THEORIES OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: AN ANTHOLOGY OF ESSAYS

Lamidi, Kazeem Oyedele
Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Administration, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

This paper provides an omnibus of theories of public administration. It analyses the series of metamorphosis experienced by the field of public administration as well as its theoretical dispositions. It compartmentalizes these theories into three (3) approaches: classical, modern and postmodern theories, and evaluates the theoretical implication and challenges of these approaches at each stage of its development. It highlights the creativeness of classical school on successful management process and its focus on organization dynamics. The argument of modern school that identifies human factors as the basis for the optimal performance of an organization has been critically put in perspectives. The arrival of postmodernism as a new approach seeks to bridge the useful parts of classical and neoclassical recommendations in view of contemporary organizational challenges. Literatures were drawn from secondary sources of data collection, such as: Books, Journals, and other internet materials. This paper reveals the contribution of these theories on important areas of public administration, such as: public policy, public-private partnership, as well as new emerging goals in the field, especially postmodernism. This paper therefore concludes that more concerted efforts should be geared towards theorizing old, contemporary and new terms in public administration so as to gain an in-depth understanding of the causes and consequences of any given subject matter in the field, as well as building new field of enquiries, and helps clarifying and directing inquiry into policy making, governance, ethics among other primary subject matters within the purview of public administration.

Keywords: Public Administration, Theory, Classical Approach, Modern Approach, Postmodernism

1. INTRODUCTION

Public administration is a combination of both theory and practice. According to Stillman (1980), there is no sharp point in history where the story of public administration theory begins, just like that of its practice. However, its practice is as old as human civilization. In the United States, there were two general textbooks on the subject matter of public administration theory which were regarded as the first attempt at presenting the discipline. These books were written by two scholars, White and Willoughby published in 1926 and 1927 respectively (Stillman, 1980). Although, the publication of these books marked the birth of public administration theory 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 theory in a futuristic manner (Pfiffer & Presthus, 1967). Despite these efforts and their relevance to the growth and maturation of public administration theory, one cannot also down-play or ignore a remarkable essay by Wilson in 1887, eulogized by Akindele (1994) as serving as the symbolic beginning of the discipline in such a perceptive, persuasive and influential way both in its analytical and theoretical parlances.

The study of public administration has been characterized by normative approach (political philosophy, lawmaking and constitutional arrangements) up till the 19th century. According to Akindele, *et.al* (2000), as socio-economic life becomes more specialised and complex and, as well as there continues to be an increase in government functions and responsibilities, there is a need for the diversification of efforts towards a more empirical analysis of events. He equally opined that there should be a science of administration, which is theory of public administration, which shall seek to straighten the paths of government, to make its business less unlike, to strengthen and purify its organisation, and to crown its duties with dutifulness. These initial practical and theoretical efforts coupled with that of those who might be called the founding fathers of public administration and, who were initially trained as political scientists, led to the

genesis of public administration as a field of inquiry under the umbrella of political science (Stillman, 1980). However, the discipline acquired certain distinctive characteristics by the mid-1920s.

According to Bartholomew (1972), there are five stages in the chronology of the evolution of Public Administration as a discipline; these stages are theoretically driven as encapsulated below:

Stage 1: politics administration dichotomy (1887-1926)

Stage 2: principles of administration (1927-1937)

Stage 3: era of challenge (1938-1947)

Stage 4: crises of identity (1948-1970)

Stage 5: public policy perspective (1971 onwards)

The first stage was the manifestation of Woodrow Wilson's view of politics - administration dichotomy (difference between two things as they are completely opposite). This led to a spurt in the interest of its studies in various American as well as universities around the globe and reforms were made in government and thus scholars were attracted to public administration with a new vigour (Adamolekun, 1985). Woodrow Wilson propagated this view since at that time people were fed up with the government and its various policies, rampant corruption and the spoils system that prevailed in the bureaucratic framework. This was the major reason for people to readily lap up his view. L.D. White published a book" Introduction to the Study of Public Administration" in 1926 that further buttressed this view.

The second stage of administrative theory was marked by the same fervor of reinforcing the Wilsonian view of Public Administration of politics-administration dichotomy and evolve a value neutral or rather value free science of management. It was believed that there are certain principles (guiding/basic ideas) of administration that are common to all organizations and will work for all bringing out optimum efficiency (Davies, 1974). This was the mature Industrial Revolution period and all that countries were concerned with was increasing production at any cost in order to earn big. Also Industrial revolution's rapid expansion of industries led to new

problems in management that were unforeseen and therefore difficult to solve. That's when F.W. Taylor and Henri Fayol stepped in and generated their principles of administration/management. They were successful administrators in their own right and therefore their views held a lot of water and were readily accepted by the industries world over. Frederich Winslow Taylor and Henri Fayol advocated for adopting engineering based scientific methods in the field of industrial work process in order to increase efficiency and economy. These schools of thought are grouped under the Classical theory of administration (Lane, 1978).

Since, we are talking about the Classical theorists of Administration we have to make a very important mention of Max Weber. His conceptual framework of bureaucracy deserves special mention as it brought about a paradigm shift in the theory of public administration. He was the first to provide the discipline with a solid theoretical base. He viewed bureaucracy as a national rule based central system that regulates the organization's structure and process according to technical knowledge and maximum efficiency. He was concerned about the evolution of modern civilization with bureaucracies. All the three theorists mentioned above laid emphasis on the physiological and mechanistic aspects of public administration and that is why this school of thought apart from being called the Classical school of thought is also known as the Mechanical theory of organization/administration (Marx, 1960).

The third stage in the evolution of the theory of public administration is known as the era of challenge because the above mentioned principles and iron cage/mechanistic view of administration and workers were challenged. The Human relations theory brought about a pragmatic view to administrative issues. It emphasized on the human aspects of administration that sprung from the Hawthorne experiments conducted by Elton Mayo and his colleagues at Harvard Business School in the late 20's and early 30's of the twentieth century. The main focus of study in this approach was to study the psychological and social problems of the industrial workers (Corson & Harris, 1963). The scholars of this theory identified variables like informal organisation, leadership, morale and motivation for maximum use of human resources in industries. This led to a far vast study by Herbert Simon and others that developed the Behavioural Science theory. The behavioural science school of thought propagated by Herbert

Simon challenged the principles of administration and its mechanistic ways as mere proverbs where one contradicted the other and thus are nothing more than general statements based on person to person experience and lacking a theoretical foundation (Davies, 1974). Herbert Simon advocated that decision analysis is what should be studied as decision making is the heart of administration where a decision has to be taken at each and every stage of administration day in and day out and administration is a series of decisions that lead to implementation and nothing more. According to Simon, if administrative behaviour in an organisational setting has to be analyzed, then that can only be done by studying the decisions taken by the administrators. Chester Barnard and Edwin Stene were other two remarkable theorists of the Behavioural school (Pfiffer & Presthus, 1967).

The next stage that is the crisis of identity stage is set in the late 20th century where many parts of the world, called the developing nations, were just out of wars and colonisation. This phase marked a debate for the return of values in public administration and cross cultural as well as cross national study of administration. Waldo (1994) asserted that the US faced a host of crisis in the 1960's and the traditional public administration failed to answer a lot of questions to provide solutions to the problems. Thus, there grew a need to reinvent public administration and lead to a question as to whether public administration that had been known as it is till then was relevant anymore. Thus was born the concept of ' New Public Administration' courtesy Dwight Waldo from the First Minnowbrook Conference in 1968 attended by young scholars and practitioners of Public Administration. These were the second generation behaviouralists as per George Frederickson who was a very important part of the First Minnowbrook Conference and the main convenor of the 2nd Minnowbrook conference 20 years later in 1988. It laid stress on values in public administration and a commitedness by administrators and scholars of the discipline towards value formulation and their implementation. It developed the thought of society and its welfare as the main goal of public administration in today's times through the public policy approach. It brought democratic humanism and client orientation as well as the science perspective in New Public Administration. The collapse of the Soviet Union also strengthened this view.

Public Policy theory is the next stage in the development of Public Administration theory. Public policy is an attempt by a government to address a public issue by instituting laws, regulations, decisions, or actions pertinent to the problem at hand. It is policy, as discussed by Stein (1952) that is made for the welfare of the people and their development. As a discipline public policy perspective is the study of government policies for the people and its pros and cons and how to better the same. Here it has come closer to political science again and also has incorporated many management principles to help public administration cope up with the dynamics of its discipline and conduct.

Against this backdrop, public administration theory is an amalgamation of history, organizational theory, social theory, political theory and related studies focused on the meanings, structures and functions of public service in all its forms (Wikipedia, 2014). Therefore, this paper provides a collection of essays on these theories of public administration.

2. PAPER FRAMEWORK

The paper is divided into seven (7) parts. Part one deals with the introduction with brief chronological analysis of public administration and its theories in stages. Part two x-rays the structure of this paper and its methodology, namely: secondary sources of data collection, such as Books, Journals, Periodicals, and Internet materials. Part three reviews the literature closely related concepts to this subject matter, such as: Theory and Public Administration. Part four reviews a collection of essays on the Classical Theory, Modern Theory and Postmodernism. Part five examines other relevant management theories to public administration. Part six discusses the contribution of these theories to public administration. Lastly, part seven is the concluding remark.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

 The part provides the review of related literatures to this subject matter in order to clarify and direct the channel of inquiry adequately towards ensuring that relevant terms and concepts are clearly elucidated.

3.1 Theory

Theories are perspectives with which people make sense of their world experiences (Halvorson, 2002). Theory is a systematic grouping of interdependent concepts (mental images of anything formed by generalization from particulars) and principles (are generalizations or hypotheses that are tested for accuracy and appear to be true to reflect or explain reality) that give a framework to, or tie together, a significant area of knowledge. Scattered data are not information unless the observer has knowledge of the theory that will explain relationships. Theory is, "in its lowest form a classification, a set of pigeon holes, a filing cabinet in which fact can accumulate. Nothing is more lost than a loose fact" (Hawking, 1996).

In sum, there are basically three main reasons why we have to study public administration theory. First, theories provide a stable focus for understanding what we experience. A theory provides criteria for what is relevant. Second, theories enable us to communicate efficiently and thus move into more and more complex relationships with other people. Third, theories make it possible – indeed, challenge us – to keep learning about our world. By definition, theories have boundaries.

3.2 Public Administration

The word 'public' it simply means the practice of administration in a particular segment of the society, that of the public sector. Public administration is therefore governmental administration and operates in the particular sphere of government. It is the machinery for implementing government policy. Public administration is concerned with the study of how a country's administration is organized and how it functions. Since it is the machinery for implementing government policy, it follows that its study must lead to the study of the most efficient ways of organizing the executive branch of government, its institutions and its procedures (Akindele, 1995).

Public administration is the machinery, as well as the integral processes through which the government performs its functions. It is a network of human relationships and associated activities extending from the government to the lowest paid and powerless individual charged

with keeping in daily touch with all resources, natural and human, and all other aspects of the life of the society with which the government is concerned (Kolawole, 1997). It is a system of roles and role relationships that defines in as clear and practicable terms as possible and in as much details as possible the intentions and programmes of government; the means available internally and externally to accomplish them; and finally, it is a system that causes these intentions and programs to be realized in real life. It is a pattern of routinized activities, involving decision – making, planning, advising, coordination, negotiation, conciliation, arbitration, command and data gathering, through which the government carries out its responsibilities (Nnoli, 2003).

Woodrow Wilson (1887), as cited in Gladden (1961), perceived Public Administration as the most visible side of government. While Ezeani (2006) posits that public administration is the management of government activities. According to him it refers both to the activities of bureaucrats concerned with the management or administration of government organizations and the study of these activities. It is the machinery for implementing government policies to ensure stability and continuity at all times irrespective of any government in power even during period of crises.

Adebayo (1992) sees Public Administration as a governmental administration that operates in the particular sphere of government as its machinery for implementing governmental policies. He believes that its study must therefore lead to the most efficient way of organizing the executive branch of the government, its functions and its procedures. From his assertion, we can deduce that Public Administration is basically concerned with the study of how a country's administration is organized as well as how it functions.

Akpan (1982) contends that Public Administration is the organ that carries out the programmes and manifestos of politicians in power. He sees Public Administration as the servant of politics. He went further to say that Public Administration covers every area and activity related to public policy. Accordingly it includes the formal processes and operations through which the legislature exercises its power. The functions of the courts in the administration of justice and the work of the military agencies all form part of the Public Administration.

According to Nicholas (1986), Public administration is the fusion of human and material resources in order to achieve the objectives of public policy. One cardinal issue here to which attention must be paid is the issue of policy implementation. This is a very focal point in the study of public administration. Public Administration can also be viewed as a body of knowledge which is directed towards the understanding of administration of the government business. Madubum (2006) opines that Public Administration is the study of the development and maintenance of policy by members of governments, public agencies and public sector employees and the practice of implementing the authoritative decisions they have made. Public Administration concerns itself more with how politicians in government and non-elected public sector employees devise policy, sustain the machinery of government and ensure policies are put into practice.

Nnoli (2003), describes Public Administration as follows:

> *Public Administration is the machinery as well as the integral process through which the government performs its functions. It is a network of human relationships and associated activities extending from the government to the lowest paid and powerless individual charged with keeping in daily touch with all resources, natural and human, and all the aspects of life of the society with which government is concerned* (pp.10).

It is a system of roles and role relationships which defines in a clear and practicable terms as possible and in as much detail as possible the intentions and programmes of government; the means available internally and externally to accomplish them; where, when and how they are to be accomplished; who is to benefit from them, and, finally, it is a system that causes these intentions and programmes to be realized in real life. It is a pattern of routinized activities, involving decision making, planning, advising, co-ordination, negotiation, conciliation, arbitration, command and data gathering, through which the government carries out its responsibilities.

4. THEORIES OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: A COLLECTION OF ESSAYS

Theories are analytical tools for understanding, explaining, and making predictions about a given subject matter. There are theories in many and varied fields of study, including the arts and sciences, public administration included. Having categorized theories into: classical, modern and postmodern, this part of the paper therefore analyses the three approaches.

4.1 Classical Theory

The classical approach is based upon the ideas similarly generated in the late 1800's and early 1900's and are primarily based upon the economic rationality of all employees. This evolved around the classical assumption of Adam smith, that people are motivated by economic incentives and that they will rationally consider opportunities that provide for them the greatest economic gain. The rational economic view is summarized as below, based on Schein (1970)'s position, as quoted by Smit, *et.al* (2007):

    i.   people are motivated by economic gains;

    ii. Because organizations control economic incentives, an individual is primarily a passive resource to be manipulated, controlled and motivated by the organization;

    iii. Irrational emotions must be kept from interfering with economic rationality;

    iv. Organizations can be designed in ways to control irrational emotions and thus unpredictable, dysfunctional behaviours of employees

There are three branches which feed on the same underlying principle of classical theory, these are: Scientific management, Administrative principles, and bureaucratic organization.

The first management theory is what is popularly referred to as Frederick Taylor's Scientific Management. Frederick Taylor started the era of modern management. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth century's, he was decrying the "awkward, inefficient, or ill-directed movements of men" as national loss. Taylor consistently sought to overthrow management "by rule of thumb" and replace it with actual timed observations leading to "the one best" practice (Self, 1976). He also advocated the systematic training of workers in "the one best practice" rather than

allowing them personal discretion in their tasks. He further believed that the workload would be evenly shared between the workers and management with management performing the science and instruction and the workers performing the labor, each group doing "the work for which it was best suited" (Smit, *et.al* 2007).

Taylor's strongest positive legacy was the concept of breaking a complex task down into a number of subtasks, and optimizing the performance of the subtasks; hence, his stop-watch measured time trials. However, many critics, both historical and contemporary, have pointed out that Taylor's theories tend to "dehumanize" the workers. Nevertheless, Taylor's postulations were strongly influenced by his social/historical period (1856-1917) during the Industrial Revolution; it was a period of autocratic management that saw Taylor turning to "science" (hence, his principles of scientific management) as a solution to the inefficiencies and injustices of the period (Matson, 2005). It has to be stated that scientific management met with significant success among which included: the science of cutting metal, coal shovel design that he produced at Bethlehem Steel Works (reducing the workers needed to shovel from 500 to 140), worker incentive schemes, a piece rate system for shop management, and organizational influences in the development of the fields of industrial engineering, personnel, and quality control.

It has to be acknowledged that from an economic standpoint, Taylorism was an extreme success. Application of his methods yielded significant improvements in productivity. For example, improvements such as his shovel work at Bethlehem Works, which reduced the workers needed to shovel from 500 to 140. Henceforth, Taylor proposed four great underlying principles of management (Tomori, 1985).

First, there is need to develop a 'science of work' to replace old rule-of-thumb methods: pay and other rewards linked to achievement of 'optimum goals' – measures of work performance and output; failure to achieve these would in contrast result in loss of earnings. Second, workers to be 'scientifically' selected and developed: training each to be 'first-class' at some specific task. Three, the 'science of work' should be brought together with scientifically selected and trained people to achieve the best results. Finally, work and responsibility to be divided equally between

workers and management cooperating together in close interdependence. Alongside Taylor's postulates is Gilbreth's motion study. The ultimate result of this study led to the centrality of efficiency in organizations (Davidson, 1971). Gilbreth was particularly interested in how he could reduce the unnecessary motions resulting from bricklaying at a construction site; he succeeded in reducing the motions from 18 to 4. He then proposed that each worker should be involved in doing his or her own work, prepare for the next higher level, and training their successors.

In this category of management theory are the works of Max Weber's bureaucratic theory and Henri Fayol's administrative theory. Weber postulated that western civilization was shifting from "wertrational" (or value oriented) thinking, affective action (action derived from emotions), and traditional action (action derived from past precedent) to "zweckational" (or technocratic) thinking. He believed that civilization was changing to seek technically optimal results at the expense of emotional or humanistic content (Zima, 2007).

Weber then developed a set of principles for an "ideal" bureaucracy as follows: fixed and official jurisdictional areas, a firmly ordered hierarchy of super and subordination, management based on written records, thorough and expert training, official activity taking priority over other activities and that management of a given organization follows stable, knowable rules (Hyneman, 1978). The bureaucracy was envisioned as a large machine for attaining its goals in the most efficient manner possible. However, Weber was cautious of bureaucracy when he observed that the more fully realized, the more bureaucracy "depersonalizes" itself – i.e., the more completely it succeeds in achieving the exclusion of love, hatred, and every purely personal, especially irrational and incalculable, feeling from execution of official tasks (Hyneman, 1978). Hence, Weber predicted a completely impersonal organization with little human level interaction between its members.

Henri Fayol's administrative theory mainly focuses on the personal duties of management at a much more granular level. In other words, his work is more directed at the management layer (Smit, *et.al* 2007). Fayol believed that management had five principle roles: to forecast and plan,

to organize, to command, to co-ordinate, and to control. Forecasting and planning was the act of anticipating the future and acting accordingly. Organization was the development of the institution's resources, both material and human. Commanding was keeping the institution's actions and processes running (Akindele, 1987). Co-ordination was the alignment and harmonization of the group's efforts. Finally, control meant that the above activities were performed in accordance with appropriate rules and procedures.

Fayol developed fourteen principles of administration to go along with management's five primary roles. These principles are: specialization/division of labor, authority with responsibility, discipline, unity of command, unity of direction, subordination of individual interest to the general interest, remuneration of staff, centralization, scalar chain/line of authority, order, equity, stability of tenure, initiative, and esprit de corps. Fayol clearly believed personal effort and team dynamics were part of an "ideal" organization. Fayol's five principle roles (Plan, Organize, Command, Co-ordinate, and Control) of management are still actively practised today. The concept of giving appropriate authority with responsibility is also widely commented on and is well practised. Unfortunately, his principles of "unity of command" and "unity of direction" are consistently violated in "matrix management", the structure of choice for many of today's companies (Thomas, 2007).

4.2   Modern Theory

The modern theory of public administration emphasizes more on behavioural and quantitative schools of thought. Modern management theory has changed the way public administrators look at their jobs (Denhardt, 2008). Advancements and refinements in management theory and practice have enabled managers and managerial systems to evolve.

The modern approach to public administration is oriented to results, focusing on clients, outputs and outcomes. The adoption of new form of public management means the emergence of a new paradigm in public sector. In the word of Katsamunska (2010) as enumerated:

> Modern public management focuses on management by
> objectives and performance management, the use of market

and market -type mechanisms in the place of centralized command and control style of regulation, competition and choice, and devotion with a better marching of authority, responsibility and accountability. In the United Kingdom during the Thatcher government there was concerted effort to implement the three e's of economy, efficiency and effectiveness at all levels of British government. The reform was mainly aimed at a massive privatization of public enterprise and cutting other parts of public sector, while the civil service moved from an administered to a managed bureaucracy (p.79).

Below is a brief explanation of modern approach to public administration.

i.   *System Approach or Model*

This is also called system analysis of organization and it was developed in the '50s to eliminate the deficiencies of the classical model by requiring that any organization should be viewed as a system and its actions performed. Ludwig von Bertalanffy, a biologist and one of its staunchest proponents wrote in the 1920's about the unification of science and scientific analysis (Manithaneyam, 1995). The system theory is however a unified whole having a number of inter dependent parts or sub system and it has identifiable boundaries that distinguish it from its surrounding environment in which it is embedded and with which it interacts. The system theory explains how public administration activities are coordinated within a system and sub system that interact.

The approach views administrative system (formal organization, informal organization, roles, and individuals) and examines the inter linkages among various parts. System theory also analyses the dynamic interaction between an administrative system and its external environment. It is noteworthy to reaffirm public administration to be the facilitation of positive outcome of these interactions and where possible, limit any unintended negative consequence.

The execution of public laws requires that the core elements of system theory which are: inputs, processes, output and feedback are harnessed in a manner that promotes functionality as the activities of the sub system affect the entire government. System theory focuses on the study of organization as cooperative or collaborative system. A social system is a unit or an entity

consisting of various social sub systems called group. These are the features of social system as enumerated below:

1. Social system are open system as they are in constant interaction with their environment
2. Boundaries of social organization are not easily identifiable. It has to be understood from their activities and functions in real life situations

The system analytical approach of organization was prominent in the writing of M.P. Follet, Chester Bernard, Herbert Simon and Philip Selznick.

ii.   *Structural-Functional Approach*

The entire units that constitute the sum of a system are structures and these structures function to ensure the delivery of services to the public. Structural functionalism or simply referred to as functionalism is the relations among government sub system such as intergovernmental relations with the goal of achieving desired goals through an institutional arrangement that perform certain functions in order to survive and operate efficiently. It tries to explain how structures operate in a society, the various part or institutions combine to give society continuity over time.

The idea of the stability of and social order that was central theme of Hobbes's political philosophy has influenced the thinking of many social thinkers with regards to the effective and efficient operation of government institution. Hobbes's view of absolute sovereignty for the purpose of regulating the selfish nature inherent in man is a manifestation of collaborative operation of government and the people to establish a stable society.

The conception of society as a system was derived from biological function of the body and the stability of the body is dependent on the proper functioning of all the organs. Social thinkers of functionalist school argue that the body that functions well is said to be in equilibrium and the same is alleged to be true of the society and that the society and their parts experience evolution just as organism do (Kingsbury and Scarzoni, 1993).

The Structural –functional approach was drawn from Sociology in which a structure, according to the approach, is a pattern of behaviour that has become a standard feature of a social system. The function in the approach denotes the impact of a structure on another structure and the interrelation among various structures. Radcliff Brown (cited in ibid.) argues that social thinkers such as Talcott Parson, Auguste Comte, and Montesquieu see societies as social systems and describe them via organism analogy and organism. Fred Riggs has successfully applied the ecological and structural-functional approach in his analysis of societies and their administrative system.

The ecological approach examines the interaction between an administrative system and its environment. Thus the impact of the political system, economic system, social system and the cultural system, the structure and behaviour of the administrative system as well as the influence of the administrative system on these environmental structures is highlighted by Riggs. The major features of Structural-functional theory have been highlighted here according to Manicas (1995), to include:

1. Structural-functional assumes that society is a system. What is the system comprised of: Candidates include: social structures (variously theorized), institutions, or roles (as on the usual reading of Parsons).
2. Since the elements are characterized functionally, we need to know what they do and how they relate to other parts of the system. This is established empirically.
3. We can ask if these functions are 'latent or manifest'. Merton (1948) defines manifest functions as 'those objective consequences contributing the adjustment or adaptation of the system which are intended and recognized by participants in the system. 'Latent functions are 'neither intended nor recognized'.
4. It is often assumed that there is some condition which defines the ends or goals of the system. E.g., Durkheim held that societies have 'a normal development. 'Parsons defines a 'stable or moving equilibrium' as the goal of the system. But it is hard to see how societies can have goal states? What, e.g., counts as a breakdown of the system? (Compare here 'dumb systems,' e.g, an automobile engine and 'smart systems,' e.g., a thermostatically controlled heating system or living organism). Similarly, while it may

be essential for continued reproduction of (say) capitalism that (say) surplus be realized, it may be that agents fail to do what is necessary to accomplish this. That is, there is nothing automatic about 'system' reproduction.

5. As regards social system, there is a problem of what counts as 'internal' to the system and what counts as 'external' to it. (As the term implies, for 'world system' theorists, no single society is an isolated system.)

6. A functionalist explains by showing that some element if functionally necessary for the system to be in its goal-state. The form of explanation is this :

System S is functioning appropriately.

S functions appropriately only if R (is doing what it is supposed to do).Hence R.

Furthermore, Manicas (1995) asserted that the above 'explanation' does not involve mention of (a) how R does what it does or (b) how R came to be in the system. Functional approach came up in reaction to defending intergovernmental model in the face of criticism that it generates structures that may obstruct the process of ensuring efficient and effective service delivery to the public. Pretoria deduced that functionalism explains reasons for the emergence of partnership and how such partnership fulfills organizational and societal needs. Although this partnership has been criticized for its negative effects on relative authority, autonomy, and independence sphere of actions by which Olowu and Wunch (2000, p.81) or as cited in Preoria, have called for institutional analysis to determine which relations requires such consistency and cohesion and how to structure relations amongst the various organization. Functionalism was identified to have failed in explaining power relation in the environment which tends to affect the role of organization as agent of shaping the society. It also fails to give explicit order of relations that underlie political relations and thereby failing to connect the institutional and societal needs.

iii.   *Contingency Approach*

According to Wikipedia (2014), "contingency theory is a class of behavioral theory that claims that there is no best way to organize a corporation, to lead a company or to make decisions. Instead the optimal course of action is contingent (dependent) upon the internal and external

situation." A contingent leader effectively applies their own style of leadership to the right situations. Some writers considered contingency theory as dominant, theoretical, rational, open system model at the structural level of analysis in organization theory and that the basic assumption of contingency approach is that the environment in which an organization operates determines the best way for it to organize (Betts, 2005).

Furthermore, the basis of contingency theory is that the best practices depend on the contingency of the situation. Contingency theorists try to identify and measure the condition under which things will likely occur. Contingency theory is relationship between two phenomena, if one phenomenon exists, then a connection can be drawn about another phenomenon (Schoech, 2006). Contingency theory is sometimes called the "it all depends" theory because the usual answer to a question pose to a contingency theorist is it all depends.

iv. *Behavioral School*

The key scholar under this category is Elton Mayo. The origin of behavioralism is the human relations movement that was a result of the Hawthorne Works Experiment carried out at the Western Electric Company, in the United States of America that started in the early 1920s (1927-32). Elton Mayo and his associates' experiments disproved Taylor's beliefs that science dictated that the highest productivity was found in 'the one best way' and that way could be obtained by controlled experiment (Hawking, 1996). The Hawthorne studies attempted to determine the effects of lighting on worker productivity. When these experiments showed no clear correlation between light level and productivity the experiments then started looking at other factors. These factors that were considered when Mayo was working with a group of women included rest breaks, no rest breaks, no free meals, more hours in the work-day/work-week or fewer hours in the workday/work-week (Halvorson, 2002).

With each of these changes, productivity went up. When the women were put back to their original hours and conditions, they set a productivity record. These experiments proved five things, as stated by (Denhardt, 2008). First, work satisfaction and hence performance is basically not economic – depends more on working conditions and attitudes - communications, positive management response and encouragement, working environment. Second, it rejected Taylorism

and its emphasis on employee self-interest and the claimed over-riding incentive of monetary rewards. Third, large-scale experiments involving over 20,000 employees showed highly positive responses to, for example, improvements in working environments (e.g., improved lighting, new welfare/rest facilities), and expressions of thanks and encouragement as opposed to coercion from managers and supervisors. Fourth, the influence of the peer group is very high – hence, the importance of informal groups within the workplace. Finally, it denounced 'rabble hypotheses' that society is a horde of unorganized individuals (acting) in a manner calculated to secure his or her self-preservation or self-interest.

These results showed that the group dynamics and social makeup of an organization were an extremely important force either for or against higher productivity. This outcome caused the call for greater participation for the workers, greater trust and openness in the working environment, and a greater attention to teams and groups in the work place (James, 2006). Finally, while Taylor's impacts were the establishment of the industrial engineering, quality control and personnel departments, the human relations movement's greatest impact came in what the organization's leadership and personnel department were doing. The seemingly new concepts of "group dynamics", "teamwork", and organizational "social systems", all stem from Mayo's work in the mid-1920s.

4.3   Postmodernism

Postmodern theory is a broad and somewhat ambiguous belief system tied to the philosophical and cultural reaction to the convictions of Modernism (sometimes equated with Humanism). Postmodernism is the philosophical proposal that reality is ultimately inaccessible by human investigation, that knowledge is a social construction, that truth-claims are political power plays, and that the meaning of words is to be determined by readers not authors (James, 2006). In brief, postmodern theory sees reality as what individuals or social groups make it to be.

Postmodernism is commonly spoken in recent time among intellectuals in arts and social sciences. It is a novel imagination and thought in social theory with no clear definition for the term. Post modernists are interested in psychedelic imagination of the world. The theory rejects

"foundationalism" and tends to be relativistic, irrational and nihilistic (Ritzer, 2012). Post modernism is a reflection of difference between modernism and post modernism over whether it is possible to find rational solution to society's problems. Post-modernists question some foundation such as the system that tend to privilege some groups and downgrade the importance of others, give some group power and render some groups powerless (Ritzer, ibid.).

The thinking in postmodernism involves the conscious development of the mind to see the society as a place for everyone irrespective of race, creed, and religion. The development of knowledge of tolerance, accommodation, comprehensive reasoning, humanism and other utilitarian principle act as the basis of postmodernism. According to Lyotard (cited in Ritzer, 2012, p. 630), postmodern knowledge is not simply a tool of authorities, it refines our sensitivity to differences and reinforces our ability to tolerate the incommensurable. Ritzer, (2012) further surmises that:

> Postmodernists reject the ideas of a grand narrative or a meta-narrative. It is in the rejection of these ideas that we encounter one of the most important post-modernists, Jean-Francois Lyotard. Lyotard (1984 : xxiii) begins by identifying modern (scientific) knowledge with the kind of single grand synthesis (or "meta-discourse") we have associated with the work of theorists such as Marx and Parsons. The kinds of grand narratives he associates with modern science include "the dialectics of spirit, the hermeneutics of meaning, the emancipation of the rational or working subject, or the creation of wealth" (p. 630)

According to Glossary definition (hhtp//www.pbs.or.faithan.com), "post modernism is highly skeptical of explanations which claim to be valid for all groups, cultures, traditions, or races and instead focuses on the relative truth of each person. It relies on concrete experience over abstract principles, knowing always that the outcome of one's own experience will necessarily be fallible and relative, rather than certain and universal". Post modernism denies the existence of any ultimate principles and tends to question all principles, in a skeptical manner and realize even that even its own principles are not beyond questioning. Postmodernism is interested in critical question that tries to reverse foundationalism.

To what extent can we readjust our social sensitivity towards societal change? Are we liberal or conservative in our social views? How do we determine moral conduct and policies that conforms to ethical principles? Post modernism is concerned with issues that divide the societies such as homosexuals, euthanasia, abortion, and many others in line with tolerable disposition to others. Post modernism has been introduced to other disciplines in a way to further evaluate existing theories and model in relation to contemporary age. For example in Public Administration, the classical and modern schools of managements have been subjected to further evaluation.

Postmodernism in Administration can be described as the New Public Administration which is traceable to the writing of Dwight Waldo (1948) and in political theory, the writing of Sheldon Wolin (1960), who has with others, examine salient issues that involved the realization of efficient and effective public agency through the application of the following models to public management. These management models include the theories of democratic citizenship; models of community and civil society: and organizational humanism and discourse theory (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2000). These approach "reveal the limitation of rational and public choice models, expose the internal contradiction of the NPM movement in public agencies, and seek ways to "enlarge the area of discretion …to increase individual freedom' and to create in open-problem solving climate through the organization" (Denhadt & Denhardt; Golemibiewski cited in Park, 2010, p. 2).

The New Public Service that is seen as postmodern approach to management where new techniques is being implemented with a new set of values, specifically value largely drawn from private sector (Denhard & Denhardt, 2000). The New Public Management rejects the measurement of inputs and seek the use of "performance measure" to evaluate programmers and management and that creative managers should be given the wildest flexibility to use the resources at their disposal to accomplishing programmatic missions and that their success will be measured by the performance in accomplishing goals rather than in their careful accounting for the resources used (Pfiffner, 2004 p. 8).

Postmodernism as a philosophical movement is largely a reaction against the philosophical assumptions and values of the modern period of Western (specifically European) history—i.e., the period from about the time of the scientific revolution of the 16th and 17th centuries to the mid-20th century. Against the backdrop of the postmodernism analysis above, postmodern theory has been the recent focal point in few disciplines in art and social sciences. An extant review of literature reveals: Postmodern Theology, Postmodern Philosophy, Postmodern Ethics, Postmodern Science, Postmodern Psychology, Postmodern Sociology, Postmodern Law, Postmodern Politics, Postmodern Economics, and Postmodern History. This paper will dwell on postmodern politics, economics, law and history due to their close proximity to public administration (Naidoo, 2004).

Indeed, many of the doctrines characteristically associated with postmodernism can fairly be described as the straightforward denial of general philosophical viewpoints that were taken for granted during the 18th-century Enlightenment, though they were not unique to that period. The most important of these viewpoints are the following:

4.3.1   Modernism vs. Postmodernism

1. There is an objective natural reality, a reality whose existence and properties are logically independent of human beings—of their minds, their societies, their social practices, or their investigative techniques. Postmodernists dismiss this idea as a kind of naive realism. Such reality as there is, according to postmodernists, is a conceptual construct, an artifact of scientific practice and language. This point also applies to the investigation of past events by historians and to the description of social institutions, structures, or practices by social scientists (Noordhoek & Saner, 2005).

2. The descriptive and explanatory statements of scientists and historians can, in principle, be objectively true or false (Sayre, 1979). The postmodern denial of this viewpoint—which follows from the rejection of an objective natural reality—is sometimes expressed by saying that there is no such thing as Truth.

3. Through the use of reason and logic, and with the more specialized tools provided by science and technology, human beings are likely to change themselves and their societies for the better. It is reasonable to expect that future societies will be more humane, more just, more enlightened, and more prosperous than they are now. Postmodernists deny this Enlightenment faith in science and technology as instruments of human progress. Indeed, many postmodernists hold that the misguided (or unguided) pursuit of scientific and technological knowledge led to the development of technologies for killing on a massive scale in World War II. Some go so far as to say that science and technology—and even reason and logic—are inherently destructive and oppressive, because they have been used by evil people, especially during the 20th century, to destroy and oppress others (Matson, 2005).

4. Reason and logic are universally valid—i.e., their laws are the same for, or apply equally to, any thinker and any domain of knowledge. For postmodernists, reason and logic too are merely conceptual constructs and are therefore valid only within the established intellectual traditions in which they are used (Thomas, 2007).

5. There is such a thing as human nature; it consists of faculties, aptitudes, or dispositions that are in some sense present in human beings at birth rather than learned or instilled through social forces. Postmodernists insist that all, or nearly all, aspects of human psychology, management and administration are completely socially determined (Stoker, 1988).

6. Language refers to and represents a reality outside itself. According to postmodernists, language is not such a "mirror of nature," as the American pragmatist philosopher Richard Rorty characterized the Enlightenment view. Inspired by the work of the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, postmodernists claim that language is semantically self-contained, or self-referential: the meaning of a word is not a static thing in the world or even an idea in the mind but rather a range of contrasts and differences with the meanings of other words. Because meanings are in this sense functions of other meanings—which themselves are functions of other meanings, and so on—they are never fully "present" to the speaker or hearer but are endlessly "deferred." Self-reference characterizes not only natural languages but also the more specialized "discourses" of particular communities or traditions; such discourses are embedded in social practices and reflect

the conceptual schemes and moral and intellectual values of the community or tradition in which they are used. The postmodern view of language and discourse is due largely to the French philosopher and literary theorist Jacques Derrida (1930–2004) which Noordhoek & Saner (2005) acknowledged as the originator and leading practitioner of deconstruction.

7. It is possible, at least in principle, to construct general theories that explain many aspects of the natural or social world within a given domain of knowledge—e.g., a general theory of human history, such as dialectical materialism. Furthermore, it should be a goal of scientific and historical research to construct such theories, even if they are never perfectly attainable in practice. Postmodernists dismiss this notion as a pipe dream and indeed as symptomatic of an unhealthy tendency within Enlightenment discourses to adopt "totalizing" systems of thought (as the French philosopher Emmanuel Lévinas called them) or grand "metanarratives" of human biological, historical, and social development (as the French philosopher Jean-François Lyotard claimed). These theories are pernicious not merely because they are false but because they effectively impose conformity on other perspectives or discourses, thereby oppressing, marginalizing, or silencing them. Derrida himself equated the theoretical tendency toward totality with totalitarianism (Dobuzinkis, 1997).

As indicated in the preceding paragraphs, many of the characteristic doctrines of postmodernism constitute or imply some form of metaphysical, epistemological, or ethical relativism. (It should be noted, however, that some postmodernists vehemently reject the relativist label.) Postmodernists deny that there are aspects of reality that are objective; that there are statements about reality that are objectively true or false; that it is possible to have knowledge of such statements (objective knowledge); that it is possible for human beings to know some things with certainty; and that there are objective, or absolute, moral values. Reality, knowledge, and value are constructed by discourses; hence they can vary with them (Sayre, 1966; Stein, 1970; & Sayre, 1979). This means that the discourse of modern science, when considered apart from the evidential standards internal to it, has no greater purchase on the truth than do alternative perspectives, including (for example) astrology and witchcraft. Postmodernists sometimes

characterize the evidential standards of science, including the use of reason and logic, as "Enlightenment rationality."

The broad relativism, as noted by Gladden (1961 & 1972), apparently so characteristic of postmodernism invites a certain line of thinking regarding the nature and function of discourses of different kinds. If postmodernists are correct that reality, knowledge, and value are relative to discourse, then the established discourses of the Enlightenment are no more necessary or justified than alternative discourses. But this raises the question of how they came to be established in the first place. If it is never possible to evaluate a discourse according to whether it leads to objective Truth, how did the established discourses become part of the prevailing worldview of the modern era? Why were these discourses adopted or developed, whereas others were not?

Part of the postmodern answer is that the prevailing discourses in any society reflect the interests and values, broadly speaking, of dominant or elite groups (Weber, 1972). Postmodernists disagree about the nature of this connection; whereas some apparently endorse the dictum of the German philosopher and economist Karl Marx that "the ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class," others are more circumspect. Inspired by the historical research of the French philosopher Michel Foucault, some postmodernists defend the comparatively nuanced view that what counts as knowledge in a given era is always influenced, in complex and subtle ways, by considerations of power (Santos, 1969). There are others, however, who are willing to go even further than Marx. The French philosopher and literary theorist Luce Irigaray, for example, has argued that the science of solid mechanics is better developed than the science of fluid mechanics because the male-dominated institution of physics associates solidity and fluidity with the male and female sex organs, respectively (Gerth & Wright, 1958).

Because the established discourses of the Enlightenment are more or less arbitrary and unjustified, they can be changed; and because they more or less reflect the interests and values of the powerful, they should be changed. Thus postmodernists regard their theoretical position as uniquely inclusive and democratic, because it allows them to recognize the unjust hegemony of Enlightenment discourses over the equally valid perspectives of nonelite groups (Waldo, 1992).

In the 1980s and '90s, academic advocates on behalf of various ethnic, cultural, racial, and religious groups embraced postmodern critiques of contemporary Western society, and postmodernism became the unofficial philosophy of the new movement of identity politics and governmental administration.

5. OTHER RELEVANT MANAGEMENT THEORIES TO PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

In this category are the works of Edward W. Deming and Douglas McGregor. Edward Deming is the founder of modern quality management and is regarded by the Japanese as the key influence in their postwar economic miracle. He postulated several assumptions: create constancy of purpose for continual improvement of products and service; adopt the new philosophy created in Japan; cease dependence on mass inspection; build quality along with price; improve constantly and forever every process planning, production, and service; institute modern methods of training on-the-job for including management; adopt and institute leadership aimed at helping people to do a better job; drive out fear, encourage effective two-way communication; break down barriers between departments and staff areas; eliminate exhortations for the workforce – they only create adversarial relationships; eliminate quotas and numerical targets; remove barriers to pride of workmanship, including annual appraisals and Management by Objectives; encourage education and self-improvement for everyone; and define top management's permanent commitment to ever improving quality and productivity and their obligation to implement all these principles (Dobuzinkis, 1997).

Douglas McGregor (1906-1964) postulated management ideas as contained in "Theory X" and "Theory Y". Using human behavior research, he noted that the way an organization runs depends on the beliefs of its managers. "Theory X" gives a negative view of human behavior and management that he considered to have dominated management theory from Fayol onwards – especially Taylorism. It also assumes that most people are basically immature, need direction and control, and are incapable of taking responsibility. They are viewed as lazy, dislike work and need a mixture of financial inducements and threat of loss of their job to make them work ('carrot and stick' mentality) (Hanekom, *et.al* 1987). "Theory Y", the opposite of "Theory X",

argues that people want to fulfill themselves by seeking self-respect, self-development, and self-fulfillment at work as in life in general. The six basic assumptions for 'Theory Y' are: work is as natural as play or rest – the average human being does not inherently dislike work, whether work is a source of pleasure or a punishment (to be avoided) depends on nature of the work and its management. Second, effort at work need not depend on threat of punishment – if committed to objectives then self direction and self-control rather than external controls. Third, commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement. Satisfaction of ego and self-actualization needs can be directed towards the objectives of the organization. Fourth, the average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility. Fifth, high degrees of imagination, ingenuity and creativity are not restricted to a narrow group but are widely distributed in the population. Lastly, under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentials of the average human being are being only partly utilized (Tomori, 1985).

There is, however, one theory or approach, the quantitative approach that is hardly used and known by managers. It emerges from operations research and management science. Theories under this category exhibit a mathematical and statistical solution to problems using optimization models, and computer simulations. It is most effective management decision-making rather than managerial behavior. The management theories that have been discussed, important as they are, have to be translated in practice by managers.

6. CONTRIBUTION OF THESE THEORIES TO PUBLIC ADMINSTRATION

Keep in mind that all these theories are relevant even today and that's why they are being discussed and even taught today all around the world. Some concepts are taken from all theories and implemented as per the situation in organisations and governmental organisations. All of them have contributed majorly to how to deal with employees in an organisation in different situations. All theories were responses to each other and the questions and issues that kept cropping up in organisations from time to time, for which answers had to be delivered (Waldo, 1994). Scientific management and classical theorists, Max Weber as well as Mary Parker Follett helped in developing a formal structure of organisation and streamlined each and every task as

well as principles of management thus developing the theory of management and taking to a subject of study. Then, the Human relations and Behaviourists approach gave life to that formal structure and mechanical jobs by studying the human being working in it and running the organisation and the problems he faced and how managers are to deal with them and solve them in the best possible way (Albrow, 1970). And last but not the least, all these participative management theories contribute to the concept of motivation and human behaviour and aspirations that need to kept in mind while boosting their morale to work better and to the ideas of decentralisation, innovation and development of professional managers.

So, one can see all the above theories are mixed and mashed to the right mix in order to suit the organisational situation as well as the government organisations it is in. Chronological trends in theories have brought about a period of stress as well as development in the field of Public Administration both as an art (way of conducting and actually doing the activities of Public Administration by administrators) and as a science(academics, field of study for students and scholars).

These are the effects or contribution of theories in the field of public administration:

1) **Public - Private Partnership**: Though the differences in public and private administration one must not forget that if they both team up viz. their respective strengths it can lead to the best of both worlds. Public administration brings in its expertise on social issues and policies and private administration brings in its specialisation on management and how to improve efficiency to achieve the pre-set goals by the public policy.

2) **Public Administration in Policy making**: Public administration as we all know very well can never be separated from policy formulation but nowadays it is becoming all the more dominant and is easily seen (Stein, 1970). Civil services can give shape to stated policies through exercise of choice and judgment in administering them and secondly they are engaged in policy formulation through their suggestive, analytical and interpretative roles.

3) Movement towards political economy: Recently economists have developed new methods of analysing the cost and benefits of government programmes and administrators are choosing more and more economics as a base of public administration than political science.

4) New emerging goals of Public Administration: Efficiency (read. Technical Efficiency) and effectiveness are the ultimate goals of Public Administration.

5) Staff and line units are complementary, not antagonistic. Line agencies are the field work agencies and staff units are the technically specialised co-ordination and facilitating agencies between upper management from where decisions come and the line agencies who implement them first hand.

6) Human Relations approach in Public Administration: Its main orientation is towards change in attitudes, values and structures of organisations.

7) People's participation decision making: minority groups and poor as well are now getting their share (UNDP, 1997).

8) Decentralisation: Local and community development administration and constitutional status.

9) Emerging changes in bureaucratic pattern and behaviour: Its emphasis upon formal structure, hierarchy and efficiency. It is most important in a democratic form of government for development of the welfare of the people. It is centrally involved in change and transformation of society (Gerth & Wright, 1958). Recently there has been a growth and spread of new management techniques in public administration. It is concerned with human goals now like: life, liberty and pursuit of happiness. The new public administration is concerned about social equity, sensitivity to human suffering and social needs.

7.   CONCLUDING REMARKS

Theoretical frameworks for Public Administration are thematically exploratory in view of the approach to the study and understanding of Public sector management. It started with the Classical or Traditional approaches that deal with the formal dimension of organization. The Modern approaches try to give importance to human dimension by emphasizing holistic approach to analyzing the organization from both sides. Modern approaches consider both human and systematic sides of organization as important and emphasize the positive side existing in each of the theories and avoid the negative sides by giving them distinct and uniting condition. Post modernism is an extreme view about management evaluating organization as closed system, and sees the organization as interacting with its environment and claimed that each organization has a situation endemic to that organization, that is, there may be difference in organizational structure.

The analysis and review in this paper appears concise in its discourse, though it encompasses all the relevant tenets of theories most often used in public administration. Theory is an important instrument because it provides an explanatory framework for some observations and from the assumptions of the explanation follows a number of possible hypotheses that can be tested in order to provide support for, or challenge the theory. Importing from the foregoing to public administration, series of metamorphosis in public administration are handiwork of the classical, modern and postmodern theories. This paper espouses that more concerted efforts should be geared towards theorizing old, contemporary and new terms in the field of public administration so as gain an in-depth understanding of the causes and consequences of any given subject matter in the field, as well as building new field of enquiries, and helps clarifying and directing inquiry into policy making, governance, ethics among other primary subject matters of public administration.

REFERENCES

Adamolekun, L. (ed.), (1985). *Nigerian Public Administration 1960-1980 Perspectives and Prospects*. Ibadan: Heineman Educational Books, Ltd.

Adebayo, A. (2000). *Principles and Practice of Public Administration in Nigeria,* 2nd Edition Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.

Agagu, A. A. (1997). "Public Administration" in D. Kolawole (ed.), *Readings in Political Science*. Ibadan: Dekaal P. 233.

Akindele, S. T., Obiyan, A. S. & Owoeye, J. (2000). *The Subject-Matter of Political* Science, 2nd Edition. Ibadan: College Press Limited.

Akindele, S. T., Olaopa, O. R. & Obiyan, S. A. (2002). The Theory of Public Administration and Its Relevance to Nigerian Administrative Ecology. *Journal of Social Sciences, Vol. 4. No. 6.* Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile - Ife.

Akindele, S. T. (1995). "The Issue of Macro-Paradigmatic Influence in Comparative Political Analysis: A Critical Assessment" in S.T. Akindele and C.O. Ajila (eds.), *Contemporary Issues in the Social Sciences,* Ile-Ife: Transcradle Media Ltd Chapter Five Pp. 47-62.

_____ (1994). Public Administration: A critical Revisitational Analysis of the Paradigm of Politics-Administration Dichotomy and its Challenge. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, xxxviii (4): 295-312.

_____ (1987). Synthesising Bureaucracy and Democracy: A Revisit. *The Quarterly Journal of Administration.* XXI (1-2): 37-56.

Akpan, N. U. (1982), Public Administration in Nigeria. Lagos: Longman Nigeria Ltd.

Albrow, M. (1970). *Bureaucracy*. London: Pall Mall Press Ltd.

Bagby, L. M. J. & Franke, J. L. (2001). Escape from Politics: Philosophic Foundations of Public Administration. *Management Decision,* 39(8).

Bartholomew, P. C. (1972). *Public Administration*. Littlefield: Adams & Co.

Betts, S. C. (2005). Contigency Theory: Science or Technology. *Journal of Business and Economic Research, Vol. 1, No. 8.* Retrieved on 22.10.14 from http//www.wpunj.edu/theory.

Blau, P. and Meyer, S. (1971). *Bureaucracy in Modern Society.* New York: Random House.

Celik, M. & Dogan, G. (2011). A Theoretical Approach to Science of Management. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, *Vol. 1, No. 3*. Retrieved on 22.10.14 from http//www.pasta.adiyan..fr

Cloete, J. J. N. (1981). *Introduction to Public Administration*. Pretoria: JL Van Schaik Publishers.

Corson, J. J. and Harris, J. P. (1963). *Public Administration in Modern Society*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Davidson, R. P. (1971). *A Primer in Theory Construction*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Davies, W. J. Jr. (1974). "Introduction to Public Administration" in R.J. Stillman (ed.), *Public Administration: Concepts and Cases.* Houghton: Miffling Company.

Denhardt, R. B. & Denhardt, J. V. (2000). *The New Public Service: Serving rather than Steering.* Arizona: Arizona State University Press.

Denhardt, R. B. (2008). *Theories of Public Organization,* 5th Edition. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Dobuzinskis, L. (1997). Historical and Epistemological Trends in Public Administration. *Journal of Management History,* 3(4).

Ezeani, E. O. (2006). *Fundamentals of Public Administration*. Enugu: Snaap Press Limited.

Gaus, J. M. (1950). Trends in the Theory of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, 10.

Gerth, H. H. & Wright M. C. (1958). *From Max Webber: Essays in Sociology.* New York: A Galaxy Book.

Gladden, E. N. (1961). *An Introduction to Public Administration*. London: Staples Press.

_____ (1972). *A History of Public Administration*. London: Cass Publishers.

Gulick, L. & Urwick, L. (ed.), (1937). *Papers on the Science of Administration*. Fairfield: Augustus M Kelley Publishers.

Halvorson, H. (2012). What Scientific Theories Could Not Be. *Philosophy of Science* (The University of Chicago Press) 79 (2): 183–206. doi:10.1086/664745.

Hanekom, S. X., Rowland, R. W. & Bain, E. G. (1987). *Key Aspects of Public Administration*. Revised Edition. Halfway House: Southern Book Publishers (Pty) Ltd.

Hanekom, S. X. & Thornhill, C. (1983). *Public Administration in Contemporary Society: A South African Perspective.* Johannesburg: Macmillan South Africa (Publishers) (Pty) Ltd.

Hawking, S. (1996). *A Brief History of Time: Updated and Expanded*. New York: Bantam Books.

Hyneman, C. (1978). *Bureaucracy in a Democracy.* U.S.A: University Microfilm International.

James, P. (2006). *Globalism, Nationalism, Tribalism: Bringing Theory Back in*. London: Sage Publications.

Katsamunska, P. (2012). *Classical and modern approaches to public administration*. Retrieved on 25/10/14 from http//www.economicalternatives/edu/platform/org

Kingsbury, N. & Scarzoni, J. (1993). *Structural-Functionalism*. New York: Plenum Press.

Kolawole, D. (ed.), (1997). *Readings in Political Science.* Ibadan: Dekaal Publishers.

Lane, F. S. (ed.), (1978). *Current Issues in Public Administration*. New York: Saint Martins Press.

Madaubm, C. (2008). *The Mechanics of Public Administration in Nigeria*. Lagos: Concept Publications Ltd.

Manithaneyam, S. (2003). *Theory of Administration*. Retrieved on 19/10/14 from jaywin.com/pubresearch/index/scf

Matson, R. A. (2005). *Comparing Scientific Laws and Theories*. Kennesaw: Kennesaw State University.

Marx, F. M. (1960). "Aspect of Bureaucracy in Hodgetts" in J. E. and D. C. Corbett (eds.), *Canadian Public Administration*. Toronto: The Macmillan Co. Ltd.

Moe, T. M. (1994). Integrating Politics and Organization: Positive Theory and Public Administration. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, Vol 3, No. 1.* Retrieved on 22/10/14 from www.jstor.org/stable/1181838

Murphy, T. P. (1981). *Contemporary Public Administration.* Itasca: F E Peacock Publishers.

Naidoo, G. (2004). *Leadership and Governance for a Sustainable Public Service. The Case for Selected South African Public Service Organizations.* Unpublished Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Ph.D. (Public Affairs) at the University of Pretoria.

Nicholas, H. L. (1986). *Public Administration and Public Affairs,* 3rd Edition. New Jersey: Prentice – Hall

Nnoli, O. (2003). *Introduction to Politics, Revised Second Edition*. Enugu: Pan African Center for Research and Conflict Resolution (PACREP)

Noordhoek, P. and Saner, R. (2005). Beyond New Public Management: Answering the Claims of both Politics and Society. *Public Organization Review: A Global Journal,* Volume 5.

Nwachukwu, C. C. (1988). *Management: Theory and practice*. Onitsha: Africana – FEP Publishers Limited, Book House.

Park, S. M. (2010). *Of Alternating Waves of Shifting Shores: The Configuration of Reform Values in U.S. Federal Bureaucracy*. Retrieved on 17.10.14 from http//www.pubadmin.skku/index:html

Pfiffner, J. P. (2004). *Traditional Public Administration versus The New Public Management: Accountability versus Efficiency*. Berlin: George Mason University Press.

Pfiffer, J. M. and Presthus, R. (1967). *Public Administration*. New York: Ronald Press.

Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The New Governance: Governing without Government. *Policy Studies,* XLIV, pp. 653–667.

Santos, C. R. (1969). Public Administration as Politics. *Canadian Public Administration*, XII (2).

Sayre, W. S. (1966). "Premises of Public administration: Past and Emerging" in M. E. O. Donnel (ed.), *Readings in Public Administration.* Boston: Houghton Miffling Co.

_____ (1979). "The triumph of Techniques over purpose" in F. J. Thompson (ed.). *Classics of Public Personnel Policy*. Oak Park, Illinois: Moore Publishing Company Inc.

Schoech, I. (2006). *Contingency Theory*. Alabama: UTA Press.

Self, P. (1976). *Administrative Theories and Politics: An Enquiry into the Structure and Processes of Modern Government.* London: Allen and Unwin.

Smit, P. J., Cronjé, G. J., Brevis, T. & Vrba, M. J. (2007). *Management Principles: A Contemporary Edition for Africa,* 4th Edition. Cape Town: Juta & Co. Ltd.

Stein, H. (1952). *Public Administration and Policy Development: A Case Book.* New York: Harcourt Brace Javenovie.

_____ (1970). "Public Administration as Politics" in L.C. Gawthrop (ed.), *The Administrative Process and Democratic Theory*. New York: Houghton Miffling Company.

Stillman, R. J. (ed.), (1980). *Public Administration: Cases and Concepts*, 2nd Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Stoker, G. (1998). Governance as Theory: Five Propositions. *International Social Sciences Journal,* 155.

Suppe, F. (1998). Understanding Scientific Theories: An Assessment of Developments, 1969 - 1998. *Philosophy of Science* (The University of Chicago Press) 67: S102–S115. doi:10.1086/392812.

Thomas, G. (2007) *Education and Theory: Strangers in Paradigms*. United Kingdom: Open University Press.

Thonhill, C. & Dijk, G. V. (2010). Public Administration Theory: Justification for Conceptualization. *Journal of Public Administration*, *Vol.45, No. 11*, University of Pretoria.

Tomori, S. (1985). "Public Administration and Economic System" in L. Adamolekun (ed.), *Nigerian Public Administration, 1960-1980; Perspectives and Prospects*. Ibadan: Heineman Educational Books Nig. Ltd.

United Nations Development Programme (1997). Governance for Sustainable Human Development Policy Paper. Available from: http://magnet.undp.org/policy/chapter1.htm#b.

Waldo, D. (1980). "The study of public Administration" in R. J. Stillman (ed.), *Public Administration: Cases and Concepts*, 2nd Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

_____ (1992). "A Theory of Public Administration means in our Time a Theory of Politics also" in N. B. Lynn & A. Wildavsky (eds.), *Public Administration*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

_____ (1994). *Contemporary Public Administration.* New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Watson, D. J. & Montjoy, R. S. (1991). Research in Local Government. *Public Administration Review*, 51 (2).

Weber, A. (1972). "Bureaucracy and Freedom" in D. A. Wrong and H. L. Gracey (eds.), *Readings in Introductory Sociology.* New York: Macmillan Company.

Wikipedia (2014). Retrieved on 23.10.14 from http//www.wikipedia.org/theories

Zima, P. V. (2007). 'What is Theory? Cultural Theory as Discourse and Dialogue', London: Continuum (Translated from: Was ist Theorie? Theoriebegriff und Dialogische Theorie in der Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften. Tübingen: A. Franke Verlag, 2004).