LITERARY EXPLORATION OF THE DYNAMICS SHAPING PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THEORY AND PRACTICE: FOCUS ON COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINSTRATION

Bashir Yusuf
Department of public Administration, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
bashiryusif86@gmail.com
08032613492;

Professor Hamza A. Yusuf
Department of public Administration, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
Hamzapad66@ email .com
08034500027
&
Musa Idris
Department of public Administration, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria
musaidrisaa@gmail.com
08034772717

Abstract

The study is an exploration of the dynamics shaping and refocusing Public Administration in theory and practice: mainly focusing on the contributions of Comparative Public Administration (CPA). The study is set to identify the paradigms of public administration and the various changes encountered by the young discipline from its inception as an academic field of study in the late 19''' century to its present state of earth. In a bid to achieve this contributions of the newly subfield of Comparative Public Administration and how this have reshaped the mother discipline were extensively analysed through literatures obtained from text books, journals, and material obtained from the internet. The study revealed among other things that, the paradigmatic shifts in public administration depicts various efforts of governments to adopt and adapt to new and better ways to satisfy the yearnings of their public and the scholarly attempts to rationalize those approaches, and that, the changes in concept from politics administration dichotomy to public administration as political science up to governance and collaborative government levels remains key to understanding the foundation of the relationship between the government and the citizens of a country on one hand and the locus and the focus of the discipline through its various developmental stages. The emergence and growth of the field of Comparative Public Administration has reshaped and refocused the theory and practice of public administration from

different angles such as widening the horizon of interest and thereby offer relevant and practical solutions to the problems being faced by mankind by looking at the problems from a comparative perspective. It was also found that, CPA has strengthened relations among institutions designed for the improvement of Public Administration practically forge new modalities for concerted action to improve public administration for development. Furthermore, CPA has helped in the growth of the subject of Public Administration by developing theoretical construct applicable across the globe. Without comparative analysis, the theories and models will lack cross-national, cross temporal and cross cultural applicability. It was recommended among other things that, more efforts need to be put in place in the development studies of the developing nations to address the peculiarities of these nations towards addressing their developmental issues and that, more emphasis should be given to non-Western countries in developing literatures in CPA.

Key words: Comparative Public Administration, paradigm of public administration, administrative science, Theory and Practice of Public Administration, governance.

1.1 Introduction

Public Administration stands for two implications. First it refers to the activity of administering the affairs of government, like the enforcement of law and order. Second, it also refers to a field of study, like that of political science, psychology, sociology, economics. As an activity public administration is as old as mankind. While as an academic field of study it is of recent and a young discipline among the disciplines in social science. The increasing complexities and responsibilities of government within most polities of the world over the years have created, among others, intellectual excitement and attention about the study of governmental processes and structures. Thus, the study of public administration as a field of inquiry has gained increasing attention in order to keep pace with the ever expanding administrative and policy functions of government and their accompanying demands on practical administration and the practitioners. This has necessitated the need to understand in both theoretical and practical sense the concept of public administration, its evolutionary trends that account for its dynamism.

In a bid to develop theoretical basis and practical sense of public administration, attempts were made by some corporations, governments and associations to develop researches in both the theory and practice of public administration. This

has led to the establishment of Comparative Administrative Group (CAG) in 1960s under the auspice of American Society for Public Administration (ASPA), National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA). The establishment of CAG coupled with the funding provided by the Ford Foundations, several studies including books, research journals, conferences etc were sponsored which advanced the frontier of public administration in focus and locus by developing sub-field of public administration i.e. comparative public administration

The focus of this paper therefore is to explore the dynamics shaping and refocusing public administration in theory and practice from the inception of the discipline in the late 19th century up to its current state of earth. Special preferences were also given on how the sub-discipline comparative administration contributes to the development of public administration both in theory and practice. The paper is divided into six parts. Part one is the introduction, while part two focuses on the conceptual exploration of basic concepts; part three discusses the paradigms in the intellectual evolution of public administration, Part four focuses on discussions of the contributions of the CPA to the development of public administration while Part five concludes the paper and offer working recommendations based on the discussions. The paper is an exploratory type using literatures obtained from books, journals, reports, online materials etc and sources were duly acknowledged in the list of references provided.

1.2 Conceptual Exploration:

1.2.1 The Concept of Public Administration

The concept of public administration like other concepts in social sciences has not been free from definitional disputations. The discipline has undergone various metamorphoses in the quest for a definitional unanimity. This has been due to the extension of governmental role from its traditional maintenance of law and order to the performance of socioeconomic roles through regulatory activities, provision of infrastructure and other services (Agagu, 1997) and the indispensability of the bureaucratic procedures and processes (Akindele, et al. 2002) which brought with it complex asymmetrical goals; aspirations and interests that cannot be ignored by any reasonable definitional elucidation of the concept of public administration

According to Wilson (1887) cited in Henry, (2007) Public Administration is detailed and systematic execution of law. Every particular application of law is an act of administration. He further says administration is the most obvious part of the

government, it is the government in action; it is the executive, the operative, the most visible side of the government. This is a classical conceptualisation of public administration. In the same vein, Corson and Harris (1963) once opined that public administration is the action part of government, the means by which the purposes and goals of government are realized. And in the process Waldo (1980) describes it as the continuously active business part of government concerned with carrying out the law, as made by legislative bodies or other authoritative agents and interpreted by courts, through the process of organization and management. Simon, (1947) sees public administration as the activities of the executive branches of the national, state and local governments. Nigro, (1969) perceived public administration as (i) is a cooperative group effort in a public setting (ii) covers all the three branches- executive, legislative and judicial and their inter-relationship; (iii) has an important role in the implementation of public policy and is thus part of the political process; (iv) is different in significant ways from private administration; and (v) is closely associated with numerous private groups and individuals in providing services to the community. This is conceptualisation of public administration in a broadest perspective (Henry, 2007).

From the above we may understand that, public administration has been used in two senses i.e. the wider sense and narrower sense. In the wider sense public administration include the activities of all the three branches of government that is legislature, executive and judiciary. While in the narrower sense it includes the activities of only the executive branch of government.

1.2.2 The Concept of Comparative Public Administration

Waldo, (1964) observed that, to compare is to examine similarities and differences simultaneously, the effort is bent forward to two main ends; (i) to discover, define and differentiate the stuff (politics and administration) to be compared wherever in the world it may be; and (ii) to develop criteria of differentiation that are useful in ordering and analyzing the stuff once it has been identified.

Comparative Administrative Group (CAG) define CPA as "the theory of public administration as applied to diverse cultures and national settings and the body of factual data by which it can be examined and tested (Heady, 1962 cited in Singh & Singh 2012) it stresses the comparative analysis of systems of public administration i.e. building and strengthening theory in public administration.

Jackson (1966) defines CPA as that facet of the study of public administration which is concerned with making rigorous cross-cultural comparisons of the structures and processes involved in the activity of administering public affairs. This definition seems more convincing. While Naidu's, (2006) point of view is that, CPA in a simpler term means cross-cultural and cross-national public administration. CPA is also a study of public administration on a comparative basis. The origin of CPA can be traced to the 1952 conference on administration held at Princeton University in USA. As such CPA is a new comer to the community of academic instruction and research.

In a nutshell, Comparative public administration deals with administrative organisations or systems pertaining to different cultures and settings whose similar or dissimilar features or characteristics are studied and compared in order to find out causes or reasons for efficient or effective performance or behaviour of administrators, civil servants or bureaucrats.

The main objective of CPA has been to contribute to a genuine and generic discipline of public administration. Specifically, CPA addresses five motivating concerns: the search for theory; the urge for practical application; the incidental contribution of the broader field of comparative politics; the interest of researchers trained in the tradition of administrative law; and the comparative analysis of ongoing problems of public administration (Sapru, 2013)

1.3 Evolutionary Trends of Pubic Administration:

Public Administration stands for two implications. First it refers to the activity of administering the affairs of government, like the enforcement of law and order. Second, it also refers to a field of study, like that of political science, psychology, sociology, economics etc. (Laxmikanth, 2014).

Public administration as an aspect of governmental activity is as old as political society that is it has co-existed with political system to accomplish the objectives set by the political decision makers. But as a field of study, public administration is much more recent. It is only about hundred years old (Laxmikanth, 2014; Henry, 2007). Though, there evidences bound to proof that, Public administration was also studied seriously as a professional career in ancient time in Persia, Rome, and China. Therefore, there is no sharp point in history where the history of public administration begins (Stillman, 1980). Furthermore, history has shown that, since the ancient times various thinkers have contributed to the administrative thought

and practice such as Kautilya's Arthashastra in ancient India, Aristotle's politics in ancient West and Machiavelli's the Prince in Medieval West. These scholars have raised significant observations about organisation and functioning of government. Towards the end of 18th century in USA, the meaning and and scope of public administration was defined for the first eime in Hamilton's the federalist (No 72), Charles Jean Bounin's principle de Administration Publique (1812) in French is considered as the first separate treatise on the subject of public administration.

However, the origin of Modern public administration as a discipline was said to be birthed and nurtured in the United States. In US there were two general textbooks on the subject matter of public administration which were regarded as the first attempt at presenting the discipline. These books were written by two scholars, White and Willoughby and published in 1926 and 1927, respectively. Although, the publication of these books marked the birth of public administration as a discipline, it should at the same time be noted that there had been several decades of preparation for the birth of the discipline ever before they were published. For example, the works and efforts of some United States political leaders such as Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton cannot be underestimated in the attention which these leaders gave to the problems of public administration in a futuristic manner. Despite these efforts and their relevance to the growth and maturation of public administration, one cannot also down-play or ignore the remarkable essay by Wilson (1887) which serves as the symbolic beginning of the discipline in such a perceptive, persuasive and influential way (Akindele, et al 2002).

According to Henry, (2007), in 1887 Woodrow Wilson largely set the tone for the early study of American public administration in an essay titled "the study of administration" Wilson observed that, "it is getting harder to run a constitution than to frame one" and he called for bringing more of more intellectual resources to bear in the management of state. Wilson's thesis had a lasting impact on the field public administration as worth of studying. From the time of the birth of the discipline to date Public Administration has undergone through numerous stages which either introduced changes to the field both in theory and practice or only succeeded in introducing changes in the nomenclature of the discipline. On the basis of this, a prominent and erudite scholar in the discipline Henry (1975; 2007) identified six paradigms in the intellectual development of public administration as a field of study in the following manner:

(i) Paradigm 1: the politics/administration dichotomy 1900-1926
(ii) Paradigm 2: principles of public administration 1927- 1937
(iii) Paradigm 3 Public administration as political science 1950-1970
(iv) Paradigm 4: public administration as Management 1956-1970
(v) Paradigm 5 Public administration as public administration 1970-NPM
(vi) Paradigm 6: Governance, 1990-present

The successions of these numbers of paradigms are overlapping as presented above. However, each of these paradigms or stages of development entails an emphasis of what should constitute the focus and the locus for the study of public administration. By the Locus we refer directly to 'Where', to the contexts that are considered to yield the phenomena of interest. The 'Focus', refers to the analytical targets of public administration i.e. 'what' with which specialists are concerned (Henry, 2007; Laxmikanth, 2014). Brief details of these are presented here:

Paradigm 1: The politics administration dichotomy (1900–1926)

The major assumption of the Politics Administration Dichotomy paradigm was the idea of separating politics and the administration functions of government as a strategy for promoting efficiency and effectiveness in the cost of running government. This was the era of generic administration model that promotes that administration or management should have scientific principles that could work whether in public or private setting. Basheka (2012) remarks that Woodrow Wilson who pioneered this paradigm with his seminal article of 1887 earmarked four requirements of effective public administration, namely, (1) Separation of politics and administration, (2) Comparative analysis of political and private organizations, (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 paradigm provided a solid foundation for the theorization and pedagogy of public administration, and also it gave the field a scientific orientation which seeks to distinguish facts from values. Thus, Henry (1975) remarks:

> The net result of Paradigm 1 was to strengthen the notion of a distinct politics/ administration dichotomy by relating it to a corresponding value/fact dichotomy. Thus, everything that public administrationists scrutinized in the executive branch was imbued with the colorings and legitimacy of being somehow "factual" and "scientific," while the study of public policy

making and related matters was left to the political scientist (Ikeanyibe et al 2017:3)

Paradigm 2: the principles of administration, 1927–1937

The principles of administration paradigm were advancement to the management orientation through the elevation of public administration, nay, administration/management to status of science. As such, there was the belief that there existed certain scientific principles of administration that could be relied upon to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of government, and these principles by their scientific characteristic, could work in any administrative setting regardless of sector, culture, function, environment, mission or institutional framework. Therefore, these principles of administration have universal validity and relevance. Hence, scholars claimed that, public administration is a science.

The stage began with the publication of W.F. Willoghby's principles of Administration in (1927), where he asserted that, "in administration there are certain fundamental principles of general application analogous to those characterizing any science." Other publications reflecting the principles of administration include: Fayol's industrial and general management (1916); Follet's (1924) creative experience; Mooney and Reiley's onward industry (1931); Gulick and Urwick (1937) papers on the science of Administration, where they identified seven principles of administration viz planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting (POSDCORB) became the climax of this stage (Basheka, 2012) and Moony and Reiley's principles of organisation (1939).

The two paradigms presented above represent what is usually described as the traditional public administration model that focuses on the career, neutrally competent civil servant working within a structure of hierarchical authority as the best means, in both normative and empirical terms, of translating policies into action (Derlien, 1999; Peters, 2003). Walsh and Stewart (1992) as presented by Peters (2003) provide the features or assumptions of the traditional model consisting of:

(1) An assumption of self-sufficiency: government is a self-sufficient actor that can act autonomously on the economy and society.
(2) An assumption of direct control: government is internally structured by authority and hierarchy, so that the individuals at the top of organizational pyramids were assumed capable of exercising control within their own organizations.

(3) An assumption of accountability upward: Accountability was to flow upward, with career officials answering to their political "masters" and those ministers answering to legislatures. This mode of accountability was to be the principal form of connection of administration with the political system, and with the surrounding social system.
(4) An assumption of uniformity: Government was supposed to treat all citizens equally and to provide the same benefits and deprivations to all similarly situated people. This was seem as a fundamental conception of fairness.
(5) An assumption of a civil service system: That is, standardized establishment procedures, in which the personnel in the public sector were to be governed through a formalized civil service for recruitment, pay, grading, and other aspects of internal management (Ikeanyibe, et al 2017)

Paradigm 3: public administration as political science, 1950–1970

Paradigm three, which Henry (1975) describes as the paradigm of public administration as political science (1950–1970) saw the revolt of political scientists to reclaim public administration. At the same period, there were increasing efforts for management theorists to also claim the discipline. Basheka (2012) as cited in Ikeanyibe, et al (2017) describes the period as the era of deflating the dichotomy and puncturing the principles. Thus, politics-administration dichotomy was refuted on the grounds of inseparability of administration from politics in the real world of government. Politics according to Basheka which had initially meant partisan and corrupt politics expanded in scholarly meaning by 1930s to include public policy-making. At this point, it became obvious that the dichotomy is practically untenable.

For scholars like Gaus (1950), a theory of public administration means in our time a theory of politics also. It was also contended that there was no such thing as "principle of administration". Herbert A. Simon's *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-making Processes in Administrative Organization* (1947) was probably the most important source of challenge at this period. His work contained a searching critique of the older Public Administration, particularly of its use of "principles." These so-called principles, he observed, are similar to maxims of folk wisdom and, in fact, given the loose and unscientific way in which they have been derived and stated, cannot be regarded as more than proverbs (International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 1968).

Things got relatively nasty by the end of the decade and, for that matter, well into the 1960s. In 1962, public administration was not included as a subfield of political science in the report of the Committee on Political Science as a Discipline of the American Political Science Association. In 1964 a major survey of political scientists indicated that the Public Administration Review was slipping in prestige among political scientists relative to other journals, and signalled a decline of faculty interest in public administration generally. 8 In 1967, public administration disappeared as an organizing category in the program of the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. Waldo wrote in 1968 that, "The truth is that the attitude of political scientists ... is at best one of indifference and is often one of undisguised contempt or hostility. We are now hardly welcome in the house of our youth." A survey conducted in 1972 of the five major political science journals of a non-specialized nature indicated that only four per cent of all the articles published between 1960 and 1970 could be included in the category of "bureaucratic politics," which was the only category of the 15 possible that related directly to public administration (Henry, 2007)

Public administration at this phase of its development was merely defined as an emphasis' or "area of interest" or even as a "synonym" of political science (Landau, 1962). The approach continued to emphasise the bureaucratic approach, but certainly led to the over-bureaucratisation and the diffusion of public administration to virtually every aspect of government ranging from policy determination to its implementation, services and the economy. On this, Farazmand (2002) remarks that, public administration during this period "emphasized institution building, bureaucratization, nationalization, and a wide variety of organizational and administrative capacity building for national and economic development." The end product was the enthronement of the welfare state.

Paradigm 4: public administration as management, 1956–1970

Fourth paradigm (1956–1970) was referred to public administration as administrative science or public administration as management (Henry, (1975; 2007). It virtually coincides with the 3rd showing that it was not a win-win victory for political science as some scholars consolidated the management outlook of public administration. Clearly in stages 3 and 4, the two disciplines contending for the soul of public administration almost left no locus and focus for the newly acclaimed science and field of study canvassed by the pioneer scholars.

There was a problem in the administrative science or management route, if it were selected as the sole focus of public administration, could one continue to speak of public administration? After all, administrative science, while not advocating universal principles, nevertheless did and does contend that all organizations and managerial methodologies have certain characteristics, patterns, and pathologies in common. If only administrative science defined the field's paradigm, then public administration would exchange, at best, being an "emphasis" in political science departments for being, at best, a subfield in schools of administrative science. There were also conceptual dilemmas as laid in the traditional distinction between the "public" and "private" spheres of American society. What is public administration, what is everything else (i.e., "private" administration), and what is the dividing line between the two types has been a painful dilemma for a number of years

Management had some distinct and beneficial influences on public administration. Among them was its pressure on public administrationists to develop new methodologies of management that worked where traditional private sector did not. Thus management paradigm pushed public administrationists into rethinking what the 'public' in public administration really means. In fact, publicness and privateness in society comprised three dimensions: Agency, Interest and Access. To sum it up this paradigm was characterised by enhanced effort from both academecians and practitioners toward an enhanced self awareness to separate public administration from both political science and management and by 1970 the separatist movement was underway.

Paradigm 5: public administration as public administration, 1970–present

Public administration as public administration refers to public administration's successful field of study and practice. The fifth paradigm is in some ways a return to the locus of the governmental bureaucracy (Henry, 2007). The emergence of professional bodies like the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) which composed of some 250 colleges and universities awarding certificates in public administration. This has moved the frontiers of the discipline by increasing the number of MPA programmes awarded by departments of public administration. In fact, the proportions of public administration programmes run by schools of business administration and political science departments have drastically reduced from 17% in 1970s to 12% by 2007.

The efforts made here reestablished the discipline as an autonomous field of study being studied in the universities and colleges.

In terms of the focus of the discipline, Henry, (1975) lament that, there is not yet a focus for the field in the form of a "pure science of administration," but at least organization theory primarily has concerned itself in the last two and a half decades with how and why organizations work, how and why people in them behave, and how and why decisions are made. Additionally, considerable progress has been made in refining the applied techniques of management science, as well as developing new techniques, that often reflect what has been learned in the more theoretical realms of organizational analysis.

The paradigm is also characterised by the fact that, the traditional and rigid distinction of the field between the "public sphere" and the "private sphere" appears to be waning as public administration's new and flexibly defined locus waxes. Furthermore, public administrationists have been increasingly concerned with the inextricably related areas of policy science, political economy, the public policy-making process and its analysis, and the measurement of policy outputs.

The paradigm has two basic trends. First, was institutionalized Curricular Autonomy With a paradigmatic focus of organization theory and management science, and a paradigmatic locus of the public interest as it relates to public affairs, public administration at last is intellectually prepared for the building of an institutionally autonomous educational curriculum that can develop the epistemological uniqueness of the field. The second trend is institutional. Public administration programs normally lodged in political science departments and schools of business are increasingly housed by department of public administration as earlier highlighted.

Paradigm 6: Governance, 1990–present

Towards the middle of the fifth paradigm, there was a move from the traditional, conventional public administration model to the New Public Management (NPM) model. Indeed against the various paradigms or stages of public administration development recognised by Henry (1975). Peters, (2003) argues that, the five assumptions of traditional model listed by Walsh and Stewart (1992) as earlier presented are collection of ideas describing how governments performed their tasks in the pre-NPM reform public sector. Thus, the critical paradigm shifts are not in the more detailed stages identified by Henry (1975), but in three distinct streams of the Conventional or Traditional paradigm, the NPM paradigm and the Governance paradigm (Ikeanyibe, et al, 2017). NPM emerged to confront the same problem of inefficiency in administrative system, its teachings were anchored on state

withdrawal and a shift to use the private sector. Peters (2003) cited in Ikeanyibe, et al (2017) in this light observed that, the whole idea of generic management portends the NPM paradigm. The paradigm shift to this approach was from the Conventional Public Administration and it gradually gave way for the Governance paradigm. In fact, he has also argued that many practitioners tend to include the Governance paradigm as part of the NPM. He argued that:

> I should also point out here that although much of the change in public administration can be characterized as the NPM, some changes also have arisen from a rather different set of practices and ideas. At the same time that some practitioners were moving public sector management in the direction of that found in the private sector, with an implicit business model of administration in mind, other practitioners were moving toward a very different conception of relationships with the private sector. This relationship between the public and private sectors has come to be known as "governance (Peters, 2003 cited in Ikeanyibe et al 2017)

The concept is defined as the exercise of power or authority by political leaders for the well-being of their country's citizens or subjects, the complex process whereby some sectors of the society wield power, and enact and promulgate public policies which directly affect human and institutional interactions, and economic and social development (Tamayao, 2014).

NPM and governance were both public administration streams of the neoliberal ideology that most Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries embraced in the late 1970s and early 1980s. The two concepts NPM and governance according to Peters (2003) in some ways do fit together well, attempting to break down the hierarchical, top-down system of governing inherited from the past. Thus,

> Some of the recommendations coming from the two approaches are almost exactly the same, e.g. the decentralization of government functions. Further, the two versions of change make some recommendations that are compatible, and even complementary. For example, the ideas in the NPM about the performance management and an emphasis on the measurement of outputs from government may facilitate the use of non-governmental actors to deliver programs.

Some scholars though, believe that the governance approach came much later and marks an important break with neoliberalism. For instance, Archer (1994) argues

that whereas neoliberalism recognizes that markets are the whole answer, the governance approach does not. It rather recognizes the importance of collaboration of government and other sectors including the private and civil society or the third sector in service provisioning (Ikeanyibe, 2016). In this instance, while the NPM can be said to be the core administrative stream of neoliberalism, governance was a reaction against the excesses of this approach. Peters (2003) provides a more clear distinction between the NPM and the Governance paradigm thus:

> In the NPM world the use of non-governmental actors is to reduce costs, increase efficiency, and limit the power of the State. In the governance approach there are some elements of efficiency but the principal justification is to involve the civil society, enhance participation, and recognize the capacity of networks in civil society to provide at least a certain degree of self-management in their policy areas.

The reform initiatives of NPM was criticized of being undermining other fundamental values in governing public affairs, such as fairness, justice, representation, and participation, in the name of improving efficiency (Wu & He, 2009). The governance orientation therefore, provides the new dimension of participation and working with various networks. The government therefore governs through collaboration of the hierarchical bureaucracy and networks to achieve not only efficiency but other important values that should be the concern of government (Ikeanyibe et al 2017).

The term governance is, therefore, employed to describe some fundamental processes of modern government that are distinct from the way "governments" traditionally operate. It consists of broad political processes where citizen and group participation in government policy and programmes is vital (Ikeanyibe, 2016). Stoker (1998) explains that the Anglo-American administrative culture uses the term government to refer to the formal institutions of the state and their monopoly of legitimate coercive power, while governance reflects a shifting pattern in styles of governing in which the boundaries within and between public and other sectors have become blurred. Like the NPM, the role of government still rests on steering not rowing (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992). This, according to Ikeanyibe (2016), entails the use of other sectors (profit and not-for-profit) for the actual rowing of the boat (provision of services) while the government steers (regulates and coordinates).

Governance entails a devolved (decentralisation/sharing of power and functions) mode of service delivery, the unit of analysis of which is a network of nonprofit organizations, private firms and other governmental units or levels (Ewalt, 2001). Essentially, governance involves partnership in carrying out governmental functions. Such partnerships include local residents, community/regional- serving organizations, the public sector, and the private sector (Gibson, 2011). Stoker (1998) has advanced five critical and dilemmatic propositions that have largely become like principles of the governance paradigm. These are:

(1) A network of institutions and actors from within and beyond government.

(2) The blurring of boundaries and responsibilities for tackling social and economic issues. This shift in responsibility goes beyond the public–private dimension to include notions of communitarianism and social capital.

(3) Power dependence among institutions involved in collective action. Organizations are dependent upon each other for the achievement of collective action, and thus must exchange resources and negotiate shared understandings of ultimate program goals.

(4) The autonomous self-governing networks of actors.

(5) The capacity to get things done which does not rest on the power of government to command or use its authority.

Today in usage of the term governance or even practical applications various concepts have emerged to extend the frontiers of the discipline of public administration. Such concepts like good governance, network governance, and collaborative governance are our centre focus here. These account for the diverse views of analysts (as well as practitioners) of how the basic thrust of governing or steering the economy and society should be done and the range of possibilities for providing that steering (Peters, 2003).

Good Governance:

Conable, (1994) explains "good governance" as a "public service that is efficient, a judicial system that is reliable, and an administration that is accountable to its public." (World Bank, 1994). The term was subsequently popularized by International Organisations and donours from this period in their bid to chart a developmental path for countries of the Sub-Saharan Africa and the new countries that emerged following the disintegration of the Soviet Union in Europe.

Good governance is based on some principles. These principles according to The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) and the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC) (2013) consist the following:

(1) Acting in the public interest: government entities should act in the public interest at all times, which entails strong commitment to integrity, ethical values, and the rule of law and openness and comprehensive stakeholder engagement.

(2) Defining outcomes in terms of sustainable economic, social, and environmental benefits;

(3) Determining the interventions necessary to optimize the achievement of intended outcomes;

(4) Developing the capacity of the entity, including the capability of its leadership and the individuals within it;

(5) Managing risks and performance through robust internal control and strong public financial management; and

(6) Implementing good practices in transparency and reporting to deliver effective accountability.

This calls for the need for stakeholder engagement or involvement of non-governmental bodies in government processes. The good governance emphasizes the importance of the role of government officials to act in the public interest through effective and visionary leadership, integrity, transparency and accountability. Hence the definition of the term by World Bank (World Bank, 1994) as follows:

> Governance is epitomized by predictable, open, and enlightened policymaking (that is, transparent processes); a bureaucracy imbued with a professional ethos; an executive arm of government accountable for its actions; and a strong civil society participating in public affairs; and all behaving under the rule of law. (World Bank, 1994 cited in Ikeanyibe, 2017)

Partnerships, Collaborative and Networks Government:

The model is defined by Ansell and Gash (2008) as an "arrangement where one or more public agencies directly engage non-state stakeholders in a collective decision-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative and that aims to make or implement public policy or manage programs or assets". The key tenet therefore is that the work of government, whether in terms policy

formulation, implementation, service delivery, at various levels global, national or local should be a product of inclusive partnership of government, private sector and civil society. Cadman, cited in Ikeanyibe, 2017)) integrating the views of other scholars, explains thus:

> Modern governance is portrayed as essentially social political in nature, and defined as "more or less continuous processes of interaction between social actors, groups and forces and public or semi-public organizations, institutions or authorities". Interaction is key, and is identified as a series of "co"-arrangements between state and non-state actors, more oriented towards collaborative approaches to problem solving. In such models the transmission of information and knowledge and its valuation by those involved plays a central role; and deliberation rather than directives has become an alternative mechanism of dealing with the complexity and ambiguity of political and social problems.

Reasons for the use of governance partnerships or networks include:
(1) Improved efficiency, such as: optimizing the division of labor or delivering on development impacts of scale;
(2) Improved effectiveness, such as: leveraging skills and resources and innovating on methods and means of delivery of public goods;
(3) Increased equity in process and outcome such as: building community-level institutional structures, networks and capacities to enable local control, as examples. (Accountability, 2006)
The participative, collaborative and networks governance is based on the following:
(1) The collaborative governance forum is initiated by public agencies or institutions,
(2) Participants in the governance forum include non-government actors,
(3) Participants engage directly in the decision-making process, not just consulted,
(4) The governance forum is formally organized and meets collectively,
(5) The governance forum aims to make decisions by consensus, and
(6) The focus of collaboration is on public policy or public management.

Therefore, the aim of governance partnership is to achieve good governance or effective and efficient public administration. Processes aim at securing defined mission by participatory decision-making of all stakeholders, accountability directly linked to performance standards and assessments, accountability of

partners to their own stakeholders; partner to partner accountability and accountability of the partnership to its stakeholders and beneficiaries.

From the foregone we could be able to understand the fact that public administration is insufficiently flexible, innovative and creative. And this missing link could well be realized through use of networks, collaboration and partnerships. The perspective reflects the perception that the previous organizing models of the public sector neglected the civil society and public positioning as a passive receiver of public goods or as a simple consumer on a huge market.
Conclusively, the paradigmatic trends of public administration in theory and practice has moved the field from the traditional or conventional way of conceptualising the field in a weberian hierarchical model to a model of collaboration, partnership and network of governance with a view of ensuring efficiency and effectiveness of government towards responding to societal needs and aspirations.

1.5 Discussions and Results

This unit explores the contributions of CPA to development of public administration in theory and practice. The emergence and growth of the field of Comparative Public Administration has reshaped and refocused the theory and practice of public administration from different angles. For instance, Jain, (1991) attested that, by looking at the problems from a comparative perspective, public administration widens its horizon of interest and thereby offer relevant and practical solutions to the problems being faced by the mankind.

CPA strengthened relations among institutions designed for the improvement of public administration in practically all countries of the world both at the national and international level in order to forge new modalities for concerted action to improve public administration for development. In fact Sapru (2013) opined that, the study of CPA establishes a network of these institutions to enable flow of information and provide opportunities for collaboration on projects and programmes.

Since 1950s the role of CPA has been emphasised in the development of science of public administration it engaged in finding out a universal set of administrative systems that have developed in each of the developed, underdeveloped and developing countries. Dahl once remarked that, in order to establish science of public administration, it is necessarily to be comparative (Arora 1979). Similarly,

there are other social scientists such as Edwin Stene, Herbert Simon and Dwight Waldo who believed that in order to make public administration a scientific discipline, it has to make its explanations comparatively rational. Rationality and scientific investigations make any subject capable of providing satisfactory solutions to the problems of public administration in different cultures.

CPA helps in the growth of the subject of public administration by developing theoretical construct applicable across the globe. Without comparative analysis, the theories and models will lack cross-national applicability. Rathod, (2007) tracing the evolution of theoretical knowledge in public administration identified the following theoretical construct in the field of public administration:

i. Public administration based on some leading ideas commonly acknowledged as principles of administration. The most well known theorists and practitioners were Taylor, Urwick, Gullick, Mooney, Reilly, and Fayol. What united these theorists was their belief that administration was a science and that uniform applicable laws and principles could be identified and would result in the best.

ii. Social psychological model appeared during the Second World War. While classical public administration is basically prescriptive, this was essentially descriptive. Mayo, Roethlisherger and Dickson were the forerunners. This is also known as Humanist School which later also included Max Weber, Robert Golembiewski, Chris Argyris, Rensis Likert, Warren Bermis, Douglas MacGregor, and Robert Presthus.

iii. Behaviouralism in the study of public administration was well started with Herbert Simon, around paradigm three (3). To him, decision became the unit of analysis and further added that administrative man arrives at rational decision for which he should have access to a carefully designed and computerised management information system.

iv. In the seventies and eighties the new approach is comparative public administration. The approach viewed administration as a sub-system of political system. Administration as a sub-system in different countries has its own cultural values, norms, folkways and socialisation process. There is an effort for interdisciplinary studies and techniques followed to arrive at concepts, formulas and theories that are truly universal, bridging and embracing all cultures. Riggs,

Weidner, Diament and Eisentadt played a major role in this regard. The model is known as ecological model and can be used in cross-cultural analysis.

Furthermore, before the 1970s textbooks in public administration were generally organised on a 'country-by-country' basis. This approach is known as the configurative approach. In this approach, each administrative system was taught separately. No attempt was made to link various aspects of one administrative system to the other. It is only after the 1970s, that the comparative method became popular and fashionable. Certainly the influence of comparative approach had an impact on public administration discipline.

CPA has played a significant role for both the developed and developing countries. It helps in conducting SWOT (Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis of different administrative structures there by making the different administrative structure capable of strengthening themselves in a given circumstances. Heady (1991) lamented that, "aside from the demands of scientific enquiry, there are other advantages gained from a better understanding of public administration across-national boundaries. The increasing interdependence of nations and regions of the world makes comprehension of the conduct of administration of much more importance than in the past".

Quah, (1979) described the significance of Comparative analysis in public administration in changing dynamics and reshaping public administration in theory and practice by dividing it into two i.e. comparison as a prerequisite for the development of science of public administration (it involves more than one case, enable scholars to identify the factors responsible for the success of failure of administration in a country, and also account for the differences in bureaucratic behaviour and bureaucracies in different countries) and comparison for more practical reasons (to help students, practicing administrators, specialists and technical assistance experts know and understand more about public administration in other countries and consider the possibility of administrative reform in the form of transplantation of certain administrative institutions and practice from other countries).

Comparative public administration helps in widening the horizon of the discipline by promoting cross-cultural and cross-national studies that were previously limited by cultural bonds and ties. Hence, CPA not only contributes the understanding of the characteristics of individual administrative systems operating in diverse cultural

settings, but also helps in explaining factors responsible for cross-cultural and cross-national similarities and dissimilarities in those administrative systems.

It also helps to facilitate explanations in the literature of public administration as it enables scholars to identify the factors responsible for the success or failure of administration of a country. Such explanations are also helpful for practical administrators by creating examples for them. And it also contributes in highlighting which of the environmental factors help in promotion of administrative effectiveness and which administrative structure function more successfully, in what type of environment. Such analysis will help in measuring the administrative capability of different structures as well as promoting their efficiency.

1.6 Conclusion and Recommendations

Public administration comes into its own as an identifiable, unique, and institutionally independent field of instruction, research, and practice. It has attained this through various Paradigms i.e. the changing dynamics of that identity through which the field gained self-identity. The discipline is conceived as an amalgam of organization theory, management science, and the concept of the public interest. It is now established fact that, public administration has established itself as an institutionally autonomous enterprise in colleges and universities in order to retain its social relevance and worth. Through all these paradigms the central issue of concern if efficiency and effectiveness in the management of government affairs. The current trend of Partnerships, Collaborative and Networks Government is also an extension of the previous paradigm in an advanced way of changing the nomenclature.

Before public administration reach its present maturity stage as a discipline of study being run in most colleges, polytechnic, institutes and universities, several factors have contributed to its growth in theory and practice. Among these is the subfield of comparative public administration as rightly observed.

Dahl argued that as long as the study of public administration is not comparative, claims for a science of public administration sound rather hollow. The growth and development of comparative studies in public administration has led to theory/model building which is a sine-qua-non to the new field of public administration. More efforts need to be done in the comparative studies of public administration structures in a bid to address and advance the public administration of under developed and developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Study of comparative administration was criticized by some scholars to be too formalistic, with more emphasis on approach had been historical, legal, institutional and formal. Behavioural aspect of comparison was altogether neglected. It is therefore, the methodology adopted to discover the gap that still remains to be fulfilled in the field of comparative research should lay more emphasis on behavioural approaches.

The failure of west based approaches to the development of under-developed and developing nations is a clear testimony that, development is from within and not from without, this calls for more efforts in the development studies of the developing nations to address the peculiarities of these nations towards addressing their developmental issues.

References

Akindele, S.T., Olaopa, O.R. & Obiyan, A. S, (2002) the Theory of Public Administration and Its Relevance to Nigerian Administrative Ecology, *Journal of Social Science* 6 (4): 247-256

American Society for Public Administration (March 2–6, 2012). "2012 Conference Program" (PDF). PP. 3, 103. Retrieved May 3, 2012.from www.aspanet.org

Archer, R. (1994). *Markets and good government: The way forward for economic and social development.* Geneva: UN Non-Governmental Liaison Services.

Arora, R. K. (1979) *Comparative Public Administration,* Associated Publishing House, New Delhi,

Basheka, B. C. (2012). The paradigms of public administration re-examined: A reflection. *Journal of Public Administration, 47*, 8–25

Blau, P. & Meyer (1971), *Bureaucracy in Modern Society.* New York: Random House. Chartered Institute of Administration Act". Retrieved on 2018-06-20. Available at www.cia.org.ng

Derlien, H.-U. (1999) On the selective interpretation of Max Weber's concept of bureaucracy in organization theory and administrative science. In Ahonen, P. & Palonen, K. (Eds.), *Dis-Embalming Max Weber.* SoPhi: Jyväskylä.

Daniel, C. & Rose, B. (1991) Professionalisation in the Public Service and Academia: A Scientific Perspective. *Journal of Public Administration* Vol.46 (1)

Donald, R. (ed.) (1988). *Public Administration in Developed Democracies.* New York: *Marcel Dekker.*

Ewalt, J. A. G. (2001). *Theories of governance and new public management: Links to understanding welfare policy implementation.* Paper Prepared for presentation at the Annual Conference of the American Society for Public

Administration Newark, NJ. Retrieved April 11, 2016, from http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/ASPA/UNPAN000563.pdf

Farazmand, A. (2001). (ed) *Handbook of Comparative and Development Public Administration*, Second edition. Marcel Dekker, Inc New York.,

Farazmand, A. (2002). *Preface. Administrative reform in developing nations.* Westport: Praeger.

Farazmand, A. (1991). (ed) *Handbook of Comparative and Development Public Administration*, Marcel Dekker, Inc New York.

Gaus (1950) Gaus, J. M. (1950). Trends in the theory of public administration. *Public Administration Review, 10*, 161–168.

Gibson, R. (2011). *A primer on collaborative multi-level governance, Canadian regional development: A critical review of theory, practice and potential.* Retrieved March 20, 2016, from https://cdnregdev.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/primercollaborativemultilevelgovernan ce-gibson.pdf

Gildenhuys, J. (2004) The Philosophy of Public Administration: A Holistic Approach SUN PRESS, a division of AFRICAN SUN MeDIA, Victoria Street, Stellenbosch available at 7600 www.africansunmedia.co.za

Gullick, L. & Urwick, L. (1937) (eds.), *Papers on the Science of Administration,* Institute of Public Administration, New York.

Gulick, L. H. & Urwick, L. F. (1937). *Papers on the science of administration.* New York, NY: Harcourt.

Hamilton, M. R. (2000). The Role of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) In Improving Teaching and Practice in Public Administration V Congreso Internacional del CLAD sobre la Reforma del Estado y de la Administration Pública, Santo Domingo, Rep. Dominicana, 24 - 27 Oct. 2000 retrieved on 5th may, 2018

Heady, F (1966) public administration: A comparative perspective. New Jersey, Practice-Hall Englewood Cliffs,

Henry, N. (1975) Paradigms of public administration. *Public Administration Review, 35*, 378–386. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/974540

Henry, N., (2007), Public Administration and Public Affairs. Tenth edition Upper Saddle Rovers, New Jersey

Henry, N., (2012), Public Administration and Public Affairs 13th edition Upper Saddle Rovers, New Jersey

Ikeanyibe, O. M. (2016). Uniformity in local government system and the governance model in Nigeria. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*. 1–15. doi:10.1177/0021909616666105

Ikeanyibe, O. M. Ez'Ori, O. & Okoye, A. (2017) Governance paradigm in public administration and the dilemma of national question in Nigeria *Politics & International Relations | Review Article*

Jreisat, J. (2011), *Globalism and Comparative Public Administration* CRC Press Taylor & Francis Group, New York.

Jain, R.B. (1991) the state of the study of comparative public administration in India: *the Indian Journal of public administration Vol* xxxvi No 1

Joseph A. U. & Lawrence F. K., (1998) "One Hundred Years of American Public Administration and Counting, " in *Handbook of Public Administration,* 2nd edition, edited by Jack Rabin, W. Bartley Hildreth, and Gerald J. Miller. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.

Lane, J. E. (1994). Will public management drive out public administration? *Asian Journal of Public Administration, 16,* 139–151.

Laxmikanth, M. (2014), *Public Administration.* (13th Reprint) MCgraw Hill Education Series. New Delhi.

Landau, M. (1962). Political science and public administration: 'field' and the concept of decision-making. In S. Mailick & E. H. van Ness (Eds.), *Concepts and Issues in Administrative Behavior* (pp. 1–28). *Englewood Cliffs*, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Moore, M. (1995). *Creating public value: Strategic management in government.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nigro, F.A. (1969) what is Public Administration: Nature and Scope of the field in Sapru, R.K. (2013) *Administrative Theories and Management* Thought 3rd edition PHI Learning Private Limited. New Delhi

Nimrod, R. (1967) Comparative public administration: An overview in Raphaeli Nimrod (ed) *Reading in comparative public administration.* Boston, Allyn and Bacon.

Olaopa, T. (2008), *Theory and Practice of Public Administration and Civil Service Reforms in Nigeria*. Spectrum Books ltd. Ibadan

Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T., (1992). *Reinventing government.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Pugh, D. L (1988) *Looking Back, Moving Forward: A Half- Century Celebration of Public Administration and ASPA.* Washington, DC: The American Society for Public Administration.

Peters, B. G. (2003). The changing nature of public administration: From easy answers to hard questions. *Viešoji Politika ir Administravimas, 5,* 1–1.

Quah, J.S.T. (1979), *Comparative Public Administration: What and Why?* In Singh, S.D. & Singh, R. (2012) comparative public administration New Delhi, sterling Publishers Private Limited

Rathod, P.B. (2007) *Comparative Public Administration* ABD Publishers Jaipur India

Riggs, F.W. (1961), *the Ecology of Public Administration*, Asia Publishing House, New Delhi

Riggs, F. W. (1964), Administration in Developing Countries: the theory of prismatic society Houghton Mifflin, Boston

Riggs, F.(1970). *Frontiers of Development Administration.* Durham: Duke University Press.

Riggs, F.(1976). "The Group and the Movement: Notes on Comparative and Development Administration."*Public Administration Review* (Nov./Dec.):648–654.

Riggs, Fred (1998). "Public Administration: A Futuristic Vision." *International Journal of Public Administration*, 21(12):1667–1758.

Robert, J. H. (1966), An analysis of comparative public administration movement in Canadian public administration No ix

Sapru, R.K. (2013) *Administrative Theories and Management* Thought 3rd edition PHI Learning Private Limited. New Delhi

Singh, S.D. & Singh, R. (2012) *Comparative public administration* New Delhi, sterling publishers private limited

Simon, H. (1947), *Administrative Behaviour*, Free Press, New York In Sapru, R.K. (2013) *Administrative Theories and Management* Thought 3rd edition PHI Learning Private Limited. New Delhi

Siffin,W. (1976). Two Decades of Public Administration in Developing Countries." *Public Administration Review* 36 (Jan./Feb.):61–71.

Siffin,W. (1991). The Problem of Development Administration, in Farazmand, A (ed.) *Handbook of Comparative and Development Public Administration.* New York: Marcel Dekker.

Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as theory: Five propositions. *International Social Science Journal, 50*, 17–28. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/issj.1998.50.issue-155

Sherwood, F. (1980) Learning from the Iranian Experience *Public Administration Review* 40: 413–421.

Tamayao, M. J. M. (2014). What is governance? *Law, Politics and Philosophy.* Retrieved October 7, 2016, from https:// tamayaosbc.wordpress.com/2014/08/21/what-is-governance/

Walsh, K., & Stewart, J. (1992). Change in the management of public services. *Public Administration, 70*, 499–518.

Wilson W. (1887), the study of Administration. *Political Science Quarterly 2/June/1987* in Nicholas, H. (2012), *Public Administration and Public Affairs* 13th edition Upper Saddle Rovers, New Jersey

White, L.D. (1936), The Meaning of Principles in Public Administration, in Sapru, R.K. (2013) *Administrative Theories and Management* Thought 3rd edition PHI Learning Private Limited. New Delhi

Wu, X., & He, J., (2009) Paradigm shift in public administration: Implications for teaching in professional training programs. *Public Administration Review, 6.* Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227699058.doi:10.1111/j.15406210.2009.020.x