

THE IMPERATIVES OF COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND NEW PUBLIC MANAGEMENT IN A CHANGING GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT

Adewale K. Kupoluyi

Department of Political Science and Public Administration,
Babcock University, Ilishan-Remo, Ogun State, Nigeria.

E-mail: adewalekupoluyi@yahoo.co.uk, Tel: +2348039402794

Taiye A. Awotunde

Department of Political Science,
University of Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria.

E-mail: awotunde.ta@gmail.com, Tel: +2348033815757

Abdulrahman Abubakar

Department of Political Science,
University of Ilorin, Kwara State, Nigeria.

E-mail: abdulrahman.unilorin@gmail.com, Tel: +2347036120503

Abstract

Public administration provides the machinery for the smooth operation of governments in a state. The comparative approach to the study of public administration emphasises systematic and organised way of seeking knowledge which underscores the dominance of theorybuilding and research that is based on empirical foundations. The study explained the concepts of comparative public administration as well as public administration in a changing global environment by analyzing the origin and characteristics of the New Public Management (NPM). The study has adopted the Bureaucratic System Approach. The study is qualitative, using secondary data sources, obtained from the existing literature such as journal articles, books, published research reports, the internet and various works in the areas of public administration and comparative public administration in selected countries. The study concluded that public administration is ever relevant in a changing global environment. It made far-reaching recommendations

such as the need to accord public administration its right of place in running the affairs of a state, imperative of public reforms and the urgent need to minimize corruption in the public sector to allow for enhanced service delivery.

Keywords: Bureaucracy, Comparative Public Administration, Public Administration, New Public Management, State.

Introduction

Public administration is the bureaucracy of government that exists for the good of the population or a society. The comparative approach to the study of public administration emphasises systematic and organised way of seeking knowledge which underscores the dominance of theory-building and research based on empirical foundations. Comparative public administration has been the first visible major development in the past world-war evolution of public administration. It aims at the development of a more systematic and scientific public administration by constructing and enhancing theory. Comparative public administration refers to the study of administrative systems in a comparative fashion or the study of public administration in other countries that is concerned with making of rigorous, systematic and cross-cultural comparison of the structures, institutions, actions and processes involved in the activity of running public affairs (Marume, 1976).

It is a very significant area of study in public administration as it helps in understanding administrative setups and their functioning in various settings and societies and what works and why it works. It helps to improvise administrative systems by making them more efficient and also add to the already existing literature and theories in public administration, which is the act of implementing public policies requiring that feedback is relayed to the policy makers. Therefore, there is the need for a detailed study of public administration in general and comparative public administration in specific in a changing world.

On a regular basis, the world is fast changing due to the numerous activities of man. As the needs of man increase, the commitment of government also increases by becoming more demanding within the available human and material resources. The major challenge then remains: How does the society cope with the many challenges of public administration in a changing world? The study seeks to explain the concepts of comparative public administration as well as public administration, to critically discuss the very urgent need for the study of public administration in a changing global environment by analysing the origin and characteristic of the new public management (NPM). The main research question for the study is: What is the relevance and the very urgent need for the study of public administration in a changing global environment? The paper has adopted the qualitative method by depending on secondary source obtained from the various journal articles, text books, published research reports, the internet and the various works in the areas of public administration and comparative public administration.

Conceptual Approach/Framework

Heady (1962) has identified four conceptual approaches to the study of comparative public administration. These include: (i) Bureaucratic System Approach as adopted by Alfred Diamant, Robert Presthus, Ferrel Heady, Michael Crozier, Morroe Berger among others (ii) General System Approach as propounded by Fred W. Riggs in his Fused-prismatic-diffracted Typology and John T. Dorsey in his Information Energy Model (iii) The Development Administration Approach as advocated by Riggs, Wiedner et al, emphasising directed socio-economic change, and (iv) Decision-making Approach as promoted by Martin Landau, to increase the decision-making capacity of developing nations' administrative system to avoid 'muddling through' technique.

This paper has adopted the Bureaucratic System Approach because it is useful, stimulating and provocative. In addition, the model is set on a large framework, spanning history, cultures and related bureaucracy to important societal variable and still focuses on the chief structural, functional characteristics of bureaucracy and a 'paradigm' of public administration (Ong'anya & Mwaruvie, 2009).

Conceptualizing Comparative Public Administration

Comparative public administration (CPA) is the study of two or more public administration systems, and then drawing parallels from them. It has to do with an analysis of the operations of the system in question, for the purpose of finding the strengths and weaknesses. Generally, comparative studies present problems of a general nature (Rodgers, Greve & Morgan, 1968). It is not necessarily restricted to a particular society. It brings out a general view of events and phenomena by drawing parallels for betterment of the system in question. As the society is dynamic, it becomes imperative to reinterpret and re-evaluate administrative structures to be in tandem with the ever-changing trends. A comparative study is usually done on an interdisciplinary basis, thus encouraging more analysis to be made on social phenomena.

Comparative public administration focuses on public administration as a field of study and research rather than simple execution of tasks. Khan (2008) has defined CPA as a quest for searching patterns and regularities in administrative behaviour and action by characterising them into present day nation states. The changes, which came about after 1960s, were basically administrative reforms implemented by the legislature to make administration more decentralised, accountable and efficient. It was imperative to look at the different situations that affect administration as a whole in different countries. Hence, the best way to look at this was through scientific study of CPA. It is also a way to identify best practices in administration so as to achieve maximum result in a most efficient manner by building a solid organisational structure and processes while Fayol, Taylor, Urwick et al in (Ong'anya & Mwaruvie, 2009), define CPA as the study of administrative

systems in a comparative manner and in the quest for patterns and regularities in administrative actions and behaviour.

Why Comparative Public Administration?

Comparative public administration studies the democratic institutions and systems of different countries, the causes of success or failure of distinct democratic institutions, how the concept is applied and the level of success of a democratic system. Political systems are also studied, just as the working of a parliamentary system in one country, when compared to another with the same system or different ones. The different methods of controlling administration are also studied since different political systems have different ways of administration. It should be appreciated that the way administration in a unitary totalitarian regime works is different from that under a decentralised liberal democracy. Also, the workings of the three traditional arms of government equally vary within the existing political system (Ong'anya & Mwaruvie, 2009).

The control and management of human resources is also within the scope of the study. It does not only consider methods of employee administration but also individual employees in their social life. Hence, problems and grievances are addressed in comparative public administration. In the developing world, there are often cases of industrial action on the base of working conditions and remunerations, issues which are not pronounced in the affluent societies. Work place discipline is also relatively higher in the developed world as opposed to the least developed countries which wallow in the miasma of poverty, corruption and political impunity (Ong'anya & Mwaruvie, 2009).

In the Hobbesian state of nature, life was brutish, short, and characterised by fratricidal bloodletting. The state came in to bring sanity and order. A welfare state, therefore, emerged to take care of its citizens through the entrenchment of human rights, rule of law, accountability and respect for due process (Kupoluyi, 2011). Comparative public administration makes it possible to study the different methods of administering a welfare state with due recognition accorded the social, economic and cultural environment and making it possible to study the workings of the traditional three arms of government relative to different political systems.

CPA also examines the role of the head of state in a parliamentary system like in the United Kingdom, where real power rests with the monarch, and that of the United States of America, where real power is vested in the President. In such cases, the study considers the influence of the head of state in administration of the state. The subject area also studies administrative systems in presidential systems, like in France and the United States of America, where power rests with the president, but applied differently. Studies on the interaction between the three arms of government are also made because the United Kingdom has a fused system while the United States has separation of powers with a strict system of checks and balances (Ong'anya & Mwaruvie, 2009).

Comparative public administration studies institutions at the global level. The changing paradigms in international relations brought about by globalisation, terrorism, piracy, global warming and health all are within the scope by studying the operations of local self-institutions in different countries. As the study becomes deeper, the scope of study also widens, which according to Arora (2003), has brought about the four elements of the level of contribution of CPA to academic discourse, as follows:

- i. It has widened the horizons of public administration;
- ii. It has opened the doors of the discipline to all kinds of social scientists;
- iii. It has made the scope of the field more systematic by studying different administrative systems in their ecological settings; and
- iv. It has stimulated interest on the part of its members in the problems of developing administration.

Chaturvedi (1977) also revealed the various impacts made in the comparative study of public administration to include: (i) eliminating the narrowness of "provincialism" and "regionalism" (ii) broadening the field of social science research, which was earlier confined to cultural limitations (iii) leading to a greater scientific outlook in theory construction (iv) encouraged the process of broadening the field of social analysis (v) playing an important role in making the subject of public administration broader, deeper and useful; and (vi) bringing politics and public administration closer to each other.

Evolution of Comparative Public Administration.

Comparative studies in administration dated back to the Aristotelian times, where scholars were sent to different parts of the world to study their political systems. Comparative public administration then started off as a topic of interest and influenced by a number of factors, starting with the World War II (Eneanya, 2010). Theorists, administrators and governments were busy understanding their own administrative setup before they could set off on a comparison with others and while this was being contemplated, the First World War erupted and with its end and the establishment of the League of Nations, there came about a lot of questions regarding the need to understand the needs of the countries who were not so developed because many of them came under the British colonialism as well as other imperialist countries in order to control these and draw maximum benefit.

Comparative study of administration took a philosophical turn during the course of the Second World War. This led to the end of imperialism and colonialism that brought about the emergence of many independent states, as a result of the joint initiative by developed countries, under the United Nations, to develop Third World countries and revamp their damaged economies. Another factor is the event that was attributed to the beginning of Cold War between the two super powers of the United States of America and the Soviet Union, which played a big part in this movement such that both blocs hegemonised world

politics and economy.

The Americans took the lead in administrative studies in providing financial as well as technical help to the developing nations in order to increase their market share and to equally curb communism that was a product of the Soviet Union. USA became the hub of these studies since the Western countries lacked the institutional and administrative capacities to implement their development plans Post-World War II. The government, United Nations and various private institutions as well as corporate organisations sponsored various technical assistance programmes that enabled public administrators, lecturers of public administration and professionals to travel abroad, study the same in depth and build universal comparative theory of Public Administration. Prominent in these efforts were that of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) and the American Political Science Association (APSA). The first organisation formally formed to formulate a universal comparative theory of public administration was the Comparative Administration Group (CAG) in 1960 that was a division of the ASPA, which was funded by the Ford Foundation to study methods for improving public administration in developing countries under the chairmanship of Fred W. Riggs.

More than providing administrative techniques, this group became a forum for intellectuals to understand why developing countries differ so much in the practice of administration and are unable to sustain the Classical Theory and Principles of Administration in their systems. Even though the Classical Theorists of Administration like Henri Fayol and Max Weber etc. had preached that their principles and models of administration were universal in their element and can be successfully applied anywhere. CAG gave the idea of scientific studies and emphasised on empirical and ecological (social, cultural and historical factors) study of various administrative systems. Today, CPA has improved both intellectual and scholarly writing of researchers as well as eliminating parochialism or narrowness (Eneanya, 2010).

Meaning of Public Administration

Public administration is the bureaucracy of government. Basically, a government exists for the good of the population or the state. According to Thomas Hobbes, in the absence of the state, man's life is 'solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short' (Hobbes, 1651). The same may be said of a situation when there is no government and by extension, public administration. Public administration is the act of implementing public policies in which feedback is relayed to the policy makers. It is government in action whereby the collective effort of getting things done is in accordance with the laid down procedures and within the legal framework (Ong'anya & Mwaruvie, 2009).

Various scholars have come up with various definitions, all of which have a hinge on the public. It pre-supposes planned human activities by organising human and material

resources (Mukhi, 1998), meaning that public administration consists of all those operations having their purpose as the fulfillment or enforcement of public policy among component parts such as in a federal state that is based on a sort of contract or agreement among the federating units and the coordination among them for the smooth running of the federation (Kupoluyi, 2015). As the former American President, Woodrow Wilson has defined it; it is a detailed and systematic application of law (Wilson, 1941) such that any application of law amounts to public administration while Gulick (1937) contends that functions of public administration include the following:

- i. Planning - setting the broad agenda and fixing the targets to be met by the staff
- ii. Organising - establishing formal structures of authority, coming up with a chain of command.
- iii. Staffing - getting the correct people for the correct job specifications in a public office.
- iv. Directing - giving orders and providing guidelines to the responsible staff.
- v. Coordination - creating harmony between and among different departments for optimum functioning. It reduces duplication and wastage.
- vi. Reporting - getting the right information to the right persons within the organisation, for record management.
- vii. Budgeting - this function deals with financial planning and controls as well as budgeting, as the name suggests (Ong'anya & Mwaruvie, 2009).

The Concept of the New Public Management

The New Public Management (NPM) is a normative conceptualisation of public administration, consisting of several inter-related components such as providing services that citizens value; increasing the autonomy of public managers; rewarding organisations and individuals on the basis of whether they meet demanding performance targets; making available the human and technological resources that managers need to perform well; and, being appreciative of the virtues of competition and maintaining an open-minded attitude about which public purposes should be performed by the private sector, rather than the public sector (Borins, 1995 & Sarker, 2005).

NPM is characterised by policy-administration dichotomy, hierarchical and centralized decision-making structure, top-down approach, and too many regulations (Sarker, 2005). The combination of critiques of the inefficiency of the bureaucracy and the nature of the activist government produced a reform model usually designated as NPM (Hood, 1991), as there are other names as well in the literature that are often referred to such as managerialism (Pollitt, 1990), market-based public administration (Lan & Rosenbloom, 1992) entrepreneurial government (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992) and post-bureaucratic model (Barzelay, 1992) but with a common cause in which NPM calls for changes and the involvement in the structure of public organisations that consists of several interrelated factors.

Justification for the New Public Management

The adoption of new forms of public management means the emergence of a new paradigm in the public sector and traditional public administration that has been discredited theoretically and practically (Kalimullah et al, 2012). The NPM agenda for service delivery is best explained in the historical context from which it emerged. Generally, there was an intermediate stage between the approaches to service delivery that were associated with the classical public administration than the approaches associated with NPM such that the traditional model of administration has been replaced with public management and culminating into a reform process that has occurred in many countries since the late 1980s. The rationales for the emergence of NPM are highlighted as follows:

i. Private Sector Influence on the Public Sector

During the past decades, there has been an unprecedented wave of reforms in developed industrial economies, whose political leaders were under pressure to reduce the levels of public taxation and expenditure while maintaining high levels of welfare and other public services (Manning, 1996). There were three main aspects of the attack on government. First, the scale of public sectors suggesting that government handling scale is simply too large by consuming too much scarce resources. Secondly, is the position that the government was involved in too many activities and thirdly, is the argument that the method of the government, which is bureaucracy, is a highly unpopular form of social organisation. Government, particularly its bureaucracy, was a source of some unease at the same time, paradoxically, as more services were demanded of it. There was a greater appreciation of the role of government and the public sectors; that is why, moves towards privatisation in its various forms such as contracting-out, reducing government spending could be considered as shedding aspects of government that are no longer parts of its 'core business'. In a number of policy areas, it is important for government to tailor its policies to enhance national competitiveness (Hughes, 2003).

ii. Economic Emerging Trends

Economic theorists have claimed that government was considered as the economic problem in restricting economic growth and models backed up their arguments that less government would improve aggregate welfare by improving economic efficiency (Islam, 2015). Rather than for governments to force people to do things through the bureaucracy, markets were superior in every respect (Friedman & Friedman, 1980). Several theories have provided the theoretical underpinnings of NPM and have helped shape NPM ideas, in particular public choice theory, principal-agent theory and transaction cost theory (Walsh, 1995; Boston et al., 1996).

Public choice theory is applied to the bureaucracy, particularly in the earlier debate over managerialism. Public choice is a sub-branch of economic thought concerned with the

application of microeconomics to political and social areas. The key assumption of public choice is a comprehensive view of rationality. Instead of being motivated by the public interest, bureaucrats are assumed to be motivated by their own selfish interest. In the Principal-Agent Theory, the economic theory of principal and agent has also been applied to the public sector, especially concerning its accountability (Islam, 2015). The theory was developed for the private sector to explain the divergence often found between the goals of managers (agents) in private firms and shareholders (principals). The theory attempts to find incentive schemes for agents to act in the interests of principals.

The activities of agents (managers) need to be monitored by shareholders, by the possibility of takeovers or bankruptcy while the presence of a non-executive board may help in 'attenuating the discretion of management' (Vickers & Yarrow, 1988). In addition, to ensure that their behaviour complies with the wishes of the principals, agents should have contracts that specify their obligations and rights. In the private sector, shareholders seek maximum profits, while managers, their agents, might want long-term growth and higher salaries for themselves. A new model of public management has effectively supplanted the traditional model of public administration, and the public sector in the future will inevitably be manageable, in both theory and practice (Hughes, 2003).

iii. Public Sectors Reforms

The emergence of public management marks a shift from earlier reforms. It seems to be clearer both in theory and in programme details than the earlier reforms which were aimed at cutting costs. New public management represents a transformation of the public sector and its relationship with government and society (Hughes, 2003:50). Many government agencies are looking for pragmatic strategies to assess their fundamental cost structure in a bid to realising a rapid, cost reducing, but not compromising service quality by enabling lasting operational transformation and setting the stage for a strategic cost reduction to achieve longer term objectives (Islam, 2015).

iv. Increase in Public Service Activities

The public sector is that portion of society controlled by national, state and local governments. A measurement of the efficiency of public sector production is meant to take the form of a ratio of the output of goods and services to the input of factors of production (Islam, 2015). Techniques to improve productivity include greater use of new technology, altered working practices, and improved training of the workforce. Performance measurement estimates the parameters under which programmes, investments, and acquisitions are reaching the targeted results. The public sector performance avenues were formulated by the OECD, which claimed in 1991, and that most countries are following 'two broad avenues' to improve production and delivery of publicly provided goods and services (OECD, 1991).

v. Professional Management

Professional management is the process of administering an organisation, where the top management positions and even the lower management positions are held by professional people who have professional qualifications, administrative and technical skills and also the good amount of experience in managing business affairs. It is the practice of investing financial, professional money or securities and getting returns on behalf of individual investors, investment companies, or institutions. This is expected to contribute to the sufficient accountable administration (Ehsan & Naz, 2003).

vi. Target-based Service

Government organisations can arrange target performance for individual employees, for departments or groups, or for all employees. This requires goals to be defined by the organisation and then performance targets to be set and later defined as performance indicators (Ehsan & Naz, 2003). A key element of managing performance of the government is to set challenging but achievable targets against meaningful performance indicators. The achievement of these targets is a key element in an organisation's duty to continually improve their services and to deliver their aims, objectives and priorities (Komur, 2010).

vii. Priority on Output Controls

Control-systems are mechanisms for adjusting course if performance falls outside acceptable boundaries (Davidson & Griffin, 2006) by allowing adaptation to change. Control-systems include procedures for monitoring, directing, evaluating and compensating employees, and influencing behaviours with the objective of having the best impact on both firms and employees (Anderson & Oliver, 1987) while output-control induces compelling individual motivation whereby non-producers receive no compensation (Anderson & Oliver, 1987).

viii. Contracts, Tendering and Procurement Responsibilities

They are efforts pertaining to contracts and public tendering procedures by using rivalry and realistic options as the key to achieving lower costs and better standards. They cover supplies, services or public works contracts that involve states, municipalities or federations of municipalities and other contracting authorities. They ensure open and transparent competitions that allow for the award of public sector contracts, tenders and procurement responsibilities to the most economically-advantageous tenders or those with the lowest prices (Islam, 2015).

ix. Burden on Private Sector Managerial Practice

Private sector style of management practice involves a move away from the military-style to upholding service ethic and flexibility in hiring, rewarding and outlining some common business practices such as setting strategies and mission, preparing interest of

shareholders and selecting a transparent fashion that could encourage effectiveness and innovation in the public sectors (Islam, 2015).

Criticism of the New Public Management

Despite the advantages ascribed to NPM such as being regarded as a good managerial approach, it should be noted that a good managerial approach is actually result-oriented in terms of efficiency, effectiveness and service quality, in a bid to improve the quality of public services, save public expenditure, improve the efficiency of governmental operations and make policy implementation more effective (Aucoin, 1990). However, it has been argued that NPM is inappropriate for the public sector as it has more complex objectives, more intricate accountabilities and a more turbulent political environment than the private sector (Islam, 2015).

Cheung and Lee (1995) noted that NPM ideas have limitations in terms of using private techniques for the public sector. They argue that in the public sector, there is no equal degree of freedom as there is in the private sector. General criticism of NPM involves ethical issues. Even though NPM provides transparency for the public sector, it can nonetheless lead to corrupt practices (Barberis, 1998). Polidano (1999) argued that the NPM does not suit developing countries since governments in these countries may lack the necessary expertise and have unreliable information systems while Caiden and Sundaram (2004) agree that developing countries lack the resources and management capacity to adopt rather sophisticated NPM reforms. The NPM principle of decentralisation as diffused from rich countries into developing countries, often retain centralised decision-making (Islam, 2015)

Traditional Management vs. New Public Management

The New Public Management (NPM) is totally different in many ways from the traditional public administration (Islam, 2015). Traditional public administration all over the world has been found to fail to take cognisance of some vital environmental forces in spite of its tremendous appeal. Accordingly, NPM emerged in response to a number of environmental forces which governments have faced in the recent years (Sarker & Pathak, 2000). A summary of the common areas of differences are highlighted in the table below.

Comparisons between Traditional Model of Administration and New Public Management

Elements	Traditional Administration	NPM
Government Organisation	Service provided on a uniform basis operating as a single aggregated unit	Break-up of traditional structures into quasi-autonomous units
Control of public organisation	Control through the hierarchy of unbroken supervision and checks and balances	Practices on professional management with clear statement of goal and performance measure
Control of output Measure	Control on inputs and procedures	Stress results and output control rather than procedures
Management Practices		Using private sector management style
Discipline in Resource Use	Due process and entitlements	Checks resources demands and 'do make more with less'

Source: Arai, et al (2001).

Philosophy underlining Comparative Public Administration

With reference to the social contract theory, it is assumed that there was a time when humans lived in an environment lacking in formally-organised political institutions and processes. This condition is called the state of nature. Under the theory, men are said to have deliberately created the state in order to promote some common interests and that, the transition from the state of nature to the formation of a political society was by means of a formal agreement, or contract, entered into by the people (Adebayo, 2000).

According to Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), man is naturally, an absolutely self-regarding, acquisitive, and pleasure-seeking creature who will do anything to achieve his quest for pleasure. Hobbes argues that it was in order to facilitate peace and security that men in the state of nature entered into a contract to establish the state. The Leviathan, as conceived by Hobbes, enjoys absolute powers and can make laws on any matter that will promote peace and security of the society. The only power denied to it, is the power to take the life of any individual. Because men entered into the contract to protect their lives, the state cannot take this away from anyone. Each person, therefore, reserves the right to refuse to give in to attempts by the state to take his life.

In his own version, John Locke (1632-1704) conceived neither man as naturally greedy nor the state of nature as violent. Locke assumed that man is a bundle of cooperative and aggressive impulses. While his cooperative instincts enabled him to live together with his fellow men in the state of nature, his selfish inclinations occasionally led him into precipitating conflicts capable of disrupting collective existence. Thus, while the state of nature was ordinarily pleasant, these occasional disputes tended to make uninterrupted peaceful coexistence uncertain. This, according to Locke, was because there was no recognised ruler who could settle disputes among the people. Though John Locke's view concerning the origin of the state differs in detail from Hobbes', both are informed by the mechanistic conception of the state. In this conception, the state is likened to a device or machine that is deliberately fashioned by men in order to achieve specific, predetermined objectives. Locke, like Hobbes, explains that the purposes for which men created the state have to do with the facilitation of peace and order, as well as security of life and property in the society (Adebayo, 2000).

The thrust of Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) on the origin of the state is based on a different assumption of what he considers the real or essential nature of man. Man, in his opinion, is naturally social, caring and cooperative. Thus, the original condition or the state of nature in which he lived was marked by peace, as men lived together and helped one another altruistically, that is, selflessly and without desiring any personal benefits. According to Rousseau, people gave up their powers, rights and freedom, not to any individual, group or institution as Hobbes and Locke's versions of the contract theories assert, but to one another. In other words, it was to the whole community that each person transferred his right and privileges. However, none of these versions has escaped serious criticisms by scholars (Adebayo, 2000).

Therefore, it is on the basis of the existence of the modern state that public administration must exist in any organisational set up for a defined purpose or objective. There has to be public administration because each one consists of human beings brought together in a hierarchical set-up, making use of tools, equipment, human and material resources, all in the quest to attain the objective for which the organisation is established (Adebayo, 2000). This process requires planning, organisation, command, coordination, and control. All these constitute administration. Every organisation in modern society consists of many different groups of people woven together in a complicated process to achieve the objectives of the organisation. The administrator's position within an establishment or organisation is, therefore, strategic and pivotal. It is true to say that the place of public administration has come to be clearly recognised in every sector of human endeavour, as being the keystone to the success and indeed to the very existence of the enterprise.

Being concerned with the planning, co-ordination, supervision and control of the enterprise or establishment with which it is involved, it is no overstatement to declare that

whatever may be the future, the science of public administration will be an essential instrument of human welfare. Indeed, so significant is the importance of this instrument of human welfare that one can agree with the writers on public administration who asserted that if our civilisation breaks down, it will be mainly a breakdown of public administration (Dunham, 1936), and that the future of civilized government, and even of civilisation itself, rests upon our ability to develop a science and a philosophy and practice of public administration competent to discharge the public functions of civilised society (Cheng Wu, 1928).

From the foregoing, it is not difficult to see that public administration is the process on which social stability rests in the sense that it ensures the establishment of institutional processes and machinery through which the function of the state or an enterprise is carried out from day-to-day. In the state, institutional machineries like the judiciary, the legislature regulatory commissions and the civil service, among others, are set up to ensure the smooth working of the various components that make up the state. Laws, rules, and mechanisms are set up and their operation is co-ordinated, controlled, and supervised. These are processes of organisation and management and they constitute public administration.

The effect of these institutional mechanisms is that they ensure stability and continuity in periods of change and stress. Without them, changes in government, especially when accompanied or occasioned by violent means, will result in disintegration of society and general chaos. The public administrative function, therefore, ensures the continuance of the existing order (Adebayo, 2000).

Conclusion and Recommendation

The Twentieth Century has seen a revolution in public administration that is profound. The Weberian bureaucratic principles began to influence many governments around the world. To make public administration more responsive to the needs of the society, the concepts of comparative public administration and new public management were introduced. This seeks to bring about effective public service delivery through the building and strengthening of institutional capacity and by introducing results-oriented management techniques in a changing global environment. Based on these, the study makes the following recommendations:

In the first place, public administration should be accorded its right of place in the running of affairs of a state. This is because of the part that it plays in the development of a country. This can be seen in such areas as policy making and implementation and the provision of infrastructures for the citizens. These are done through public administrators. Public administrators and managers should also be given the appropriate discretion in decision making in their areas of responsibility.

Secondly, too much emphasis should not be placed on the new public management at the expense of public administration that is wider in scope. That is to say, traditional public administration is more encompassing than new public management. Traditional public administration can also promote efficiency and increase in productivity like the new public management.

In addition, researchers should develop more reliable instruments to accurately measure, the impact of public administration in countries. This would help to promote the course of traditional public administration which is gradually being regarded as obsolete.

Furthermore, more home-grown models should be developed to understand public administration better in African nations. These models would also enhance the development of the African nation. This is because Public Administration has important role to play in the sustenance of democracy in most African countries and also in the area of socio-economic development.

Lastly, corruption should be minimised to allow enhanced public service delivery. This is especially true of developing countries like Nigeria. Corruption has impacted negatively on these countries and has resulted in poor public sector service delivery. For public administrators to maintain their exalted positions, they should not be involved in cases of corruption.

References

- Adebayo, A. (2000). Principles and practice of public administration in Nigeria (2nd ed). Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- Almond, G. A et al (eds.) (2000). Comparative politics today: A world view. (7th ed). Singapore: Pearson Education.
- Anderson, E. & Oliver, R. L. (1987). "Management system behaviour control and output control." 123 Help Me.com. Retrieved from <http://www.123helpme.com/view.asp?id=166109>.
- Araikp, et al (2001). Improving public service delivery: The crossroads between NPM and traditional bureaucracy. Public Administration, 79(4).
- Arora, R. K. (2003). New public management: Emerging concerns. Prashasnika, 30(2).
- Aucoin, P. (1990). Administrative reform in public management: Paradigms, principles, paradoxes and pendulums. Governance, 3:115-137.

- Barber, M. P. (1972). Public administration. London: McDonald and Evans.
- Barberis, P. (1998). The new public management and a new accountability: Public administration, 76: 451-470.
- Baridam, D. M. (2002). Management and organisation theory (3rd ed). Port-Harcourt: Sherbrooke Associates.
- Barzelay, M. (1992). Breaking through bureaucracy: A new vision for managing in government. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Borins, S. (1995). What the new public management is achieving: A survey of commonwealth experience. In: Jones, L. R, Kuno, S. & Wade, S. W. (eds). International perspectives on the new public management: Advances in international comparative management, Supplement 3. Greenwich CT: JAI Press.
- Boston, J. (ed.) (1996). The state under contract. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Caiden, G. E. (2001). Administrative reform, handbook of comparative and development public administration. New York: Marcel Dekker, pp. 655-688. Centre for Policy Dialogue. Policy Brief on Administrative Reform and Local Government, CPD Task Force Report, Dhaka: CPD. Cheung A, Lee JCY (1995). Public Sector Reform in Hong Kong: Key Concepts, Progress-To-Date and Future Directions. Chinese University Press, Hong Kong.
- Chaturvedi, T. N. (1977). "Sardar Patel's contribution to public administration", Indian Journal of Public Administration, XXIII, October-December, p.4.
- Cheng Wu, Y. (1928). Ancient Chinese political theories. Shangai: Commercial Press Ltd.
- Davidson, P. & Griffin, R.W. (2006). "Management systems: Behaviour control and output control". Retrieved from <http://www.investopedia.com/terms/a/armslength.asp>.
- Dunham, J. (1936). Taking time seriously. American Journal of Political Science 52(1): 184-200.
- Duru, E. J. (2001). The bureaucratic set-up and operations in Britain, France, the United States and Nigeria: A comparative analysis. In: Duru, E. J; Ikejiani-Clark, M. O;

and Mbat, D. O. (eds.) Contemporary issues in public administration. Calabar/Benin: BAAJ International Company and the Atlantic Publishing Company, pp. 30-40.

- Ehsan, M. & Naz, F. (2003). Origin, ideas and practice of new public management: Lessons for developing countries, July - September, <http://www.cdrb.org/journal/2003/3/2.pdf>. Asian Affairs, 25(3): 30-48.
- Eneanya, A. N. (2010). Comparative public administration and public policy: Theories and applications. Lagos: University of Lagos Press.
- Fried, R. C. (1990). Comparative public administration: The search for theories. In Lynn, N. B. & Wildavsky, A. (eds.) Public administration: The state of the discipline. New Jersey: Chatham House, pp. 322-325.
- Gulick, L. H. (1937). Papers on the science of public administration. New York: Institute of Public Administration: Columbia University.
- Heady, F. (1962). Comparative public administration: Concerns and priorities. In "Papers in comparative public administration".
- Hobbes, T. (1651). "Project Gutenberg eBooks". Project Gutenberg. Edward White. (Accessed February 19, 2009).
- Hood, C. (1991). A public management for all seasons?. Public Administration: An International Quarterly, 69(1): 3-19.
- Hughes, O. E. (2003). Public management and administration: An introduction. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Islam, F. (2015). "New public management (NPM): A dominating paradigm in public sectors". African Journal of Political Science and International Relations, 9(4): 141-151.
- Kalimullah, N. A., Alam, M, Ashraf, N. & Ashaduzzaman, M. M. (2012). New public management: Emergence and principles, BUPJ. 1(1).
- Komur, G. (2010). Target setting in performance management. Retrieved from <http://www.pmcde ltd.com/bloggs/34-target-setting-in-performance-management.html>.

- Kupoluyi, A. K. (2011). On the state of the nation, Sunday Punch, September 11, p.14.
- Kupoluyi, A. K. (2015). Senate and social media Bill. New Telegraph, December 21.
- Manning, N. (1996). Improving the public service, Unpublished Paper, London Commonwealth Secretariat.
- Marume, S. B. et al (2013). Comparative public administration. International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR).
- Mukhi, H. R (1998). Comparative public administration. Delhi: Surjeet Book Depot.
- OECD (1991). Public management developments. Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO). Enterprise Architecture.
- Ong'anya, G. & Mwaruvie, J. (2009). Concept, nature and scope of public administration, Blog Article posted on Tuesday, March 16, 2010.
- Osborne, D. & Gaebler, T. (1992). Reinventing government. New York: Ingrid Schneider. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.1995.11949751>.
- Polidono, C. (1999). The new public management in developing countries. Institute for Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester, Precinct Centre, Oxford Road, Manchester, UK.
- Pollit, C. (1990). 30 years of public management reforms: Has there been a pattern? A Background Paper for the World Bank Consultation Exercise.
- Riggs, F. W. (1964). Administration in developing countries: The theory of prismatic society. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Sarker, A. E. & Pathak, R. D. (2000). New public management an analytical review. Productivity, 41:1.
- Sarker, A. E. (2006). New public management in developing countries: An analysis of success and failure with particular reference to Singapore and Bangladesh. International Journal of Public Sector Management, 19(2): 180-203, <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513550610650437>.
- Vickers, J. & Yarrow, G. (1988). Privatisation: An economic analysis. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Walsh, K. (1995). Public services and market mechanisms. London: Macmillan.
- Wilson, W. (1941). The study of administration. Political Quarterly.