best way' to respond to the challenges of public policy implementation and public service delivery in the 21st century. Rather, it is being presented as a conceptual tool with the potential to assist our understanding of the complexity of these challenges and as a reflection of the reality of the working lives of public managers today. Governance and public governance are not new terms; they come with considerable prior theoretical and/or ideological baggage. He informs us that critics have differentiated two broad schools of governance literature – corporate governance and 'good governance'. He argues that NPG focuses more on inter-organisational relationships and on the governance of processes, stressing service effectiveness and outcomes that rely on the interaction of PSOs with their environment. The central resource-allocation mechanism within NPG is argued to be the inter-organisational network, with accountability being something to be negotiated at the inter-organisational and interpersonal levels within these networks.

In his final observations, he suggests that if we are to develop NPG as a conceptualisation of public policy implementation and public service management, it is necessary to move towards an integrated body of knowledge about the NPG. What about the German Professor Stein who had advocated for this in the 19th century? Had academics built on this approach, probably we would have a new public administration body of knowledge. This requires our research community to start asking a series of 'new questions' about the fundamentals of NPG. These questions are focused on the underlying principles of public services delivery in the plural and pluralist state and on the public service system rather than on individual PSOs. But public administration has traditionally focused on a political system, not an individual PSO. He suggests the following new questions:

- What should be our basic unit of analysis in exploring public policy implementation and public services delivery, and what are the implications of this for theory and practice? -- the fundamental question

- What organisational architecture is best suited to delivering public services in the pluralist state? – the architecture question
- How do we ensure sustainable public service systems and what does sustainability mean? – the sustainability question (the same as the previous questions above but he has changed the order)
- What values underpin public policy implementation and service delivery in such systems? – the values question (what about the propositions by Weber and other writers?)
- What key skills are required for relational performance? - the relational skills question
- What is the nature of accountability in fragmented plural and pluralist state? - the accountability question
- How do you evaluate sustainability, accountability, and relationship performance within open natural public service delivery systems? – the evaluation question. How is it different from the performance measurement in NPM or Weber's views on expectations of the public servant?

CONCLUSION

The challenges before us today are different from those of yesterday, and will most likely be different from those of tomorrow and the days to follow. However, the study of public administration is informed by the history that hardly changes. There is an impressive past in the practices and theory of public administration that we should never forget. History needs to be a walking stick for our discipline. Contextually, pre-colonial Africa had impressive systems for managing public affairs that scholars of the discipline on the continent must examine. The teaching of public administration in African universities should explore the indigenous systems with a view to capturing major value systems that put societies together for the common good of everybody. Community resources were jealously guarded by everybody and discipline was a key principle for harmonious existence. Precolonial Africa had accomplished a great dea; in the areas of political and social organisation, architecture, city building, arts and crafts, commerce and trade, tax administration, grievance handling and discipline, as well as the practical elements of democracy. In an effort to understand pre-colonial Africa, scholars must create a balance sheet where good values that could have maintained practices are screened from bad practices, especially those that were practised by tyrants. Despite the historical facts, public administration has to respond to challenges of our times. While Henry (2010:39) predicts that the future of public administration is one of less government, the extent to which this will be possible under situations of global economic crises and apparent failure of other actors should be a matter of concern to all public administration scholars. Citizens are increasingly becoming concerned about the kind of services they get from their agents–government.

Citizens in a democratic government will always blame their own governments because it is the same governments to which they transferred their responsibilities.

Dhameja (2003:8) has observed that contemporary public administration cannot sustain itself in a political, economic and social vacuum. The implication of such a statement is that the discipline will keep changing in the light of changing circumstances within society. Public administration of the contemporary folk will keep facing complex challenges and pressures in the face of changing trends in liberalisation, privatisation and globalisation. Compared to the problems existing in public administration, general research in public administration is comparatively backward. Today, the management of public affairs remains an extremely important area of practice. The study of public administration is essential in the day-to-day world. It is assuming global importance and gradually occupying a central place and position in the family of social sciences. However, we cannot understand the public administration of today or the one of tomorrow without knowing what has happened before.

REFERENCES

Adamolekun , L. 2005. Re-orienting public management in Africa: Selected issues and some country experiences. *Economic Research Working Paper No 81* (November 2005). Available online at: *http://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Publications/00457497-EN-ERWP-81*. Accessed on 21 May 2011.

Ake, C. 2000. Deeper into original sin: The context of ethical crisis in African public services. In S. Mukandala Rwekaza, (ed.) *African Public Administration: A reader*. Harare: AAPS Books.

Bana, B. & Basheka, B.C. 2011. 'Governance and democracy as critical pillars for successful East African regional integration'. Paper presented at the East African Conference. Dar es Salaam, 19-21 December 2011.

Basu, R. 1994. *Public administration: Concepts and theories* (3rd revised and enlarged ed). New Dehli: Sterling Publishers Private Limited.

Breton, A. & Wintrobe, R. 1985. *The logic of bureaucratic conduct: An economic analysis of competition, exchange, and efficiency in private and public organizations*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Cox, R. W. Buck, S.J. & Morgan, B.N. 2011. *Public administration in theory and practice*. (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Dahl, R.A. 1947. The science of public administration: Three problems. *Public Administration Review 7* (Winter):l-ll.

Denhardt, R.B. & Denhardt, J.V. (2000). The New Public Service: Serving rather than steering. *Public Administration Review*, 60(6).

Dhameja, A. (ed). 2003. *Contemporary debates in public administration*. New Dehli: Prentice Hall of India.

Dimock, M.E., Dimock, G.O. & Koerug, L.W. 1953. *Public Administration* (Revised ed.). New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc.

Dwivedi, O.P. & William, G. 2011. Public administration: State of the discipline – a historical odyssey. In Dwivedi. O.P (ed.) *Public administration in a global context: IASIA at 50*. Brussels: Bruylant.

Englebert, P. 2000. Solving the mystery of the Africa dummy. *World Development*, 28(10):1821-1835.
Esman, M.J. 1991. *Management dimensions of development: Perspectives and strategies*. West Hartford, Connecticut: Kumarian Press.

Fesler, W.J. 1980. *Public administration: Theory and practice*. Prentice Hall: United States of America.
Gaus, J.M. 1950. Trends in the theory of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 10:188.
Gladden, E.N. 1972. *A history of public administration*. London: Frank Cass.
Goodnow, F.J. 1900. *Politics and administration: A study in government.* New York: Russell & Russell.

Henry, N. 2010. *Public administration and public affairs* (11th ed.). New York: Pearson.

Hughes, O.E. 2003. *Public management and administration: AniIntroduction (3rd ed.).New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.*

Holzer, M. & Zhang, M. 2002.*Chinese Public Administration Review*, 1(1):1-8. Available online at: http://scpa.newark.rutgers.edu/~scpa/pdf/Introduction.pdf]. Accessed on 12 March 2007.

Jayapalan, N. 2000. *Public Administration*. New Dehli: Atlantic Publishers and Distributors.

Jones, G.N. 1976. Frontiersmen in search of the 'lost horizon': The state of development administration in the 1960s. *Public Administration Review* 36:99-110.

Mair, L. 1962. *Primitive government*. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books.
Martin, R.C. 1952. Political science and public administration: A note on the state of the Union. *American Political Science Review* 46:660-676.

Mkandawire, T. (2007) Good governance: the itinerary of an idea. *Development in Practice,* 17(4/5):679-681. [http://www.jstor.org/stable/25548269] Accessed on 29 July 2011.

Mullins, L.J. 2007. *Management and organizational behavior* (8th ed). London.

Mutahaba, G. 2010. *Integrating and re-aligning public sector reforms to more effectively respond to current and future crises facing Africa.* Background paper, 7th Commonwealth Africa Heads of Public Service Forum. Yaoundé, Cameroon, 27-29 July. London: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Nasrullah, M.A. 2005. From public administration to New Public Management: An analysis. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(1):197-204.

Nicholas, H. 2010. *Public administration and public affairs* (11th ed). New York: Prentice Hall.

Njoh, A.J. 2006.*Tradition, culture and development in Africa: Historical lessons for modern*. Aldershot, United Kingdom: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.

Peter, A. 2008. Conference on New Public Management and the quality of government. Paper presented on *New Public Management and the Quality of Government: Coping with the New Political Governance in Canada*. SOG and the Quality of Government Institute, Sweden: University of Gothenburg, 13-15 November 2008:14.

Raadschelders, J. 1998. *Handbook of administrative history.* Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Rotberg, R.I. & Gisselquist, R.M. 2009. *Strengthening African governance: Index of African governance, results and rankings 2009*. Cambridge, MA: Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University and World Peace Foundation.

Shafritz, J.M. & Russell, E.W. 1996. *Introducing public administration .*Addison Wesley Publishing Company.

Shafritz, J.M., Russell, E.W. & Borick, C.P. 2011. *Introducing public administration*, (7th ed.). London: Pearson.

Simcox, J.E. 2010. Primitive civilization or outlines of the history of the ownership in archaic communities. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simon, A.H. 1946. The proverbs of administration. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 6, No. 1:53-67.

Simon, H.A., Smithburg, D.W. & Thompson, A.V. 1991. *Public administration*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Stone, S.A. I999. Judicialization and the construction of governance. *Comparative Political Studies,* 32, 2:I47-84.

Stone, D. 2008, Global public policy, transnational policy communities, and their networks. *Policy Studies Journal*, 36:19-38.

Stone, A.B. & Stone, D.C. 1975. Early development of education in public administration. In Mosher (ed). *American Public Administration*. Tuscaloosa: University Press:11-48.

Storing, J.H. 1965. Leonard D. White and the study of public administration. *Public Administration Review*, 25(1):38-51.

Turner, M. & Hulme, D. 1997.*Governance, administration and development: Making the state work*, Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.

Van Wart, M. & Cayer, N. 1990. Comparative public administration: Defunct, dispersed or redefined? *Public Administration Review*, March/April: 238-248.

Woodrow, W. 1887. The study of administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 2(2):197-222 [URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2139277 Accessed on 24 February 2009.

Young, C. I994. *The African colonial state in comparative perspective*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Zhang, M. 2001. The root and paradigm shift of public administration, *Chinese Public Administration,* 3:396-401.

***Basheka** is an Adjunct Professor of Political Science and Public Administration at the School of Political Science and Public Administration of the University of Electronic Science and Technology (UESTC) in China and a Head of Higher Degrees at Uganda Management Institute in Kampala, Uganda. He is the Coordinator for the department's PhD Programme in Management and Administration. bbasheka@ yahoo.co.uk